I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel:

Which is not another; but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.

But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.

As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed.

For do I now persuade men, or God? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.

But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was preached of me is not after man.

Galatians I: 6-11

Guard that which is committed unto thee
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Enemies of God’s word would be glad to see this question made prominent in all newspapers, magazines and periodicals, because of what they think it implies. Why not put it: “Can an Honest Sensible Man Reject the Bible”? Such is my query now, and I submit this article with the hope of strengthening the faith of those who read it. For twenty centuries the enemies of the Bible have filed every objection possible—nothing new has been presented for generations—and yet, the Bible proves itself amenable to all attacks. Many a hammer has been beaten to frazzles on the anvil of God’s truth.

To determine the authenticity of any writing certain standards have been accepted:

1. The writings of a contemporary considered credible.
2. The writings of those who obtained information from eye-witnesses.
3. Writings based upon corroborative traditions of hostile nations.
4. The testimony of independent writers when matters are mentioned incidentally.

An objection has been raised to the effect that during the time Jesus is supposed to have lived practically nothing is said about him in the secular press or by the historian. The fact that but little is said is perfectly natural and altogether human.

At that time the world was engaged in military affairs and only heroes and heroines on the field of battle received publicity. Worldly glory and deeds of valor occupied the pages of publications. The weapons used by Christ and his disciples were not carnal. He had no great armies, clad in brilliant uniforms, to unfurl his banner. There was no great political power or men of wealth to shout his praise. He lived in a despised town and belonged to the common people. Why waste ink and space in telling about the carpenter’s son?

But there were a few references made by some of his enemies and, while not intended, these but confirm what the Bible says.

Among the Jews, Josephus is the outstanding historian. He was born only four years after Jesus was put to death. He was seven years old when James was beheaded and he lived until the end of the first century. At the age of nineteen years, he took his stand with the Pharisees, the leading denomination of his clay. As a historian he could have said but little about Jesus and his teaching without uprooting his own sect. He tells of the war between Herod the Tetrarch and his father-in-law, Aretas, and of the intrigue between Herod and Heroclias. Herod was defeated in the war and Josephus says: “But some of the Jews were of the opinion that God had suffered Herod’s whole army to be destroyed as a just punishment on him for the death of John, called the Baptist.” He also says: “Herod had killed John who was a just man, and had called upon the Jews to be baptized and practice virtue.”

The details of the above mentioned war are not given in the Bible but Matthew! Mark and Luke tell of John the Baptist’s rebuking Herod for taking his brother’s wife. Thus between the historian of opposite faith and the writers of the New Testament there is perfect harmony.

Caius Cornelius Tactitus was a heathen writer of the first century. He rose in the realm of Rome to become consul in the year 97. His reliability and superior style are recognized by the fact that some of his texts are used in many of our colleges to this day. He hated the Christians of his time because they would not worship his idol gods. But in writing the story of affairs, the following is a summary of what he says regarding Christ and his disciples:

1. Christ was the founder of a sect of Christians.
2. Christ was put to death as a criminal.
3. He was executed by Pontius Pilate.
4. Tiberius was Emperor of Rome—Hence.
5. Jesus was born in the reign of Augustus.
6. This “pernicious superstition” was checked—for a time by the death of its founder.
7. This “pernicious superstition” broke out again and spread not only over Judea but reached the city of Rome.
8. Christians were persecuted in Rome as early as 64.
9. Vast numbers were discovered and condemned because they were accused of burning the city and because of their hatred for mankind.
10. They were hated as the outcoursings of the earth and the filth of all things.
11. They were destroyed to gratify the cruelty of one man.

Pliny, the younger, was another great Roman writer and was made Proconsul of Bithynia from 106 to 108. Upon entering this district to assume the office he “found a great persecution being waged by the Government. He continued it for a while and finally wrote a letter to the Emperor Trajan at Rome to know what to do about the matter.

From the letter he wrote the following facts were stated:

1. Many Christians of every age and rank and of both sexes were then in Bithynia.
2. Their teaching and influence were such that heathen temples were almost deserted and the victims for sacrifices could hardly find a purchaser.
3. None who were really Christians could, by any means, be compelled to make supplication to the image of Caesar, or the statue of the gods.
4. After the most searching inquiry, including torture to force confessions, he had found no vice among them.
5. They suffered for the name of being Christians without any charge of crime.
6. They were accustomed, on stated days, to hold two meetings; one, for singing “in concert” hymns to Christ, and for making vows to live righteously; and the other, for eating a “harmless meal.”
7. Those who were Roman citizens were sent to Rome for trial.

This testimony comes from writers who lived in the first century of the Christian Era. They were all enemies of our Lord but they wrote as historians an accurate account of things then going on. Scholars and infidels have never questioned the authenticity of their statements about secular affairs. I must insist that but for prejudice and downright hatred of Christianity they would be forced to accept the Bible, seeing its statements are so perfectly corroborated by those who lived (Continued on page 7)
Editorial

MUST HERESY BE FELLOWSHIP?

Periodically the brotherhood is treated to the lamentations of R. H. Boll, in Word and Work, against being "put out" of the fellowship of the brethren because of his heresies. In the October issue of his pamphlet he again bewails that the church has become a sect, a denomination, a religious party; excluding Christians, such as himself and others with him who hold and propagate his "admittedly peculiar" beliefs. He declares that those of us who oppose his "prophetic teaching" are "An Anti-Millennial Sect", under which title he would justify himself for upholding the doctrines that he condemns us for opposing. He alone is undenominational, non-sectarian, nonpartisan, and un creed-bound, holding "membership" in "the church universal" and simply "of the church to which all God's children belong". The whole tone and tenor of the article represents an apology for error and a plea for the toleration of "every wind of doctrine" that may blow over the church. He argues that if a man "believes and obeys the gospel and teaches men so" he should not be disfellowshipped for any other teaching in which he may indulge no matter how far beyond that gospel he may go or to what extent his peculiar teaching may be pressed. And right with his apparent meekness he injects the very tone of sarcasm into his references to those whom he denominates as the "us" and the "we" who oppose him and who he says "are no longer of the church to which all God's children belong".

The Church Universal

If conclusions from one's reasoning are ever in order then the inevitable conclusion from Brother Boll's line of talk is that he must fellowship all who "have obeyed the gospel" and "are of the church to which all God's children belong". Now, on this basis we want to know how the Word and Work editor will disfellowship some of "God's children" of the Christian Church with their many innovations and deviations-the digressives. What right does he have to "put them out" seeing they "obeyed the gospel" and were (or at least were) "of the church to which all of God's children belong"-that church universal. Does the Word and Work "draw the line" on them?

The October issue of Word and Work announced "An important article on 'instrumental music' by Brother R. H. Boll" to appear in their November issue. How "important" is Instrumental Music? Is it important enough for these brethren to break fellowship with some who have "obeyed the gospel" and are of the "church universal"? If Word and Work's "Brother R. H. Boll" sticks to his dictum in that article he will not be able to say anything very important on the subject.

It would be interesting indeed to read an article in Word and Work telling us who should be disfellowshipped and why. His "all God's children" rule will not allow him to "draw the line" on anything taught or practiced by anybody who is one of God's children and belongs to "the church universal".

A Different Doctrine

Compare Word and Work's rule with some of Paul's instructions along the line. Paul admonished Timothy to "charge certain men not to teach a different doctrine" and said "if any man teacheth a different doctrine, and consenteth not to sound words . . . he is puffed up, knowing nothing, but doting about questionings and disputes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, wrangelings of men corrupted in mind and bereft of truth". What shall we do about those men who against these charges persist in teaching these "different doctrines"? Brother Boll's "all God's children" rule says they must be disfellowshipped. But Paul's rule says: "A factious man after the first and second admonition refuse; knowing that such a one is perverted, and sinneth, being self-condemned". Will Word and Work's "Brother R. H. Boll" tell us in that important article how to refuse such a man?

Again, Paul commands: "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". Now will "Brother R. H. Boll" tell us who, according to his little rule, should be marked and from whom should we ever turn away? Will he mark the users of Instrumental Music? Will he turn away from them? Will he "put them out" of that church "to which all God's children belong"? We will see just how important that coming article will be, and incidentally, how consistent it is with Word and Work's "all God's children" rule.

Shifting the Blame

The whim of Word and Work's editor that those who oppose his "prophetic teaching" are "An Anti-Millennial Sect" and the cause of the division is the weakest of all the weak things that he has penned. Is "Brother R. H. Boll" anti anything? If so, then he is an Anti-Some-Sort-Of-A-Sect. Is he against Instrumental Music enough to disfellowship its users? Then he is an Anti-Instrumental Music Sect, disfellowshipping some of "God's children" who hold "membership" in "the church universal", and thus he belongs to a "religious party" which does not include all Christians and which excludes some of "God's children". We are just feeding Word and Work's "Brother R. H. Boll" out of his own spoon with the hope that he may lose his taste for the spoon.

Shifting the blame for division has been the common effort of all innovationists schismatics, and dividers of churches, since the church began. The innovators never cause division, 0, no! it is always the opposition! In the July Word and Work its editor has the unvarnished audacity to say that he "has never divided a church in his life"! So said Chas. M. Neal in the Winchester debate. So say the digressives. But take a look at Louisville and Winchester! Then read the statement of E. L. Jorgenson in which he boasted that there are thirty-two congregations in and around Louisville identified with the Word and Work party. Is that not a tacit admission of the division they are promoting?

Of course, unopposed, no error or ism from sprinkling to speculation would ever cause division. The cause of the division, however, is the teaching; opposition is the effect; division the result. Acquiescence to error is not the price
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nor the basis of Christian unity.

Will Word and Work's "Brother R. H. Boll" tell us who caused the division over Instrumental Music and Societies, in that "important" article he is about to write? Was it those who teach and practice such or was it those who oppose these innovations? This effort of Word and Work's editor to shift the blame is stale with age. He borrowed it from the digressives. He ought to send it home. We know that the stigma and reproach of the division he has caused by his heresies must be weighing heavily upon him. His writings show it; but the ignoble attempt he is making to shift the blame and shield his guilt is not the way out of it.

The Prophetic Creed

Sometime ago Word and Work entered a demurrer that "in order to fellowship this sectarian body" (referring to us) he must subscribe to certain negative views on prophecy, and wrote out our negative creed. That is, what we do not believe is the creed he objects to. Then the opposite of that, or what he does believe is the creed he subscribes to! I do not say why not! It's a poor rule that works only one way. So if all that Word and Work says on creeds be true it only proves that he has one. Like the boy whose playmate called him a bad name, when we accuse Brother Boll of "speculating" he just says "You're another one!"

Because we oppose his prophetic doctrines he charges that we have a creed that preachers must "sign up" in order to be orthodox. Now the Word and Work's "Brother R. H. Boll" besides being too meek and sweet-spirited to talk that way is in reality the last man who ought to say anything about anybody having a creed. Let us take another look at the Premillennial Creed.

1. The kingdom of Dan. 2 : 44-the kingdom of God--has not yet come into existence.
2. This kingdom, though announced by John and Jesus as at hand, "has never yet appeared." (R. H. Boll.) It was postponed because national Israel rejected Jesus.
3. In consequence of his rejection by the Jews, Jesus pigeonholed the divine plan, introduced the "church age"—meaning the present dispensation—and went back to heaven to stay until the Jews get into a notion of letting him set up a kingdom on their territory.
4. While he is waiting for the Jews to decide what they will do about it, (the kingdom promise having defaulted) Jesus is sitting in an attitude of expectancy at God's right hand, not being King in either "act or fact"—only expecting to be King when the Jews allow him.
5. During this period of waiting, politics must play its part. According to Daniel, the kingdom of God must be established "in the days of these kings"—the Roman kings. But Rome is gone-ended in 476 A.D. Hence, old pagan Rome is to come back into existence to play her part in the fulfillment of Dan. 2 : 44.
6. As a prior and contingent event, however, the Jews must be nationally restored to Palestine, and converted to Christ, so he can return as a real King "in act and fact," instead of being a mere figurehead, sitting by his Father in heaven, holding his hands!
7. It calls for another reconstruction of the temple of Solomon, the complete national restoration of Israel, and the entire reinstallation of the Jewish system.
8. With national Israel restored, and the Solomonic temple rebuilt, the next thing in order is the reoccupation of David's literal throne in Jerusalem. The Lord, leaving the throne of his majesty on high, descends upon Jerusalem and sits down upon an old dilapidated Davidic Jewish throne—to be a king on earth
9. The resurrected and living saints will meet the Lord in the air, accompanying him "somewhere" in the heavens "for a time" to attend to "certain affairs," designated by Russell and Rutherford "the rapture," but by Boll and Neal "the first stage" of the second coming.
10. An interval between the "first stage" and the real second coming (believed by most millenniologists to be several years) of great tribulation on the earth, escaped by those righteous, who will be "somewhere" with Christ, who afterwards descends again with the saints to vanquish the wicked nations and start the millennium.
11. That is the beginning of the thousand years' reign of Christ—the real millennium—the literal thousand years' reign of Christ on the earth. It is all liable to happen overnight, for the second coming of Christ is imminent-impending. The event of his momentary appearance thus requires a series of miraculous interventions that completely upset the gospel order of things. It would necessitate a spontaneous regeneration of the Jewish nation that makes the theory of direct operation of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of sinners a mere side issue; a phenomenal transportation of Israel to Palestine that would make the crossing of the Red Sea look like stepping over a puddle; and a rebuilding of the old temple in less time than it took to grow Jonah's gourd.
12. After the thousand years, Satan again musters his forces for a great battle of short duration (Armageddon) in the Valley of Esdraelon, to be defeated and cast down for the last time, and Christ, victorious, takes the saints to heaven.

Page the Proof

Now; does the Boll theory actually embrace such a system of "prophetic views"? It does. The documentary evidence is available.

If Brethren Neal and Boll, or any of their apologizers deny these things, we have as evidence their own books and writings.

Brother Boll admitted in Word and Work the following points of my itemization:
1. The "reign of Christ with his saints on the earth for a thousand years, following this dispensation and the return of Christ."
2. A literal resurrection of the righteous, "separated from the resurrection of the rest of the dead by a thousand years."
3. The conversion and restoration of Israel to their "own land."
4. Another kingdom of Christ, "more than the church," yet future, which Christ will establish on the earth at his coming.
5. Prophecies concerning the kingdom, taken at "face value," are yet unfulfilled.
6. The apocalyptic vision of Rev. 20 is literal, not figurative, and its "plain import" teaches a literal, earthly millennium.

Having thus far represented Brother Boll correctly, by his own admissions, let us now cite the proof for the other items.

From Boll's own "booklet on 'The Kingdom'" the following is sifted:
1. On page 34, last paragraph, he says that the kingdom announced by John and Jesus "has never yet appeared."
2. On page 35, first paragraph, he says "the kingdom promise was national" and "the preparatory repentance must also be national"; and since the Jews did not nationally repent, the kingdom promise was not fulfilled.
3. On pages 37 and 38 he says that in consequence of the kingdom postponement, Jesus introduced a new and unexpected phase of his teaching—the parables; and also a new and unexpected aspect of the kingdom—"the church age."
4. On page 61 he says that Christ is not King “in fact and act;” but his throne is now “de jure et potentia”-by right and authority only; but when Christ returns, his throne will be “de facto et actu”—in fact and act.

5. On page 81 he uses the famous “vestibule illustration” and says that the church is only the vestibule of the kingdom.

6. On page 71 he says that “so long as Satan’s throne is on the earth, Christ is not exercising the government.”

7. On page 18 he argues that old pagan Rome must come back into existence in order to fulfill the prophecy of Dan. 2: 44, which said the kingdom of God would be established “in the days of those kings,” the Roman kings.

8. Then in his treatise on “The Second Coming” (now out of print), on page 21, he said: “The first stage of the second coming is when the Lord comes down to receive his saints up. Then after certain affairs have been attended to, he comes with them, and the whole world sees his coming.” This is what Russell called “the rapture,” but Brother Boll names it the “first stage” of the second coming, and “a time” for Christ and the saints to attend to “certain affairs” in the heavens somewhere.

9. Finally, on page 55 of “Light in a Dark Place,” Charles M. Neal orders the reallocation of the land of Canaan to the Jews in the millennium, and locates the site in Jerusalem for the rebuilding of Solomon’s temple, when Jerusalem, “Israel’s capital city,” becomes “the capital city and religious center of the world.”

Some time ago E. L. Jorgenson said that while there was “a semblance of truth” in things I have urged he yet accused me of deliberate misrepresentation and classed me with the wicked Jews “who told lies on Paul”. We met this challenge of veracity by producing the evidence from R. H. Boll’s own books to support every item we had charged, challenge of veracity by producing the evidence from R. H. Boll’s own books to support every item we had charged, misquoted and lied. Up until this time he has not done so. It is his plain duty to do it. It was his challenge of our honesty. We met it by furnishing the evidence in question. There is only one course of procedure left for Brother Jorgenson—disprove our evidence or withdraw his accusations.

Charging the Consequences

It has been repeatedly shown that the consequences of this ponderous premillennial program is destructive of the gospel and vitiating to the entire Christian system.

1. The postponement of the kingdom theory makes God false to his promise. Jesus and John preached: “The kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe the gospel.” Multitudes repented in good faith, but did not get the kingdom—the Jews postponed it.

2. The theory makes the church a mere accident, the result of a prophetic default, for the “church age” was introduced in lieu of a kingdom that did not arrive.

3. The theory of the future reign virtually denies that Christ is reigning now. It puts the “reign of the Son of God” at the end of this dispensation— the millennium.

4. It nullifies the Great Commission in that it denies that Christ is exercising “all authority in heaven and in earth.” It denies that he is King in “act or fact” now, thus stripping him of his kingly power and rule.

5. It antagonizes every passage of Scripture that speaks of this dispensation as “the last days.” If there is another dispensation of time to follow this, differing from the present dispensation, then the present dispensation is not the last days. But the Bible says it is.

6. It brings Christ down from the throne of his majesty and puts him on the earth, his footstool—an ignoble demotion.

7. It denies that Christ is on David’s throne in heaven now; therefore, bars the Gentiles from the blessings of the gospel. James said in Acts 15 that the prophecy of Amos regarding the rebuilding of the tabernacle or throne of David had been fulfilled, that the Gentiles might seek after God. This was his argument to justify the work that Paul and Barnabas had done at Antioch among the Gentiles. If the Christ is not now seated on David’s throne in the heavens, the work of Paul among the Gentiles was premature and the argument of James a fallacy; and, worse still, we, being Gentiles, cannot seek after God today. Believe it or not, this consequence exists. A simple parsing of the sentence in Acts 15: 17, containing the above adverbial clause of purpose, is sufficient to anybody who knows grammar. The conclusion cannot be escaped, and it alone condemns the future throne of David theory.

