Finally, be strong in the Lord and in the strength of His might. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places. Wherefore take up the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having girded your loins with truth, and having put on the breastplate of righteousness, and having shod your feet with the preparation of the gospel of peace; withal taking up the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God: with all prayer and supplication praying at all seasons in the Spirit, and watching thereby in all perseverance and supplication for all the saints, and on my behalf, that utterance may be given unto me in opening my mouth, to make known with boldness the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in chains; that in it I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.

Ephesians 6:10-20.
Maintains Senior High School, Junior College, Business School, Departments of Bible, Music, Instrumental and Voice, Home Economics, etc. All Work standardized and accredited. Living Conditions Unsurpassed. Good, clean well-furnished rooms with all modern comforts and conveniences. An abundance of well-prepared wholesome food attractively served. Strong faculty of experienced teachers-graduates of the big colleges and universities of the South.

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

Expenses are as low as we can make them and pay our debts. Enrollment increased from 135 to 471 in past few years. Write for beautiful picture bulletin and catalogue.
About 700 years B.C. Isaiah stood upon the hilltops of Israel and drew aside the curtain to look into the mystic future. To him the whole sky was clear and he predicted world events that the most pronounced critics of the ages cannot deny. In chapter 13, he speaks of Babylon, "the glory of Kingdoms, the beauty of Chaldees' excellency." He says: "It shall be as when God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah. It shall never be inhabited; neither shall it be dwelt in from generation to generation; neither shall the Arabian pitch his tent there."

At the time of this prophecy Babylon had not attained its greatness. About 100 years later, Nebuchadnezzar made it one of the wonders of the world. Its walls, 15 miles on each side, 87 feet thick and 350 feet high, were, excepting that of China, without an equal either before or since. The temple of Belus, the palace and their hanging gardens, the banks of the river, and the artificial lake and canals for draining the great Euphrates have ever excited the wonder of the world. Strange it is to imagine any one's having the courage to predict the downfall and desolation of so great a city, and yet this is what the prophet declared. It came to pass that just 51 years after the destruction of Jerusalem and the carrying away of the Jews this great Babylon fell to rise no more. Subsequent history literally confirms Isaiah's prophecy and demonstrates the inspiration of him who foresaw its doom.

In Ezekiel 27: 7-14. the prophet foretells the destruction of old Tyre situated on the main land of the Phoenician coast. He declares that Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon will come against it, and with his weapons of war, he will break down its walls and towers, with his horses he will tread down its streets, with the sword he will destroy its people, and its site shall be occupied by old walls, fallen towers, stones, arches and remains of an ancient magnificence. His final prophecy is that "the stones and timbers and dust shall be laid in water." This prophecy was spoken more than two hundred years before its fulfillment and while old Tyre was yet in her glory. The years rolled by and then came Nebuchadnezzar and laid waste to the city and left it a mass of ruins. The inhabitants that were left moved to an island half a mile from the mainland and which was about three miles in diameter. They erected a wall around the island 150 feet high and built a modern city called new Tyre. The glory of this latter was greater than the former. Tyre now sent her ships to distant ports and carried on the commerce of all countries round about. Protected by its gigantic walls, it became prominent, powerful and wealthy. In the year 336 B.C. Alexander the Great began his march to conquer the entire world. Reaching the Phoenician shore he looked upon the ruins of an old city and then gazed with some misgivings upon the Island city so prosperous and prominent. At first he thought of making terms with them and passing on, but later decided it dangerous to leave behind such an influential city. He therefore conceived the idea of building a causeway 200 feet wide and a half mile long from the mainland to the island. He saw plenty of stones and masses of timber and dust on the ruins of the old city to accomplish his purpose. With 200,000 men working through a period of seven months, he finally succeeded, and with his battering rams he made a breach in the wall, burned the city, destroyed and enslaved its inhabitants: eight thousand he slew and two thousand of those taken prisoners, he crucified and erected their crosses along the shore of the Mediterranean. Thus, it was literally true that the stones, timbers and dust of old Tyre were laid in water. Let an enemy of God's word tell how Ezekiel knew this 250 years in advance.

Luke 2: 1 says: "There went out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world should be taxed." When John began his ministry, it was the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar, Luke 3: 1. Many years after Paul appeals to Augustus, Acts 25:21. Here is confusion and apparent contradiction. Unless one has made a study of the political affairs of that land, it is impossible to get through this tangled network of allusions. The Augustus who appears in Luke as if dead and alive again in Acts is none other than old Nero who, by his flatterers, was called Augustus. No record of this decree, other than Luke's could be found, and for hundreds of years infidels denied that such a decree ever went forth. They declared it a forgery and many a friend of the Bible suffered embarrassment before them. In 1927, Mr. William T. Ellis, noted scholar and world traveler, wrote an article in which he says that on the walls of an unearthed building in the city of Angora, Asia Minor, the original decree has been found. Luke has been corroborated and the story of the Bible confirmed. Let Christians thank God for those who are spending millions in the field of archaeology. Regardless of their purpose they invariably find evidences in support of that story given by inspiration.

Writers and travelers have ever had great difficulty in maintaining geographical and topographical accuracy. Especially is this true if one is trying to give an account of some country with which he is not perfectly familiar, and even then egregious errors are found. When the Encyclopedia Britannica written by leading scholars and experts in their respective lines, first appeared, it contained so many errors in geography and topography that its rival, the New American Cyclopedia, got out a pamphlet exposing them. Such is the inability of man to speak and write accurately about these matters.

Most scholars who visit Palestine with a view of writing an article or book regarding that country feel it their special duty to correct the errors of all others regarding places and the physical features of that sacred land. Books written especially as a guide for tourists are so filled with errors as to render them largely useless and un dependable. Now let it be said with absolute assurance and without fear of contradiction that in the New Testament not a single error can be found in either geography or topography. This is equally true whether the writer speaks of Palestine or of foreign fields. The argus-eyed critics of twenty centuries have been unable to find a single error. Let the enemies explain how those "Ignorant Jews" and illiterates could write with such accuracy. To this query there is but one answer and that is "that holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

We give this Bible to all as a book good always and everywhere—a light to our feet when we are young—a guide to our path during mature years, and when we come to die, it is the only book one cares to have beside him.
R. H. BOLL MAKES A STATEMENT

The editor of Word and Work specializes in statements, mani festos and agreements. In 1932 under the caption “Here’s My Hand” he offered to withdraw all theories, speculations, and views on prophecy on an agreement to take what every “passage in question actually says” and then without additions, subtractions and alterations and without regard for any theories on the subject”. This proposition was made to the Gospel Advocate with evident aim at tactfulness. The proposition was promptly accepted, for that was the very thing we had been trying to get these brethren to do i.e. teach the Bible on these subjects without their additions and theories. This very offer to do so was within itself an admission that he had not been doing so. But-lo! upon the acceptance of his proposition Brother Boll immediately withdraws his hand and his offer on the ground that he did not believe we were sincere in our acceptance of it! Then followed the great “Doctrinal Manifesto” by R. H. Boll furnishing additional occasion for controversy and adding fuel to the fire.

Though Brother Boll protests strenuously against creed-making and creed-writing, charging all who oppose his “prophetic views” as having one, he yet writes more statements of his supposed beliefs (with much of his teaching withheld) than anybody else.

Evading the Issue

Now the Word and Work is on a hot spot again, and Brother Boll makes another statement. But all who have followed his course and know his teaching through the years know that he has not made a full statement. He and his adherents know that his statement in the November issue of Word and Work is only a small part of what he believes and teaches. And what he does say is vague and in his carefully chosen words is couched his hidden theory of things. Note for instance that he refers to the church as “the manifestation of the kingdom of God on earth, in this present dispensation”. Per that statement the church is not the kingdom at all-just the “manifestation” of it in “this dispensation”. Why did he not state “clearly” as he claimed to do, what he teaches regarding the actual kingdom on earth in what he calls “the next dispensation”-the millennium? He knows that to do so would defeat the very purpose of his statement.

He further states that he believes “this kingdom or church exists now”. But that is not the issue. The controversy is over that kingdom which Brother Boll says Christ will establish on earth when he comes, over in Palestine, to reign in another dispensation entirely different from “this dispensation” and in a world kingdom. Why does he withhold this? Simply because it does not serve the purpose of his “statement” to reveal it.

He declares also, that “Jesus is King now, crowned with honor and glory, enthroned on the right hand of the Father”. But he did not tell you that He is not King in “act and fact”-only in expectancy-and will not become King in fact or act until at the end of “this dispensation” when He will become a real King on earth-in act and fact. And he did not disclose his belief that Christ now sits not on His own throne but on the “Father’s throne”, but when He comes He will revive David’s throne in Palestine, earthly Jerusalem, and will then occupy “His throne” as king on earth. Why did he not make a full statement or none at all? Because the present statement is pure propaganda, an effort to catch the unwary.

He then assures us that he does, at least, “teach the Great Commission and encourage the practice of it” and concedes that it “applies” to the Gentiles. But he did not tell his readers his denial of the existence now of the Tabernacle of David which James says (Acts 15:14-17) must be established that the Gentiles might seek after God? So if the Tabernacle of David is not in existence now (and Brother Boll says it is not) then the Gentiles cannot seek after God? How, then, does the Great Commission “apply” to the Gentiles, and why does Brother Boll “teach” it to them and “encourage” them to practice it? The answer to these questions does not serve the immediate purpose of his little statement.

I now call upon Brother Boll to say that his statement represents all that he believes and teaches as it stands on the questions at issue. He began his statement by saying “I desire also to state clearly my position on some of the questions at issue”. But he did not do it. He did not state “clearly” his position on any question at issue. The establishment of the church and Christ sitting at the right hand of God now are not the questions that are at issue. Brother Boll’s statement as it stands to those who know his actual teaching is worse than the maneuvering of a politician to get votes.

Boll Versus Boll

In order that the reader may be able to contrast his statement with his teaching let us compare it with certain other statements he has made in his books where he does reveal, even though with much care and caution, what he really believes.

1. “I believe that the church of Christ (which is the manifestation of the kingdom of God on earth, in the present dispensation) was established on the first Pentecost after Christ’s resurrection”. (The Statement)

But in his book “Kingdom of God” he says that in consequence of the postponement of the kingdom which John announced was “at hand”. Jesus introduced an unexpected aspect of the kingdom-the church age”. (Kingdom of God, pages 37, 38)

And on page 81 of the same book, Kingdom of God, by R. H. Boll himself, he uses the famous “vestibule illustration” in which he says the church is only the vestibule of the kingdom. Sometimes it is “a vestibule” and again a “manifestation” but never the actual kingdom provided for in his theory. Such wincing under the weight...
of pressure and such withholding of actual teaching in what purports to be sincerity is lacking in the straightforwardness of even ordinary honesty.

2. “That this kingdom or church exists now”, (The Statement)

But in his book he says definitely that the kingdom announced by John and Jesus “has never yet appeared”--get it reader, has never yet appeared. (Kingdom of God, page 34, last paragraph).

Again in the same book, he says, that “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. (Kingdom of God, page 35, first paragraph).

Still more in the same book, he argues that old pagan Rome must come back into existence in order to fulfill the kingdom prophecies such as Dan. 2:44, which John announced was “at hand” since it was to be established “in the days of those kings”. (Kingdom of God, page 18).

3. “That Jesus is King now, crowned with honor and glory, enthroned on the right hand of the Father”. (The Statement)

But read from his book such statements 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 to earth. His throne will be “de facto et actu”--in fact and act. (Kingdom of God, page 61). It is there friends, so how does his “statement” look? But that is not, all that is there. He further says that “so long as Satan’s throne is on the earth, Christ is not exercising the government” (Kingdom of God, page 71). Get that, reader--Christ is not exercising the government! He only sits enthroned at the right hand of God-waiting to rule--more of a Crown Prince than a King!

The Test of Fellowship

Of his teaching Brother Boll says: “I have never made it a test of fellowship and have never caused division over it and never shall”. (The Statement)

He has a school to propagate his theories, a paper to disseminate it, a party to support it, and a missionary agency to sow it in foreign fields, but he never causes any division and makes no test of fellowship--that is, if you will fellowship his scheme of things and his course of conduct he will fellowship you! Who, from a liberal Methodist to a compromising digressive, will not do as much?

But in the same issue of Word and Work in that very “important” article on Instrumental Music he said : “The moment the instrument was introduced it compelled a division: those who believed it to be wrong had no alternative left them but either to submit or get out. Some swallowed their conscientious objections and remained but many got out. This is the simple history of the case”. Yes, and it is the simple history of the Boll case! In order to fellowship Brother Boll’s party “those who believed” his teaching to be wrong “had no alternative” but to submit. He does not make his teaching a test but to fellowship him you have to submit to it.

Of instrumental music he said that it being a matter of indifference, or a nonessential--”then in that case the law of love would demand its abolishment”. Then he says “on that subject, “the conclusion is that for love and unity’s sake it should be abandoned. There are other reasons besides this, but this alone, it seems, should be sufficient”. And there are other reasons why we believe R. H. Boll should abandon his teaching “but this alone, it seems” to us also “should be sufficient” as a demand for the abolishment of his own theory and the abandonment of the divisive course he is pursuing.

If Brother Boll can apply the law of love to the Digressives in their unscriptural practices why can he not apply the same law of love to himself in his unscriptural teaching, which is also a practice? Verily, the legs of the lame are unequal.

A Sinister System

There are many who believe too much has been made of opposition to Premillennialism. They disavow any belief either in whole or in part of the theories but regard them as “harmless guessing” and as on the whole “unimportant”. Most of this class of good people have never studied the questions involved, have never lived where they have disturbed the church, and have never experienced the inner workings and secret movements of this party that has “sowed tares in the field,” while others who have had too much confidence in the goodness and piety of these speculators have slept. It is a sinister system. Their methods are cowardly. They work “in a corner” not in the open. Millennial propaganda is disguised in the sale of literature featuring divers and uncanny approaches to the various phases of premillennialism. So-called “analytical Bibles,” such as the Scofield Bible, are but handbooks on premillennialism. These books are not Bibles at all--they are works of men bearing the Bible title. They are rank with sectarianism and are not to be recommended. Christians who want the Bible should procure a copy of the King James, or American Revised, translation of the Scriptures. Get the Bible, not some man’s analytical perversions of it.

This movement also seems to be working as a sort of secret operative system. There is an ambitious program somewhat under cover to gain influence and representation in the churches. It works through individuals, preachers, teachers, and laymen who are not avowed “Boll followers,” but who are sympathizers and supporters. They hold positions in our schools, write in our papers, and are leaders in our churches.

When a preacher or a teacher says he is neutral on the question of instrumental music in the church, everybody knows that he is in favor of it and would have it under favorable circumstances. The same is true of the neater genders among us on this question.

It is folly to allow advantages. There is too much at stake.

The gospel preacher who will not defend the church against the manifold errors of premillennialism, but who criticizes those who do, is not a safe leader in thought and action.

F. E. W., Jr.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMBINATIONS</th>
<th>PRICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal-Wallace Disc.</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel Guardian</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both for</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of Pioneers</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel Guardian</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both for</td>
<td>$2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neal-Wallace Disc.</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of Pioneers</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel Guardian</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPECIAL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All for</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MAJORITY RULE IN THE CHURCH

The immediate occasion of this article is some questions that have been received with request for an early answer. Being of a general nature and such as vitally affect the scriptural procedure of the church, to deal with them editorially could not be untimely and will serve a twofold purpose. It will set forth the teaching of the New Testament on a vital subject, and it will be a declaration of policy on the part of this magazine toward certain tendencies to anarchy, rebellion against constituted congregational government, with resultant factions pulling away from churches in various localities.

The tendency toward democracy, or majority rule, in the churches is markedly visible. The will of the majority rather than the will of God is the fast-prevailing sentiment. The spirit of religious anarchy rather than submission to “them that have the rule over you” is growing. It is epidemic. As blown by a stiff wind, conditions in one church spread to another.

The evils of majority rule in the church have always been decried by men of experience, Bible knowledge, and spiritual discernment.

It was one of the errors in denominational bodies which Alexander Campbell sought to correct. He referred to the popular-rule government of the Baptists as “fierce democracy.” According to “the fierce democracy of congregationalism (majority rule), all are equally rulers and the office (elders) of which Paul spoke is extinct.” And “there never was a community (a church) that got along peaceably and profitably for any length of time that presumed to settle matters of discipline by a public vote in public assembly. Such societies (congregations) as have advocated this wild democracy have either broken themselves to pieces or greatly dishonored and injured the profession. No family, church, or state could be long kept in order, in harmony and love, under such an economy.” (Millennial Harbinger, 1940.)

E. G. Sewell said: “Churches should never set out to carry things by majorities.”

David Lipscomb said: “A church in which majorities rule is not a church of Christ.”

E. A. Elam wrote a tract against it entitled “Shall the Majority Rule?”

But as in society, so in the church, the younger generation is bent on breaking away from long-established and time-tested principles.

The duties and qualifications of elders as set forth in the New Testament are within themselves against the majority-rule contention. The word “elder” denotes age, experience, knowledge, and piety. It takes years to grow elders in the church. They are not made overnight as a candidate may be elected to an office. And they cannot be unmade by a sort of a “referendum-and-recall” action of a majority. If so, then elders can be disposed of as often as a preacher may work up sentiment in the church against them.

Men become qualified for elders gradually, by Christian growth, and their recognition is the result of their attainments. It is not difficult to go into a congregation and by observation pick out its elders.

Majority rule in the church is wrong in principle, fundamentally wrong. Applied to the family, parents would be helplessly in the minority. Yet, in churches where the majority rule has been in operation, young members, uninformed members, worldly members, who do not know anything more about what the church ought to be than a year-old child knows what it ought to have, are given as much voice and authority as elders and others of experience and knowledge.

A Recapitulation

A recapitulation of the evils of majority rule is in order as a further warning to churches against this enemy to congregational peace and unity.

First: It does not discriminate between experience and inexperience, nor regard knowledge as anything. It thus violates the New Testament principle that some by experience are more capable of discernment, possess more knowledge than others, and should teach, while others of less experience and knowledge should be taught. “For when for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God; and are become such as have need of milk, and not of strong meat. For every one that useth milk is unskilful (without experience) in the word of righteousness: for he is a babe. But strong meat belongeth to them that are of full age, even those who by reason of use have their senses exercised to discern both good and evil.” (Heb. 5: 12-14.)

Second: It makes elders subject to the church instead of the church being subject to the elders and reverses the New Testament principle: “Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief: for that is unprofitable for you.” (Heb. 13: 17.)

Third: It is the parent of the ballot, or vote, method, and becomes the occasion of politics, electioneering, instructing children and young people “how to vote,” all of which results in division of sentiment and is contrary to the New Testament injunction: “Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.” (1 Cor. 1: 10.)

Fourth: It encourages preachers to disregard and ignore the elders and cater to the wishes of a majority in the church. Thus it has come to pass that any preacher of average ability and personality can work up a sentiment against the elders in almost any church and with his majority-rule doctrine divide the church, in flagrant violation of the New Testament command to “know (recognize) them which labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their work’s sake. And be at peace among yourselves.” (1 Thess. 5: 12, 13.) Some opposition to elders in Paul’s day must have called forth this timely admonition.

Fifth: It breeds anarchy in the church, leaves the church in a state of uncertainty, without permanent leadership, and is against the New Testament admonition to the elders to “take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers (bishops), to feed the church of God which he hath purchased with His own blood.” (Acts 20: 28.) Arguments against unqualified elders do not apply here, because the same contingency can and does exist, and is even more likely to exist, with the majority rule. It is not the cure for the condition.

Sixth: The demand for the majority rule always comes from an uninformed and unruly element in the church, not from pious, consecrated people who are contented to worship God in spirit and in truth, or from preachers who think that to be “the minister of the church” is to hold office of high authority and who do not respect the author-
ity of elders over them. It is, indeed, strange that these preachers will recognize the authority of elders when the elders engage them, but refuse to recognize the authority of the same elders when it is thought best for them to leave. Such preachers take work with a church upon the authority of the elders, but insist on staying with the church by majority rule. Almost any preacher who is "a good mixer" can put it over with women, young people, and generally indifferent members whose interest has been revived to "take sides." And this is a perversion of everything the New Testament teaches on the duty of members of the church to the elders. "Likewise, ye younger, submit yourself unto the elder. Yea, all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility." (1 Pet. 5:5)

Seventh: In short, the majority-rule heresy is entirely too political to be Scriptural. Politics in government is bad, but in religion it is sad.

Matters of Faith

Some brethren who advocate majority rule and voting in the church say that they do not believe in majority rule in "matters of faith," but in matters that are not of faith the vote of the majority should be the basis of determination.

But when is a thing a matter of faith, and when is it not? Who shall decide, and how, whether it is a principle of faith or a mere expedient? Shall we vote on what shall be voted on? Innovations are never considered matters of faith by those who introduce them. That is true of all innovations all the way clown from the organ to voting on elders. Advocates of instrumental music in worship have always insisted that it is only an expedient, not a matter of faith. Shall the majority decide by vote whether the organ is a matter of faith or not, and then leave it to the will of the majority whether we shall have it or not? If elders can be deposed and elected by congregational voting, then what if a majority should decide to dispose of the eldership entirely and have no elders at all?

The eldership is itself a matter of faith, and everything the Bible says about it is against the majority-rule contention. The divine arrangement requiring elders in every church is against the majority-rule idea. Why have elders, if the church is to be governed by a vote of its members? Only a chairman or an election board would be needed. The qualifications of elders as laid down in the New Testament is against the majority-rule idea. It would have those without qualification ruling by vote over those who have the qualifications. Then why have them? Their descriptive titles, the terms describing the office, or work, of elders, are against the majority-rule idea. They are called "elders" (men of age, experience), "bishops," "overseers," "shepherds," and "pastors." Majority rule would have inexperi-

ence ruling over experience, the flock ruling the bishops, the sheep tending the shepherds, and the people teaching their pastors. It reverses the entire system of Sew Testament church government. (Acts 20:28)

Matters of Expediency

God's wisdom is seen in committing the welfare of the church to the elders of it. The Sew Testament does not teach congregational government. It is a government by elders, whose duty in matters of faith is to enforce the teaching of the New Testament, and in matters not of faith their province is to determine the course of wisdom and expediency, with all sentiments and angles considered, and follow that course. Is it not reasonable that elders should know better what course to pursue in the affairs of the church than a majority of the members? If matters of

faith shall be executed by the elders, surely they should be able to decide matters of less importance. But if it is contended that matters of faith are already decided by the New Testament, and matters which are not of faith should be decided by the vote of a majority, then when do elders rule at all? Again, why have them?

Preachers sometimes say that if a respectable minority opposes them they will resign. But when has a preacher ever considered a minority that opposed him respectable? The preacher who takes a work upon the invitation of the elders of the church should submit to their counsel when the time comes to make a change. But when a preacher who advocates majority rule fails to hold the majority, his rule is to pull off a minority and start a factious congregation. Then what becomes of his majority-rule doctrine?

Majority rule in matters of any kind in the church is wrong. The principle is wrong. The church is to be ruled by the wisdom, judgment, and discretion of the elders. And other system will work havoc in any church.

F. E. W., Jr.

IN NEED OF J. R. GRAVES

T. S. Bolin, a Baptist preacher says in the Baptist and Commoner: "We need J. R. Graves worse than ever." He thinks Dr. Graves is needed to straighten out some straying Baptists on matters of doctrine. According to my information, Dr. Graves contended that "born of water" in John 3:5 refers to baptism and reminded some of his Baptist brethren that no scholar of any note thought otherwise until Alexander Campbell came along and scared them off of it. Dr. Wall says it means baptism and "There is not any one Christian writer of any antiquity, in any language, but what understands it of baptism." John Wesley, Albert Barnes, Dean Alford, Adam Clarke, the Methodist Discipline, the Presbyterian Confession of faith and the Episcopal prayer-book all bear the same testimony. But that makes baptism a condition of entrance into the kingdom of God and Baptists are so set against such teaching that they have adopted a strained and unnatural interpretation of the expression "born of water." Dr. Graves might do them some good along this line but I doubt it. They won't pay much attention to Jesus, Peter and Paul. Jesus says "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Interpretative antics have not been very successful here, so even a Fundamentalist like Dr. Norris is disposed to repudiate it and say it does not belong in the Bible at all. Possibly he secretly wishes that Jesus had not said what he did in John 3:5. It would be a little bold to clip that too out of Baptist Bibles. Jesus really said: "Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5) And that there be no doubt about His meaning He also said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16:16)

I do not think that even Dr. Graves could improve on it.

-Sword Swipes.
THE INCONSISTENCY OF
EDWIN R. ERRETT
JOHN T. LEWIS

Edwin R. Errett is the present editor of the Christian Standard, and therefore sits in the sanctum of his illustrious great-uncle, Isaac Errett-its founder. He can push a virile and pungent pen when he is forced by the Radicals in the Christian Church to take a tenable position, and if he was not manacled by the inventions and devices of men, which the Christian Standard has sanctioned and furthered for nearly seventy years, he could be one of the strongest defenders of New Testament Christianity in the editorial field of religious journalism today. But it makes no difference about a man’s ability, when he leaves the “old paths,” goes so far with the inventions and devices of men, and then tries to say thus far, but no farther, he becomes inconsistent, and his position untenable. This is Edwin R. Errett’s position today.

“That Illinois Convention”

Under the above heading there is a lengthy criticism by Warner Muir, in the Christian Standard Nov. 30, 1935, of a report the Standard made, Oct. 19, 1935, of a convention held in Canton, Ill., Sept. 16-19, 1935. The following is the first paragraph of the criticism, and will give the reader an idea of the trend and flavor of the whole criticism.

Mr. Edwin R. Errett,
Editor Christian Standard,
Eighth and Cutter Sts., Cincinnati, 0.

Dear Brother Errett - A considerable number of us in Illinois wish to make a decided protest to the article published in the Christian Standard for Oct. 19, 1935, page 16, entitled “Illinois Convention Features Radicals.” It is unfair, filled with mistakes, and contains unjustified allusions and interpretations, which can have been made only in an un-Christian spirit.

After a somewhat lengthy explanation of its report of the convention the Christian Standard gives what I suppose may be termed its 10 articles of faith. Although the Standard calls it a “platform.” It follows:

“Perhaps we can state our purpose as follows:
1. Absolute loyalty to Jesus Christ.
2. Kindly proclamation of that both to the denominations and to the world.
3. Exaltation of and development of fellowship between all who are thus loyal despite any differences as to human creeds or human devices.
4. Emphasis upon the evangelism that preaches the gospel of salvation through the risen Saviour, upon terms laid down by Him.
5. Emphasis upon the Christian’s social responsibility.
6. A challenge to the right of any one to set upon any human creed, be it theological, social or organizational, as a test.
7. Opposition to the glorification of preachers or teachers who deny the basic fundamentals of our faith.
8. Emphasis upon a better educated leadership and a stronger local church. This involves a well-read membership not dependent upon the preachers for information.
9. Development of a spirit of fellowship and cooperation, without sacrifice of the Christian right of the free field.

10. An effort to avoid attributing unworthy motives to any one unless there is complete evidence of such motives and the defense of the cause demands their revelation.

On this sort of platform we shall be happy to have co-operation.”

I will now notice Brother Errett’s articles of faith as he gave them.

(1) “Absolute loyalty to Jesus Christ” surely means that His words are our last and final appeal in all matters of faith and practice. Christ’s idea of “absolute loyalty” is stated in the following question. “Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say? Every one that cometh unto me, and heareth my words, and doeth them, I will show you to whom he is like” etc. (Luke 6: 46, 47). John says: “And hereby we know that we know him, if we keep his commandments. He that saith I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him.” (1 John 2: 3, 4)

That is, God’s truth is not in him. Again John says: “Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God: he that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son. If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greetings: for he that giveth him greetings partaketh in his evil work” (2 John 9-1 1). Doubtless a “kaleidoscopic” professor would say John was an “Iconcolast, demolishing right and left,” “advocating truth minus love,” etc. but while we are waiting for some professor to “find a gem of truth outside the beaten path,” I will go on with Editor Errett. If Brother Errett will accept the above scriptures as “absolute loyalty to Jesus Christ,” there will be plenty room for co-operation.

(2) If Brother Errett will accept Paul’s teaching, in Gal. 1: 8-12, as an explanation of “kindly proclamation” his second plank will pass.

(3) There is a “fly in the ointment” in his third article of faith because there is positively no place in “absolute loyalty to Christ” for “human creeds and human devices” for men to differ over.

(4) The fourth plank is free of knots, it is fine.

(5) The fifth plank is all right if he will add 1 Cor. 15:33 as a codicil to it.

(6) In his sixth plank Brother Errett has left a hole to drug his organs, fiddles, horns, vested choirs, and missionary societies through, but if he piles all this humap machinery on his platform and thinks he can stop Radicalism he had just as well resurrect the once famous “Mother Hubbard cartoon.” The Word of God is the only rule by which we can and must test loyalty to God.

(7) If Brother Errett will substitute fellowship for “glorification” in his seventh plank that will make it a strong plank too.

(8) His eighth article or plank needs no explanation, it is good.

(9) If Brother Errett simply means in his ninth article, the Christian’s right to teach or preach God’s word in any field-fine-but if he means the right of promoters of human societies and schemes to visit churches to push their programs upon the churches I demur.

(10) I offer no objection to article ten, that is fine. Will Brother Errett accept these amendments I have offered to his platform? If so there is plenty room on it, for co-operation.

The following is the heading and first paragraph of Brother Errett’s write-up of a church trial, in the Christian Standard, Dec. 7, 1935, page 15:
"RADICALS STEAL ILLISOIS CHURCH"

In Civil Court Action vs Church at Thompson Ill., Judge Refuses Injunction Against Modernists

The daily press carries the story of the unhappy trial, in the Circuit Court meeting at Mount Carroll, Ill., of the civil action over control of the church of Christ at Thompson. The action was an appeal to the court for an injunction against the action of the minister, David E. Todd, and trustees, who are practicing open membership and teaching disbelief in miracles recorded in Scripture.