8. The theory alternates type and antitype-Judaism and Christianity. It revives in the millennium ceremonies and ordinances of the law which Jesus nailed to the cross and buried in his tomb. What a loathsome work!

9. It is the same mistake the Jews made when they expected a king like Caesar, and in their disappointment rejected Christ, our King. The present effort to dethrone him is but little short of the Jews’ rejection of him.

10. The system is rank materialism. It teaches that saints now living will in the millennium occupy “positions” of authority in which they will exercise temporal power under Christ, and thus “judge the world.” It is a complete let down. It is a flaw back to “the weak and beggarly elements.” It is not conducive in any of its phases to true spirituality.

Pressing the Issue

In the Gospel Advocate sometime ago, on the matter of charging consequences of a doctrine, G. C. Brewer correctly stated that the one against whom the consequences were charged could take an option on one of three things. 1. Avow the consequences and try to defend them. 2. Deny the consequences and try to prove that they do not exist. 3. Or, just let them alone, in which case we should “press them (the consequences) for all they are worth”. Now, that is right. Since we are all agreed on charging the consequences, it is now up to Brother Boll or anybody who wants to help him, to either avow these consequences and defend them, or attempt to prove that they do not exist. If he or they will do either we are ready to meet them on that ground of battle. If they will do neither then we should all, including Brother Brewer, “press the issue for all it is worth”. That is exactly what some of us are doing.

It is just this sectarian doctrine that R. H. Boll is demanding the churches to fellowship in order to avoid becoming a sect! By his persistent pressing of these rank theories he has forfeited his right to the confidence and respect of a charitably inclined brotherhood, has theorized himself out of their fellowship, and has made of his party a little human sect among others of like sort. He has no one to blame but himself. But for his own stubborn declaration of independence he could now be enjoying the fellowship of the churches of Christ everywhere and be doing untold good. As it is, he has chosen to ostracize from their fellowship himself and his party. In one of his “doctrinal manifestoes,” in the very term of defiance, he said: “If any of us must be rejected from fellowship on these grounds, I can see no other chance. They will just have to put us out.” Thus by their own dictum would they put themselves out.

So, rather than abandon their pet theories, R. H. Boll and his party are going out from us—because in heart and faith they are not of us. It is the emergence of a sect.

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.
A thousand years-And the conversion and restoration of Israel to their land, is to deny the plain teaching of the Word of God.

Foy E. Wallace, Jr., recently denied these two clearly revealed and outstanding truths in public debate with J. Frank Norris.

Foy’s brethren seem less than enthusiastic at his efforts. His own brother Cled speaks as follows:

“The Fort Worth brethren exercise peculiar taste sometimes. They selected Foy Wallace Jr., to meet J. Frank Norris in debate. They passed me by again. They do not know me as well they ought to. I believe I could have whipped Frank’s ears down so he would not wiggle them so much after the show was over. But I am not holding that against Foy. He did the best he could. I have forgiven him too. There is nothing like a forgiving spirit. The brethren ought to exercise it oftener.”

Quoted from Firm Foundation June 4th, page 3 by J. Frank Norris in FUNDAMENTALIST June 7th, 1935.

On the back of the leaflet, Brother Brewer notes the following:

Dear Brother Cled: Have you seen this? Evidently Neal is distributing them. A brother in Texas gave me this. No he was not a Dallas man. It came from Neal at Winchester, Kentucky.

See what you get for taking a crack at me, Smarty!

Yes, I “see” and am not in the least surprised. The use that both Norris and Neal are making of my language is in keeping with their character and their methods. I am no more alarmed than I am surprised for I'm sure that the brethren ought to exercise it oftener. The brethren ought to exercise it oftener.

But I am not holding that against Foy. He did the best he could. I have forgiven him too. There is nothing like a forgiving spirit. The brethren ought to exercise it oftener.

CONCERNING THE POLICY OF THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN

The following letter from W. W. Otey is especially timely and significant.

“When I first learned that you were going to bring out a magazine I thought it was a mistake to do so. It is so hard to make religious publications pay expenses, and I did not see the real need of another paper. But through your courtesy I have received the first issue, and I am most thoroughly convinced that a publication of the character and scope of your publication is greatly needed. You and those associated with you seem to see clearly the present trend in some matters among both congregations and preachers, and also you discern the port into which some will finally drop anchor, unless a vigorous effort is made to check this trend. Had the Romeward trend of the first apostasy, which was in full swing forty years ago, been clearly seen by a sufficient number of men, and proper efforts had been made, it is probable that one-half of the church could have been saved from that apostasy instead of about one fourth. But enough men of unaltering faith threw their whole souls into one of the greatest spiritual battles since apostolic days, and saved a respectable number of the church.

For years when innovators were called upon to defend their teaching and practice they treated the demand with contempt. J. B. Briney, the outstanding advocate of innovations, and when on the right side of a question undoubtedly second to no man since Campbell till his day, was compelled to attempt a defense. The debate between Briney and the writer was held in Louisville in September, 1908, and published. Briney’s example led others to meet preachers of the church of Christ in debate. And from these debates came a turning point in the battle. Truth has triumphed over error, and the Christian Church has rapidly lost prestige. Today, many who enjoy the association of large congregations, and where preachers have good positions and liberal pay, are crying out against debates, the very thing that made their present situation possible.

Yater Tant aptly says that the present restating of the fundamental truths and checking of present trends, rests largely with younger men. And I am glad that there are a host of young men in whom we can repose trust to carry forward this great work.”
ASSOCIATE EDITORIALS

DENOMINATIONALISM

Denominationalism, the outstanding religious crime of today. Denominations, jointly or separately, do not constitute the church of Christ. Universal acceptance of the New Testament would destroy all of them.

CLED E. WALLACE

TOWARD THE close of his personal ministry Jesus said: Upon this rock I will build my church. (Matt. 16:18) He did so and years after its establishment Paul referred to it and its divine mission as being “according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.” ( Eph. 3:10-11) It is not an accident, an afterthought nor a substitute but is identified with the kingdom of Old Testament prophecy. It was “at hand” in the days of John the Baptist and during Christ’s ministry on earth and had an established existence when Paul was preaching the gospel. It is the “kingdom which cannot be moved” which took the place of shaken and fallen Judaism. Beyond any doubt we have a new kingdom, a new law and a new priesthood. It is a sickly hope that pines for an earthly kingdom and a revival of Judaism in view of what the kingdom of God is and the blessings it confers upon its citizens and the promises it holds out before them. We have our inheritance in heaven.

Faith Versus Flesh

In view of his purpose to build the church, or establish the kingdom, Jesus said: “And there shall be one fold, and one shepherd.” (John 10:16) But Judaism had to go first. So Paul said that Christ broke down “the middle wall of partition” between Jews and Gentiles by abolishing the Jewish law, that he might establish the church which is called the “one new man.” In this church, which is also called “one body”, Jews and Gentiles without distinction are reconciled to God. ( Eph. 2:11-16) This church of Christ is the new kingdom of Israel where faith counts for everything and blood counts for nothing. “Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.” (Gal. 3:7)

It is both strange and false, this idea that is freely advocated, that a man can be a true child of Abraham by faith, reckoned with the true Israel of God, an heir of God and a joint-heir with Christ, and not even be a member of the church at all. Paul makes it clear that Christ established the church “that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross.” A man who contends that salvation is outside the church has the choice of an undesirable classification. He is either ignorant of New Testament teaching on the subject, or in rebellion against it. All Christians we read about in the New Testament were members of the church because they were Christians. They became members of the church at the same time and in the same way they became Christians. It follows quite naturally, then, that they were all members of the same body. “For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ. For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.” (I Cor. 12:12-13)

Christians Versus Sectarians

Since the New Testament was written, differences have come up over matters not in the New Testament. An Ashdodish language has sprung up to describe conflicting parties and their principles, and so we have denominations and human creeds. Believing and doing what the New Testament teaches never did and never will make a man anything but a Christian. It takes something else to make a sectarian. These weeds of sectarianism did not grow up from the planting of the word of God. They came of another sowing. And we might do well to remember that Jesus said: “Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.” (Matt. 15:13)

Denominationalism, which is partyism in religion, is the outstanding religious crime of today. Its condemnation is established by the testimony of its own advocates. Each one of them will inform you that you can be saved and go to heaven without being a member of his particular denomination. They do not jointly, or separately, constitute the body of Christ, for the body of Christ consisted of all Christians before there was any such a thing as a denomination in existence. The sure way to go to heaven is to get into the body of Christ by obeying the gospel, stay in there by living as the New Testament directs, and stay out of the partisan affairs which everybody admits you do not have to belong to in order to be saved.

The Church Versus Choice

“Out, but one church is just as good as another,” we are told so often it starts a yawn. How such a piece of pious inanity ever enjoyed the currency it has is beyond me! If I believed it, which I really think nobody does, my advice to inquirers would be brief. I’d tell them to flip a coin and choose according to heads or tails. It would be so much simpler than proving all things and holding fast to that which is good. My idea of a hard job would be to have less respect for popular religion than it has for the plain teaching of the New Testament.

It was popular for awhile to thank God for so many churches so that the whims of the individual could be satisfied in choosing what suited him. Each partisan brotherhood was supposed to emphasize some “truth” and the individual made his choice according to the “truth” he wanted emphasized. The whims of human weakness were exalted above the duty of obeying God. If a man were found who wanted to emphasize all the truth, he would have to join all the denominations or find himself cut off from some of the truth by a partisan fence. And this contradictory situation would not allow him to join even two. Who ever heard of a man being a member of two religious denominations at the same time? The whole thing was and is a farce, a travesty, to be ridiculed. A man who belongs to the body of Christ, the church of the New Testament has all the truth that anybody else has, and all the truth that others do not have. The apostles’ doctrine, which is the creed of the true church, includes the entire will of God, and the membership of this church is not cut off from intimate fellowship with any of the people of God by sectarian adherence to partisan principles. Party lines will vanish and party organizations will dissolve when everybody stands firmly on the New Testament.
It is the only perfect bond of union. Popular religion with its disgraceful divisions is rapidly settling down to a sort of truce where fundamental and irreconcilable differences are politely ignored and smooth tongues cry “peace, peace, when there is no peace.” It is not the unity that Jesus prayed for and the body of Christ represents.

Many communities have been treated to so-called union revivals where denominations united to make “Christians” and divided again to make sectarians out of these same “Christians.” What advantage is there in being a sectarian? Whoever makes a sectarian out of a Christian has done a dirty trick on him. But whoever makes a Christian out of a sectarian has done a divine piece of work.

The thing that makes a Christian is not Methodist doctrine, or Baptist doctrine or Presbyterian doctrine or any other partisan doctrine. The gospel does this work most effectively. It was preached by the apostles before modern denominationalism ever existed. It is no compliment to “our denominations” to recognize the fact that a universal acceptance of the New Testament would destroy every one of them.

SERIAL SWIPES

A BROTHER writes me that he has been confined to his bed for over a year but that he laughed till he cried over something I wrote in the paper. Not so bad. Making a sick man laugh may do as much good as making a well man pray. A hearty laugh occasionally has a cleansing effect on the disposition. The gospel is not a synonym of killjoy. The blubbing piety that some preachers and writers constantly display gets tiresome to normal people. It should be kept away from sick people altogether. Christianity is not a neurosis.

CELEBRITIES have their “fan mail.” You should read some of my crank mail. A wild one seems anxious to sacrifice oceans of ink and reams of foolscap exposing the ignorance and sin of baptizing penitent believers “into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.” I answered him on a postcard. What he rails against is exactly what Jesus authorized. (Matt. 28:19) Uncle Sam will probably charge six cents to carry his reply to what Jesus commanded. “Though thou shouldst bray a fool in a mortar with a pestle along with bruised grain, yet will not his foolishness depart from him.” (Prov. 27:22) You will probably have no better success with a hobby rider.
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GERALD L. K. SMITH “organizer of Long ‘Share-Our-Wealth’ Societies” is a Baptist minister. So also is his inveterate political enemy Senator Theodore G. Bilbo. These Baptist preachers have been passing some hot compliments in reverse. Brother Bilbo says that Brother Smith “is a contemptible, dirty, vicious, pusillanimous, damnable self-made liar.” Bilbo thinks Smith is not fit for politics and advises him “to take his Bible and get back into the pulpit where he belongs.” The Senator’s idea of Smith’s qualifications for preaching Baptist doctrine are at least interesting. These Baptist preachers have been saved, of course, and can’t fall from grace according to their own admission and it is Baptist doctrine. We wonder how they will get along in heaven. It would take a good-sized Mediation Board composed of angels to do anything with them down here.

HAS M. NEAL was super-anxious to lend aid and comfort to J. Frank Norris over the drubbing he received in the Fort Worth debate. Brother Neal wrote Dr. Norris that Brother Wallace must have made a poor showing in the debate. Well, the Neal-Wallace debate is in print. The Neal-Boll party are not pushing the sale of the book. We are the ones who want the brethren to read it. We all know who made a poor showing in that debate. Brother Neal declined to make his closing speech at Chattanooga for reasons quite obvious to the audience. It was not a physical breakdown. The debate permanently cured Brother Neal of mailing out cards over the country challenging the brethren to meet him at Wall Street. Dr. Norris is smarter than Brother Neal is. He managed to get out the Norris-Wallace debate with only his own speeches in it. He shows up better without an opponent. Brother Neal would have made a better showing in the Neal-Wallace debate if Wallace’s speeches had been left out. Norris backed out of the proposed debate in Dallas. In the generosity of his soul he was unwilling for Wallace to make “a poor showing” like he did in Fort Worth. There is no logical reason for ordering the Norris-Wallace debate unless you want to make a financial contribution to Dr. Norris. You might as well subscribe for the Word and Work, The Fundamentalist or order Brother Neal’s book “Light in a Dark Place.” Some misguided brethren who are wasting sympathy on these wild theorists in the name of “fairness” should wake up, rub their eyes and look at a few facts in the case. A few pious remarks about peace, prayer, or love will not meet the issues raised by the speculators. Sterner measures are demanded and some of us know how to apply them. The heat of debate has as much divine approval as a prayer meeting when the situation demands it.

Can A Sensible Man Believe the Bible-(Continued)

with the Apostles and early disciples and knew whereof they spoke. Were the whole New Testament blotted out, the world could get a pretty fine idea of its teaching and influence upon the hearts and lives of men from these and other historians who, though enemies of the cross of Christ, in giving the story of their day, confirm the words by inspiration given.

The period covered by New Testament history was characterized by frequent and complicated changes in the political affairs of Judea and of the countries around it. None of these is accurately described in the New Testament and yet it contains many allusions to each in an incidental way. Josephus gives a detailed account of all. This fact affords a most excellent opportunity to test the accuracy of sacred writers. Agreement can be accounted for on no ground except perfect information on both sides. The New Testament reader who has no other source of information is left in great confusion. In the history of Matthew and Luke we read of “Herod the King.” In Mat. 2, we find that Herod the King dies, yet in chapter 14, Herod appears again and is called “the King” and “the tetrarch.” In Acts 12, Herod the King beheads James. In these statements not a word of explanation appears. In Mat. 2, Archelaus is king of Judea, and in Mat. 27, Pilate is governor of the same region. In Acts 12, Herod is king of Judea, and in Acts 23, Felix is his governor. No explanation is made, and yet by consulting Josephus, all is in harmony with the facts of history. The Herod under whom Jesus was born died and was succeeded by his son Herod as ruler of a part of his father’s dominion with the title of both king and tetrarch. The Herod who beheaded James was a grandson of the first, and was made king by Claudius Caesar. Herod the tetrarch was deposed by the Romans and procurators were sent to rule in his stead.

After these, the government of Palestine was again changed and Herod who beheaded James was made king over all the land. Upon his death three years later, governors were again appointed, of whom Felix was one. Thus it appears that the Bible is absolutely accurate in all these matters pertaining to political changes so frequently made.
Dear Brother Gardner,

Thirty six years ago you were a young man teaching in the Old Nashville Bible School, a school of sacred memory, whose spirit and policies died with its founders. At that time I was a green country boy in the school attending your classes. Since we left the old school our paths have crossed a few times, and our meetings have always been a pleasure and an inspiration to me. We have also passed a few letters, and thus our friendship has been kept alive. Therefore more than a third of a century has passed since you used to ask me: "How many more times will I have to tell you?"

But the paramount question with me today is, can we know the teaching and spirit of the New Testament? If so, what is it?

Judging from some things you say in the August Truthseeker our ideas are antipodes as far apart as the poles on these important questions. Since your ideas on these matters have been published to the world, I am writing this open letter. The purpose of the Truthseeker seems to be to change, mould, and control the manner and spirit of preaching and writing, not only of all the present day students of Bible colleges, but "all who have attended a Christian college". I agree with you that there is a great need of a change in the most of our preaching and writing, but our ideas are quite different as to what the change should be.

In speaking of the Truthseeker you say: "We want it to be such that you would deplore it, however, if it were so good (?) as to be "good for nothing." When we preach or write to please "non-members of the church and those who may differ religiously. We would deplore it, however, if it were so good (?) as to be "good for nothing." When we preach or write to please "non-members of the church and those who may differ religiously."

Both our preaching and writing become "noise" than "nothing", so far as the cause for which Jesus Christ and his apostles lived, fought and died is concerned. If you had said: "We want it to be such" that it will be pleasing to God, then I would be with you heart and hand; but I demur when it comes to pleasing men in our religious activities.

The different religious denominations of today are the fruit of a perverted gospel. "I marvel that ye are so quickly removed from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel: which is not another gospel: only there are 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. ... For am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God? or am I striving to please men? if I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ" (Gal. 1:6-10). Brother Gardner, do you believe Paul's kind of preaching would please gospel perverters today?

Methodists and Presbyterians teach and practice infant baptism. They also teach and practice sprinkling for baptism. The Baptists teach there is nothing in baptism; but if you want to get into a Baptist church you have to be baptized by an ordained Baptist preacher. Now, Brother Gardner, I wish you would write an article in the Truthseeker showing that those who teach such doctrines are perverters of the gospel, and do it in such a spirit that you would not be ashamed to hand them the paper. My idea is that your idea is not to mention such things in the Truthseeker, am I right?

Again you say: "I can speak for myself: my claim is to be a member of all the church of Christ. There is no sectarian member of any part of it. Therefore I could not 'draw the line' on any brother, for we are members one of another, and must have the same care one for another so that there may be no schism in the church. (1 Cor. 12:25). Brother Gardner, you surely must have been feeling good when you wrote the above. Using an algebraic term, when we get so good that we "cannot" do what the Lord says do, then our goodness equals nothing in religion. Paul says: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the divi- sions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned: and turn away from them" (Rom. 16:17). And you could not 'draw the line' on any brother? I can. And I do not claim to be any part of the faction that has been "marked."