Twenty-five or thirty years ago, the digressives, or instrumental music and society brethren were stealing meeting houses all over the country from the churches of Christ, and calling themselves Christian churches. In those days the Christian Standard was their strongest defender, and thought the Gospel Advocate was outraging every principle of Christianity for charging them with stealing churches. And when David Lipscomb began to advise brethren to put a restrictive clause in the deeds to their meeting houses, the Standard began to shout: "The creed in the deed." The Standard also contended that they were not "digressives": but "progressives". Today the Christian Standard is calling some of those progressive brethren Radicals, and charges them with stealing a church. Who could have thought it possible? But if the Radicals steal from the meeting houses which they stole from the Churches of Christ a quarter of a century or more ago, what of it? If the Christian Standard encouraged the first steal, why should it protest the second? Will the Editor of the Standard recommend "the creed in the deed"? That is the only way the Church of Christ stopped the stealing. I quote again from the Standard's write-up of the steal:

Four members, who have attended the church for more than a generation, testified in strong opposition to Mr. Todd for admitting unimmersed to membership and permitting election of two new unimmersed members to office as deacons.

The defendants brought Prof. E. S. Ames from Chicago to testify for them. The newspaper reports of his testimony are as follows:

Examined for more than two hours by Stephen Reynolds, of Chicago, attorney for the defendants, and A. M. Blodgett, Fulton attorney, representing the protesting church members, Dr. Ames parried leading questions, but finally admitted he thought the matter should be left up to a majority of the congregation.

The liberalism of a changing church was explained by a defense witness, the Rev. E. S. Ames, pastor of the University Church, Disciples of Christ, Chicago. Changes listed by Ames in the swing from fundamentalism included the use of music and vested choirs and united action with other churches. He said many Christian Churches now admit members without baptism by immersion.

He pointed out the First Christian Church of Thompson and other churches of the denomination are governed by no church law other than the New Testament, and declared majority rule of the congregation should prevail.

Items in the Macomb (Ill.) Journal and the Chicago Tribune state that "Dr. E. S. Ames testified that a majority of the independent Christian Churches of the country also take Mr. Todd's view on baptism, and no longer require 'total immersion.'" We shall await the stenographic record before assuming that Dr. Ames so testified.

On the third day the judge handed down a decision refusing the injunction.

Whatever the "stenographic record" may show about Dr. E. S. Ames' testimony, he was absolutely correct when he said "the swing from fundamentalism included the use of music (instrumental music) and vested choirs and united action with other churches." The Gospel Advocate, ten years the Christian Standard's senior, has contended for eighty years that to permit one departure from God's way was to open the flood gate for all the isms of men. It does seem to me that the Christian Standard could learn this truth in three quarters of a century.

It would be a great day for the church if the Christian Standard would join forces with the Gospel Advocate, Christian Leader, Firm Foundation, and The Gospel Guardian in fighting every departure from God's truth. It would doubtless encourage many of the Church of Christ to abandon some of their denominational aping.

A PAPER WITHOUT POLICY OR PRINCIPLE

E. G. CREACY

The Truthseeker elucidates on the "policies" of said paper, but declares that it "can have no policies, for it is an impersonal thing, a creation of man, without mind or conscience, guilt or innocence." The publishers of "Truthseeker" are not agreed on anything "except to teach the truth as each one sees it." If the Truthseeker is not careful, it will apologize for some of the "winds of doctrines" that are whirling in the church today, as well as out of the church.

Truthseeker is so broad that "any brother may write contrary to any set of brethren, as long as he leaves out unchristian language, personalities and abuse." The implication is that somebody is using "unchristian language and abuse." Why generalize on such a serious matter? Why not be definite? Does he mean that the Firm Foundation, Gospel Advocate and Christian Leader, are following such unchristian ethics? He cannot mean the Gospel Guardian, for he made these charges before the Gospel Guardian was born. Will Brother Gardner tell us who is guilty, and what paper is "criticizing in a self-righteous spirit" with an "air of superiority"?

Truthseeker further declares that "divisions, factions and parties are heinous sins, classed with drunkenness, fornication, uncleanness and lasciviousness (Gal. 5:19-21)." That is true, and it will be interesting for the publishers of Truthseeker to tell us where they stand in regard to the premillennial party. No Christian should refuse to do this, especially a teacher or a preacher, for a "public man is public property." Why should any one be timid about declaring himself on any vital issue? He suggests that "each one is free, under God, to express himself one way or another, no one forbidding him." We shall anxiously await his committal on the premillennial issue, which is causing so much trouble today.

Truthseeker truly states that "error cannot be allowed to continue unmolested" and that "truth must be taught." Therefore, the error of Premillennialism, which strikes at all the fundamentals of the gospel of Christ, as espoused by R. H. Boll, must not be "allowed to continue unmolested," and the "truth must be taught." May we expect some strong articles in Truthseeker on these issues? Just as certain as the brethren who introduced the "organ and societies" in the churches caused division, Brother Boll and his associates, by the introduction of the fanciful system of Premillennialism in the churches, have caused division. Brother Boll's movement has become a definite party, and according to Truthseeker it is sinful.
WHAT A BAPTIST THINKS OF PENTECOST

Baptists and others who deny that Pentecost is the birthday of the Church should name another day and furnish at least one passage to support it. The events that transpired on Pentecost clearly show it to be the beginning of the Church. But whenever or wherever the Church of the New Testament began it is certain that it was not the Baptist Church.

CLED E. WALLACE

Some time ago the Baptist Standard used some strong language to express its aversion to some plain teaching of the New Testament. It was used in an editorial on “Pentecost.” It referred to the teaching that Pentecost was the birthday of the Church as “more fanaticism and unsupported wild teaching.” If the church was established on Pentecost, as the New Testament teaches, then it becomes quite impossible to defend some cherished Baptist principles. This sends shivers up and down the Baptist spine of the Baptist Standard and causes it to say some pretty “wild” things. The first sentence of the editorial says that “Nine-tenths of all we hear or read about Pentecost contradicts some passage in the Old Testament or the gospels. It sounds like the editor of the Standard had come out second best in a scrimmage with a gospel preacher, and was still smarting over his defeat. He continues:

Pentecost was not the birthday of the church as is proved by a number of passages in the gospels. There has been more fanaticism and more unsupported wild teaching connected with Pentecost than with any other day or occasion in all Bible history. The true meaning of Pentecost has been almost wholly obscured by such fanaticism and wild teaching. It would do the average Bible student good to forget all that he has heard, or read, or imagined about the Day of Pentecost.

Among the passages the Standard quotes is not even one of “a number of passages in the gospels” which proves that “Pentecost was not the birthday of the church.” These are the passages the editor should use in connection. When he finds them and points them out we will look them over. We have never found them and think the editor of the Standard has drawn on his “wild” imagination. In the long list of references he quotes not even one lends any support to his contention. His contention in the editorial is wholly negative. He does not say when he thinks the church was born. Possibly he doesn’t know. It seems to be a case of just anything, Lord, but Pentecost. If he will name some other day but Pentecost as the birthday of the church, just any other day, we promise the readers plenty of diversion, and him plenty of trouble, if he will notice what we say.

“Fanaticism and Wild teaching”

I am reminded of an incident in the Srygley-Hall debate which appeared in the Gospel Advocate and the American Baptist Flag many years ago. Brother Srygley affirmed the New Testament teaching that the church is the body of Christ and includes all Christians. Hall said that a man who would preach such doctrine “must be crazy or an infidel.” Brother Srygley immediately called to his support a long list of Baptist scholars including John A. Broadus, Professor A. T. Robertson, the Baptist and Reflector, Edward T. Hiscox, Edwin C. Dargan and Pendleton’s Manual. After that Hall talked about something else besides crazy folks and infidels. An imposing list of Baptist scholars can be presented which agree with Smith’s Bible Dictionary and the New Testament that Pentecost was the birthday of the church. The editor of the Standard had better be a little more temperate in the language he uses about those who disagree with him or he will classify some of the ripest scholars of his denomination as “wild” and “fanatic” and no telling what else. Besides, if it makes no vital difference what church a man belongs to, or whether he belongs to any, what difference does it make when the church was established or whether it was established at all or not? If the Baptists are right a man can become a Christian, serve the Lord or not, die and go home to heaven, and have no connection with, or interest in, the church. Why should the editor of the Baptist Standard be so wrought up over a little matter like the birthday of the church? Whatever it was in the New Testament that had a birthday or whenever it happened, it was not the Baptist church. It was not called that by any writer of the New Testament who referred to it, and no member of it was ever called a Baptist.

Speaking of “wild teaching” and “fanaticism”, there are preachers running around over the country shouting that Jesus was a Baptist preacher and that Paul was a member of the Baptist church. And the editor of the Baptist Standard believes it. If he doesn’t I’ll be glad to “take it back” in italics.

“Facts and Passages”

The Standard editor is giving Bible students some dangerous advice. He exhorts “the average student to forget all that he has heard, or read, or imagined about the Day of Pentecost and quietly consider these facts and passages.” If the “average” Baptist will “forget all that he has heard, or read, or imagined about the Baptist church and Baptist principles and quietly consider” what the New Testament says, he may be violently surprised over the absence of the Baptist church and its distinctive principles in that book. New Testament “facts and passages” do not make Baptists. When accepted and obeyed they make Christians. For one, I’d like to see the editor of the Baptist Standard explain the difference between a Baptist and a Christian. What blessing is there in being a Baptist that an “average Bible student” cannot enjoy by just being a consistent Christian? When this explanation is made, I may possibly have some remarks of my own to make about “wild teaching and fanaticism.”

Some “facts and passages” are cited in a manner and a setting to lead the reader to conclude that “Pentecost was not the birthday of the church.” Here is a synopsis of them.

1. “Jesus told the disciples that he had come down from heaven.” References to prove it.
2. “Jesus told his disciples that the Father had sent him into the world to perform a definite work.” References to prove it.
3. “Jesus told his disciples that he would return to the Father after his resurrection.” References to prove it.
4. “Jesus told his disciples that if he went to the Father, the Father would give them proof of that fact by send-
ing a Witness from heaven, even the Holy Spirit, to testify that they might know it.” References to prove it.

5. “Jesus told his disciples to wait for such testimony (from heaven) before they began their world-wide testimony.” References to prove it.

6. “Pentecost was the day when that Witness came.” Reference to prove it.

7. “The day of Pentecost was therefore the great testimony day, the day when proof was given that the Father had accepted, approved as completely satisfactory, the work of the Son.” Reference to prove it.

The conclusion is that the church was not established on Pentecost.

Shades of logic! The “facts and passages” the editor of the Standard cites certainly do not prove that the church was established before Pentecost. It appears that if “the day of Pentecost was therefore the great testimony day, the day when proof was given that the Father had accepted, approved as completely satisfactory, the work of the Son” it would be a very fitting birthday for the church. Especially so, since Peter explained on Pentecost that God raised Jesus in fulfillment of the promise he had made to David that “he would set one upon his throne.”

He was “therefore by the right hand of God exalted” after his resurrection and ascension and “made both Lord and Christ.” (Acts 2 :29-36)

Pentecost is evidently the beginning of the reign of Christ. Also when God made him sit at his right hand after his ascension, he made him the head of the church. (Eph. 1:20-23) Pentecost was therefore the birthday of the church. The editor of the Standard is wrong and Peter and Paul are the authors of “such fanaticism and wild teaching” he complains about. I cannot help but feel complimented when a Baptist editor throws a rock at me and hits Paul.

“Beginning From Jerusalem”

There are a few things the Standard editorial does not contain in the way of “facts and passages” that I think ought to be mentioned. Just before he ascended to heaven to be crowned king and made head of the church, Jesus told the disciples that “repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem.” (Luke 24 :46-47)

It was preached for the first time on Pentecost soon after the apostles were baptized in the Holy Spirit. See Acts 2. This was a fulfillment of prophecy. Jesus said “It is written” that such should be. The place “It is written” is in Isa. 2, which tells about the establishment of the mountain of the Lord’s house, the law going forth from Mount Zion and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. “But before faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.” (Gal. 3 :23) Jesus was “born under the law” and lived under the law. The law was “disannulled” at the cross. (Col. 2 :12 ; Heb. 7:18, 19) The new law began to be proclaimed on Pentecost. Peter’s sermon on Pentecost was the first sermon under it. “But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor.” (Gal. 3 :25)

Pentecost—or Before?

Nobody claims that the church was established since the day of Pentecost. The editor of the Standard thinks it was established before Pentecost but is careful not to state where or when. If it was established before the death of Christ it was established under the law and “before faith came.” The resurrection of Christ is a part of the faith. No Christian in New Testament times could be such or belong to the church who did not believe that Jesus arose from the dead. “Because if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved.” (Rom. 10 :9-10) There were no believers in the resurrection before it happened. Even the apostles were hard to convince of the fact after it happened. The birth of the church certainly did not precede the birth of Jesus from the tomb. Why a man can’t even be a member of the Baptist church who is an unbeliever in the resurrection of Christ. Yet the Standard editor thinks the church had an established existence and was full of unbelievers in the resurrection before Christ died. Has the church changed its faith and terms of membership since Pentecost? After all it is not so strange that he cannot see that the church was set up on Pentecost. He cannot see that baptism is a condition of remission of sins in Peter’s sermon on that day. Convicted sinners cried out, “Brethren, what shall we do?” Peter answered the question by saying “Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” (Acts 2 :38) Christ said: “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” (Mark 16 :16) In the face of this the Standard argues that sinners are saved by faith in Christ before and without baptism. It “contradicts” both Jesus and Simon Peter. It is not surprising, then, that it thinks the teaching of the New Testament on the establishment of the church is “fanaticism and wild teaching.”
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Some of the Main Arguments Used by Baptist Debaters to Prove an Ante-Pentecost Church. Their Proof-texts Not Only Ruin the Baptist Theory but the Future Kingdom Idea Also.

WILL M. THOMPSON

It is the purpose of this article to notice more of the leading or outstanding arguments used by Baptists in endeavoring to prove an ante-Pentecost kingdom or church.

I. TELL IT TO THE CHURCH

In Matt. 18:15-17, we have the following language: "Moreover, if thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone; if he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established; and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church, but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican."

On this scripture the Baptists raise the question: How could you tell it to the Church if the Church did not exist? Then, they assume that the Church existed during the personal ministry of Christ on earth. They lose sight of the fact that in Matt. 16:18 the Saviour said, "Upon this rock I will build my church." And, in Matt. 18:15-17 that the Saviour was giving the law in the matter of discipline for church members after the church was established. A pertinent question, at this point, is in order; viz. Is Matt. 18:15-17 a part of the testament of Christ? To this, they reply, "it is". Paul says, in Heb. 9:15-17, "And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means, of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." For where a testament is there must also of necessity be the death of the testator, for a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise, it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth. Hence, we see that Matt. 18:15-17 did not go into effect until after the death of Christ. So, no telling it to the church until after Christ's death.

II. LEFT HIS HOUSE

In Mark 13:34, Jesus said: "For the son of man is as a man taking a far journey, who left his house and gave authority to his servants and to every man his work and commanded the porter to watch." Baptists connect with this scripture I Tim. 3:15, "But if I tarry long that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." They then draw their conclusion, that since the Church is called the house of God, then Jesus left the church when he went into the far country (Heaven). Baptists are wrong in their conclusion here for the following reason:

1. The church is called the House of God, but the word "house" does not always mean church, and it does not mean church in Mark 13:34.

2. The original word from which we have "house" in this scripture, per the best of authorities, means habitation or abode or kindred. Jesus did leave his earthly abode or habitation and his fleshly kindred when he went into the far country.

3. With this we connect a parallel scripture, recorded in Luke 19:12 which reads as follows: "He said, therefore, a certain nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return." The far country is heaven. Jesus is the young nobleman, and, as the young nobleman had to go into a far country to receive the kingdom, Jesus did not have the kingdom while on earth but received it after going to heaven. This proof text not only ruins the Baptist theory, but also the premillennial idea of the future kingdom.

III. THE CHURCH—THE BRIDEGROOM

In John 3:29 Christ said, "He that hath the bride is the bridegroom, but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegrooms voice; this, my joy, therefore is fulfilled." Baptists contend that Christ had a bride during his personal ministry, and that that bride was the church; therefore, the church was established during personal ministry. On this particular passage, some questions are in order.

1. If Christ had a bride during his personal ministry, and that bride was the Church, when and where was the marriage ceremony performed?

2. If Baptists be right in their contention at this point, when Christ died did he not leave the Church a widow?

3. Since Paul says in Romans 7:2, "And, if the husband be dead, she is loose from the law of her husband." Then, is the church loosed from the law of Christ by reason of his death? If yes, then what law is the church governed by now?

Other interesting questions for Baptists are in order just here.

1. Since you say the Church is the bride of Christ, is this church the Baptist church?

2. How many brides does the Lord have? If he has more than one, then you accuse him of polygamy. If you say he only has one, and that is the Baptist church, then the conclusion is inevitable that no one is married to the Lord but Baptists. And, if this conclusion be correct, then no-one but Baptists will be in heaven. The Baptists ought to be the last people on earth to accuse anyone of preaching everybody into hell but their own church members.

IV. APOSTLES SET IN THE CHURCH

In I Cor. 12:28, the Apostle Paul declares: "And God hath set some in the Church; first, apostles; secondarily, prophets; thirdly, teachers; after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." Baptists connect with this scripture Mark 3:13-14, which reads as follows: "And he goeth up into a mountain and calleth unto him whom he would, and they came unto him; and he ordained twelve that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach."

They insist that the word, "ordain" means to set in and that because Paul in I Cor. 12:28 says God "set some in the Church, first, apostles," that therefore the apostles were set in the church by the Lord in the mount of ordination. It is true that the word "ordain" means to set in, but into what were they set in? They went up into the mountain "disciples"; they left the mountain "apostles".
were therefore set into the apostolic office and not the church, for, after the Lord had ordained them, he gave them the limited commission and told them to go preach the kingdom is at ‘hand’ (approaching). I Cor. 12:28 refers to rank and not order. The apostles were the highest in authority in the church on earth.

V. THEY SANG IN THE CHURCH

In Heb. 2:12, we have the following statement: “Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee.” Baptists connect with this scripture Matt. 26:30: “And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives.” They inform us that this is where the singing was done in the church, and, therefore, the church was established before the death of Christ. They are wrong on these scriptures. If you will drop back to Heb. 2:11, you will hear Paul saying: “For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one, for which cause, he is not ashamed to call them brethren.” Now read the 12th verse. “Saying, I will declare thy name unto my brethren, in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee.”

You will note that the singing was to be done in the church after they were sanctified. If you will read John 17:17, you will find that Christ prayed for the sanctification of his people. In Heb. 10:9-10, the Apostle Paul has this to say: “Then said he, Lo I come to do thy will 0 God; he taketh away before the second could be established.

2. We are sanctified by the second will or testament.

3. Testament is of force after men are dead. (Heb. 9:17). No singing in the church until after sanctification.

4. No sanctification until the second testament is established. Therefore, no singing in the church until the second testament goes into effect.

5. Second testament did not go into effect until after the death of Christ.

6. No singing in the church or sanctification until after the death of Christ.

Other arguments advanced on the Kingdom Question by the Baptists are just as easily met or exposed. Baptists are simply wrong on the Kingdom Question.

THE president of the International Convention of Disciples of Christ, who is also the president of Drake University addressed three thousand delegates in San Antonio, Texas. Among other things he said:

We can not go preaching our message to the world and refuse to recognize Methodists and Baptists, Congregationalists and Presbyterians, young people’s associations, the Salvation Army, Catholics, Jews and others.

Why be so narrow and sectarian? Why not include Universalists, Mormons, Mohammedans and infidels? If the business of these International Conventions is to repudiate the plain teaching of the New Testament and “recognize” both what the New Testament does not teach, and what it expressly condemns, then we will continue to “recognize” the New Testament and repudiate the conventions. In this case “our message” does not chord with Paul’s message. His came by revelation of Jesus Christ and condemns about everything “our message” goes out of the way to “recognize.” We wonder if the San Antonio Convention of Disciples of Christ would “recognize” Paul. If they did he would tell that crowd of muddled delegates that there is one body, and one Spirit, one baptism, one Lord and one faith. The gospel of Jesus does not make Methodists, Baptists, Congregationalists, Presbyterians and the like but only Christians. And as for Catholics and Jews, the Roman hierarchy is Paul’s man of sin, and the Jews are still ignorant of God’s righteousness, are seeking to establish a righteousness of their own and have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God. The International Convention seems to think the way to destroy denominationalism is for the Disciples of Christ to become one and “recognize” all the others without regard to their faith or practice or whether they have any. They would place Christianity in the range of Dean Swift’s jibe. “Of what religion is he of?” “0, he is an Anythingarian.” The Convention seems to have a Nothingarian for president.

D. John Freeman of the Baptist and Reflector says that “no responsible person is saved until he receives the truth.” He quotes and approves Jas. 1:18. “Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth.” “This” he says forever explodes the Hardshell theory that God does not use the Gospel as a means in the salvation of sinners.” Dr. John is lacking in courtesy. The nickname “Hardshell” is offensive to a people as respectable as the denomination he belongs to and much older. They call themselves Old Baptists or Primitive Baptists. Dr. John should not despise them. He cannot trace his own church back even two centuries without running his line directly through them. You ought to be careful what you use to “explode the Hardshell theory.” Your text jars your own doctrine of total depravity and the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion so hard that the wreck looks about like the exploded “Hardshell theory.” “I begat you through the gospel” said Paul to the Corinthians. That makes a total wreck of the Baptist theory of conversion both Primitive and Missionary.
Q. What penalty was inflicted for violation of the Sabbath law?
A. “Six days may work be done: but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord; whosoever doeth any work in the Sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death.” (Ex. 31:15)
Q. Do those who believe the Sabbath still binding also believe this penalty should be inflicted?
A. No.
Q. Was there any change ever made in the law governing disobedience of the Sabbath in the Bible?
A. ‘No.
Q. What was another Sabbath law?
A. “See, for that the Lord hath given you the sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days; abide ye every man in his place, let no man go out of his place on the seventh day.” (Ex. 16:29)
Q. Do sabbatarians observe this law now?
A. They do not.
Q. Do people in this age who believe on Christ have everlasting life?
A. Yes. “Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.” (John 6:47)
Q. Can that everlasting life be lost?
A. Yes. “Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity; but toward thee, goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou also shalt be cut off.” (Rom. 1:11)
Q. What is the meaning of the word everlasting?
A. The American Dictionary and Encyclopedia gives the two following definitions: “Unceasing—continual—perpetual” or “During the present state of things.”
In other instances sabbatarians do not interpret “perpetual”, “forever” and “everlasting” to mean “continual” and “unceasing” but rather do they interpret it to mean “during the present age” or “present state of things.”
Webster’s International Dictionary says that Everlasting means “unceasing—continual—perpetual” or “continuing indefinitely” or “for a long period of time.”
It was over fifteen hundred years from the giving of the law at Sinai to the death of Christ. This was a “long period of time” and since the Israelites did not know when Christ would come it was an indefinite period of time and since the Sabbath lasted during the entire period of the Jewish system it lasted “during the (then) present state of things.”
Q. Are there any statements in the Old Testament that would indicate that the covenant that God made with Israel when they came out of Egypt would end?
A. Yes. As indicated in the first of this article. Jer. 31:31-34 states that there would be a new covenant that would not be according (agreeing—harmonizing with) the covenant that God made with Israel when he brought them out of Egypt.
Also Hosea says, “I will also cause all her mirth to cease, her feast days, her new moons: and her sabbaths and all her solemn feasts.” (Hos. 2:11)
Q. When was this to take place?
A. Hosea 2:18-23 states in substance that it will be on that day when a covenant is made that will bring mercy “to a people that are not my people” (the Gentiles).
Q. Does God say he will break the covenant that he made with all the people?
A. Yes. “And I took my staff, even Beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my covenant which I had made with all the people.” (Zech. 11:10)
Q. When was this to be done?
A. It was when thirty pieces of silver was given for the price of a life, and then be given to the potter. (Zech. 11:10-13)
Q. Of what was this a prophecy?
A. Of Judas’ betrayal of Christ and the purchase of the potters’ field by the priests. (Matt. 27:3-10)
Note. We find that God has said in substance that because the people broke his covenant that he made when he brought them out of Egypt he would make a new and different covenant, (Jer. 31:32) that at the time mercy was shown to the Gentiles he would cause their Sabbaths to cease. (Hosea 2:23) that he would break the covenant that he had made with all the people at the time when Christ was sold for thirty pieces of silver and a potter’s field bought with the money. (Zech. 11:10-13)
Let us then turn to the New Testament and see if these three prophecies have been fulfilled.
Q. Has God made this new Covenant?
A. Yes. “And to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel.” (Heb. 12:24) “For the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has made me free from the law of sin and death.” (Rom. 8:2)
Q. Is this law of the spirit of life different from the covenant that God made at Sinai and wrote on two tables of stone?
A. Yes. Note the following comparison:

OLD TESTAMENT
1. Figure of true. (Heb. 9:24)
2. So clear conscience. (Heb. 9:8-9)
3. Blood of animals. (Heb. 9:18-20)
4. Carnal ordinances. (Heb. 9:10)
5. Purifying of the Flesh. (Heb. 9:13)
6. Faulty. (Heb. 8:7)
8. No forgiveness. (Heb. 9:22)
9. Adultery in act condemned. (7th Commandment)
10. Do not kill. (6th Commandment)

NEW TESTAMENT
1. True. (Heb. 8:1-2)
2. Makes perfect. (Heb. 7:18-19)
3. Blood of Christ. (Heb. 9:12)
4. Spiritual sacrifices. (1 Pet. 2:5)
5. Purifying of Soul. (1 Pet. 1:22)
6. Perfect. (Heb. 8:6)
7. Eternal Inheritance. (1 Pet. 1:4)
8. Remission of sin. (Acts 2:38)
9. Adultery in heart condemned. (Matt. 5:27-28)
10. Do not be angry with brother. (Matt. 5)

Note. There are many more passages that might be cited showing a difference in the covenants but these should be sufficient to prove that a new and different covenant has been made. The prophecy of Jer. 31:31-34 which says, “Behold the days come that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and 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 Egypt which my covenant they brake”, has been fulfilled.
Dear Editor:

Everything connected with the Boll myth has been marked by stupendous weakness, within and without. The progress of the movement has been weak, but we have only the inherent complexity and stupidity of the theory itself to thank for that; for until recently there has been virtually no opposition to it. The opposition adopted the weak attitude, “Let it alone and it will die.” Although that attitude is unscriptural and unreasonable and is now twenty years out of date, in so far as this movement is concerned, it is still clung to by thousands of misguided church members. The Gospel Guardian is needed to combat the great neutrality which has developed in the church of Christ.

Of Self-Defense.

The chief and original weakness of the Boll myth is that it is founded on a speculation. It is based on a profound silence of the Scriptures. Such teaching distinguished Brother Boll from other preachers within our ranks. It made him the target of criticism. Self-justification is one of the strongest laws of nature. He was naturally led to think in terms of a lone wolf, with the pack against him. He eventually reached the conclusion that the church could not disfellowship him without formulating an unwritten creed-without becoming sectarian. That conclusion was very weak and illogical, but natural, since he was thinking in self-defense. If he had not distinguished himself by teaching his theory, there would have been no occasion for reaching such a foolish conclusion.

Of Creeds

If it is necessary for us to formulate a creed to bar him for teaching his speculation, we have already made one to exclude those who use instrumental music and who work through missionary societies. We are already sectarian because we already exclude some. On the basis of history they are to blame for the division, for they introduced these into the worship, for given us to worship with them, or not worship at the same time and in the same building. If they had not introduced the instruments, there would have been no division. If Brother Boll had not taught his theory, there would be a thoughtful disfellowship, and no weak position on sectarianism.

Then when Brother Boyer manifested strong Holiness tendencies, Brother Boll, having already retreated to the grounds of the impossibility of disfellowship, very consistently announced that he could not give Boyer up without making himself a sectarian. But now that Boyer has gone over to the Holiness, Brother Boll finds that Boyer has built a sectarian fence around himself, excluded himself from his fellowship. But he does not reach that conclusion without taking a childish fling at his own opposition. Having assumed one tremendously weak position in preaching speculation, Brother Boll goes on from weakness to weakness.

Of Criticism

He says that about three years ago Boyer unintentionally used a misleading phrase calculated to indicate that he believed Holiness doctrine. He says that “a perfect barrage of vicious, bitter, condemnatory criticism was levelled against Boyer in several papers.” It is strange that the criticism of Boyer made such an impression upon Brother Boll. I have been unable to find anybody that remembers such criticism as he describes coming from any paper. An “several papers” would almost necessarily mean all of them, for it would take them all to make several.

He says the hostile criticism that was heaped upon Brother Boyer caused him to investigate the subject. That is strange. Had he never investigated the subject before? If not, what was he doing in the field as a missionary, the sole dependence for instructing the natives in the religion of Jesus Christ? Was he not investigated by those who sent him, to see if he had investigated the truth of the Bible and was sound in the faith? If not, those who sent him, whoever they may be, should be investigated before they send anybody else to the foreign field.

If Boyer had investigated this question, why did this criticism lead him to investigate it again? He knew his critics were honest about it. They did not know him. They were jealous of the truth. If he had simply explained that he believed as they did, but had made a slip in using an unfortunate phrase, every word of the so vicious criticism would have been immedeately withdrawn. They only wanted to protect the readers from false teaching. If the slip was published, it ought to have either been explained or criticised. It was for the good of Boyer and the cause that criticism be made, in the absence of a prompt explanation.