Again, Paul says: "For there must be also factions among you that they that are approved may be made manifest among you" (1 Cor. 11:19). Therefore if you are a member of all the church of Christ there is: you must be a member of all the factions and parties in the church. I am a member of the church of Christ; but riot a member of any faction or party in the church. To be this, I teach and practice in the work and worship of the church only those things required in the New Testament. Therefore the most conscientious can work and worship with me without violating either his conscience or the Word of God. I have no sympathy for any faction in the church, and no respect for those who teach the things that cause factions and parties in the church. For example, I have no sympathy for, nor fellowship with, those who have introduced organs, fiddles, horns and orchestras into the worship of God, and all kinds of societies into the work of the church, and thereby make it impossible for the conscientious to worship and work with them. I consider them a faction in the church, and their teaching and practice the cause of the faction. Therefore I have "marked" and turned away from them, and I am sorry you cannot "draw the line" on them.

Your teaching and "claim" would justify our highly recommended Korean missionary in receiving support from the digressives, and in walking out of the very building where the Lord was worshiped according to his appointments, to worship with the digressives, on the Lord's Day. It would also justify him in going as a delegate to the "world convention of the Christian Church" at Leicester, England. Of course, Brother S. K. Dong would say: "My claim is to be a member of all the church of Christ there is, no sectarian member of any part of it. Therefore I could not 'draw the line' on any brother, for we are members one of another, and must have the same care one for another so that there may be no schism in the church. (1 Cor. 12:25). Brother Gardner, was the above commitment just an impulse of yours or is it really the policy of the Truthseeker? If that is the spirit and policy of your paper, it certainly needs to seek the truth, and anything I can do to help you find the truth will be a pleasure to me.

I want to ask you a few questions about your commendation of the "EL
CAMINO." In orrer that the readers
of the Gospel Guardian may un-
derstand the questions I may ask you I
am copying below the dipping from
the August Truthseeker.

"El Camino is the name of the Span-
ish paper that brethren Schug and
Treat are publishing to circulate
amongst the Mexicans. The name
means, "The Way." We give below
some policies of the publishers that are
wholesome and will likely be encour-
gaging to the readers of Truthseeker.

"I. We should not take the debating,
controversial, contentious attitude. We
should lead our friends, our fellowmen,
our associates gently, without violence
nor controversy to the Way of the
humble Savior. The Jews living in
the time of Christ were controversial-
ists and enjoyed compassing land and
sea to make one proselyte. (Matt. 23:
15), but they did not build up (edify)
sinners in the faith of the Lord. That
is only another way of saying that we
must take a greater, more extensive
view and comprehension of the king-
dom of God. Sometimes, for example,
our American brethren get way out of
the road (Camino over themes such as
premillenarianism) or 'how many
cups should be used at the Lord's
table,' or a controversy is staged with
a Baptist or Methodist about the name
of the church in such spirit that neither
side gets the Lord's will nor follows
God's will ; on the contrary each tries
by sarcasm, deception or anger to show
the other that his own proposition is
correct. This results sometimes in a
lamentable sectarianism even in the so-
called 'church of Christ.'

"II. All that is written should be
written in love. Perhaps some of the
things we have written above need not
to have been written. We all have
the ideal of following the steps of our
Master and not a one of us would will-
ingly do anything that could possibly
harm the cause of Christ, not even for
great riches. We are only writing
these ideas in order to form some prin-
ciples and ideals which should always
exist, and which should and must be
the guiding principles and policy of
EL CAMINO (THE WAY), and all
other Spanish religious papers that we
shall strive to maintain, Got! helping
us, in order that never may occur in
them that which has occurred too often
in other religious papers to the scandal
and confusion of many Christians.
We pray that such ideals may ever
move the hearts and pens of those who
come after us |
Your brothers and servants in Christ,
H. L. Schug, J. W. Treat.

"These policies and the spirit mani-
ifested in them are commendable. If
all papers, preachers and Christians
for the last 100 years had applied
these principles in their writings, ser-
mons and conduct toward one another
and toward the world, the church
would have grown faster, would
be understood better and loved more,
more peace and unity would prevail,
the services of the church would be
enjoyed more, and brighter hopes and
increased joy would inspire greater
zeal to spread the Gospel and do good
works. In short, the Gospel should be
preached in love without modification
or speculation as nearly as is humanly
possible.

A !! Christians rejoice that these
brethren are publishing a paper to cir-
culate amongst the Mexicans. If their
policies are maintained I should like
for it to be printed in English for our
benefit.-R. N. G."

You have the right to commend any
spirit, or principle, that you think prop-
er, either in the pulpit or in religious
journalism. But I consider your criti-
cism of "all papers, preachers and
Christians for the last 100 years" very
untimely, and unfortunate, if not un-
christian. IF SUCH POLICIES OF
PREACHING, AND RELIGIOUS JOURNALISM, AS
ENUN-
ciated by brethren Schug and Treat,
and commended by you, had been fol-
lowed for the last hundred years these
would be no church of Christ on earth
today.

What do brethren Schug and Treat
mean by "We must take a greater,
more extensive view and comprehen-
sion of the kingdom of God"? Do
they want to extend the "kingdom of
Earth" to such an extent as to compre-
hend all religious denominations? Or,
do they just want to include premil-
enarianism? Of course, you know
what they meant or you would not have
commended their policies.

What do brethren Schug and Treat
mean by "a lamentable sectarianism
even in the so-called 'church of
Christ'? Do you think it is the spirit
of Christ to speak of His spiritual body
as 'the so-called! church of Christ'? Is
that what you call 'preaching the
Gospel in love without modification
or speculation'? Don't editors Schug
and Treat know the difference be-	ween the hobby of a few brethren about
'what the Holy Spirit, through Peter,
charted' upon the pages of sacred
writ faith, repentance and bap-
tism in the name of Jesus Christ unto
the remission of sins. Do you believe
it is the spirit of Christ to fellowship
preachers who have quit preaching
the Gospel, or to style me intolerant,
dictatorial, rentless, merciless, exterminat-
ing-against everything not expressly or by
necessary implication authorized in the
New Testament. Such is my unwaver-
ing convictions: and my only regret is
that I cannot fight this fight as it should
be fought. In conclusion, let me add
that if any brother who reads this sees
fit to style me intolerant, dictatorial,
or self-consequent, I say to him that I
claim to be nothing more than one
plain disciple of Christ, and exercise a
prerogative which belongs to us all. It
is my duty to find fault with everybody,
and everything that is wrong, and it is
equally the duty of every other brother.
In the full and free performance of
this task lies the only safety for the
truth. Error alone can suffer in such
warfare, and she alone is afraid of it" (Mille-
nennial Harbinger 1868, page 219).

I commend the above to the Truth-
seeker and also to the El Camino. I
believe it is the only spirit, and prin-
iple, that will save the church of Christ
today from being engulfed in the
whirlpool of denominationalism.
THE AXE IS LAID AT THE ROOT OF THE TREE

Judging The Tree By Its Fruits The Boll Movement Should Be Hewn Down.

E. G. CREACY

\[ OHN the Baptist said: And even now the axe is laid at the root of the tree: every tree therefore that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire. \]

The following excerpts will attest the evil of this movement which is launched among the churches by a group of brethren at Louisville, Ky. Immediately after the Norris-Wallace debate at Fort Worth, Texas, Mr. Norris had this to say in his paper:

Next week’s paper will carry the account of the love feast by the great audience at the close of the debate, participated in heartily by Baptists, members of the Church of Christ, and all. There was an old fashioned hand shaking and everybody was on the mountain top. As an evidence of the fine spirit, one of the best known ministers of the Church of Christ, Rev. Frank M. Mullins, pastor of the Mount Auburn Church of Christ, Dallas, will preach at the First Baptist Church, on the Premillennial Coming of Christ.

One of the daily papers at Dallas, Texas, carried the following announcement for this Frank M. Mullins:

MOUNT AUBURN—At 712 Parkview at Lindsay ; Frank M. Mullins, minister; Bible school at 9:45 a.m., W. M. Hunt, superintendent. Service 7:30 p.m. “Premillennialism: What It Is, and Why Any Church True to the Restoration Movement Must Be Premillennial.”

For a church to be true to the Restoration Movement—to be a New Testament Church—-it must be “Premillennial”!! And yet, Boll and his brethren declare that their doctrine is not “a ground of division,” and should not be made a test of fellowship! Who is making a test?

At Dallas, the Lord (?) and John R. Rice (Baptist) have a paper, “the Sword of the Lord and of John R. Rice!” In this paper, Mr. Rice published:

Red-Hot Radio Service

“Church of Christ” friends will want to hear Rev. Frank M. Mullins, Pastor of the Mount Auburn Church of Christ Sunday night over KTAT, Fort Worth. * * * Bro. Mullins will answer some of the mistakes and false teachings on the second coming of Christ by Rev. Foy E. Wallace in the Norris-Wallace Debate and Dallas “Church of Christ” ministers in recent addresses. Be sure and tune in and hear this scholarly, meet-spirited (italics mine, E. G. C.), brilliant preacher on the second coming of Christ. You will hear more from this man, for God has laid His hand upon Him.

Mr. Norris, in a letter to his “Beloved John” R. Rice, said:

I am indeed highly gratified over what you reported concerning the discussion of Premillennialism among our friends, “the Church of Christ.” I understand the addresses in my pulpit and over the radio by Rev. Frank M. Mullins, pastor of the Mount Auburn “Church of Christ,” Dallas, has caused no small stir among them.

As further evidence of the “blight of Bollism,” we reproduce the following announcement from Mr. Norris’ paper:

Another Premillennial Minister of The “Church of Christ” Fills First Baptist Pulpit

Rev. Earl C. Smith, pastor South Side Church of Christ, Abilene, Texas, speaks three times Sunday * * *. Inasmuch as the Premillennial Coming of Christ was the main issue in the Norris-Wallace Debate it is exceedingly timely for various ministers of the “Church of Christ” to come and represent the great body of Premillennialists among their people from time to time.

We had the Rev. Frank M. Mullins of the Mount Auburn Church of Christ, Dallas, to speak for us, and then we had the great pleasure of having Dr. Eugene V. Wood speak several times over the radio, and also his son, Edward V. Wood. And now we are happy that this brilliant and courageous minister from Abilene will deliver triple blows * * *.

Don Carlos Janes, self-appointed Missionary Agent, and one of the outstanding leaders of the Boll group, has advertised Norris’ one-sided “Norris-Wallace Debate” book, and encouraged Christians to read it. Norris advocates Baptist theology, affirmed the impossibility of apostasy and denied the truth on the design of baptism. The R. H. Boll constituency endorses it, by advertising and recommending his one-sided book.

In the very recent past, Charles M. Neal, of Winchester, Kentucky, through Norris’ paper, praises him “highly” for his “great” work, and in an article for said paper, declared that “baptism is an outward sign of an inward grace,” which is the “age-long and time-honored position of the Baptists,” as Mr. Norris boasted. How far will the Boll Movement go?

The following letter was written to Mr. Norris and published in his paper:

Dear Dr. Norris:

I was at the debate * * * I want to take this privilege to express to you my appreciation for the fine Christian way you conducted this discussion. I am a Christian Minister in the Church of Christ, but I teach the Premillennial Coming of Christ. Also preach Salvation by Grace and believe in the indwelling of the Holy Spirit.

I want to thank you also for giving radio time to my good friend and Brother Dr. E. V. Wood.

Yours in the Blessed Hope,

E. P. Mead.

Later, I heard Edward V. Wood, an ardent supporter of R. H. Boll, introduce this E. P. Mead to his radio audience over Norris’ radio station, as “a minister of the church of Christ at Abilene, and a great Premillennial.” For forty-five minutes Brother Mead argued Baptist doctrine on the impossibility of apostasy, bordered on the direct work of the Holy Spirit, minimized the gospel plan of salvation, and emphasized the future-millennial-kingdom doctrine.

Norris and his First Baptist Church at Fort Worth, have been especially gratified to shave their time over the radio to brethren of the “Boll group” to press this materialistic doctrine, reflect on the sainted dead, criticize faithful brethren in Christ, and berate churches of Christ for not teaching the theories of premillennialism.

It is true, Brother Boll in his paper sought to disclaim the responsibility of this divisive work, but it is impossible for him to shift the responsibility, for he is reaping from his own sowing. Not one time, through his paper, has he reproved these men for their conniving with these enemies of the truth. He often commends them, and frequently tosses them bouquets. As much as seventy-five per cent of the Word and Work has been devoted to the teaching of premillennialism. Yet, R.H. Boll declares that the “Word and Work brethren” do not elevate, and never intended to elevate the prophetic views they hold to the position of a distinctive doctrine.

November 1935
KINGDOM ARGUMENTS EXAMINED

Some Baptist Inconsistencies; and a nut for Premillennialists to crack.

WILL M. THOMPSON

IN THE LAST DAYS

In Isaiah 2:2 the prophet says, “And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it.” This proof-text is one of the outstanding passages used by the Baptists. They fly to Mark 3:13 and Matt. 10:5-7 and endeavor to show its fulfillment at the time Christ ordained the twelve apostles, and, in connection with these scriptures, they use Hebrews 1:1-2 to show that the “last days” referred to by the prophet were the last days of the Jewish dispensation. They are out of joint here for the following reasons:

1. You will note that the prophecy was to be fulfilled in the last days.
2. The prophet shows that the mountain of the Lord’s house was to be established in the top of the mountains (Plural). Mark 3:13 and Matt. 10:5-7 record mountain in the singular.
3. The Prophet Joel (Joel 2:28-30) foretells the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon all flesh, and the Apostle Peter in Acts 2:17 quotes the prophecy of Joel and says that this prophecy was to be fulfilled in the “last days.” The Holy Spirit was poured out upon the Jews on the day of Pentecost and it was poured out upon the Gentiles at the household of Cornelius. Hence, we see that the “last days” had their beginning on Pentecost and embraces the “Gospel Age.” Therefore, the kingdom could not have been established prior to the day of Pentecost, per these scriptures. You will note further that in the third verse of Isaiah 2 the law was to go forth from Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. This prophecy had its fulfillment on the day of Pentecost, and, since you cannot have a kingdom without a law to govern the subjects, the one who goes behind the day of Pentecost to show the kingdom established has a kingdom without the law of the Spirit of Life to govern it. A kingdom consists of: (a) A king upon his throne, (b) Subjects to be governed, (c) A law, (d) Territory. In the absence of any of these there can be no kingdom of Christ.

THE KINGDOM AT HAND

Baptist debaters use Matt. 10:5-7, where the Lord gave the “limited commission” to the apostles to preach the kingdom “is at hand.” They insist that “at hand” means already come. This statement by them is without proof from any standard authority. The original word in Greek, from which the English expression “at hand” is translated, is defined by all standard lexicographers as meaning to approach, to draw nigh or near. It never has a retrospective view but is always prospective. If the Baptists be correct in rendering the expression “at hand” as already come, then this proves too much for them. For in Matt. 3:1-2, John the Baptist preached “Repent ye for the kingdom of God is at hand.” If “at hand” means already come, then the kingdom had already come when John began to preach in the wilderness of Judea and was established before the personal ministry of Christ instead of during the personal ministry of Christ, as they affirm. The truth of the matter is that John preached an approaching kingdom; and Christ taught that the kingdom was approaching in Matt. 4:17; and afterwards commissioned the apostles to preach that the kingdom was approaching or drawing near. Note the fact that the Lord only gave the apostles two commissions; first, the “limited commission” and second, the “world-wide” commission. The “world-wide” commission did not go into effect until Pentecost. Prior to the day of Pentecost, they only had the “limited commission” under which to labor, and it was under this commission that the Lord commanded them to preach that the kingdom was at hand or approaching.

Question: -How long were they to preach that the kingdom was approaching?
Answer: -As long as that commission lasted.

Question: -How long did the “limited commission” last?
Answer: -Until superseded by the world-wide commission.

Since the “world-wide” commission began to be executed on the first Pentecost after Christ arose from the dead, until Pentecost they were required to preach the kingdom “at hand” or approaching.

At this point, let me also submit a nut for the premillennialists to crack.

Suppose some of these wise cohorts of J. Frank Norris tackle the job. I challenge the entire group to point to a single passage of scripture uttered this side of the day of Pentecost where God, Christ, Holy Spirit, Apostles or any faithful preacher of apostolic time ever taught or said one word about the kingdom being “at hand.”

THE LAW AND THE PROPHETS UNTIL JOHN

The law and the prophets were until John. Since that time the Kingdom of God is preached and every man presses into it. (Lk. 16:16) Baptist preachers and debaters use this passage in endeavoring to show that the law ended with John and that the kingdom was then established. They are wrong again, for the reason, if the law ended with John then the prophets ended with John, and if the Kingdom was then established this was before the personal ministry of Christ. The truth, as taught in this scripture, is clear viz., until John all they had was the law and the prophet’s, but when John appeared on the scene his work was in addition to the law and the prophets. That is, they have something more than the law and the prophets since John.

Question: -What do they have?
Answer: -Since John’s time the Kingdom of Heaven is preached.

Question: -How was it preached?
Answer: -At hand, approaching. (Matt. 3:2; Matt. 4:17; Matt. 10:5-7)

But, we are told that since John’s time every man presses into it, and they tell us that you cannot press into that which does not exist or is established. The pressing into the kingdom by the Jews on the day of the Pentecost and by the Gentiles at the Household of Cornelius was since John.
On the Installment Plan:

The religious weeklies have never provided space in their news departments for continued pieces. All news stories are supposed to be complete in each issue. But when some preachers take illogical positions with reference to false teaching, they are never satisfied, and keep on seeking to make themselves clear. If the weeklies think well of the suggestion to create a department for these brethren to explain their positions by installments, we would suggest that they name it "Religious Fiction."

Sitting Or Standing?

Because Brother Blansett is "so sincere" and because he did not sit on the platform with the enemies of the truth in the recent "shameful" debates in Dallas and Fort Worth, Brother Witty thinks the Fair Park Premillennial Church for which Blansett preaches should be fellowshipped. The implication is that Brother Witty would not so earnestly champion the cause of the "platform sitters". Is fellowship to be based upon sitting or standing? Shall we fellowship Brother Boll whose teaching led some of his followers to sit in the enemy's camp, and disfellowship Dr. Woods and others for their "wrong-sitting"? Of course, if Brother Blansett never teaches these theories privately or publicly, on the air or in the paper he publishes, he would qualify on that score. It would appear that teaching is more important than sitting; for if the teaching would stop, the whole discussion would quickly fade out of the picture and we would have fellowship, just as it was before the teaching began. Brother Boll could have stopped all of the trouble at any time, and could still stop it-provided it has not gone beyond his control-by giving up the teaching of these theories and making proper confession and amend for the divisions and damage his teaching has caused. Where a man stands is more important than where he sits.