Why did Boyer take an antagonistic attitude? Is it not preposterous weakness to allow honest criticism, or any other kind, to drive one to investigate the truth and arrive at error? Did he investigate in order to reach the wrong conclusion? What else could have guided him to error? The truth did not guide him to falsehood. It was so weak that he could not stand criticism, and rather than explain a mistake, would embrace it, he was too weak to be a missionary. It is a reflection on Boyer’s intelligence and spiritual manhood to insinuate that he was driven to such investigation by criticism; yet if that is not what Boll means, there is no point to his statement. He concluded thus: “Thus one extreme tends toward another.”

Of Sectarianism

I did not read a word of such criticism, but suppose it was in the wrong spirit, would that justify the wrong spirit upon the part of Boyer, and the error to which it finally led him? Did not Brother Boll hold the Holiness belief something like a year ago when he submitted his list of questions? Yet, Brother Boll said that he could not turn him loose, because to do so would make
Brother Boll a sectarian. Now he turns him loose because Boyer has become a sectarian. Was not Boyer sectarian in faith before he joined the Holiness? Is that not why he joined them? Is it merely a matter of a name, of formal identification with those who wear a different name?

Is endorsement of sectarian belief not fully as bad as endorsement of a sectarian name would be? Is it not even worse to endorse a sectarian within our ranks than to endorse one out of our ranks? If forced to do either, I had rather support Boyer in the Holiness fellowship, than to have supported him in our own fellowship, while he was teaching Holiness doctrine. He would not do as much harm now, for people know what he is. But, fortunately, I do not have to support those who teach Holiness doctrine anywhere, and will not if I know it.

Of Martyrdom

Brother Boll held on to Boyer, and slapped those who do not believe his theory when he turned Boyer loose, because he is in the same predicament as Boyer. He has been mistreated all of his life. He has always pleaded sympathy. He has been fighting with his back to the wall, even when there was no wall, and before there was any fight. He is a self-made martyr. That is, his friends have made him a martyr and he has by the plan and spirit of his teachings and by his tacit approval of what his friends say accepted the title.

I am afraid of men who are always being mistreated. There is something dead up the branch, for nature distributes her blessings and her sorrows more evenly than that. One man never gets all of either. And the idea of my friends intimating that Brother Boll has been driven to extremes in his teaching by the harsh opposition! They ought to be ashamed of themselves. As little as I think of his doctrine, and as little as I have in the mystery of his superpiety, I would not be guilty of preferring such a charge against him. Why that is an insult to his intelligence and his Christian character. I would not follow a leader that would change his convictions, or be influenced to stubbornly cling to a position because of criticism, whether it were just or unjust.

Of Opposition

Now Brother Boll made the first move. He started teaching his speculative theory, and that has led to all the other weak positions, even to his weak defense of being mistreated and tossed about by the opposition. Brother Boll voted first. Now, what difference does it make how somebody else votes? Do they not have as much right to vote against his theory as he has to vote for it? If not, the election is useless, and Brother Boll is virtually the dictator of the church. I am sure he would not want to be a dictator, for that is one of the epithets that he hurls at the opposition. On the other hand, if others can vote against his theory, will that lead Brother Boll to change his vote, or vote twice?

In principle this is the same argument the "wets" have always made. They said that more whiskey was being consumed under prohibition than before. I did not believe it. I know some ault when it came to be a violation of the law to buy it. Then if more whiskey was consumed, some must have started drinking when it was illegal, who never bothered with it when it was permitted. Granting that some did do this, what do you think of them as good citizens? So hostile to authority that they would contract the habit of drunkenness!

Brother Boll blames everything on the opposition to his theory. What is wrong? Is the opposition making more adherents to his doctrine? Would he object if he thought that were true? That would be right up his alley. Is the opposition interfering with the progress of Brother Boll's theory? What does he expect? Does his theory not have to stand upon its merits? Then why is it wrong to examine and discuss the merits of the question? Does he expect protection from opposition because he is so outstandingly pious, and because he prays so much in his closet—but leaves the door open a peep, so that his followers can capitalize the fact for the enlightenment of the world?  

Personally, I have never met Brother Boll, and frankly do not believe half I hear about him. That is not presumption. Prayer and piety are elements of secret service. How did it leak out? Why does Brother Boll allow and encourage this "martyr stuff" and superman propaganda? I do not have to be personally acquainted with a man to know that he cannot boast, directly or by proxy, of his great piety and meekness and still have any of it left! It is contrary to self-evident truth.

Now will this frankness furnish him justification for his giving deeper into speculation, or becoming more stubbornly entrenched therein? What has frankness or neutrality or kindness or unkindness got to do with the correctness of his theory? Would he renounce his theory if the brethren would be kind? Sentiment has no standing in the court of logic, where his theory stands condemned.

The teaching of his theory has led to all the weakness of his childish positions. It has led to the opposition of both his theory and his other manifestations of weakness. He did not ask me about teaching the theory. When he stops teaching it, the opposition will automatically cease. So, it looks like it is up to Brother Boll, as it has always been, whether the discussion goes on or not.

Of Spiritualizing

Brother Boll has complained because those who oppose their speculations have attempted to spiritualize certain prophecies-involving their theory—"out of existence." It is significant as a passing commentary upon the materialistic tendencies of their teaching and thought that they cannot understand how a thing can be spiritual and at the same time be real. In the Neal-Wallace discussions, it finally developed that what Brother Neal meant by all prophecies being literally fulfilled was that they were really and truly fulfilled. This sort of infidelity with respect to the reality of things spiritual must be a handicap in studying the Bible.

We would naturally expect that Brother Boll would not spiritualize. But the facts do not bear out this expectation. He is very technical in some of his statements. He is as technical as a shrewd attorney. He leaves himself a loophole. He is not like his Savior in frankness. Jesus said, "If it were not so I would have told you." But Brother Boll leaves men to guess about some things in his statements.

He made an agreement one time to stop teaching his doctrines; then, denied that he had agreed; and later said that he agreed, but that the word "agree" did not mean what some people thought it did, etc. He does a lot of spiritualizing when it is convenient to his purposes. He spiritualized that agreement out of existence, in so far as his part was concerned.
He resembles a Delphian oracle. His pronouncements can be taken one way by his followers and another way by his opposers, provided the opposers will take it the way he wants them to. In a recent statement a casual reader might almost infer that he had conceded a point with reference to Christ reigning now—almost, but not quite. He did not make a full statement. He said nothing about David’s throne. He will not say that Christ is now reigning on David’s throne. That would be fatal to his theory, and he has no notion of giving up his theory. Then why the statement? What significance did it have? None whatever. He just loves to experiment with ambiguous utterances. It keeps the ignorant ones guessing what the great man is thinking about.

His statement says nothing, means nothing—just an oracle, one thing being an oracle-ing. Why does he not make a frank statement, if any at all, of what he believes and does not believe, and leave no loopholes or avenues of escape? If the people ever found out all the oracle knows, they would cease coming to the oracle and the oracle would have to go out of the oracle-ing business. He spiritualizes all the meaning out of his statements.

Of The Kingdom

But as a matter of fact he does a major job of spiritualizing. He spiritualizes the kingdom of Christ out of anything except a sort of literary existence. He admits that Christ is now reigning, but he spiritualizes it. It is not real reigning on a real throne in a real kingdom—it is just a manifestation of the kingdom! It used to be a phase of the kingdom, but now it is only a manifestation. This is not much improvement, in so far as lending comfort to his theory is concerned.

Phase was a good word. There could not be a phase of a thing unless the thing existed—not without a lot of spiritualizing. But there was just a trace of distant kinship, or family resemblance, with the word “phantom.” A phase is something that appears. A phantom is something that seems to appear. But manifestation is a more definite word. The original signification was “Struck by the hand.” Something manifest is made as plain as if one were struck by a hand. It is a kind of knock-down argument for the existence of the thing manifested.

Now if Brother Boll was struck by a hand, he would surely believe that there was a hand, and that there was something back of the hand that wielded it in the striking. If the kingdom is manifest to Brother Boll, if it struck him with a hand, then the kingdom must be in existence and active. The arguments in favor of its existence are forcible enough to knock a man down. But that is not what Brother Boll means. He means that what Christ is now doing, the kingdom in which he is now reigning, is a mere manifestation of the real kingdom. I suppose the future kingdom casts its shadow ahead and we are merely passing through the shade of the kingdom that is to come.

Now, which is calculated to accomplish the greatest defection in faith, the introduction of instrumental music, which merely alters the practice of the church? or the making of the kingdom of Christ a mere shadow, phase, or manifestation of the real thing?

Yours In The Real Kingdom of Christ,
A. D. Bunker.

A Timely Tract

“Christ On David’s Throne” is the title of a twenty-four page tract by John T. Hinds, editor of the Gospel Advocate, Nashville, Tennessee. Characteristic of its author, the tract presents a logical, unanswerable, argument against the Premillennial theory. The burden of the tract is to prove that Christ is reigning now in the only sense and in the only kingdom in which he will ever reign, and this the author does very definitely and conclusively.

There is, however, no point, as we see it, in the emphasis that some who are commending the tract are putting on the kindness of this tract. It is the truth, not kindness, in which we are interested at present. Besides, who is it that has been unkind in the defense of the truth on these questions?

Along through the tract Brother Hinds quite correctly repeats that a “misunderstanding” of plain scriptures on these questions is “out of the question.” That is true—but it leaves the reader to think kindly or otherwise, what those who do not accept these Scriptures are guilty of. Brother Hinds implies it by saying that denying the existence of the kingdom per these arguments is “equivalent to rejecting these scriptures as false” and adds that it is “a daring thing truly!” And he reaches the right conclusion by saying that “Nothing less than a false theory or a disregard for plain facts will prevent admitting this truth.” So those who do not admit the truth of it are wedded to “a false theory” and have a “disregard” for the “plain facts”. This language is not one whit too strong and Brother Hinds is to be commended for his able exposure of these false teachers, but my present point is that the language does not seem to be much kinder that that which others have employed.

Those who have emphasized the kindness of it are putting their emphasis on the wrong thing. I am personally commending the tract because of its truth. There has been too much sentimentality. Let kindness take care of itself while we take care of the truth.

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

Pleading Guilty

Under paragraph header “Who Is the Troubler In Israel?” R. H. Boll compares himself to Elijah, Paul, and other “fire-brands”—and then with Jesus, concerning whom he quotes: “There was a division among the people because of him”. He reminds us that Jesus “brought not peace but a sword” and “because of him people were divided in every household” and Paul, he says, was a “first-class troublemaker” who went into “perfectly peaceful communities” and left them in “riot and uproar”. This brother has surely changed his tune. All the time he has pleaded his docility, meekness, humility, played up the martyr spirit and protested that he never divided anything in all his life. He has charged the rioting
and tearing up in general to others. Now, he pleads guilty to being the trouble, but reminds us of Elijah—and behold, a greater than Elijah is here! Heretofore, the rest of us have disturbed “peaceful communities” by our opposition; now, he breaks down and admits that he is himself a veritable firebrand-like Paul! Moreover, what of it if the church is divided?—“for time and again we read that ‘there was a division among the people because of him’”—and Brother Boll is very Christlike!

Brother Boll forgot to refer to the Lord’s conclusion concerning these offences and divisions: “For it must needs be that the occasions come; but woe to that man through whom the occasion cometh!”

From Comedy To Christ

In the city of McAlester, Oklahoma, there is an imposing theatre structure, located on a downtown corner one block off Main Street. It was built after the style of a few years ago for stage plays and comedies. Such plays as Ben Hur had been staged in this theatre, with horse and chariot features, which will indicate the immensity of it. It has main floor, first and second balconies, fully equipped. Abandoned for the lack of patronage sufficient to make it a paying investment in this day of the more modern in theatrical performance, this imposing edifice stood for a number of years as a tax burden to its owners. The sequel to it is that the McAlester church negotiated for its purchase and obtained it at a surprisingly nominal figure. It has been remodeled into one of the best church buildings owned by any church of Christ in the State of Oklahoma.

The building was used for the first time in the recent Wallace-Doran meeting. During this meeting more than thirty were baptized (all grown, mature people) and ten or twelve people were reclaimed from the First Christian Church and otherwise restored. Most of these results came the last three services of the meeting which had been extended to take care of the immediate demands.

McAlester was bombarded with the gospel during the two and one half weeks of this meeting. And it took effect. The town was stirred. Denominational preachers were served herding their flocks. The Christian Church preacher who tendered his cooperation the first week of the meeting “took to tall timber” when he saw the bark flying around. But some of his members learned the way more perfectly and abandoned their error. Groups were heard on the downtown street saying: “If we do not get that Campbellite preacher out of town he will ruin every church here”. The meeting should have continued. But the McAlester church has a future and this will not be their last meeting of that sort, unless they yield to the sentiment of getting some preacher who is trained in the art of “removing prejudice” instead of blasting sin and error out of existence.

Another Platform Sitter

E. C. Detherage, of Lexington, Kentucky, sends this word: “M. F. Ham, a Baptist and Premillennialist, is holding a large tent meeting here and last night J. Frank Norris spoke. Charles M. Neal was present and was seated on the preacher’s platform. Dr. Norris announced publicly that he and Neal had become friends and intimated that the recent debate with you was the occasion for it. I was not present but this came straight.”

Chiming and Chumming

Gospel Chimes, bulletin of the First Christian Church, Abilene, Texas, announces:

“REV. 0. E. PHILLIPS AND WIFE
TAKE MEMBERSHIP I P”

“It was a most happy service, last Lord’s Day at the evening hour when this good couple came for membership with us. They have been with the Church of Christ for many years but have gradually come to feel that they ought to be in the fellowship with us, and so they made the change at the evening service last Sunday. A fine audience heard Brother Phillip’s inspiring sermon and gave to them the hand of fellowship while the congregation sang, “Blest Be The Tie That Binds Our Hearts In Christian Love.” Brother Phillips will preach next Sunday at Albany and about Thanksgiving he will go to Paris, Arkansas, for a two weeks meeting. The Paris Church will dedicate a new building and the revival will follow.”

It is well known that 0. E. Phillips is the one who “chummed” with Norris after the Fort Worth debate, was featured by Norris over the radio as one of the “Church of Christ preachers” who stood with him. It was Phillips also who underook to hold a meeting in the Norris tabernacle and couldn’t fill the vestibule! And he, this selfsame 0. E. Phillips, is the one who announced the downtown Premillennial Church of Christ for Fort Worth, assisted by Dr. Eugene Woods and his boys. His tracks of division and discord have been seen in Oklahoma as well. He also held two meetings at Gallatin, Tennessee, with H. L. Olmstead, just prior to their most recent meeting there, and “pleased” them. He is furthermore the one who was featured in Louisville, Kentucky, not long ago by the Boll-Jorgenson group of that city. And he is the one and same 0. E. Phillips who told his good old father, T. W. Phillips (a great man and a grand preacher who has passed to his reward), that anybody who denied that “psallo” meant instrumental music was either prejudiced or ignorant (and his father was among those who denied it) and in short, he is just a fair sample of the tribe of Premillennialists that are agitating the Boll theories and otherwise annoying the churches.