New Colored Churches

A number of congregations of colored disciples have been started in recent weeks. At Atoka, Okla., twenty-two were baptized in a meeting conducted by Levi Kenney. A congregation was started and Brother Gray of Muskogee, Okla., is to assist them. A church of twenty-three members was started at Daytona Beach, Fla., as the result of a meeting held by R. E. Sanders and J. O. Williams. The number has since been swelled by other additions, including two former Baptist preachers. The same two brethren have started a congregation at St. Augustine, Fla. R. N. Hogan of Muskogee, Okla., recently baptized twenty-four in a meeting at Longview, Texas. M. Keeble has conducted many good meetings and continues to capture sectarian preachers among his, race. At Tyler, Texas, he baptized fifty-five, including a l a w e r and three preachers. Here is missionary work. The responsibility rests with the white brethren to see that the gospel is preached to the colored people in their communities. We have the colored preachers. Call them.

MAKE THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN YOUR CHRISTMAS GIFT TO YOUR FRIEND OR RELATIVE. A GIFT CARD WILL BE FURNISHED UPON REQUEST. ONE YEAR—ONE DOLLAR.

Foreign Work at Home

Harry R. Fox, forced to give up his work in Japan because of ill health, has returned to America and settled in a Japanese district of Los Angeles, Calif. If he is able to gain a foothold he will continue there indefinitely. Converting Japanese in America will help the work in Japan, for many of them return to their native land, and those who do not, have friends there with whom they doubtless correspond. The Japanese in America have better social and financial opportunities and are not so apt to be influenced by hope of charity to embrace Christianity. Conversions may not be any easier to effect, but they should be more reliable. We believe this missionary work is headed in the right direction.

McCaleb Speaks Out

One of the most significant things that has happened in recent months is the repudiation by J. M. McCaleb of Don Carlos Janes as the unofficial and self-appointed head of foreign missionary work. That action has been due for some time. The church could not go on contributing to foreign missionaries through this unscriptural arrangement, headed by one of the leaders of the Louisville faction. Brother McCaleb, the oldest and most practical of all missionaries on the foreign field was preeminently the one to take the lead. His not unkind but unmistakably plain statement will undoubtedly prove a turning point in the handling of missionary work. The work should be adjusted to a scriptural basis as to method, and freed from all domination of the premillennial faction. The missionaries have been supported through an agency antagonistic in doctrinal viewpoint to those contributing most of the money. The situation leaves the impression on some uninformed brethren that nobody was attempting to do missionary work except this Louisville group. Brother Janes does not object to that impression. But let him solicit funds from his own faction only for his "missionary society" and then he can take all the credit he can get. Loyal churches should cut loose from the patronage of this faction, from the Janes Missionary Agency down to the Jorgenson Premillennial Songbook.

Condensed or Concentrated?

In a letter to the missionaries Don Carlos Janes asked for a "condensed" page of "frank thoughts" on the future missionary program. The word "condensed" (which might be something like canned milk) hardly expressed what he received from J. M. McCaleb. The effect of the McCaleb statement on the unscriptural control Janes has held over the missionary work is likely to be more like the effect of "concentrated lye" on germs than of "condensed milk" for missionary promoters. Among t h e
things Brother McCaleb said are the following high points: (1) Churches have been as faithful in support as missionaries have been in service. Many missionaries have not measured up and some have been positive misfits. (2) Churches have had cause to hold missionaries in doubt due to numerous cases of unsoundness such as Armstrong-Hopkins, McHenry-Martin, and more recently the Smith-Boyer-Gruver defections. (3) Brother Janes himself has done more to hinder the progress of the missionary cause than any other factor. He has encouraged churches to send money to him leading them to believe that he can forward funds cheaper, while he should have been teaching churches to select, send and support its own missionary. (4) As matters now stand, he has the missionaries depending almost wholly on one man-himself, whereas they should be looked after by the church or churches sending them. (5) The result is that the Janes’ “distress calls” have become so chronic as to have no more effect than the boy who cried, “Wolf, wolf!” (6) When the Lord’s orders are followed on all hands, the missionaries will not be in distress. (7) Still more serious than his methods is Brother Janes’ faith. He does not hold the faith he once did. As a premillennialist he does not represent the brotherhood, but only a fractional fraction of it. (8) Since he has departed from the faith he has no right to appeal to the brotherhood for anything. He should continue his appeals only to those who believe as he does. (9) Brother Janes has been shown to be a bandit in the hope that he would see his mistakes, but late developments make forbearance impossible longer. Missionaries, in justice to themselves, should sever connections with the Janes’ Agency and make their appeals direct to the churches, following the example of Brother Brown in Africa. And, the churches should awake and support loyal, worthy missionaries.

The foregoing “frank thoughts” should be plenty frank to suit Brother Janes. But he asked for it. And some of us are thinking that this same dose of frankness might help some neutrals in America who are not missionaries.

Honorable Discharge
Forty three years is a long time for one man to be on the same job. Brother McCaleb has been that long in Japan. He deserves the honor-able discharge that he seeks. He is the most practical man who has represented the churches in the foreign field. Through practical insight he has property to turn over to whoever succeeds him which has increased in value through the years. He has made the church money, enough to go a long way toward covering the support which he has received from the churches, by his business ability. If at the same time he has had the foresight to handle his own private funds to accumulate property for himself, surely one will begrudge him that opportunity. It would be a fitting recompense for his sacrifices. Rare, indeed, is it for a foreign missionsary to turn over to the church at the end of his labors a profit realized, instead of a debt accumulated!

Investigations
Church investigations are often just about as effective as congressional investigations. On the heels of the criticism by J. M. McCaleb, the oldest missionary in the foreign fields and one who had been sent to investigate his case, S. K. Dong visited this country from Korea. He is a native missionary. About the same time Brother Benson expressed misgivings about Brother Dong’s work. Brother Dong was investigated by the congregation which had indorsed his work. He was given a clean bill of health, and visited for many months among the churches of America. He makes a good impression. He was indorsed by churches and leading brethren and turned loose to seek funds among the churches. But Brother Dong has never had the opportunity of being thoroughly indoctrinated. The fact that the editor of the Christian Standard and other members of the Christian Church continue to support him has been passed over too lightly. His attending the International Convention of the Christian Church in England on his way home, and his appointments with churches other than churches of Christ while in this country casts a shadow of doubt over his record. There has been entirely too much carelessness in choosing men for foreign service. That service calls for sound and capable men.

Pleases Premillennial Church
S. H. Hall recently conducted a meeting for the church in Gallatin, Tenn. E. L. Jorgenson, Word and Work factionist of Louisville, Ky., led the singing. H. L. Olmstead, rank premillennial local preacher, reported the meeting in the Word and Work as follows: “Brother Hall’s preaching was of the highest order, spiritual in tone, earnest in manner, true to the word of God, and heart-searching in its results, magnifying Christ and the gospel of his grace”.

E. L. Jorgenson said: “I am at this writing blessed in the association of two great preachers, and the fine congregation of disciples at Gallatin, Tenn., where H. L. Olmstead labors. S. H. Hall of Nashville is bringing the message twice daily in crystal clearness and spiritual power. We expect a real revival. Pray for us.” E. L. Jorgenson.

F. L. Rowe said (in Christian Leader): “A fully confirmed whisper comes to us that S. H. Hall, E. L. Jorgenson and H. L. Olmstead are in a meeting at Gallatin, Tenn. The only difference between the Wittry-Blansett meeting in Dallas, is that there are three in this meeting and there were only two in the other.”

And, finally, Brother Hall himself said in Price Billingsly’s paper, The Gospel Advance, November 1921: “It may be by the providence of God that your paper has come up to fight effectively the vagaries of R. H. Boll.” But the fact that the Gallatin meeting was an Olmstead-Jorgenson setup, and the preaching pleased them so, does not indicate that Brother Hall “has come up to fight effectively the vagaries of R. H. Boll.” The question now is: Who has changed—the issue or Brother Hall?

A Regular Preacher
E. W. McMillan, formerly of Fort Worth, Texas, is now broadcasting daily from Central Church, Nashville, Tenn., succeeding the late Hall L. Calhoun. Brother McMillan’s sermons are meeting with hearty response from a radio audience over a wide section. It is an opportunity for the Central church and for Brother McMillan which no other church or Christian gospel preacher has, to exert so far-reaching influence for plain New Testament teaching against so many forms of error today. If they do it, we are interested; but if they merely put on “a noon prayer meeting and devotional service”, any of us can do that at home. Announcements, song practice, “much speaking” in prayer over the air does not seem to fill the purpose of such a period. To say the least, there is no incentive to postpone a good din-
ner long enough to listen in on it. The demand is for straight, plain, live - coal - from - the - altar, hot-cakes - off - the - griddle preaching that will start people to talking, even arguing. The people will listen to it. Try it.

But we started out to say that a church that preaches their preacher on eight fixed broadcasts weekly, has a "regular" preacher.
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Real Mission Work
If when members of the church are "scattered abroad" by the call of their business opportunities, they were as thoroughly indoctrinated as were the disciples who went out from Jerusalem preaching the word everywhere, mission work would be easy. Richard Walker and his wife moved from Pensacola, Fla. to Hat-tiesburg, Miss., a city of some 18,000. They could find no members of the church, but wrote to the religious papers inquiring for some. Meanwhile, they were worshipping in their home and tithing against the day when their funds would be sufficient to hold a mission meeting. Pensacola sent preachers for two different meetings. Of these preachers were sent. A dozen members were located. A church was started.

J. Harrison Daniels was converted from the innovations of the Christian Church while preaching in New York State. His conversion was effected, partially at least, through correspondence. He gave up his "pastorate" and found himself, a long way from the center of things in the church of Christ. He obtained a small printing shop in Randolph, N. Y., and proceeded to build a church. He has recently started a congregation at Bradford, Pa., thirty miles east of Randolph.

There is much other good missionary work being done but these cases prove what a Christian can do, and what a preacher can do, when they try.

... ... ... 

John Allen Hudson and New Zealand:
Through other papers the readers, many of them, are informed of the proposed missionary tour of Brother John Allen Hudson through New Zealand. Concerning the progress of this movement Brother Hudson has the following to say:

"Many in the brotherhood know that I have been contemplating for several months going to New Zealand and Australia in answer to calls that I have had from those parts of the British Empire. This work has been given endorsement by many leading brethren, and is now on the road to a successful termination. I will go out from the Church at Tenth and South Rockford in Tulsa, where I have been serving for the past seven and one-half years as local minister. This congregation will also support this new work in those far off isles to the extent of fifty dollars per month. This shows their faith in this new mission work. And several other good congregations of the State, such as Shawnee, Seminole and Tenth and Francis in Oklahoma City, have promised to have a part in this work.

Paul E. Taliaferro, 1109 Phil-tower Building, Tulsa, Oklahoma, has been appointed by the elders of the church in Tulsa to be the treasurer of the funds for this work. All checks should be made payable to him. He will disburse all funds too, of course. Brother Taliaferro is rigidly honest, and a very capable man as well. With this sort of a background for the work it should be conducted in a business like and scriptural way. No doubt it will be. And the brotherhood may have confidence in it from the start.

I go on a two-year leave of absence. This is not a rigid thing, however. I will be governed by conditions as to the length of my stay. I will visit the principal cities in New Zealand and Australia. My first objective is Auckland, New Zealand, which is a city of two hundred and fifty thousand people. We already have a small group of brethren in that fine city who are anxiously waiting for my coming.

The beginning time for this new work is January 1, 1936. We will sail just as soon after the first of the year as arrangements can be completed.

There is a need for this work to be financed systematically. And the way for it to be done is for a number of congregations and individuals to send a monthly amount to Brother Taliaferro, whose address is given above. This should be done every month. Will not several good congregations take this matter up immediately and agree to send five or ten dollars every month? If this is done a great work can be done in the right sort of a way and nobody will suffer unduly. It is enough to go, and the brethren should be glad to support this work amply."

November 1935
A SABBATH QUESTIONNAIRE

W. W. FOSTER

Q. Which day of the week was the Sabbath?
A. The seventh clay. “But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates.” (Ex. 20: 10)

Q. When was the Sabbath given?
A. At Mt. Sinai. “Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments: And madest known unto them thy holy sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant.” (Neh. 9:13-14)

The first mention of the sabbath is in Exodus 16:23 as the children of Israel journey toward Sinai. The language employed in Genesis 2:1-3 and Genesis 3:5, 1-2 show that God sanctified the seventh day “because in it he had rested” does not tell when the sanctifying was done. Adam did not keep the seventh day as a sabbath nor does scripture say that it was observed until Israel came out of Egypt. (Ex. 16:23)

Q. To whom was the sabbath given?
A. “The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day.” (Deut. 5:1-14) Note that this covenant includes the sabbath.

Q. Why was the sabbath given?
A. “And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand and by a stretched out arm; therefore the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath clay.” (Duet. 5:15) The reason Israel was commanded to keep this day was because they had been delivered from bondage by the power of God.

Q. Did any other nation have such a cause to keep the sabbath? A. No.

Q. Was the sabbath one of the ten commandments?
A. Yes. The fourth commandment. (Ex. 20)

Q. Were the ten commandments called the covenant?
A. Yes. “And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights: he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments.” (Ex. 34:20) “And he declared unto you his covenant, which he commanded you to perform, even ten commandments: and he wrote them upon two tables of stone.” (Deut. 4:13)

Q. When was this covenant made?
A. When they came out of Egypt. “There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the Lord made a covenant with the children of Israel, when they came out of Egypt and I have set there a place for ‘the ark, wherein is the covenant of the Lord, which he made with our fathers, when he brought them out of the land of Egypt.” (1 Ki. 8:9,21)

Q. Was there a new covenant promised that would not be according to this covenant?
A. Yes. “Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt.”

Q. What does the word “according” mean?
A. Agreeing-Harmonizing. (Webster) Then “not according” to this covenant would mean not agreeing, not harmonizing, with these ten commandments that God made with Israel when he brought them out of Egypt.

Q. What reason did the Lord assign for making a new covenant that would not be in harmony with or according to the covenant he made with their fathers when he brought them out of Egypt?
A. Because “my covenant they break”. (Jer. 31-32)

Q. Had God kept his part of the covenant?
A. Yes-he had been “a husband to them.” (Jer. 31-32)

Q. Did this breaking of the covenant by the people give God a right to break or change his part of the covenant?
A. Yes. Law founded on justice, wisdom and mercy will release the faithful party to a covenant if the second party fails and refuses to observe his part.

Q. But was not the sabbath commandment, included in this covenant, to be an everlasting covenant?
A. Yes. “Speaking thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily my sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations: ... Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the sabbath, to observe the sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant.” (Ex. 31:13-18)

Q. Can that which is “perpetual”, “forever”, and “everlasting” be set aside?
A. Yes. He abrogated others, such as incense, burnt offerings, etc., that were “perpetual” and “everlasting.” (see Ex. 30:8)

Q. Was Canaan to be an everlasting possession of Israel?
A. Yes. “And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession: and I will be their God.” (Gen. 17:8)

Q. Was the covenant of circumcision an everlasting covenant?
A. Yes. “He that is born in thy house, and he that ‘is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant.” (Gen. 17:13)

Q. Were the meat offerings to be a perpetual statute?
A. Yes. “All the males among the children of Aaron shall eat of it. It shall be a statute forever in your generations concerning the offerings of the Lord made by fire: every one that toucheth them shall be holy.” (Lev. 6:18)

Q. Was the tenth day of the seventh month made a perpetual sabbath?
A. Yes. “And this shall be a statute forever unto you: that in the seventh month, on the tenth day of the month, ye shall afflict your souls, by a statute for the remembrance of the day whereon thou wast delivered out of the land of Egypt; and shall consecrate the tenth day of the month as the sabbath of rest unto you, and ye shall afflict your souls, by a statute for ever.” (Lev. 16:29-31)

Q. Do those who think of the sabbath as still binding because it was to be a perpetual statute also believe that Israel has possessed Canaan unceasingly and forever since that promise?
A. No.

Q. Do they believe that the everlasting covenant of fleshly circumcision is binding today?
A. No.

Q. Do they believe that the meat offering as a “statute forever” is for us to observe today?
A. No.

Q. Do they believe that the holy sabbath of the seventh month and tenth day—which sabbath was to be holy and observed forever by an everlasting statute—should now be observed?
A. No.

In these scriptures we have found possession of lands, circumcision, meat offerings, incense and etc., binding by statutes “forever” but not held as binding today, the force of these expressions does not, therefore, make the seventh day sabbath binding now.
CONTRIBUTORIAL

PAUL'S DOCTRINAL PURITY

Moral Purity or Personal Piety Cannot Atone For Corruption In Doctrine.

T. B. THOMPSON

QUOTE from my former article: Every religious movement has been built around some man (or woman) 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. It is the purpose of this article to further establish this fact, and to warn against being caught in the net of humanism and man-made religious theories.

I suppose it need not be argued that Methodism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, and all other isms among religious bodies are examples of the truthfulness of the above statement; the men around whom these religious organizations are built were persons of great piety, and unimpeachable morality. In spite of that fact their doctrines are corrupt, and their religious practices contribute to division, partyism, strife, alienation and disregard for the plainest teachings of the Son of God; nor does their purity of moral practices atone for their unscriptural doctrines.

But, is purity of doctrine necessary to the purity of Christian life as revealed in the Bible? James (3:17) tells us that the wisdom that is “from above is first pure, then peaceable”. It follows that since all our religious doctrine comes from above it has something to do with our religious purity: it also contributes to peace among brethren. Doctrinal impurity may be handled with ease and dispatch as compared with doctrinal impurity. Note the cause of division in the Corinthian Church as recorded in 1 Cor. 1:10-17. By necessary implication there will be found three items involving corruption in doctrine: (1) a denial of the unity of the Godhead; (2) a denial of Christ’s crucifixion for them; (3) and, a denial of their baptism into the name of Christ. These deceptions had nothing to do with their moral purity or piety, but had much to do with their purity of doctrine, and for which they were accused of being “carnal” in chapter 3. Paul in 1 Tim. 1:3 warns against teaching “a different doctrine”; in verse 10 he speaks of things “contrary to sound doctrine”, while he admonished Titus to show “in thy doctrine uncorruptness.” (Tit. 2:7)

Can there be any doubt, therefore, that Paul is a strong believer in doctrinal purity as well as moral purity of life? We propose to show that Paul believed that his purity of life depended upon his being pure in doctrinal teaching. Hear Paul declaring to the elders of Ephesus (Acts 20:20) that he had kept back nothing that was to them profitable, and that (v.25) he “went about preaching the kingdom”, and, furthermore, he was pure from the blood of all men (v. 26). The purity of the gospel preacher today depends upon his preaching all concerning the kingdom that Paul preached, and no more, for only that is profitable to the hearers, and will be conducive of peace and purity in Christian life and conduct.