They “chum” with Norris and “Chime” with the Digressives! Yet some of the brethren allow them to “two-time” with us. Let them go. As for me, Norris and the Digressives are welcome to every one of them. Who will be next?”

Mistakes Never Made

Under a paragraph heading of “Mistakes Often Heard” editor R. H. Boll of Word and Work avers that he has never divided a church in his life, has never drawn the line on any brother “over prophetic teaching”, nor “marked” any one who differed from him, nor excluded any from his fellowship, and he has not elevated his teaching, and—in short has made no mistakes in either teaching, conduct or practice! So all the division and disfellowship in Louisville, Winchester, Dallas, and other places, is over nothing! He conducts a Premillennial school, publishes a Premillennial paper, heads a Premillennial faction, sends out a drove of Premillennial agitators, and when a division occurs he washes his hands and says “I am innocent”—like Pilate!
Wanted-A Theory

Word and Work says that it has received the request "Please send me literature on your Theory," and added: "To this enquirer we had an impulse to send simply the New Testament-until we realized that he probably had one." Yes, but he did not have what he requested—"your Theory." Why did you not send him Boll's pamphlet "Kingdom of God" and "Revelation" like you did that "honest brother" at Paducah, Kentucky? Or, did you not really send the "literature", after all your other impulses?

Additions

Nothing is more calculated to advance truth and retard error in religion than pure speech-Bible language-among those devoted to the principle of "speaking where the Bible speaks." Gospel preachers know and emphasize this basic principle in their preaching on all subjects, but do not seem to respect it in reporting results of their meetings. By the use of the words "additions," "responses," "accessions," etc., readers are left to guess how many obeyed the gospel.

It is not amiss to observe here how the apostles and New Testament preachers reported the results of their meetings.

Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them by the hand of the Lord, multitudes both of men and women. (Acts 5:21.)

And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women. (Acts 5:14.)

And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved. (Acts 2:47.)

And the hand of the Lord was with them: and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord. (Acts 1:21.)

And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized. (Acts 18:8.)

It is plain that "additions" in the New Testament were conversions. The growing tendency to report a large number of "additions" when often only a few of the number were baptized should be discouraged, not only as a matter of fairness to the readers, who are left to wonder how many obeyed the gospel, but because a Scriptural principle is involved. The plea for pure speech, or Scriptural language, that we have so long and earnestly been making, should be applied to reporting the results of meetings.

The writer has held meetings where hard feelings existed among members of the church. At a day service, in a certain place some time ago, nearly all members present confessed their sins and mistreatment of one another, asking forgiveness of God and each other. A few were baptized. While it would have made a much larger showing to have reported a total number of "additions," to do so would not have been true to the facts.

People are added to the church once—when they obey the gospel. Transfers of memberships and confessions of faults were never called "additions" in the Bible. It is known that in some instances members of the church in certain places who have been worshiping with the congregation for years, but who never formally "placed membership," are rounded up by high-pressure methods and during the meeting persuaded to "place membership," and the preacher reports a wonderful meeting with so many additions. Common honesty and a good conscience will not allow such padding of reports.

When Paul returned from the first missionary journey, he reported in the following manner to the church at Antioch: "And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles." (Acts 14:27.) If preachers will give more emphasis to what the Lord does by us and less to the personal element, it will not only look better in print, but will be placing the emphasis where it belongs.

Neutralitis

There are some who feel indignant if they are asked where they stand on important issues. They are too independent to tell where they stand on anything. Some years ago a prominent man in the church was held in doubt on the question of instrumental music in the worship. Some interested brethren asked him what his attitude was, and—lo! he was too independent to tell. He would not subscribe to a creed nor bow to an imaginary Sanhedrin. But preachers, like statesmen, are public property. The people have the right to know their positions. The man who expects a brotherhood to sustain him should recognize the right of that brotherhood to know what he believes and teaches. It is poor grace for a preacher to be dependent upon the brethren for support in his work and be too independent to answer questions his supporters have the right to know concerning him and his teaching. The interest of the church is of more importance than any man's feeling of independence.

But there are preachers today who shrink from preaching the plain plan of salvation and "things pertaining to the kingdom of God," lest they be found subscribing to a creed.

Mark Them

Some of the brethren of the speculative group object to being marked for their theological teaching. One writer diagnosed the "trouble" of the brethren who are particular about what is taught in the churches as a case of the marking itch. Still, it is evident that some should be marked. Paul said so. Now, who would this brother mark, itch or no itch? If he marks a "digressive," could not his music brother appropriate the diagnosis and register the same objection? It would seem to depend on who marks and who gets marked as to whether it is the mania of this diagnostician or not.

Paul said "mark them." "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." (Rom. 16:17.) Whom does this include? All
who "are causing the divisions . . . contrary to the doctrine" we have learned. When brethren cause divisions over the teaching of theories regarding a supposed future-kingdom reign of the Lord on the earth, the case is plain enough. Such teaching with its consequent divisions is contrary to the doctrine we have learned in the New Testament. They will either have to quit teaching these theories or be marked.

When a man is promoting unity, upon the truth and nothing but the truth, he is not concerned about being marked. He is willing to be distinguished by what he teaches. The man who does not want to be marked for what he teaches is likely the very man who ought to be marked. It is the teaching, after all, that does the marking. Brethren should observe it. For "by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent." . . . . . .

A Library In One Volume

"The Voice of the Pioneers" by John T. Lewis, on the missionary societies and instrumental-music questions, was called forth by repeated assertions made by some of the "digressive brethren" that the "pioneers" were not opposed to those innovations. Brother Lewis has utterly annihilated the erroneous claims the society and music brethren have been making concerning those early preachers. In doing so he has performed a signal service. The book represents a careful and tedious research. It offers a collation of testimony and a compilation of evidence on the subjects treated equal to that of "Shepherd's Handbook on Baptism." Not many students have access to the valuable material contained in it. The wealth of matter is not within the reach of the average preacher. It is a book worthy of a place in the library of every preacher, teacher, elder, and Bible student in the land.

Order this book from the Gospel Guardian, P. O. Box 1078, Oklahoma City, Okla. Price $2.00. . . . . .

Appeals

Occasionally a complaint is heard against appeals from weak churches in hard and destitute fields.

Brethren who live in places where the church has been long and firmly established, the meetinghouse paid for, and current expenses easily met with the Sunday contributions, even when these contributions represent a mere pittance in proportion to the ability of large congregations to give, cannot appreciate the struggle that a few God-fearing, Christ-loving men and women make in these hard places, striving to establish the cause of Christ under every sort of physical handicap, opposition, and discouragement. To complain at appeals for help from such places is the wrong attitude. We should rather be glad that opportunity has been given us to have part in such worthy efforts. The admonition for the strong to "bear the infirmities of the weak" may have a missionary as well as a benevolent application.

Many of the great cities in U. S. and Canada are without churches of Christ. Others have small congregations, without church property, meeting in rented quarters, with no hope of acquiring property of their own without substantial assistance. Shall we complain when such needs are placed before the churches? Rather, let us rejoice in having the opportunity to have fellowship with the Lord's faithful people in these hard places and respond liberally to every worthy call. Every well-established congregation should determine to establish another congregation in some mission field every year. This would solve our missionary problem on the New Testament plan. . . . . .

Anesthetic

We are hearing somewhat about certain "methods of approach" in preaching the gospel, which seems to mean the soft-pedal art of "get ting it over to the hearer in such easy style that he doesn't realize it--a sort of anesthetic preaching. The apostles were not trained in that art. On Pentecost Peter's hearers were "pricked in their heart." A brilliant young preacher in the Jerusalem church named "Stephen" preached a sermon to the Jews so caustic that they were "cut to the heart," and they killed him. But it is better to preach one sermon like that and die than live in the praise and plaudits of the modern sort.

But we are softly, told that we should preach in love. Paul was the author of the admonition, "speaking the truth in love," yet to one who was opposed to the truth and sought to turn people from the faith he said: "0 full of all subtlety and all mischief, thou child of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" (Acts 13.10.) He was accused of "turning the world upside down," of being a disturber of peace, of clashing with other religions, opposing other parties, and unsettling things generally.

Preaching the truth in love does not mean that the preacher ought to sentimentally love all people so well that he will let them die in disobedience and go to hell rather than say anything to nettle their feelings or stir their consciences.

Paul charged a certain young preacher to "reprove, rebuke, exhort." Some preaching heard and heard about these days would make one think Paul had said "exhort, exhort, exhort! . . . . .

The man who loves the truth does not have to try to preach it in love. A young man once asked a veteran preacher how to best prepare himself to preach. The pioneer preacher, known for his plainness in preaching, said, "Get brimful and running over with the word of God, and it will come out!" We add that the methods, the gestures, and the love will take care of themselves. . . . . .

Apologetic

Comes the word from several sources that preachers are saying that none of the apostles "took baptism for a subject." Such a statement can only be taken as an apology for preaching baptism and as an effort to court the favor of people who do not like plain gospel preaching. It might be just as truly said that no apostle took faith or repentance as a subject. And if the preachers making such statements will check over their own lists of sermon subjects, how many of their sermon subjects will they find that any apostle ever used as a subject? Why all this softness? No man can preach the gospel without preaching baptism. And if in one sermon he should read deliberately all that the Bible says on the subject, he would preach long enough for one sermon, and baptism would be the subject. Too much apologetic preaching is being done. Such preaching never converts anybody, and loose statements in the pulpit by gospel preachers only lend solace to enemies of the truth and start compromise in the church. Any Bible subject is a good sermon subject under appropriate circumstances.
Another thing. Some young to preaching were recently exhorted not to preach "like the old pioneer preachers did." They should preach more smoothly and pleasingly! Paul, a New Testament pioneer, gave the following advice to Timothy, a young man beginning to study to preach: "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but after their own lusts shall they heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables. But watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do, the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry." (2 Tim. 4: 2-5.)

When a preacher begins trying to preach something new, he usually preaches something that is not true. If we could preach what the pioneers preached as effectively as they did, the world today would be stirred with the power of the gospel and the church saved from compromise and digression.

An Immediate Duty

There are said to be about one thousand churches in Tennessee, and as many in Texas, not to mention other States where the church has been firmly established for a century or more. Yet, to our shame, Alexander Campbell visualized a great work that merits the endorsement of missionary work. There are counties in these States where the church saved from compromise and digression.

With such conditions prevailing, need we become seasick at the mention of missionary work? There are several hundred preachers of the gospel who would willingly go for a time into these home fields, if the churches would provide the means.

A Hardeman Bible Class

A Christian teacher, with quite a respectable connection with a State College gave N. B. Hardeman the following well-deserved commendation some time ago:

"I do not write for publication often, but so forcibly was I impressed by a visit to a Bible class taught by Brother N. B. Hardeman in the college at Henderson, Tenn., recently, that I have really wanted to make a statement concerning it. Neither Brother Hardeman nor any one connected with Freed-Hardeman College, I am sure, expects me to write. My visit to the college was of a purely business nature."

In this class were about thirty students, ranging in age from about sixteen to forty. I learned that probably half of the members of the class were members of denominations or of no particular religious persuasion. Many were teachers working to renew certificates.

"I readily concluded while in the classroom that the truth of the Bible is being taught in a more effective way than most men are able to teach it from the pulpit. Here men and women are actually studying the Bible as a textbook and drawing conclusions from the same reasoning employed in the study of regular texts.

"It is almost inconceivable that an intelligent young person, after working in these classes two years, can ever have his faith wrecked by the atheistic teachings so common in the world today. Verily, Brother Hardeman and his faculty are doing a great work that merits the encouragement and support of all lovers of the truth."

If schools have been so effective in the propagation of error and the growth of denominationalism, will they not be even more effective in the dissemination of truth?

Alexander Campbell visualized such opportunity and established Bethany College, where hundreds of young men were trained in the principles of the plea to "restore the ancient order of things." Paul was guided by this principle when for the space of two years he taught in the school of Tyrannus, and "all Asia heard the word." Upon this principle N. B. Hardeman operates Freed-Hardeman College. It and others pledged to that principle should be patronized and supported by loyal brethren.

Poorhouses and Paupers

It has been suggested that if the brethren will keep the preacher poor, the Lord will keep him humble. The brethren are accomplishing the former.

The fact that preachers, as a rule, are not good business men makes it all the more necessary for brethren who are, to make liberal allowances for their support. The preacher who has devoted his life to the preaching of the gospel has had little time to study business problems. Brethren who have made a success in business should be willing, without being all the time urged, to contribute liberally to the support of the man who has given his life to the gospel. It was because of some preacher's willingness to do so that the gospel was preached to these brethren and their families. Plain gratitude should prompt liberality, and the desire for others to hear the gospel should increase it.

Let preachers put their whole heart into preaching the gospel, and let brethren support them liberally, that their time and thought may be given wholly to the gospel without worry over financial straits. "Let him that is taught communicate with him that teacheth in all good things." (Paul.)

And it should not be ignored, that the faithful preacher's expenses in carrying on his work are often as much as an average salary. Brethren should not make paupers out of Preachers, and Poorhouses out of their homes.

The Elders Speak

"Announcements have recently appeared in the Gospel Advocate concerning the establishment of a new congregation in south St. Louis under the name of "South Side Church of Christ." For the information of the public, and especially the readers of the Gospel Advocate, we desire to state that the group who composes this new congregation went out from the old Spring and Blaine church as a faction and at first met in a hall only a few blocks from the Spring and Blaine building.

"The name "South Side Church of Christ" is within itself misleading since the Spring and Blaine church is on the south side and the foregoing, therefore, capitalizes on the long standing association of the Spring and Blaine church with south St. Louis. The church was not large enough to "swarm" as the present building is more than ample to accommodate the entire membership of the church. Those who went away did not do so in order to "swarm", but withdrew as a faction, and not in peace. They are now bidding for fellowship but it appears that it is only recognition that they desire, inasmuch as they could not fellowship the church while with it and had been with-holding their financial support from the congre-
The preachers who have labored with us in meetings at various times, are: Horace W. Busby, John T. Smith, N. B. Hardeman, J. D. Tant, Rue Porter, C. L. Wilkerson, W. B. Ragsdale, John C. Graham, John T. Lewis, F. L. Rowe, Foy E. Wallace, Jr., and many others. J. H. Horton is now the regular minister for the church and has been for many years.

This group has been asked to make restitution scripturally (Matt. 5:3, 18; 15-17), but they refuse to do so.

We submit this statement in the interest of facts and of the cause of truth.

Signed by
J. W. Pruett, M. D.,
S. W. Bell,
J. H. Horton,
Elders.

(These elders are faithful godly men, and the Spring and Blaine church is a loyal congregation which has suffered for years against the handicaps surrounding a small church in a large city to build up the cause of Christ in St. Louis. Faction has not be indorsed—not even encouraged by the presence of faithful people, including preachers.-Editor)

Too Controversial

Some good but misinformed brethren would keep all disputed issues out of our papers. That is too much like trying to preach Christ and say nothing about baptism. The Bible itself is full of disputed issues' Jesus disputed with every class of errorists of his day. Paul was both an offensive and a defensive fighter. His words to that perverter of the Way, named "Elymas," who sought to turn Sergius Paulus the proconsul, "from the faith," represent a veritable verbal volcanic eruption: "0 full of all guile and all villiany, thou son of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to prevent the right ways of the Lord?" Too harsh, too harsh, Paul; you ought to preach in love! If gospel preachers today should preach like Christ and the apostles preached, it would give some of the brethren creeping paralysis.

It will not bid a fair future for the church of Christ when brethren in large numbers come to maintain an apologetic attitude toward the truth, or oppose exposition of error, or object to the discussion of disputed issues.

The church of the New Testament grew when opponents of the truth beheaded its exponents. The church of the past century grew when our own pioneers waged relentless war on error in denominations. When the doors of public buildings were closed against them, when persecution was bitter, and when courage was an essential quality in the man who would preach the gospel. Imagine the preachers and editors that have graced the pulpit and page in the past generation steering clear of disputed issues! Where would the church be today? The church of this generation will become languid in compromise, if not entirely lose its identity among the humanisms of the day, if the noncombative policy some brethren urge should be adopted.

Those brethren who think the policy of exposing error in or out of the church too drastic and who believe a course of less resistance and severity should be pursued would do well to look up some old files of the papers and see how the men whose memories are cherished and whose praises are yet sung, wrote and preached a generation ago. We often hear it said: "We need a Lipscomb, a Sewell, a Benjamin Franklin, at the helm today." True, indeed; and if they were here to do the steering, certain forms of error gaining currency in our own ranks could not get a start.

The fact that there have been objections to the policy of exposing error all the way up and down the line, from "first principles" of the plan of salvation to the destructive theories concerning a future-kingdom reign of Christ on earth, with all of their latent evils, is but proof that the teaching is well timed, well aimed, and taking effect.
Under the heading “The Churches and the Chaplaincy”, the Christian Evangelist, Saint Louis, Mo., of October 3rd, has a most timely and thought provoking article by James A. Crain. The editor states Mr. Crain’s thesis in these words:

“The chaplain’s task is to rationalize warfare for young men-and churches which have ‘dissociated themselves from the war system’ cannot logically continue to furnish chaplains to the army and navy.”

That there is a glaring inconsistency between the spirit of war and the spirit of Christianity is too evident in any thoughtful mind to admit of discussion. That there has and always will be wars and rumors of wars so long as human governments endure is as certain as selfishness, greed, and lust for conquest in fleshly controlled human hearts can make it. Josephus declares that human governments represent the organized rebellion of man against God, and to that we might add that it seems that organized society, as much as it may seem necessary, is proving to be in rebellion to the highest ideals of political and Christian liberty.

Jesus says in Matthew 24:12 that on account of wars and rumors of wars, the strife, hatred and slaughter incident thereto, the love of many shall wax cold, and little wonder, for Christ and Mars have nothing in common; the heart cannot be host to both at the same time. The fact that there are some excellent Christian men vitally connected with our peace time military machine does not lessen the force of the facts.

With reference to furnishing chaplains for service in the army and navy, Mr. Crain says:

“Since the close of the World War the major religious bodies of the United States and many interdenominational agencies through which Christian opinion expresses itself, have declared in the most positive terms that war is wrong and that the church of Christ must break with it. By official sanction the churches have condemned war; they have renounced it; they have declared they will no longer have any part in it. They have placed the stamp of sin so indelibly upon the whole war system that to continue to supply ministers to serve as commissioned chaplains with the rank of officers in the army and the navy seriously compromises their sincerity.”

The International Convention of the Disciples of Christ in Des Moines last October adopted a drastic resolution declaring that:

“As the churches of Christ, we dissociate ourselves from war and the war system and hereby serve notice to whom it may concern that we never again expect to bless or sanction another war.”

The Ohio convention of Disciples of Christ meeting in Dayton on May 21, 1935, passed the following resolution:

“We believe that Christians owe an obligation to the kingdom of God that is superior to loyalty to their own country, and that in any matter in which the laws of their country conflict with the laws of God they must assert their right ‘to obey God rather than men.’ ” The essence of this statement presents the battle ground for a war that will last as long as human governments endure, and unquestioned allegiance is necessary to meet the demands of earthly government’s expediences. Worldly governments have no thought of yielding the point, and the enlightened Christian mind can not yield.

Mr. Crain continues:

“Does the presence of the minister as a commissioned officer in the armed forces involve the church in the war system?” As the Christian Century pointed out in an editorial dated June 27, the chaplaincy is not a function of religion, but a function of the war system. The war and navy departments are but little concerned with the religious functions of the chaplain. They are concerned primarily with his military function as a builder of morale among troops.”

It is but a natural conclusion that such as the above is true, for there can be absolutely no ground of compatibility between Mars and Christ; and the philosophy of the latter is applied (?), not in its enemy-loving purity, but in such degraded and corrupt form as to serve the base purposes of the former-what a travesty on the Author of the Sermon on the Mount. If we must go to war, in the name of conscience, consideration, and justice, let us not attempt to drag Christ and Christianity into it.

Some inconsistencies and impossibilities of the “chaplain” are pointed out by Mr. Crain as follows:

“In warfare the chaplain must not only not stay the hand of the soldier who is about to take the life of an enemy, but he must build for him a philosophy that will enable him to do the deed and still retain some shred of moral sanity. His is the impossible task of finding a spiritual process whereby men can escape the ghastly chaos that warfare works in one’s own soul. Young men from farms, offices, and factories cannot be sent out to shoot men whom they have never seen, rip open the enemy with a bayonet, blow up a Vimy Ridge, or send a torpedo into a ‘Lusitania’ and be expected to return home without suffering the spiritual consequences of such acts. One of the functions of the chaplain is to attempt to provide a process of reconciliation for the inner conflicts of men who cannot look at their hands without seeing blood on them.”

The inconsistency of trying to render a spiritual service to men on their way to the “front” to slaughter, is expressed by the author under review, as follows:

“In my late teens I used to hear one of the better-known army chaplains preach to his men. I often wondered why he chose such topics as ‘Success.’ During the World War I learned the answer. No man can preach on the wider themes of Christianity in the military service with any degree of prophetic insight. How can any man discuss such a text as ‘Love your enemies’ if the men to whom he speaks must tomorrow go into battle to kill their enemies? Or what can he say on the words of Jesus, ‘Put up thy sword again into its place: for all they
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that take the sword shall perish with the sword? If the chaplain were to deal realistically and prophetically with these and other great scriptural themes, the men to whom he preached would be completely demoralized for the purpose of war.

In the Congressional Record of June 16, 1934, will be found a sermon preached by Harry Emerson Fosdick, printed in the Record as an extension of the remarks of Senator James P. Pope, of Idaho, by the unanimous consent of the Senate. I quote some excerpts which will be further illuminating in this connection.

“Do I not have an account to settle between my soul and him (The Unknown Soldier-T. B. T.)? They sent men like me into the camps to awaken his idealism. To touch those secret, holy springs within him so that with devotion, fidelity, loyalty, and self-sacrifice he might go to war. 0 War, I hate you most of all for this, that you do lay your hands on the noblest elements in human character, with which we might make a heaven on earth, and you use them to make a hell on earth instead. You take even our science, the fruit of our dedicated intelligence, by means of which we might build here the City of God, and, using it, you fill the earth instead with new ways of slaughtering men. You take our loyalty, our unselshiness, with which we might make the earth beautiful, and using these our finest qualities, you make death fall from the sky and burst up the sea and hurtle from unseen ambushes 60 miles away; you blast fathers in the trenches with gas while you are starving their children at home with blockades; and you so bedevil the world that 15 years after the armistice we cannot be sure who won the war, so sunk in the same disaster are victors and vanquished alike. If war were fought simply with evil things, like hate, it would be bad enough, but, when one sees the deeds of war done with the loveliest faculties of the human spirit, he looks into the very pit of hell.

At any rate I will myself do the best I can to settle my account with the Unknown Soldier. I renounce War. I renounce war because of what it does to our own men. I have watched them coming gassed from the front-line trenches. I have seen the long, long hospital trains filled with their mutilated bodies. I have heard the cries of the crazed and the prayers of those who wanted to die and could not, and I remember the maimed and ruined men for whom the war is not yet over. I renounce war because of what it compels us to do to our enemies, bombing their mothers in villages, starving their children by blockades, laughing over our coffee-cups about every damnable thing we have been able to do to them. I renounce war for its consequences, for the lies it lives on and propagates, for the undying hatred it arouses, for the dictatorships it puts in the place of democracy, for the starvation that stalks after it. I renounce war and never again, directly or indirectly, will I sanction or support another! O Unknown Soldier, in penitent reparation I make you that pledge.”

H. Austin Smith, in Christian Evangelist of November 7th although admitting that men have a right to go as “individual chaplains” into such service says:

“We should, nevertheless, call their attention to the grave dangers involved in chaplaincy service. A few such dangers are listed:

1. The chaplaincy trains men to react as servants of Mars rather than as servants of Christ. Touch any question related to war and the chaplain reacts, not as a minister but as a military officer.

2. The chaplaincy kills the prophetic element in one’s utterances. The chaplain becomes, perforce, a priest of the status quo instead of the prophet of the new day.

3. The emphasis of the institution is non-Christian. The chaplain tends to embrace a nationalistic religion modeled after early Hebrew patterns instead of the world religion of Christ.

1. The institution commits men to the way of force as the ultimate recourse whereas Christ’s way is the way of love.”

IN DEFENSE OF OUR DEBATEERS

A. LeROY ELKINS

In the Truth Seeker, published at Searcy, Ark., under the caption “Miscellany” Brother R. N. Gardner takes a rap at debaters in the following language: “When I was a boy just beginning to try to preach I thought my mission was to show the world that we were right and other religious people were wrong. I thought that I was called upon to regulate others, to whip them in line with my ideas of what it compels us to do to our enemies, bombing their mothers in villages, starving their children by blockades, laughing over our coffee-cups about every damnable thing we have been able to do to them. I renounce war for its consequences, for the lies it lives on and propagates, for the undying hatred it arouses, for the dictatorships it puts in the place of democracy, for the starvation that stalks after it. I renounce war and never again, directly or indirectly, will I sanction or support another! O Unknown Soldier, in penitent reparation I make you that pledge.”

H. Austin Smith, in Christian Evangelist of November 7th although admitting that men have a right to go as “individual chaplains” into such service says:

“We should, nevertheless, call their attention to the grave dangers involved in chaplaincy service. A few such dangers are listed:

1. The chaplaincy trains men to react as servants of Mars rather than as servants of Christ. Touch any question related to war and the chaplain reacts, not as a minister but as a military officer.

2. The chaplaincy kills the prophetic element in one’s utterances. The chaplain becomes, perforce, a priest of the status quo instead of the prophet of the new day.

3. The emphasis of the institution is non-Christian. The chaplain tends to embrace a nationalistic religion modeled after early Hebrew patterns instead of the world religion of Christ.

1. The institution commits men to the way of force as the ultimate recourse whereas Christ’s way is the way of love.”

He further adds: “What the world needs today is a better type of men, more Christian living. Living the doctrine is the best”. He says we need men who do not “strain at gnats in others and swallow camels in themselves”. Christian living is fine-but that is not all. To “contend earnestly for the faith” is another way that Heaven has pointed out. We are commanded to “Rebuke, exhort.” Again, “They that sin rebuke before all that others may learn to fear,” is another way to straighten out the crooked ways of men.

Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him Godspeed; for he that biddeth him Godspeed is partaker of his evil deeds.

That would be a good way to live, Brother Gardner.

Shall we let him alone and just live so he will be ashamed of his teaching? When Satan can effect a compromise he has won a sweeping victory.

Why should a man be considered like Christ when he is willing to let evil teaching go by unnoticed? The Christian church has acted on the principle of compromise until it has lost all claims of being anything more than a modern denomination.

How can we speak as the Bible speaks and not oppose error? How can we be true to Him and not “contend earnestly for the faith”? That means “making alternate speeches on different sides of the question”.

I am unable to see the need of constantly pleading for tolerance, unless one is in sympathy with error.
ARE THERE TWO FUTURE RESURRECTIONS?

The Premillennial System Requires Two Future Resurrections--One for the Righteous and One for the Wicked--and Two Future Judgments. Bible Statements of What Will Occur “At the Last Day” Leave No Room for a Thousand Years Reign on Earth Between Two Resurrections.

W. CURTIS PORTER

A number of theories are necessary to the construction of that system of theology and speculation known today as Premillennialism. Many of these have been discussed thoroughly in recent months. Readers have learned that the advocates of Premillennialism claim that Jerusalem, in Palestine, at the second coming of Christ, will be made the capital city of the world; that the kingdom of Christ has not really been established, but the church was offered as a substitute because of the rebellion of the Jews, and at the Lord’s second advent he will be placed upon David’s throne in Jerusalem to rule over all the nations of the earth; that the exercise of his sovereign reign in that city will extend over the period of one thousand years, known as the Millennium; and that during that time, or likely at the very beginning of it, the Jews as a nation will be regained to Palestine, have their Jutalastic services restored, and be nationally converted to the Messiah. But the system also requires that there be two future resurrections and judgments—one for the righteous before the beginning of that material, earthly reign of Christ: the other for the wicked when the thousand years are over. This is one of the vital points of Premillennialism which has not been discussed as completely as it might, and to it I wish to give my attention at this time.

There can be no mistake as to the issue at this point. Either there will be a general resurrection and judgment, in which all the multiplied millions of Adam’s race will be raised and rewarded according to their works: or there will be a resurrection for the righteous, and a judgment for them, at the Lord’s second coming, with the resurrection and judgment for the wicked deferred till the end of the fantastic Millennial reign. This issue has been studied as carefully as I know how, and my conclusion is that there is one future resurrection and judgment for the entire world. Premillennialism involves itself in so many absurdities and contradictions that you are made to wonder if its advocates have really satisfied themselves as to what they teach. And while they claim to teach two future resurrections and judgments for men, when the theory is carried to its final analysis it begins to appear that there will be

Three Future Resurrections

The “first resurrection” of Premillennialists includes only the righteous dead, not the righteous living, and the second resurrection includes the unrighteous dead. But what condition is to obtain during the thousand years? The righteous dead will be raised to immortality, no doubt, but what of the living? Will God bestow immortality upon all those who are living, both righteous and unrighteous, at the Lord’s return? Or will there be any death—any dying—during the Millennium? It may be claimed that the righteous living, as Paul teaches in I Thess. 4:14-16 and I Cor. 15:52, will be changed at a state of incorruption at the time the righteous dead are raised. But that does not solve the difficulty. For another question presents itself: Will any of the wicked over whom Christ reigns be made righteous during the thousand years? And if not, just what will be accomplished by his reign? And will the marriage relationship exist among those who have not died? and will children be born during that time? And from any or all these will any become righteous while the Millennium goes on? And if any become righteous (luring that period, what will their condition be? Will they be mortal or immortal? If they will be immortal, just when will that immortality be bestowed upon them? and where is the proof? But if they are not immortal, they will be subject to death: and if they die during that reign, when will they be raised? I can understand how the wicked might die during that time and yet be brought forth in the “second resurrection” which we are told, is for the wicked. But that leaves the righteous out. If they become righteous during the Millennium and die, that is too late for the “first resurrection” which must take place before the Millennium can begin. So they cannot be in that resurrection. And if the next resurrection is for the wicked, it cannot include them, for they have ceased to be wicked. So when will these righteous be raised and judged? It makes necessary a third resurrection and judgment. Thus Premillennialists, while claiming two future resurrections and judgments, are forced to the position that there will be three future resurrections. Else they must say there will be no death during the Millennium. Let them choose their position! Which of them will be first to inform me on this point?