Special mention has been made concerning the piety and purity of some of our brethren who are promoting the doctrine of Premillennialism. I noted a statement of one of the outstanding preachers of the church, who, himself, does not believe the theory, yet who felt called upon to say that Bro. A. “is one of the purest men I have ever known”, and yet he believes this very preacher is corrupt in doctrine. I wonder if there has not somewhere, sometime, been some one known to this preacher who was pure in both doctrine and conduct, and thus purer than Bro. A. To continue to compliment and commend the piety, purity and prayerfulness of these erring brethren, who are daily sowing discord among churches, which thing the Lord declares he hates (Prov. 6:19), can but encourage them in their hurtful course, and cause weaker brethren to rally to the faction that is doing the church of the Lord more damage than all the forces outside can possibly do.

One of the outstanding marks of real purity and piety is an unifying, uncompromising love for the truth of the gospel. It matters not how fervent our denominational friends are in their religious life, nor how prayerful and pious they may be, if they have been forced to stand aloof from them because they persist in setting aside the plain teachings of the gospel, or adding to or going beyond divine instructions. Have we been wrong in this? But it may be argued that this defection is within our own ranks, which might be all the more reason why we should use drastic measures to keep it from spreading. Suppose we had done as the Millennialists and their apologists indicate we should; can you visualize the results? Suppose we had offered no resistance to these erroneous doctrines, and had done like some who never lose an opportunity to compliment the purity of these brethren; where would we be now? If the direction of the straws indicate the trend of things we would all be lined up with Frank Norris, John Rice and their ilk; are we ready for that? We would be exchanging pulpits, and canceling our services in order to attend sectarian services, thus boosting error; are we willing to come to this? Has the fight of the Restoration been in vain? and were our brethren wrong in coming out from sectarian error and fighting unscriptural doctrines and practices? Is the church of Christ a definite institution with a definite faith, based on a definite foundation, with a distinct doctrine, or, is it a conglomeration of just anything that might happen to suit the fancy of the theorists? Shall the church survive or shall it be lost in the wilderness of human speculation, and sectarian corruption? Shall we not stand for purity of doctrine as well as purity of life?

A STATEMENT AND EXPLANATION

Since it is being circulated from some source that Homer N. Rutherford is back in Jacksonville, Florida, preaching for the Riverside church. I deem it proper, just and entirely appropriate, that I make an explanation on behalf of that congregation. When I took up work with the Riverside Park church January 1st, 1933, I did so with the understanding, together with the rest of the brotherhood generally, that H. N. Rutherford was pro-Boll and Premillennial in his beliefs and teaching. Of course, it was to be supposed that the church would be saturated with such ideas and influence. No church ever listened more appre-
citably to the truth than did this one, even though the thoughtful fully understood it meant the severing of the fellowship and the breaking of the most dear to them, the very idea of which brought sadness to hearts and tears to the eyes of some of those fine characters. Martyrs have shown no greater love for truth, nor willingness to suffer than did these godly, truth-loving Christians. To know ‘the history of this church, its influences, teaching and environment, together with its recent heroic stand for the truth against anything that savors of Premillennialism, is to know a congregation that would excite the most fervent admiration and appreciation.

It is but proper to say just here that the climax of our work for two years in Riverside Park church was the meeting in which our brother Foy E. Wallace, Jr., did the preaching. We had him speak two Sunday afternoons on Premillennialism, and that finally settled the matter with almost the whole of the three churches of Christ in that city who were not already convinced.

The result of this meeting, together with the other mitigating circumstances, brought a division in the Edgewood congregation, a number of whom, disregarding the issues, and holding on to the man, are doing all they can to establish a Premillennial Church adjacent to the Riverside Park church. They evidently think that the influence of H. N. Rutherford can ultimately and successfully overcome the influence of the truth to the extent that a Premillennial church can be established and maintained right in the shadow of the church that formerly supported Brother Rutherford. So be it known to all that Brother Rutherford is not back with the Riverside Park church, but is using every ounce of his energy, together with his followers, to establish a church that will have no fellowship with the church he served for ten years.

As the matter now stands there are three churches in Jacksonville that stand for the truth: Riverside Park, Springfield and Edgewood; the latter two congregations have as their ministers Brethren W. Herron and H. A. Godbold, respectively, who are sound and settled the matter with almost the whole of the three churches of Christ in that city who were not already convinced.

If our piety is the test of our soundness, then the Pharisees would be orthodox. They were reverent. The Pharisee instead of leaving the door of his room open while he was on his knees praying, would stand out on the corner of the street and make long prayers. Thus he could be seen of all men. I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, nor a dresser of sycamore trees, but I predict that these superpious brethren will be on the street corners next. Paul was reverent, saintly, godly and heavenly minded, but was not too pious to call one fellow a "son of the devil". (Acts 13:19) His brotherly love did not keep him from resisting Peter. "I resisted him to his face because he stood condemned". (Gal. 2:11) The word of God will accomplish divine results. First: The word preached, believed and obeyed will put one into Christ where he is saved from his sins. (Acts 2:38: Eph. 1:7: Col. 1:14: Gal. 3:26-27) Second: The word preached will expose false teachers. Paul told the elders of the church at Ephesus that false brethren would arise among 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 perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them". (Acts 20:29-30) False teachers should be exposed. Those in the church shall not be spared. Third: The word preached fulfills the sacred charge of Paul to Timothy. "We would thus save ourselves. "Take heed unto thyself, and to thy teaching. Continue in these things: for in doing this thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee." (II Tim. 4:16)

The word of God will accomplish divine results. First: The word preached, believed and obeyed will put one into Christ where he is saved from his sins. (Acts 2:38: Eph. 1:7: Col. 1:14: Gal. 3:26-27) Second: The word preached will expose false teachers. Paul told the elders of the church at Ephesus that false brethren would arise among 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 perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them". (Acts 20:29-30) False teachers should be exposed. Those in the church shall not be spared. Third: The word preached fulfills the sacred charge of Paul to Timothy. "We would thus save ourselves. "Take heed unto thyself, and to thy teaching. Continue in these things: for in doing this thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee." (II Tim. 4:16)

The gospel preached “with thoughts that breathe the words that burn” will please God and disturb man. The early preachers did not please everybody. Occasionally a preacher of our day boasts that all were pleased with his work. Even the sects dismissed to attend his services. How different from Paul. He did not please the world nor all the brethren. When he went into a place to preach he had a revival or a riot. The enemies of the truth spoke of Paul and his companions after this fashion, “These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also.”

**A CHARGE TO PREACHERS**


G. K. WALLACE

"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." (II Tim. 4:2)

There are a lot of priggish, puritanical brethren who are led astray by the assumed piety of certain preachers. What Brother Longface preaches is surely the truth because he is such a devout man. They size up what he preaches by his piety and not by the book. I am not opposed to piety. The Bible teaches us to be sober. It also teaches us to be honest. But the man who keeps insisting that he is honest is generally a crook. And who parades his piety is usually a hypocrite. Piety, like honesty, flourishes better when it is treated as something personal and too sacred to be put on parade.

IF our piety is the test of our soundness, then the Pharisees would be orthodox. They were reverent. The Pharisee instead of leaving the door of his room open while he was on his knees praying, would stand out on the corner of the street and make long prayers. Thus he could be seen of all men. I am not a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, nor a dresser of sycamore trees, but I predict that these superpious brethren will be on the street corners next. Paul was reverent, saintly, godly and heavenly minded, but was not too pious to call one fellow a "son of the devil". (Acts 13:19) His brotherly love did not keep him from resisting Peter. "I resisted him to his face because he stood condemned". (Gal. 2:11) The real test of one’s orthodoxy is not his sincerity nor affected devotion, but whether he is true to the charge to preach the word.

Realizing that the gospel and not piety is the power of God unto salvation, how shall we preach it? It must be preached boldly and without fear or favor. The second recorded prayer in the book of Acts is a prayer for boldness. Brethren today call the preaching of the Word? The Sanhedrin was amazed at the boldness of Peter and John. (Acts 4:13) Please notice that the text says “Peter and John”. John was just as bold as Peter.

What reckless saints were those early preachers! They did not so much as regard their own lives in preaching Christ. (Acts 20:24) Watch these great men in action and compare some brethren who are apparently afraid to quote the Great Commission with emphasis lest they should offend some sectarian. No doubt the uncompromising fearlessness of these apostles was derived from Christ. “They took knowledge of that they had been with Jesus”. (Acts 4:13) No one would suspect a compromising, cringing preacher of having been associated with the world’s greatest Preacher.

FAITHFUL preaching of the Word of God will accomplish divine results. First: The word preached, believed and obeyed will put one into Christ where he is saved from his sins. (Acts 2:38: Eph. 1:7: Col. 1:14: Gal. 3:26-27) Second: The word preached will expose false teachers. Paul told the elders of the church at Ephesus that false brethren would arise among 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 perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them". (Acts 20:29-30) False teachers should be exposed. Those in the church shall not be spared. Third: The word preached fulfills the sacred charge of Paul to Timothy. "We would thus save ourselves. "Take heed unto thyself, and to thy teaching. Continue in these things: for in doing this thou shalt save both thyself and them that hear thee." (II Tim. 4:16)

The gospel preached “with thoughts that breathe the words that burn” will please God and disturb man. The early preachers did not please everybody. Occasionally a preacher of our day boasts that all were pleased with his work. Even the sects dismissed to attend his services. How different from Paul. He did not please the world nor all the brethren. When he went into a place to preach he had a revival or a riot. The enemies of the truth spoke of Paul and his companions after this fashion, “These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also.”
And he said unto them, the harvest indeed is plenteous, but the laborers are few. Pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest that he send forth laborers into his harvest” (Luke 10:2). Though this appeal was made by the Lord at the sending of the seventy, before the church was established, the principles of this text are true today. The condition of the world, the opportunities and obligations of the church are all strikingly and accurately portrayed, even though it was made before the kingdom was set up.

The expression, “the harvest indeed is plenteous,” carries the idea that great numbers of people will accept the truth, and that much work is to be done.

Then, the expression “but the laborers are few” simply enforces the idea of the immensity of the task.

Assuming that we (Christians) can scripturally utter that same prayer today, it is herein affirmed that the right to pray such a prayer necessarily imposes at least three obligations.

First, to pray the Lord to send forth laborers into His harvest demands a personal interest upon the part of the one praying—an interest in the entire harvest. Is it possible for one to be a Christian and not be personally interested in the progress of the harvest work? Every principle of Christ’s enlightened kingdom demands a convincing negative to that query. He who professes to have accepted the truth that saves surely would want others to be saved. Any failure at this point brands one as the personification of selfishness. And it is equally true that we cannot confine our interest to any one nation or section, unless we want to respect persons. In that event we part company with God (Acts 10:34-35).

Second, to pray the Lord to send laborers into His harvest demands cooperation with the prayer by the one praying. Speculating upon how much influence the Lord will exert in sending laborers is an excellent way to allow imagination to run riot and revel in hurtful opinion. That is the Lord’s business, so let Him attend to it, while we look after our portion. So far as we are concerned, the practical lesson just here is this: it is sinful for us to pray the Lord to send laborers unless we assist in answering the prayer.

Some have gone into excesses that men “enter the ministry” as they receive a direct call from God, denying thereby the influence of teaching and free moral agency. Others have just as foolishly taught, either directly or substantially so, that the church must commission all sent out and that none are able otherwise to labor—thus stifling individual enterprise and encouraging the dodging of responsibility, the art of passing the buck. Regardless of such excesses and abuses, the fact nevertheless remains that the church is interested in the harvest to the point of feeling every right means in the promotion of that holy endeavor. Work must accompany prayer.

Third, the obligation to pray that laborers be sent into the harvest carries not only the duties of personal interest and actual sending, but involves a definite voice in the selection and maintenance of those sent. If not, why not? If the church is to be interested in the harvest to the point of (1) prayer and (2) sending, certainly the church should have a voice in the ones supported. Right here is where a great part of “our missionary program” (Shades of the language of Ashdod!) is confused and has a portion of the church confused with it.

Some hold to the view that if a man decides to “offer himself for the mission field,” the church is automatically obligated to support him. Several years ago I was blindly reading and following a “missionary bulletin.” This little bulletin claimed that its publisher generated much enthusiasm for “foreign missionary work.” It featured a little volunteer list—those who wanted to go to “the field” and who were merely waiting to be sent. They may never have done any such work, preached a sermon or held a meeting over here—but that mattered not. One of the things that first began to get my eyes opened was not so much the attacks of those condemning this one man missionary society as it was some things in the paper itself. I discovered that the paper let it be known that these volunteers ought to be supported merely because they wanted to be sent! If a church or preacher demanded the right of private investigation, or if a public stand was requested, as to the merits of the “one sent,” the requests were ignored. Some missionary promoters and some of the missionaries have adopted the same attitude of certain of our college professors; i.e., let the church send and support but ignore the demands of the church to know how they live, what they teach, and how they stand on matters affecting the unity of the church.

Just a few months ago it was noticed that the “dean of our foreign missionaries” apologized for the fact that “the missionaries” ignored the plea of “home brethren” for published statements of position. He explained that they wouldn’t do that, lest they become involved in wrangles in the papers, that they reported anyway to the churches that sent them, and that was enough. That sounds plausible, but here is where it breaks down: these same “missionaries”, their “sponsoring churches”, and itinerant promoters call on the entire brotherhood for support!

This habit of laborers in our “fields” and “institutions” demanding support and then turning up their superior noses at requests for clarity of position and life if persisted in, will either wreck that part of “our” work or alienate it from the church. The writer is wholly in sympathy with evangelizing the world, and has no desire to detract from that work. On the other hand, it is believed that the church is under no obligation to support laborers unless the church can know their qualifications. Judging from some loose practices some of these need examination. If they want to be independent of responsibility to the church as a whole, let them labor without calling upon the church as a whole. He who calls for general support but withholds his position from those who support him is fundamentally dishonest.

Some hold the view that when a man offers himself for the foreign field the church is automatically obligated to support him.

Missionaries, promoters and sponsors call on the entire brotherhood for support but turn up their noses to any request to state their positions on vital questions.

To call for the support of the church but withhold positions on issues is to be fundamentally dishonest.
I have said that the “Christian Church” is the greatest enemy of the church. Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians et al., change their creeds every few years, but the Christian church has departed so far from the things once held by them to be fundamental that it cannot be recognized as being the same church of a few years back. The things mentioned in this article have come under my personal observation during the eight and one half years I served the Southside Church of Christ in Fort Worth. Some of these things received wide publicity in the daily papers.

Jazz Religion

The Magnolia Ave. Christian Church in Fort Worth has as its pastor, Rev. J. Leslie Fennell. Very soon after his coming to that work, they put on a building program that included the building of a commodious educational plant, in which space was provided for the young people to have various kinds of social activities. The right kind of social activity could not be condemned, and ought to be encouraged perhaps. But the Fort Worth Press carried a feature article about one of these activities. It was a cabaret party. It was mentioned that the attendants enjoyed their smoking, and that sales girls went in and out with their wares, selling cigarettes and other commodities that are sold at cabaret parties. The reporter for the paper commended the pastor of this church for his broadmindedness. This party was followed later and continues until this day, with a dance. A good Methodist lady of that city had a daughter who was invited to one of these dances, and she came home and boasted of the fact that she had danced with the pastor. Well, if it was right to have this thing in the church, it was all right for the pastor to indulge in the dance. It has been reported that this same pastor does not confine his dancing, however, to this particular church building, but that he attends public places where dances are in progress.

We were startled (if we are not past being startled by anything they do) a few years ago, when Dr. Jenkins, in Kansas City, employed the services of Red Nichols and his orchestra to give a program of jazz music at a service on Sunday night. We are not surprised to learn that he has demanded that the word “Christian” be taken down from in front of his place of “amusement”. Maybe he is consistent without being conscious of it. Certainly the word should not appear where every practice of the participants is contrary to the demands of that word.

Again we are astonished to learn that the pastor of the Christian Church, Sapulpa, Okla., has installed the gambling marble boards, similar to the ones we see in drug stores, for the amusement of the boys, the pastor to get the profits. Every one of these ungodly practices is a bid for publicity. It is a shame that such things should be done and condoned by any church. Spiritually minded people are having hard enough time trying to keep our members out of sin without having sin condoned, tolerated, and even practiced in church buildings, by those who are spiritual leaders.

Page The Catholics

In order to be like the world around them, many of the Christian Churches are observing days that were instituted by the Catholics. The University Christian Church, Fort Worth, Texas, is located adjacent to the Texas Christian University campus. Dr. Perry Gresham is the pastor of this church. This past year they observed Maundy Thursday, and if my recollection is not at fault, other days of the “Passion Week” of the Lord. On Maundy Thursday night, they observe the Lord’s supper. Why? There is no more authority for this than the churches of Christ have for the practice of setting the Lord’s table twice on the Lord’s day. No command, no precedent, no example; but someone thought this would be nice, and therefore a practice began that has swept the country and will lead to the observance of other feasts and feast days of the Old Testament order and of the Catholic Church. Indeed, the Dr. Fennell, of whom we have already spoken, has instituted the practice of dedicating babies on Easter Sunday. On last New Year’s eve, at eleven thirty at night, the Christian churches of Fort Worth met in the First Christian church building for a communion service. Again, why? It has become a practice in Dallas for all of the churches of the city to assemble on New Year’s day in a union communion service. This takes place in one of the large auditoriums of the city. All faiths participate. All differing in doctrine, faith, and practice, as individual congregations, yet throwing away all this for the sake of a show.

Nothing Distinctive

In the recent convention held in San Antonio, Texas, D. W. Morehouse, president of the International Convention of Disciples of Christ, in the feature address of the opening sessions day, said, “We cannot go preaching our message to the world and refuse to recognize Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians, young people’s associations, the Salvation Army, Catholics, Jews and others.” What kind of message could be called “our message”? So what if every faith in the earth? What is the distinctive plea? When your plea is such that you can recognize every other plea as being just as good, it ceases to be a distinctive plea, and therefore has no place in the world. If we do not believe and teach something essential to salvation that no other body teaches, then we forfeit our right to exist.

In the same convention, Rev. T. H. Matheison, pastor of the First Christian Church, Colorado Springs, Colo., said this; “Proof of correct doctrine is interesting exercise, but it means little in a land where 2 percent of the people own 80 percent of the wealth and where millions of the citizens are in bread lines.” I am thinking the learned Doctor is sadly wrong in his contention. If that great body of people would put forth a greater effort to prove the doctrine, and cling to the fundamental principles preached by the apostles and the pioneers, they could accomplish more for the salvation of souls. True, there wouldn’t be so much show, but more people would be satisfied with the simplicity in Christ Jesus.

Too Modern

Another item of interest that took place during the convention was a pageant depicting the history of the church from its founding in 1809 to the present day. Well, if that was the date of its founding it certainly can’t be the one the Lord said he would build. It’s about 1800 years too young. The acknowledgement is fatal to any claim of being a New Testament institution. I knew all the time it wasn’t the Lord’s church, but I did not know they would admit it. In fact, I thought they held to the same belief I do as to the date of its establishment. So we will just line them up with all the sectarians as to this point.
THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE BIBLE

The Catholic Church Is And Always Has Been The Uncompromising Foe Of Bible Reading.

O. C. LAMBERT

TIMOTHY

The series of quotations here given are not irresponsible statements of unknown writers but are from books which have been circulated by the millions and issued with the full authority of the Catholic Church. We will note in these statements that during the Dark Ages, which is called the Golden Period of Catholicism, she did prohibit the reading of the Bible. We note, too, that with the invention of the printing press and its companion the Reformation, the power of Catholicism was broken and since then she has adopted other means because her prohibition could no longer be enforced. We will learn also as we proceed with our study of the many fancy ways she invented for torturing to death those who disregarded her mandates. She not only admits that she prohibited the reading of the Bible in the early Church and that the Bible occupied a much more prominent place in the New Testament Church than is true with Catholicism.

She tells us that her reasons for not wishing her communicants to read the Bible are: that it is too sacred to be read; that some parts are “unsuited to the very young or the ignorant”; and that “more harm than utility is thereby caused”. She exultingly informs us that as a result of her diligent campaign to disparage the Bible her members usually prefer human books!

Policy

We learned in our former article that what a Catholic writer or speaker will say depends very largely on the exigency of the hour and that they are at liberty to tell just the opposite of the truth if the interests of Catholicism can be best served by that means. We must understand this principle of Catholicism to be prepared for Catholic statements on both sides of nearly every question. For instance, in this country they would prefer that the public believe they are in favor of toleration; that they are the champion of human rights; that they are especially devoted to the Constitution of the United States, when nothing could be farther from their real feelings and designs, as I shall prove.

Propaganda

It is very common in lectures and books designed primarily for non-Catholics that they make the ridiculous claim that they have always urged Bible reading. Non-Catholics are so little informed on the real history and teaching of Catholicism that they believe it.

Prohibited

The series of quotations here given are not irresponsible statements of unknown writers but are from books which have been circulated by the millions and issued with the full authority of the Catholic Church. We will note in these statements that during the Dark Ages, which is called the Golden Period of Catholicism, she did prohibit the reading of the Bible. We note, too, that with the invention of the printing press and its companion the Reformation, the power of Catholicism was broken and since then she has adopted other means because her prohibition could no longer be enforced. We will learn also as we proceed with our study of the many fancy ways she invented for torturing to death those who disregarded her mandates. She not only admits that she prohibited the reading of the Bible in the early Church and that the Bible occupied a much more prominent place in the New Testament Church than is true with Catholicism.

She tells us that her reasons for not wishing her communicants to read the Bible are: that it is too sacred to be read; that some parts are “unsuited to the very young or the ignorant”; and that “more harm than utility is thereby caused”. She exultingly informs us that as a result of her diligent campaign to disparage the Bible her members usually prefer human books!

Proof

1. Catholic Church Forbids Bible Reading.

"More than this, parts of the Bible are evidently unsuited to the very young or to the ignorant, and hence Clement XI. condemned the proposition that 'the reading of the Scriptures is for all'. These principles are fixed and invariable, but the discipline of the Church with regard to the reading of the Bible in the vulgar tongue has varied with varying circumstances. In early times the Bible was read freely by the lay people... New dangers came in during the middle ages... To meet these evils, the Council of Toulouse (1229) forbade the laity to read the vernacular translations of the Bible. Pius IV (1565) required bishops to refuse lay persons leave to read even Catholic versions of Scripture unless their confessors or parish priests judged that such reading was likely to prove beneficial.” (Catholic Dictionary, 82).

2. Bible Reading Not Allowed Before Luther.

"It was well for Luther that he did not come into the world until a century after the immortal discovery of Gutenberg (the printing press). A hundred years earlier, his idea of directing two-hundred and fifty millions of men to read the Bible would have been received with shouts of laughter, and would have inevitably caused his removal from the pulpit of Wittenberg to a hospital for the insane.” (Quoted from Martinet by Cardinal Gibbons in Faith of Our Fathers, 107)

3. Bible Too Sacred to Be Read.

"If occasionally she has seemed to restrict its use or its diffusion this, too, was through an easily comprehensible love and particular esteem for the Bible, that the sacred book might not like a profane book be made a ground for curiosity, endless discussions, and abuses of every kind.” (Catholic Encyclopedia, XV., 9)


"In other spiritual books the truths of the Bible are presented more fully and in a more modern style, so that we can hardly wonder that they are, as a rule, preferred; and that though good Catholic families generally have a Bible, it is more venerated than read.” (Plain Facts, 154)

5. Bible Reading More Harm Than Utility.

"As it has been clearly shown by experience that, if the Holy Bible in the vernacular is generally permitted without distinction, more harm than utility is thereby caused, owing to human temerity: all versions in the vernacular, even by Catholics are altogether prohibited, unless approved by the Holy See, or published under the 'vigilant care of the Bishops with annotations taken from the Fathers of the Church and learned Catholic writers.” (Pope Leo XIII., in Great Encyclicals, 413)

MAKE THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN YOUR CHRISTMAS GIFT TO YOUR FRIEND OR RELATIVE. A GIFT CARD WILL BE FURNISHED UPON REQUEST. ONE YEAR—ONE DOLLAR.
Ichabod

THADDEUS S. HUTSON

“And she said, the glory is departed from Israel; for the ark of God is taken.” (1 Sam. 4:22.) This mournful language was uttered by the wife of one who by descent and occupation had been associated with the important office of the priesthood of ancient Israel. The people had been engaged in war with a neighboring nation, the Philistines, their relentless foe. After a reverse in battle, it was proposed, that they should bring into the camp the ark, that sacred vessel formed by Moses and deposited in the Most Holy place of the tabernacle. It had become a memorial of whatever was most valuable in the institutes of the Jewish religion. The Israelites thought if they could carry this ark to the scene of conflict, it would control the events of war and give them the victory. They were mistaken, as shown in the chapter from which our text is taken.

The Philistines fought and Israel was smitten, and they fled every man to his own tent, and there was a very great slaughter. There fell of Israel thirty thousand footmen, and the ark of God was taken, and the two sons of Eli, Hophni and Phinehas, were slain. The old father died when he heard the sad news. The wife of Phinehas was overtaken prematurely in her travail, and sank beneath the stroke. A woman stood by her and said, “fear not for thou hast borne a son. But she answered not whether she regarded it, and she named the child Ichabod, saying: The glory is departed from Israel, for the ark of God was taken.”

From this narrative we may be properly led to a topic, considering the times and conditions of the country and the church where we now live. We refer to the anxious and sensitive concern of pious men and women in behalf of true religion, and especially when its interests appear to be in danger.

The covering or the lid of the ark was called “the mercy seat.” It was associated with immediate displays of divine presence. The ark was an instrument of divine presence only to those who possessed and rightly applied it. God uttered his will and his promises to the priests whom he had chosen. In the economy of the gospel God’s presence is possessed spiritually. It is vouchsafed in the work of the Lord Jesus Christ. God has given the light of his glory in the face of Jesus Christ. He is the image of the invisible God; the brightness of the Father’s glory and the express image of his person. His saints are the temple of the Holy Spirit. When the ark was denominated “the mercy seat”, it was because the priest by divine command sprinkled upon it the blood of the sacrifices, which had been offered typically for the atonement for sin. So it is written of Christ, “God hath set him forth to be a Propitiation (an atoning victim) through faith in his blood.”

The ark was an instrument for divine protection. When the journey in the wilderness was concluded and they were about to cross over the Jordan, the priests bore the ark of the Lord before them. The waters were held back and they went triumphantly over. And when Jericho was about to be captured, while they marched round it the required number of times, they were to bear before the ark seven trumpets of ram’s horns. But the ark was there to contribute to their victory. Now the religion of the gospel is the agent of God for imparting direction and deliverance to man. It is to the church now, what the ark was to Israel of old. The revealed truth becomes vital to Christianity. It cannot have redeeming power when perverted. “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.” (Col. 2:8) There are some “who preach another gospel which is not another but would pervert the gospel of Christ.” (Gal. 1:7) It is these perversions that give concern to the faithful teachers and preachers of the word today. The word was not intended to take care of itself, but was to be committed to faithful men, that they might teach others also. There are errors in religious teaching, by which the gospel is compromised or abandoned altogether. I need not more than remind the reader. To compromise is to surrender.

We are living in an age of division, politically and religiously. Denominations have been divided and subdivided. Even the church of Christ has been divided. There was the organ, festival, and society division. There was a bid for popularity by one part, and a contention for “the old paths” by the other. Any one who openly contend-ed against the human departures, would be accused of “widening the breach.” Religion was attacked by eminent women leaders, Aimee McPherson on the Pacific coast; Mary Baker Eddy of the Christian (?) Science (?) cult, and the prophetess of Adventism Ellen G. White; Russelism, Mormonism, Liberalism, and Romanism. Now Premillennialism challenges the armies of the living God. A doctrine that denies that Christ is now on David’s throne or teaches that he will re-establish a Judaistic Kingdom at Jerusalem, with many other carnal aspects, takes the glory of the gospel away. Shall we allow the ark of God to be stolen and the glory of Israel to depart?

The emotions of the mother of the infant whose case is here recorded perpetuated her impassioned emotion, in the name which she gave to her offspring. She named the child Ichabod saying “The glory is departed from Israel”. Like emotions may well fill the hearts of Christians, when they behold the apparent danger to religion today. Shall the work of the defenders of the faith be forgotten and their work discredited by the cowardly who claim not to believe in debates? “Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed, saying, let us break their bands asunder, and cast away their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; The Lord shall have them in derision.” There should be great zeal in behalf of the truth. This requires aggression. We cannot grope in Egyptian darkness, just to please the vain talker. Follow the ark, and it will lead you on over the Jordan into the Promised Land which is not in Asia, but in heaven and immortal glory. There in the bliss of the unclouded Shechina, with countless hosts of the redeemed, is the glorious reward of all who follow the ark.
"To within living memory in England, such a large number of ministers were unable to prepare a sermon that the secret writing and syndication of these discourses by professional writers was quite a business. In 1870 London still had 12 concerns that weekly supplied sermons to about 1,500 preachers-the copies being printed 'in imitation of handwriting' in order to fool the congregations."

The problem is becoming quite the fashionable thing now for a certain type of preacher in the church of Christ (both old and young, degreed and undegreed) to memorize and recite sermons which have been taken almost bodily from sectarian sources. Clovis G. Chappell, eminent Methodist preacher, has written a number of books of sermons (Familiar Failures, Sermons on the Parables, Sermons on Old and New Testament Characters, etc.) which are light, airy, and easy to memorize. They are "frothy". There is nothing doctrinal or distinctive in any of them; they would fit perfectly in any Catholic, Unitarian, Methodist, or Mormon church in the country. They have a popular "newspaper" style that makes them easy to listen to-entertaining but not very instructive.

When a Christian preacher forsakes the gospel of Christ to deliver memorized sermons which he has taken from sectarian sources, he has become nothing more than a plagiaristic pulpiteer, parroting oratorical platitudes which have no meaning to the congregation-least of all to him.

When a church is supporting such a preacher one of two results is probable. Either the members soon awaken to the fact that they are being cheated and that the minister is taking money under false pretenses, and dismiss the man, or else they begin to acquire an appetite for entertainment and lose their taste for the "sincere milk of the word". This latter consequence, alas! is the more frequent. The members lose all desire to be militant and aggressive in their opposition of sectarian error; they deprecate debating; they complain that the evangelist who comes in to hold the yearly meeting is "preaching too hard"; and the next year they engage a man "who won't offend anybody, and whom all the denominations will like". In a word they cease to be churches of Christ and become spineless sentimentalists. The bones of their doctrinal skeleton (especially the backbone) have been denied proper food so long that they have become soft and brittle. In familiar terminology, "their bones have turned to water".

It was the ringing declaration of the early restoration preachers that if the seed of the kingdom would produce only Christians in apostolic days, that same seed sown today would have the same result. That principle is undoubtedly true. And if sectarian sermons are preached in Christian pulpits the result will be sectarian members in the pews. If gospel preachers are going to preach Clovis G. Chappell's Methodist sermons to the people they need not be surprised to learn that the people in the pews look upon themselves as a "sister church" to the denominations. Quotation Marks

If the effect on the churches is such, what of the preacher? It need hardly be mentioned that each time he delivers a memorized oration filched from some sectarian source he is nullifying his own conscience and willfully doing that which he knows to be wrong. Of course he might follow the example of one enterprising homiletician who was not entirely devoid of a sense of honor. This man entered the pulpit, and before ever speaking a single word raised both hands above his head and brought them down swiftly together. At the conclusion of his sermon he repeated precisely the same gesture. Upon being asked by a curious observer the meaning of such peculiar gestures he replied, "Those were the quotation marks". If we are going to have sermons which have been lifted from the works of others, it seems just ordinary honesty would demand the use of a few "quotation marks".

And if the preacher feels that he is compelled to preach a sermon he has taken from someone else let him be at least honest enough to make an announcement something like this: "I am preaching today a sermon written by that eminent Methodist, Brother Clovis G. Chappell".

The preaching of sermons which have not been learned by a diligent study of the Bible is one of the most dangerous practices into which any preacher ever permitted himself to fall. The insidious thing about it is that it so quickly destroys a man's power to study and do original work. He becomes accustomed to leaning on helps. The law of atrophy diminishes all power for and incentive toward creative thought. He finds it so much easier to preach someone else's sermon that he loses any desire to go to the hard work of preparing one of his own. He becomes a homiletical parasite, drawing his salary from the fruits of other men's labors. And his conscience being seared over in this respect, it is not surprising to find him going more and more astray along other lines.

Preach the Word

The remedy for this situation is obvious-a bold and emphatic campaign of "preaching the word". The only possible way to put strength and backbone into anemic churches, the only possible way for the preacher to have his own self-respect and the respect of others is to preach the word. In doing so he has God's promise that "My
CONCERNING PERSONS AND PERSONALITIES

Jesus Called the Names of the Sects (Denominations) of His Day and Pointed Out Their Errors. It Cannot Be Wrong to Follow the Example of Jesus in the Method of Preaching the Gospel.

G. A. DUNN, Sr.

Since the battle has become warm among some of the brethren as to “Bollism” and other “isms,” the question of persons and personalities has come up for study. The Bible is the right Book for all religious information.

If one’s ideas are out of line with the New Testament they need to be “aligned” so as to be brought into harmony with it. We now offer a little study on the subject.

1. Always one should state positions properly, never misrepresent a position. To misrepresent is not fair nor Christ-like.

2. Persons should be treated according to truth and righteousness and not according to hate or prejudice. Never lie about anyone. To do so will damn the one who does it besides mis-treat the one lied about. Those who lie about others will never be forgiven till they quit it and confess and correct it. God will judge all such.

3. The purpose in dealing with persons and personalities should not be holy but also wise. One may be sincere but unwise. To do good and not evil-sin, should be the motive; and then it should be studied closely to see if it is certain to do good and not evil. Where there is doubt, take the side of mercy and safety.

Under such caution let us always act. For a study now let us turn to the teaching and practice of Jesus.

a. Did Jesus “personate”? Matt. 16:6 has Jesus saying:

“Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.”

Acts 5:17 speaks of the “sect (denomination) of the Sadducees.” Acts 1:5:5 speaks of “the sect (denomination) of the Pharisees.”

From this it is seen that Jesus did personate the sects (denominations)—the leading ones of His time. No one will claim that Jesus did wrong.

b. In Luke 13:32 it is said:

“And he said unto them, Go and say to that fox (Herod), Behold, I cast out demons and perform cures today and tomorrow, and the third day I am perfected”.

In this case he is talking of a person, individual, Herod and he calls him a fox, a cunning quadruped. Did Jesus do wrong in comparing a ruler to an animal? Thus it is seen that Jesus named the sects (denominations) in his talks, as well as to refer personally to men, and compare them to dumb animals. Jesus did no wrong.

c. Jesus not only called the names of the sects (denominations, even his brethren) but he called attention to their teachings and pointed out in detail wherein they were wrong in teaching. In Matt. 15:1-9 we have this:

“Then there came to Jesus from Jerusalem Pharisees and scribes, saying: Why do thy disciples transgress the traditions of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread. And he answered and said unto them. Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition? For God said, Honor thy father and mother: and, he that speak-

Word will not return unto me void”. It requires constant study of the Bible. It means that a man must never be content to preach over and over a few sermons and stereotyped discourses (however good) that he has worked out in years past. He must constantly be bringing forth “things both new and old” from the storehouse of God’s truth. He must be alive to the needs of the people, and must be ready to feed them on “sound doctrine” at every opportunity. The outstanding need of the church today is not more money, more missionaries, more preachers of power and influence, better houses, or more members—4 is indoctrination. And that can be brought about only by the preaching of “sound speech which cannot be condemned”.

It is not our purpose to condemn unreservedly the use of sermon helps. What we are condemning is their misuse. Sermon outlines, and sermon suggestions rightly used can be very helpful. But they are to be used only to stimulate thought and suggest lines or original thought, never as substitutes for study.

Without taking time and space to quote Matt. 23 here, turn to it, and you will see Jesus naming the religious sects and calling attention to their teachings and practices, and also fore-telling their doom. I fear some talk about others will never be forgiven till they quit it and confess and correct it. God will judge all such.

In this the Pharisees called in questions the practice of Jesus’ disciples. Jesus did not tell them that it is wrong to discuss religion. Some folk say it is wrong to discuss religion. Jesus countered by asking the Pharisees, “Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God? “ He also took up in detail their teaching and practice and showed wherein the Pharisees transgressed in both teaching and practice.

It can not be wrong then to take up the teachings and practices of religious people in detail and show that they are wrong and wherein they are wrong. This may be one reason that we do not get more folk to see the truth.

d. Jesus not only personated and also discussed the doctrine and practice of religious folk, but he, also, when it was necessary, dealt with their hearts and characters. In Matt. 15:8 Jesus says:

“This people honor me with their lips but their heart is far from me.” That was a personal reflection on them.
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A MOUNTAIN MOVED INTO THE SEA

A Church Purged of Card-Playing, Dancing, and Multiple Forms of Worldliness

C. A. NORRED

MY definite connection with Tenth and Francis Streets church, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, began the third Lord's day in September, 1929. The membership then numbered around five hundred. At that time the church held desirable real estate at our present corner, measuring 100×150 feet, and on which had been erected a frame auditorium seating around five hundred persons. Also, there had been built on the premises a small, boxed structure containing two class rooms and an office. The membership was made up of representatives of good people.

The First Step

One element in the agreement on which I began work was that I should have charge, under the elders, of the Bible school. Proper sequence requires that it be said that at that time the Bible school was operating along rather liberal lines. The superintendent was a man of liberal sympathies and had very naturally built a teaching force representing those feelings. Soon after assuming the work I called the teachers together and assured them that although I had no desire to disturb unduly the then existing arrangement I did desire to request all teachers to put themselves on the side of good citizenship in the church. Specific request was made that card-playing, dancing, swearing, social drinking, gossiping, and all other activities offensive to moral sensibilities be avoided. When some complaint was made against such recommendations the church cast its influence for the improved order. From that time on our teachers were chosen for their character and teaching ability.

Only The Bible

And this elevation of our teaching force was followed by a very interesting development. Although not caring to appear as critical toward the literature used the teachers began expressing a wish for a different type or lesson material. After long and careful effort a graded course based upon the use of the Bible alone was inaugurated. The immediately ensuing increased interest in Bible study was little short of phenomenal.

And from this careful teaching of the Word other results followed. First, through the expenditure of $42,000—additional real estate was secured and a Bible school structure, carefully designed to accommodate a maximum attendance of 1200, was erected. And, secondly, during this time around one thousand persons have walked down our aisles in answer to the gospel invitation.

And underlying all that has already been noticed there more, and more asserted itself a general spiritual improvement. Of the previously mentioned persons answering the gospel invitation about one hundred and twenty-five were restorations. Most of these were persons whose names were unknown to us—but not all! Among them were some of the best known members of the church, who had gone in and out among us they had failed as Christians and had in many instances been an influence for evil. And while this was going on old scandals were removed, broken homes restored or stayed from dissolution, attendance augmented materially, and the church made to realize and exemplify the increased usefulness, happiness and satisfaction found in really walking with the Lord.

And it should be said just in this connection that the increased spirituality just referred to was not a merely temporary thing but has continued with the passing of time. In proof of this the records show that the year closed, the sixth year, was the most fruitful year of all. The improvement was therefore permanent.

Crusading Against Worldliness

It is hoped that the purpose back of this article is obvious. As a simple matter of fact, a great measure of the success portrayed in this article is attributable to the suppression of worldliness. And, after all, this is what we might expect. Were it not for our judges who sit upon the bench and maintain among us the traditions of law and order we should be overrun by violence: were it not for our teachers who direct the minds of the young in the beginning of worthy citizenship we should be swallowed up in ignorance and wretchedness—but unfortunately the church, the divinely appointed guardian of the spiritual values of life, has, in many quarters at least, fallen victim to the notion that she serves her highest mission in becoming like the world about her. The result is that spiritual leadership is lost. Then an increasing spirit of worldliness settles down over what might otherwise be a happy and useful people in the Lord. But generally in such instances there is a large and intelligent body which if given the opportunity would take the lead for better things.

And this crusade for improved conditions need not be the unpleasant thing that it is sometimes pictured. The simple truth is that if the teaching of God's Word is placed in the hands of the proper persons and all leaders and God-fearing members of Christ humbly but firmly give their friendliness, sympathy, and the weight of their influence to the effort toward better things and the sound conventions of true religion the way will be largely prepared for peaceful progress. Parents and teachers are increasingly perceiving that children will, generally speaking, develop along the lines indicated in the homes. The same principle applies to the matter of church life—the church will develop, generally speaking, along the lines indicated in the lives of those who give the church its leadership. If therefore all those who love the Lord would exemplify the best things in the kingdom there would break upon us such a spiritual revival as would beggar description. Such has been our experience here.

The Transforming Power

Should anyone be disposed to raise the question of credit for the success discussed in this article I should like to say that although every person is always entitled to the credit that is rightfully his the overshadowing influence in this matter is the gospel. The Word of God possesses marvelous transforming power, and if given even half a chance will correct every evil it may confront. The regrettable thing is that in many quarters, even among professing Christians, the gospel is not given a decent chance but is all but buried under the rubbish of worldliness and iniquity. A good Christian and the gospel can work wonders—they can do greater things than casting mountains into the sea. And I am profoundly thankful to Almighty God for having been permitted to witness this with my own eyes. May the Lord be praised!
There are peculiar divisions in the religious world, which account for the many conflicting religious bodies. The Lord only knows how many more there will be. Some say that nothing you can do has anything to do with salvation; and, seem to think they prove this absurd doctrine by quoting statements that one is saved by faith. If the faith that saves does not embrace the doing of the Lord’s will. it would be interesting to search the Bible to find some one who received a special blessing from God by a faith that did not manifest itself in the doing of anything.

A preacher with forty years experience well versed in Hebrew, Greek and English, according to his own modest estimate of his Biblical information, endorsed this theory, mentioning baptism and the Lord’s supper as having nothing to do with salvation.

There are works that have different results. Nobody is saved by works of merit. “By works of law shall no flesh be justified in his sight.” (Rom. 3:20) And, “as many as are of the works of the law are under a curse”. (Gal. 3:10) Again “we reckon therefore that a man is justified by faith apart from the works of the law”. (Rom. 3:28) The apostle Paul illustrates the contrast between legal works and faith as follows: “For if Abraham was justified by works, he hath whereof to glory: but not toward God. For what saith the scripture ? And Abraham believed God, and he was reckoned unto him for righteousness”. (Rom. 4:2, 3) He also mentions this glaring contrast between faith and law in Galatians, stating that we are justified by faith (Gal. 3:23) and, that those who would be justified by the law are severed from Christ, and fallen away from grace. (Gal. 5:4)

James discribes the faith that saves in terms that can be understood, even though some, like Martin Luther, may have a contempt for it. (James 2:14-26) Faith without works is dead; it cannot manifest itself; it is such as the demons have; it is barren; it is imperfect; and finally, it is compared to a corpse. He says that Abraham was justified by works in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar—a deed which perfected his faith; and that Rahab the harlot was justified by works, in that she received the messengers, and sent them out another way. Hebrews 11:17, 19, 3.5 mentioning these same works states that by faith Abraham offered up Isaac; and, by faith Rahab the harlot perished not with those that were disobedient, having received the spies with peace. Neither Paul nor James states that one is justified by faith only, or by works only. If the faith that justified, excluded works, then James, as well as other inspired writers blundered egregiously.

Paul says that God will render to every man according to his works; to them that by patience in well-doing seek for glory and honor and incorruption, eternal life; but unto them that are factious and obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness, shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that worketh evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Greek; but glory and honor and peace to every man that worketh good to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.” (Rom. 2:6-9) This is in perfect harmony with James’ statement; “Ye see that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only”. (James 2:24)

Denying that anything that one does has anything to do with salvation contradicts a very plain statement made by Christ. “Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of this world: for I was hungry, and ye gave me to eat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me. . . .”

Then shall he say also unto them on his left hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels; . . . . Then shall they also answer, saying, Lord, when saw we thee hungry, or thirsty, or a stranger, or naked, or sick, and in prison, and did not minister unto thee? Then shall he answer them, saying, Verily I say unto you, Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these least, ye did it not unto me.” (Matt. 25:31-46)

The ground of eternal life, as stated by Christ is doing service to him through his brethren, and the end of faith is the salvation of the soul, consequently, the faith that saves embraces every item of works that God commands to be done.

When Saul of Tarsus, later the apostle Paul, learned that Jesus was the Christ he said: What shall I do, Lord? and Jesus replied: “Arise and go into Damascus; and it shall be told thee of all things appointed for thee to do.” One thing Ananias, the Lord’s messenger, said to him was: “Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name.”

If we enter the realms of the blest it will be by faith, working through love,—a faith which excludes nothing that God commands.

To say that I am pleased with it expresses it moderately—I am delighted with it. Our preaching and writing have become sterile-having no reproductive power so far as New Testament vivaciousness is concerned. The first sentence in the prospectus of the Millennial Harbinger, published January 4, 1830, nearly one hundred and six years ago, says: “This work shall be devoted to the destruction of sectarianism, infidelity and antichristian doctrine and practice”. Thus the course was chartered and the policy stated of that magazine which for more than a third of a century stirred the religious world as it had never been stirred since the days of the apostles. But when that great luminary which had so brilliantly reflected the rays of the light of the Sun of Righteousness into the very center and circumference of denominationalism, began to be dimmed by the infirmities of old age, and the compromising elements began to cast their shadows over its pages, the magazine lost its usefulness.

The announcement of your vigorous editorial policy is timely and sorely needed. Nothing like it since the Campbell and Fanning pronouncements. And nothing needed more or worse.—John T. Lewis, Birmingham, Ala.
WHAT REVELATION 20 DOES NOT TEACH

The Keystone of the Whole Structure of Premillennialism Is Wanting.

B. L. DOUGHTITT

The “thousand years” of Revelation 20 is the heart of the premillennial theory. One brother teaches that it is “God’s key” to unlock many closed doors. We are told that the “thousand years” of Revelation 20 is an age as real as the present age and to preach there will be an age or dispensation of one thousand years during which Christ will reign on the earth is to “contend earnestly for the faith which once for all was delivered unto the saints.” With some this future age or dispensation becomes the leading thought of the Bible. It is the keystone of the whole premillennial structure, and a failure to prove an “earthly” reign of Christ for one thousand years after his second coming means the whole structure falls.

The Scriptures teach that the church of our Lord Jesus Christ, the one body, the kingdom of Christ, was established on Pentecost after Christ’s resurrection. The kingdom established on Pentecost is God’s kingdom on the earth. The day of Pentecost marks the beginning of the reign of Christ and every Christian reigns with Christ in the kingdom of Christ, and Christ is now reigning as King of kings and Lord of lords over the kingdom which began on Pentecost. Peter says: “But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation.” (1 Pet. 2:9.) (A royal priesthood —in Peter’s time Christians were addressed as kings and priests.) Paul says: “For if, by the trespass of the one, death reigned through the one, much more shall they that receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one, even Jesus Christ.” (Rom. 5:17.) Those in the kingdom of Christ reign in life now.

Passages Cited-A Parallel

1. Rev. 3:21—“He that overcometh, I will give to him to sit down with me in my throne, as I also overcame, and sat down with my Father in his throne.”

2. 2 Tim. 2:12—“If we endure, we also shall reign with him; if we shall deny him, he also will deny us.”

It is argued from the two passages given above that the reign of the saints with Christ is after his coming and this earthly reign for a period of one thousand years is contingent on their over-

coming and enduring till Jesus comes. Christians reign with Christ as they overcome and endure in this life. Let the reader consider Rev. 3:21 and 2 Tim. 2:12 in the light of a plain parallel passage. Christ says: “As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father; so he that eateth me, he also shall live because of me.” (Jno. 6:57.) The life our Savior promised is lived daily by Christians. The promise is contingent on the eating in this life. Study the following parallel:

He . . . Overcometh . . . Will Sit
(Rev. 3:21.)

We . . . Endure . . . Shall Reign
(2 Tim. 2:12.)

He . . . Eateth . . . Shall Live
(Jno. 6:57.)

The sitting, reigning, and living are enjoyed by the Christians just as he overcometh, endureth, and eateth in this life daily. This is in harmony with 1 Pet. 2:9 and Rom. 5:17 which teaches that Christians are now reigning with Christ.

In the Neal-Wallace debate, held at Winchester, Kentucky, from January 2 to January 6, 1933, Brother Wallace did some of his best work on, “An Inadequate Proof Text.” He itemized five wanting features in Revelation 20.

The items were 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 nor the nature of his reign.” (Neal-Wallace Debate, page 21)

Brother Wallace held this work before the audience throughout the entire discussion and it proved to be a death-blow to Brother Neal’s proposition.

More Wanting Elements of Revelation 20

1. David’s literal throne in Jerusalem.

2. Jerusalem the capital city and religious center of the world.

3. National conversion and restoration of Israel to Palestine.

4. Restitution of all things.

5. Rebuilding the temple.

6. The Tabernacle of David.

7. The church gaining momentum and swinging into world-wide triumph.

8. New age or dispensation during which Christ will reign on the earth.


10. 1000 YEARS between the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked.

John 5:28, 29—“Marvel not at this: for the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of judgment.” John says, the hour cometh, in which all that are in the tombs (both righteous and wicked) shall hear his voice and come forth. Now, by what authority does the premillenialist say there will be an age of “one thousand years” between the resurrection of the righteous and the wicked? According to John the righteous dead and the wicked dead are raised at the same time. Let us keep in mind that the writer of this passage is the same writer of Revelation 20. Does Revelation 20 clash with John 5:29? No, for John does not say in Revelation 20 there is a thousand years period between. The keystone of the whole structure is wanting.

Mat. 16:27—“For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then shall he render unto every man according to his deeds.” Christ will render unto every man according to his deeds. Both the righteous and the wicked. When? When he comes in the glory of his Father with his angels. THEN will he render unto every man. The premillennial theory, of one thousand years between the resurrection of the righteous and the resurrection of the wicked, clashes with this plain passage.
FOR the persecuted Christians, “strangers scattered” throughout Asia Minor, the apostle Peter had a strong consolation. If in this life they had to forfeit Palestine, their home on earth, they had the happy assurance of Heaven, a spiritual inheritance. To comfort the exiles further, Peter contrasted their inheritance above with carnal Canaan. That eternal land bequeathed to them was to be:

I. Incorruptible
   Everything we know in this old world is corruptible. “Death and decay and passing away are written upon the wings of time and timely things.” (N. B. H.) So corrupt was this earth at one time that God could not bear his own creation—even a God of unvarying mercy and long-suffering repented “that he had made man.” And that awesome flood of rising waters cleared wickedness from the world. But it wasn’t long till sin again prevailed; it is rampant even yet; and the way it pleases the Almighty finally to rid this earth of corruption is by such a fire that will burn the earth and the works therein. Water couldn’t kill corruption; fire will kill it, but it will kill the patient (the earth) too; thus there is nothing in this old world for the scattered strangers or for us either. But what a striking contrast is that “new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness”; no corruption nor the leaven of it will be there; only that which makes for permanence and indestructibility.

In consoling the pilgrim Christians, Peter said their inheritance was going to be so much better than Palestine; besides being incorruptible, the land of the twelve tribes was contaminated; not so with Heaven, for it was to be

II. Undefiled
   Again, everything we know in this world is subject to defilement. Disease germs, bacteria, invisible to eyes, float around doing just that work. Defiling is all they can do. Slop, filth, stagnant pools! The misery, the utter repulsiveness of it all! Yet in America we hardly know what filth and disease and unsanitary conditions are. Those who have been to Palestine say it is one of the most defiled sections of God’s creation—especially Jerusalem! The unbathed, afflicted beggars along cobbled narrow streets; the sickish, defiled boys and girls crying for a coin. “Jerusalem! the most-talked-of city in the world! . . . unsanitary conditions, with filth and vile stenches, the shiftless, indecent people lolling about the streets, with deep poverty and persistent beggars on every hand; children in tatters who show plainly that they suffer from malnutrition; others blind, or a child in whose form the ravages of disease have left its marks till it resembles ‘starving India,’ is carried by some husky man and pushed under your eyes to excite your pity and touch your charity,” . . . No wonder Peter thought it would comfort the exiles from Palestine if he should promise them a land that was undefiled. How happy they should be in forsaking carnal Jerusalem for the Jerusalem “which is above”. “And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination.”

In pursuing his line of contrast further, Peter affirmed the Christians’ inheritance to be a land that

III. Fodeth Not Away
   All that we know in this life fades away. Boyhood friends of yours now linger only in your memory; girlhood chums have slowly slipped from you; wedding bells have broken up that “old gang of mine.” You’ve moved to another city; fondly you recall happy childish things, but now they are gone, eternally gone.

All pleasures of this life, too, are quickly spent, and the joy of them disappears; be it a lovely vacation trip or a tight ball game, it soon is in the past. Even more enduring joys are but for a season—excluding the joy of friendship. Bacon said that life without friends is but a wilderness; without real loving encouragement from friends you’d have given up many a battle; friends have stood by you; they have staidly warded placed shoulder to your shoulder; you could depend on them! But even the best, the strongest, and the dearest of friends must—they don’t want to; you don’t want them to—must fade away.

As childhood joys, mature pleasures, even friends must leave you, so must the nearest, most intimate, God-given relations on earth must fade from you. That mother who was in the “twilight of two worlds” for you to be born; that calloused hand of a sacrificing father—all will leave you. One day you receive a rose from mother; affectionately it’s laid between the leaves of your Bible; in a few days it’s faded away. All life withers, in Palestine, in America, but not in Heaven! Your Christian mother and godly father will be there unfaded; if roses are there they won’t fade; “And God shall wipe all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain: for the former things are passed away.” (Emphasis mine.)

Not only is spiritual Jerusalem incorruptible, undefiled, that which fades not away, but it is

IV. Reserved In Heaven
   At the World Series you must have reserved seats. Already many reservations have been made for the next 500 Mile Indianapolis Race—some for faraway Africans; they know the necessity of reservations. In a crowded season, you will have reserved your hotel suite ahead of time; you know it is common sense; you know you cannot get one without it. How much more so spiritually! Jesus is preparing a spiritual hotel with many mansions, not made with hands, eternal in the heavens; the Lamb will be the light thereof. We must send our reservations on ahead of time to get in that finely furnished, well-lighted, luxurious hotel. No one can take up your reservation; if you don’t appear your suite will be closed and locked; but if you do appear it’s yours, guaranteed by his imutable promise and unbreakable oath.
Among other things, we discussed the theory of an opportunity for eternal life to be given in what they call the Millennial Age, or day of judgment, Elder Green introduced the language of Isaiah in Isa. 26:9: "For when thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness." It was claimed that this referred to the thousand year reign of Christ on the earth, to the thousand-year-judgment-day, and during that time the inhabitants of the world would learn righteousness. Thus multitudes who did not learn righteousness during their lifetime in the ages preceding the Millennium will do so in that age. However, it was shown that this could not refer to any such period of time. The Millennium, according to Jehovah’s Witnesses (?), is to be a time of favors. During that period Satan is to be bound, or dead in Adam’s lap, unless they turn it down. In the Millennial Age the wicked man will not obtain mercy. He sinned in ignorance and obtained mercy. So all others who sin in ignorance will obtain mercy. But the wicked man will not obtain mercy because he sins against knowledge.

In dealing with this position I showed the absurdity of any such contention. The mere fact that a man may sin ignorantly does not keep him from being a wicked man. Speaking to the Jews who crucified the Lord Peter said: “Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain.” Acts 2:23. Thus we are informed that the murderers of Jesus were wicked men—they crucified him “by wicked hands.” And yet when they were killing the Savior he prayed: “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” Luke 23:34, And Peter also declared: “And now, brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers.” Acts 3:17. And yet they were wicked! So a man may be wicked despite his ignorance.

And besides this we read of Lot in this language: “And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked.” 2 Pet 2:7. Here the men of Sodom were called wicked. Does this mean that they had heard and learned the truth and turned it down? Does it mean they had already had their opportunity and would be given none in the future? That is what my opponent claimed it takes to make a wicked man, and Peter said these Sodomites were wicked. Well, let’s completely cut Elder Green loose from one of their favorite proof texts that he could never be induced to use it. Let any one who may be called upon to meet him in discussion remember this.

The Second Chance Theory

Among other things, we discussed the theory of an opportunity for eternal life to be given to heathen and unbelievers after being awakened from the dead. To prove that an opportunity for life would be given in what they call the Millennial Age, or day of judgment, Elder Green introduced the language of Isaiah in Isa. 26:9: “For when thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness.” It was claimed that this referred to the thousand year reign of Christ on the earth, to the thousand-year-judgment-day, and during that time the inhabitants of the world would learn righteousness. Thus multitudes who did not learn righteousness during their lifetime in the ages preceding the Millennium will do so in that age. However, it was shown that this could not refer to any such period of time. The Millennium, according to Jehovah’s Witnesses (?), is to be a time of favors. During that period Satan is to be bound, or dead in Adam’s lap, unless they turn it down. In the Millennial Age the wicked man will not obtain mercy. He sinned in ignorance and obtained mercy. So all others who sin in ignorance will obtain mercy. But the wicked man will not obtain mercy because he sins against knowledge.

In dealing with this position I showed the absurdity of any such contention. The mere fact that a man may sin ignorantly does not keep him from being a wicked man. Speaking to the Jews who crucified the Lord Peter said: “Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain.” Acts 2:23. Thus we are informed that the murderers of Jesus were wicked men—they crucified him “by wicked hands.” And yet when they were killing the Savior he prayed: “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” Luke 23:34, And Peter also declared: “And now, brethren, I wot that through ignorance ye did it, as did also your rulers.” Acts 3:17. And yet they were wicked! So a man may be wicked despite his ignorance.

And besides this we read of Lot in this language: “And delivered just Lot, vexed with the filthy conversation of the wicked.” 2 Pet 2:7. Here the men of Sodom were called wicked. Does this mean that they had heard and learned the truth and turned it down? Does it mean they had already had their opportunity and would be given none in the future? That is what my opponent claimed it takes to make a wicked man, and Peter said these Sodomites were wicked. Well, let’s completely cut Elder Green loose from one of their favorite proof texts that he could never be induced to use it. Let any one who may be called upon to meet him in discussion remember this.

The Rest Of The Dead

Continuing this line of thought I submitted to him the following question: “If the rest of the dead (who, you say, are the wicked) live not again till the thousand years are finished, how
will they be given an opportunity for life during the thousand years?" This question was answered somewhat in the following manner: The rest of the dead refers to the wicked, those who have had an opportunity in the gospel age and rejected it, those who came to a knowledge of the truth and turned it down. Others-heathen and unbelievers—will be raised at various times during the thousand years, but these wicked ones, who are to be given no further opportunity, remain dead till the thousand years are over. Then they will be raised from the dead and everlasting destroyed.

Such position as the above certainly presents something strange. These wicked people died; they became as dead as a dead dog, according to Ruthford and his followers; they became as though they had never been; they were completely destroyed in death. There they remain till the fancied Millennium is over. Then God goes to work and raises them from the dead. But why does he raise them? They have had their chance and it is over. There is to be given them no further opportunity to prepare for eternal life. God has nothing in store for them—no opportunity, no favor, no mercy, no blessings, no chance. That was all settled before they died. There is not even to be any judgment, or trial, for them, for they have had that already we are told. Then why does God raise them from the dead? Just to destroy them everlasting? They were already destroyed, according to the theory, and as completely destroyed as it is possible to be. Since then God has nothing for them, and they are already destroyed, why not just leave them dead? Being already destroyed completely they could remain dead forever without a resurrection and another destruction. Or is it a fact that God couldn't keep them dead? If he could keep them dead, there is no sense in raising them with nothing in view for them but to return to the same condition in which they were. Verily the theories of Ruthford and his cohorts are strange things. Anything that is so absurd cannot be true. And I know that their theories of the Millennium, like the speculations of some of our own brethren and others, are entirely out of harmony with plain gospel statements. Let us beware of them. Too much is at stake.

THE PLAN OF SALVATION

Do Men Believe The Bible? Certain Religionists Hold It Up And Admire It or Some Particular Truths Found In It; But When Passages Are Found That Disagree With Their Creeds, They Part Company With It.

A. O. COLLEY

The above question may seem strange to some who read this, but it is a sad fact that the Bible is now suffering in the house of its friends. Jesus was treated that way by His own people—the Jews-who, through religious zeal, put Him to death because He did not agree with their notions of religion.

There are religious teachers today who treat the Bible that same way. It is held up and admired for certain truths found in it, but when statements are found that disagree with their theory of "Salvation by Faith Only" they are ready to part company with it and openly challenge any one to prove that other commands are necessary for the salvation of the soul from sin.

Let us remember the Bible is the last message from the Divine Mind, and whatever it says, on the all important subject we must believe. If there has been a single law annulled since Jesus suffered, went back to the Father and sent the Holy Spirit to direct the Apostles into "All Truth," there is no way for us to know it. It will not do to select a few isolated passages from the Bible and build a theory on them. It is a harmonious Book. Whatever one must do to have his sins remitted or to be saved from his past sins, all must do. There is not a single example where one was ever saved on faith only in the entire plan of salvation. (See Jam. 2:24; Rom. 6:17; Mark 16:16).

The plan of salvation is not found under the Law of Moses for us today; neither is it found during the personal ministry of Christ, but after His death; Heb. 9:16-17, "For where a testament is, there must of necessity be the death of him that made it. For a testament is of force where there hath been death; for it doth never avail while he that made it liveth." Men who go back of the Cross to find the plan of salvation get wrong and teach people wrong. The will of Christ is the New Testament. While He was yet alive, not one line of it was written. He sent His Spirit to guide the apostles into all truth. They, under His guidance, taught men how to be saved.

After the death of Christ, and before He finally ascended to the Father, He gave the Apostles "The Great Commission" recorded in Matt. 28:19-20; Mark 16:15-16; Luke 24:48-49. He told them they should not begin to teach this great plan of salvation until the Holy Spirit should come upon them, as Luke said, in the above passage. No man was ever treated as a Christian until he was baptized "Into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." I know of no better illustration of this thought than the wedding ceremony. Good promises of love are made by both contracting parties, but she is never a wife nor he a husband until the ceremony is said that announces them "Husband and Wife." Just so we may confess Christ and claim to trust in Him, but we are not "Married to Him who was raised from the dead" (Rom. 7:4) until we are baptized into Christ." (Gal. 3:27).

Mark gives some additional information as to the purpose of baptism in his record of the "Great Commission." (Mark 16:15-16) He tells us why one should be baptized. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Here belief in Jesus as the Son of God, and baptism are coupled together by the conjunction "and" which denotes that whatever one of these acts of the soul is for, the other one sustains the same relation. Both look to the promise—"He shall be saved."

Wallace pointed this out to Norris and the large audience in the Norris and Wallace debate. Mr. Norris attacked the genuineness of the passage. Said it was not in a manuscript that he had seen through gloss in some museum. Brother Wallace promptly told him the Book of Revelation was also left out of old manuscripts to which he referred, and according to Norris all of his two days contention, based mainly on Revelation, twentieth chapter, was also "Spurious". Norris had many things to say; but overlooked that. Who could blame him? In fact Norris reminded me of the negro preacher in Tennessee who said he still believed in the Passover. "When I gets to anything hard in the Bible I jes passes over it."
**ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THAN WORDS**

**Love Is An Active Principle, Not A Verbal Sentiment; If Jesus Had Said, “If You Love Me, Ye Will Say So”, Many Would Qualify.**

P. W. STONESTREET

The adage, “Actions speak louder than words”, is not Scripture but it is scriptural. Its phraseology is not in the Bible but its substance is. Its truth is the basis of Christ’s question: “Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?” (Luke 6:46). Since Lord means ruler, it was futile, so far as those thus speaking and acting were concerned, to call Jesus Lord and not loyally submit and obey. And no wonder Christ also said: “By their fruits ye shall know them.” (Matt. 7:16). So, concerning matters over which we have control, the truth of this principle not only has human recognition but also divine sanction.

Jesus Cites Action

“If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments” (John 14:15), embodies the same principle. But if Jesus had said: If ye love me, ye will say so, then myriads would easily qualify as loving him; but as he cites action as proof rather than words, the number who qualify is greatly reduced. For this reason, comparatively few can worship in truth in singing “0 how I love Jesus” and other songs of like sentiment, however good their intentions may be, for to not loyally submit and obey his commands rather than a mere verbal sentiment. Yet, in the Providence of God, we have the writings of Moses and others for their historic value that we may profit by the experience of people who lived under previous dispensations, having a record of their failures as a warning to us, and a record of their successes as an encouragement for us. In fact, the very same principles of obedience that obtained during the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations obtain now. Commands, rules, and customs change, but principles do not; and this is why we may profit by a study of laws that do not apply to us, except the principle of obedience which they embody. “For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope.” (Rom. 16:4).

Victims Of Human Doctrine

Also, had Jesus said: If ye love me, ye will keep the commandments of good religious men, as they may appeal to you, many more religious people would qualify as loving him, for neither Moses nor any other Bible character commanded many of the things that are practiced in religion today. And Christ anticipated the condition thus: “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 doctrines the precepts of men.” (Matt. 15:7-9; the prophecy of Isa. 29:13). By the Savior’s interpretation of the prophecy, we are assured that his immediate reference was to the Scribes and Pharisees; and guided by the infallible principle under discussion, we may just as surely know that religious people now, who manifest no more regard for the authority of Christ than the Scribes and Pharisees, are under the same condemnation and for the same reason.

A spiritual examination is vastly more important than a physical examination to which we occasionally submit. So allow me to suggest that we all make a re-study of our spiritual case, closely observing the instructions of the great Physician, for I am persuaded that many honest victims of the doctrines and commandments of men will extricate themselves from the clutches of tradition and superstition if they can only identify themselves as such victims. The Savior has spoken plainly and there should be no difficulty in making the identification.

Christ acted in harmony with the truth of the principle that demonstrated acts rather than words furnish absolute proof of the truth of his teaching by confirming his verbal teaching with miracles, which was the very purpose of miracles. (See John 20:30). Nicodemus was guided by the same principle in saying: “Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou dost, except God be with him.” (John 3:2). The present generation has only the record of miracles: we are not eye witnesses. “Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet believe.” (John 20:29). So then, inasmuch as the Savior of the world observed this principle while on earth, just think how much more necessary it is for uninspired men to observe it. Why, to disregard a principle thus established by both Inspiration and human experience, and expect to get away with it, discredits both the heart and head of the one thus acting.

An Example Of Saying And Not Doing

Incidentally, after recently reading his book, I am reminded of Dr. J. Frank Norris, of Baptist and premillennial persuasion, and what he said in his speeches in the “Norris-Wallace Debate” indicating a willingness to publish his opponent’s speeches with his own and his final course, in contrast with his speeches, in refusing to comply with the custom of very reasonable conditions under which those speeches might have been published. Thus his course, in disregard of custom and human experience, and expect to get away with it, discredits both the heart and head of the one thus acting.
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THE SECOND COMING
E. P. WATSON

In the New Testament, a book that can be read in ten or twelve hours, there are no less than fifty direct calls to "watch" for the coming of the Lord—a call to every twenty-five minutes of reading. These exhortations scattered through its pages with that commanding word "watch" are so many taps on the shoulder by the finger of God bidding us look up for the appearing of Jesus.

The time of his coming we do not and cannot know. But among the unknown things concerning his coming there are some that we can and do know, some of which are here set forth.

The Manner Of His Coming

1. He will come as he went away. "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven". (Acts 1:11)

He ascended in the cloud. "And a cloud received him out of their sight". (Acts 1:9) And so he will come. "Behold he cometh with the clouds and every eye shall see him". (Rev. 1:15)

2. He shall come quickly. "As the lightning cometh out of the east and shineth unto the west; so shall the coming of the Son of Man be". (Matt. 24:27)

What a wonderful sight to contemplate; to see the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven; coming with power and great glory; coming as quick as lightning, yet every eye shall see him.

3. He shall come in glory. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory and all the holy angels with him". (Matt. 25:31)

What a unanswerable glory! Jude says "Behold he cometh with ten thousand of his saints". (Jude 1:14) That will be the greatest and grandest and most wonderful sight ever beheld in all the world.

The Events Of His Coming

It is contended by some that Christ will come to Jerusalem and reign one thousand years on David's literal throne. If that is taught in the Word of God I confess my inability to find it. That a thousand year period is mentioned in the visions of John no one will deny, but being set forth in symbols it does not form a part of the plain teaching of the New Testament. It is best to study plain passages that deal with the events of the Lord's coming that no violence may be done to the Word of God.

1. When He comes his kingdom will be delivered to God. Paul said that He (Christ) "must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet". (1 Cor. 15:25)

Verse 24: "Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power". (Verse 26: "The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death". Death shall be destroyed when the dead are called from their graves. "Then shall come to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. 0, death where is thy sting? 0, grave where is thy victory?" (1 Cor. 15:55)

2. When He comes there will be the resurrection of the dead. "For we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent (precede) them which are asleep". (1 Thess. 4:16)

Verse 13: "But the dead in Christ shall rise first". (1 Thess. 4:14-15) It should be observed that in 1 Cor. 15 Paul said "the dead" should be raised "at the last trump". He called it the resurrection of the dead—all the dead. But in 1 Thess. 4 he says "the dead in Christ shall rise first" that is, before the rest of the dead: then a thousand year reign on earth, and after that the resurrection of the rest of the dead. NOW the passage does not even hint at such a thing. What it does say is that "we that are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent (precede, or go before) them which are asleep" but "we which are alive and remain shall with the dead in Christ "be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air and so shall ever be with the Lord". In this passage Paul is not discussing the resurrection of the wicked nor the order in which it shall occur, but rather the order of the ascension of the living and the dead in Christ when they are caught up to meet him in the air. The dead in Christ shall rise first&that is, before the living in Christ are "caught up" and they together shall ascend to meet the Lord and "so shall ever be with the Lord".

But in 1 Cor. 15 Paul discusses the resurrection of all the dead which, he says, will take place at the last trump. It is the same trump mentioned in 1 Thess. 4:16. In one the living are "translated" and in the other they are "caught up". It is the same occasion of John 5:22 when "all that are in their tombs shall hear his voice and come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation". Language cannot be plainer. How can any one understand that there will be a thousand years between the resurrection of the righteous and the resurrection of the wicked ?

3. When He comes there will be the judgment of all the nations. "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit on the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats". (Matt. 25:31-32)

Describe the same judgment scene. John said: "And I saw the dead, small and great stand before God; and the books were opened and they were judged every man according to their works". (Rev. 20:12-14) John saw the dead and the judgment mentioned included every man.

4. When He comes it will be the end of the world.

The day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night: in which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the earth also and the works
that are therein shall be burned up... Nevertheless we, according to his promise, look for a new heaven and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. (2 Pet. 3:7-14) A further description of the new heavens and the new earth—the Christian’s eternal home—may be found in the closing chapters of the New Testament. May God help us in the study of his word and to meet the Lord in peace when he comes.

THE POSTMAN’S WHISTLE

The first issue of your paper came duly to hand and I wish to congratulate you upon the issue. Not only is it creditable from a mechanical standpoint, but it is also well edited. Wishing you success in your undertaking. Leon B. McQuiddy, Publisher Of The Gospel Advocate, Nashville Tenn.

I desire to congratulate you upon the first issue of The Gospel Guardian. The make-up is splendid; the subject matter is grand. I feel that the entire brotherhood is pleased with your publication. The magazine rings true to its title-THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN. May it continue upon its course to "contend earnestly for the faith once for all delivered to the saints."—N. Z. Crass, Dallas, Texas.

I received your first paper a day or two ago. I gave my copy to Brother Hall as I have access to Brother Hinds’ copy. You certainly got up a fine edition. Fine in appearance and good in matter. You gave Brother Armstrong an extra dose, but he needs it. I have not yet read everything in it, but I will as soon as I get time.—F. B. Srygley, Nashville, Tenn.

I said last week The Gospel Guardian would be a mistake. I said yesterday that it was a success. Carry on, Old Boy, and may God bless you as you go.—James L. Lovell, Los Angeles, Calif.

I am simply delighted with the “Guardian” in every way. I like its appearance. The contents meet exactly the announced purpose of the magazine and only good should come from this “watchman on the tower”.—C. A. Taylor, Louisville, Ky.

The Gospel Guardian is absolutely wonderful and to my mind is destined to supply a greatly needed situation in the brotherhood today.—T. C. Walker, Dallas, Texas.

Accept our commendation of the first issue of The Gospel Guardian and have read it carefully and am frank to say that I like it. I like the spirit that you manifest in presenting the argument in its entirety and with firmness, yet not with boastful spirit. There is a wide open field for The Gospel Guardian so long as it carries the spirit of Christ in its message.—Raleigh Martin, Lubbock, Tex.

The Gospel Guardian came yesterday. It seems to be set for plain speaking. I wish it success. If it will be true to New Testament teaching and practice, it surely will bless and be blessed. Such is badly needed. The devil is exerting himself to destroy the church through false teaching and rotten living. A check for one dollar to cover subscription for a year.—G. A. Dunn, Dallas, Texas.

Comments on your first issue received here are all praise and compliments. This kind of a magazine is badly needed and I am confident that much and everlasting good will come from reading it.—R. E. Burks, Blackwell, Okla.

My eye is full (and my heart, too). The Gospel Guardian is an Encyclopedia. I do not see how it is possible for one to publish and edit such a fine thing. I know it will do good—it can’t help but do good.

I have read and reread, every line. The magazine is a beauty, and best of all, it is one hundred percent for the truth.—E. G. Creacy, Horse Cave, Ky.

I have read the first issue of The Gospel Guardian. It sounds like the pioneers. Surely, it sounds the first gun in the reformation of journalism! We have too many sweet little articles which tell nothing, and far too many sweet little sermons which can do no more than disgust a Bible student. Please let us have more of the same kind.—J. H. Horton, St. Louis, Mo.

The Gospel Guardian, a magazine set for the defense of the truth as revealed in the New Testament is now before me. The youngster is of fine appearance, robust, with a splendid physique. He is courteous, refined, dignified, and unrelenting, drawing a fine bead, and firing with deadly aim. We extend family greetings with the hope of a speedy adoption. May success crown your efforts far beyond expectations. I will lend a helping hand.—J. E. Black, Plainview, Texas.

Your magazine is all you claimed it to be. I can and do publish it for one dollar a year is beyond me. Here is a dollar.—G. W. Sosebee, Wichita Falls, Texas.
A BOOK EVERY PREACHER NEEDS

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.
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