At The Lost Day

But let us study some Scripture statements to learn the truth of God on this question before us. “And this is the Father’s will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.” (John 6:39) The next verse also states: “And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life: and I will raise him up at the last day.” These statements are entirely too plain to be misunderstood. Jesus simply says that believers will be raised at the last day. And this truth is further shown in his conversation with the sister of Lazarus. Martha had said: “Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died.” But Jesus informed her: “Thy brother shall rise again.” To this Martha replied: “I know, that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day.” (John 11:24) These statements definitely locate the time of the resurrection of the righteous—they are to be raised and rewarded at the last day.

Sow, then, if it can be shown from the book divine that there will be a thousand years in this old world after the last day has passed, there will be room for the Premillennialists’ “second resurrection.” But if “the last day” is the last day, how are you going to make 365,000 days follow it? Whatever might he said about the resurrection of the wicked the fact remains that the righteous are to be raised at the last day). If the wicked come forth in another resurrection, it must be before
the righteous are raised, or it must be in eternity after the last day of this world has ended. But Premillennialists do not claim that the wicked will be raised in the eternal age, and since they do not they have no place for another resurrection after the righteous are raised, unless they can get the foregoing statements out of the divine text.

But what saith the Scriptures? Do they tell us the wicked will be raised one thousand years after the last day? If so, then we must join hands with Premillennialists; but if the Scriptures declare the wicked are to be judged at the same time the righteous are raised, we can well afford to oppose, with all our power and strength, these speculative theories that are disturbing Zion today. Listen to the language of the Lord: "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." (John 12:48) The judgment of unbelievers is here declared; the time of it is explicitly stated; and we can accept it or throw it to the winds. In so many words does Jesus say that his word will judge the wicked in the last day. To suit Premillennialism this text must undergo some revision: it must be made to read: "The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him a thousand years after the last day." But the Lord said that the righteous are to be raised and the wicked are to be judged at the same time—the righteous are to be raised at the last day, and the wicked are to be judged in the last day. Who is able to insert a thousand years between the two?

It will do no good to resort to the old position that this day is one thousand years long. Pastor Russell and Judge Rutherford (and their followers) claim that the judgment day is a day of a thousand years; that the Millennium is the judgment day. And some brethren grab at the position—that the righteous are raised at the beginning of the thousand-year day and the wicked at the end of it; so both are in the last day, yet one thousand years apart. According to that the thousand-year period does not begin till after the first resurrection, and it ends before the resurrection of the wicked. So if the Millennium is the last day, the day of judgment, neither the righteous nor the wicked are raised at the last day. The righteous would have to be raised before "the last day" begins, and the wicked would have to be raised after "the last day" is over. The last day, the thousand years, intervenes the two resurrections, and neither of them is in the last day!

In this day of many false religions, we need not be surprised at most anything happening. On Nov. 26th, the Dallas News carried an associated press news item with this caption: "BAPTISM BY IMMERSSION OR NOT? CHURCH GOES TO COURT TO DECIDE." To be fair to the transgressors of New Testament authority I will give the entire news item as it appeared, and here it is:

MOUNT CARROLL, Ill., Nov. 25 (AP) —An aged elder of the First Christian Church of Thomson—split by a fight over doctrine that led to Circuit Court—testified Monday that real baptism must have water-plenty of water.

William Hawk, 70, hobbled to the witness stand to contend that total immersion and absolute belief in Christ's miracles are essential to church membership.

He was the first complaining witness in a suit of twenty-two members of the congregation of 100 for an injunction restraining the pastor, the Rev. David E. Todd, 32, and some of the trustees from teaching doctrines which the plaintiffs regard as contrary to the fundamental principles of the church.

The complainants sought a court order to prevent the defendants from admitting persons to the church without baptism by total immersion, from preaching that some of Christ's miracles were myths and from approving election to church posts of persons not members of the congregation.

Bitterness over these charges raised a controversy in the flock. The church, established in 1868, is independent. So the difficulty was taken to the court.

Judge Albert Manus heard opposing counsel outline the case and ruled the major issue is church doctrine.

Dr. E. S. Ames, dean emeritus of the philosophy school at the University of Chicago—saw there are 7,000 independent Christian churches in the United States and a number have elected to require immersion. Now you have it from the doctor himself who is an outstanding representative of the Babylonian church, the Christian church, saying "the church elected to require immersion" and not the Lord. He had just as well said the church has taken the authority from the Lord who commanded immersion and given it over to the congregations to elect or select or decide the doctrine of baptism. Baptism by immersion, (for baptism is immersion), is from Christ and not the church.

I would not overlook that the Doctor said "The majority decide their own principles." Here you have a democratic rule on the sacred doctrines taught by Christ. God's Word is ignored with the high hand of human legislation in the local church.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH REAPS WHAT IT HAS SOWN BY MAJORITY VOTING ON SUCH MATTERS AS INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC.

The Chickens Come Home to Roost in the Controversy on Baptism.

J. B. NELSON

The majority decide their own principles, and a number have elected not to require immersion. Hawk referred to the pastor as "That man Toocl," and to members of the opposing faction as "Mister and Missus," but he mentioned his adherents as "Brother" and "Sister."

They did not need to appeal to the courts to settle such a plainly taught subject as "baptism by immersion." There is only one baptism. (Eph. 4:5) They could have saved all the expense, hard feelings and insults to God by turning to the New Testament and settling the dispute.

These sweet spirited brethren fussing over the doctrine of immersion seem to us ridiculous. What need is there of contending for "water-plenty of water" if one can be a Christian without baptism?

Many in the Christian church believe those that have been sprinkled are Christians. When the way is made to compromise one vital Divine truth it will not be long until the flood-gates will be thrown wide open for all forms of sectarianism.

The above associated press article states that Dr. E. S. Ames, dean emeritus of the philosophy school at the University of Chicago—said there are 7,000 independent Christian churches in the United States—and a number have elected to require immersion. Now you have it from the doctor himself who is an outstanding representative of the Babylonian church, the Christian church, saying "the church elected to require immersion" and not the Lord. He had just as well said the church has taken the authority from the Lord who commanded immersion and given it over to the congregations to elect or select or decide the doctrine of baptism. Baptism by immersion, (for baptism is immersion), is from Christ and not the church.


A SERMON SYNOPSIS: “YE HAVE FILLED JERUSALEM WITH YOUR DOCTRINE”


HUGO McCORD

The Lord ordained that “repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem.” Accordingly, he commanded his eleven: “... tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, ...” When they had seen the Meek One rapidly exalted from Olivet, “Then returned they unto Jerusalem ...

“And there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven.” A mighty conourse, citizens and visitors, were in the city of David. A fitting occasion, under the arrangements of Providence, for the law to go out of Zion and the word of God from Jerusalem. Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice, and said unto the multitude, “Ye men of Judea, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be this known unto you, and hearken to my words: ...

So began the first complete gospel sermon! the first time remission of sins was preached in the name of a resurrected Savior and a crowned King! So powerful was the preaching the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. Then the soul-winners were fired to more work; daily in the temple and in every house they ceased not to preach and teach Jesus Christ. Many of them which heard the word believed and the number of men alone soon was about five thousand. With such a movement begun, the old high priest and his fellows were filled with jealousy and anger, and laid their hands on the apostles and put them in the common prison. Next day, at trial, the wrathful priests said angrily, “Did not we straitly command you that ye should not teach in this name? and, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine ... (Acts 5:28) 

I. “YOUR DOCTRINE”

What was the doctrine of the apostles? Luke has preserved for us the very doctrine that so offended the self-seeking priests. Their doctrine was of a glorious Christ! one that with wicked hands had been crucified and slain, but whom it was not possible for the pains of death to hold. This Jesus had God raised up, raised up for the very purpose of sitting on David’s throne. Such was the doctrine that nauseated the carnal Jews. But the apostles’ doctrine involved another thing, unquestioned then, viciously fought now: be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, ...

Your doctrine—the apostolic doctrine—was unpopular in A. D. 30 and in A. D. 1935. That Christ was raised from the grave was denied then and now; now not only by infidels but by professed Christians (modernists). That Christ was raised to sit on David’s throne and was exalted to be King of kings was denied then and now; now not only by infidels but by some Christians. The apostolic doctrine of baptism for remission of sins was not denied then; never has been denied by real scholars; but is denied by the orthodox to-day.

Orthodoxy, approved popular customs, did not sanction any belief in Christ’s resurrection. Orthodoxy was wrong; it was found to fight against God.

To-day orthodoxy frowns on Peter’s command in Acts 2:38. Great theologians, from Luther to Cadman, decry the apostolic doctrine as unsound. Orthodoxy can still be wrong.

II. “HAVE FILLED JERUSALEM”

How were the apostles and the brethren able to fill busy Jerusalem with their doctrine? Tho aided much by miracles, there were other factors that enabled them to fill the city. And these other factors can be ours to-day; may, we are responsible to God if we don’t make them ours: (1) they gave all they had, were wholly consecrated! (Acts 4:32, 34-37) (2) They did not fear ridicule, persecution, jail. (Acts 4:3; 5:18) (3) They continued in prayer. (Acts 2:42, 46; 4:24-31) If we as Christians in Indianapolis to-day will make those characteristics ours, we can fill this city with the doctrine! And the reason we’ve done so little so far is a manifest lack of those characteristics. Starting with one hundred twenty disciples, it wasn’t long till the apostles filled Jerusalem with the doctrine. If this congregation at East Side numbering about 225, had the spirit and faith of the little band in A. D. 30, it could fill Indianapolis with the doctrine. Not as fast, of course; we don’t have miracles; but it can be done if we want to! If we will forsake all, deny ourselves, we can start the leaven working. If we are not afraid of shame and ridicule and being un-orthodox, we can make the leaven work faster! If we will pray, and mean it, and without ceasing, the Lord will make the leaven save souls!

Brethren in Detroit have done much toward filling that city with “Your doctrine.” Nashville Christians have filled Tennessee’s capital with the doctrine. They must have given much; they must braved fiery darts of ridicule; they must have prayed fervently and often. Still it took a long time to fill Nashville with the doctrine, but it was done. The same cause will produce the same effect in Indianapolis. Consecration, fortitude, and prayer will always produce results.

In Indiana’s capital what has been done? Nearly 400,000 people; a pitiable few even know the churches exist. The North Side church has been in existence many years but hasn’t begun to fill Indianapolis with the doctrine; instead it has ridden a hobby about Bible colleges to the neglect of weightier matters of the law. It has objected so much it hasn’t projected any.

The West Side church hasn’t had a protracted meeting in over twenty years. Dead while yet it liveth. Devilish hobby riding there too.

Here at East Side you’ve been in existence only a few years. You have done some good; you have wasted many opportunities; but forgetting those things which are behind you can yet fill Indianapolis with your doctrine.
THE SPECIALIST

Ministers of Christ Should Beware of Specialization. Any Over-emphasis of One Part of the Gospel that Causes Neglect of Another Part Is a Perversion.

YATER TANT

For nearly two centuries Jonathan Edwards’ famous sermon on “Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God” has remained the classic example of “hell-fire and brimstone” preaching. The effect this sermon produced on the hearers is almost incredible to the twentieth century. It is said that women screamed and fell fainting into the aisles; strong men, who had faced un-daubed and unafraid the terrors of the wilderness and the savage Indians, trembled as with the ague, and with blanched cheeks and quivering lips cried out for mercy, grasping their seats until their fingers bled to keep from sliding into the awful pit of hell which Edwards was so realistically laying open before them. As a depicter of the tortures of the damned Edwards has never had a rival in the history of American preaching — imitators, perhaps, but surely no equals.

But that was a long time ago. The pendulum has swung in the other direction, and to the other extreme. Today not one sermon in a thousand even mentions hell—much less describes it. Our generation has decided that hell is no longer a fit subject for church-going ears to hear, and the obli-ging clergy have considerably deleted all reference to it from their sermonic efforts. In the “Christian Century Pulpit” of a few months ago Halford E. Luccock, eminent modernist divine, had a sermon entitled “Shall Be Damned” which serves as a good example of the type of preaching which is popular today. In this sermon the whole effort seems to have been to destroy the force of Christ’s words in Mark 16:16. He has converted the sword of the Spirit into a regulation skinning-knife, and wields it with considerable dexterity and power. He rarely preaches on Christian living; and more rarely still on Christian giving.

That the fallacies and sophistical reasonings of sectarians should be exposed is admitted, and when such is necessary, no half-way job should be done. The compromising soft-soaper does more harm than good in trying to tackle such a job. But for a man to let such work become a hobby with him is clearly a mistake. There is much more to preaching the gospel than a mere skinning of the sects; and however much pleasure the latter may afford, it can never accomplish the results that a more balanced program of sermons might. In fairness to the preachers, however, it should be said that the professional sect-splitter isn’t found nearly so often in the pulpit as in the pews.

I. THE SECT-SKINNING SPECIALIST

What the sect-splitter is to the sectarians the sin-splitter is to the church-members. With a tongue dipped in vitriol he lays open and describes (sometimes with suspicion-arousing accuracy) the sins of the modern generation. His forte is in telling people what not to do, rather than in telling them what to do. Dancing, card-playing, swimming pools, the theater, are condemned so often and so vigorously that there is small time left to tell the rest of the gospel story.

Let us recognize that sin in the church is a deadly and insidious foe to the cause of Christ. It cannot be condemned too often, but in our opinion it can be condemned too often. There is a time for all things; and for a man to preach occasionally on something other than sin seems to us merely an act of good judgment and psychology. It does not mean at all that he concedes sin. The man who preaches every sermon on sin seriously handicaps himself in leading the ignorant and untaught into a knowledge of the plan of salvation. His preaching must be more balanced.

II. THE SIN-SPLITTING SPECIALIST

That the love and spirituality of the church should be cultivated and increased is not open to argument. In many places the lack of spirituality is positively appalling. But a gospel preacher cannot afford to let this obvious need blind him to the danger of false doctrine and church-dividing doctrines; nor can he afford to become so lopsided on “love” as to neglect preaching on the plain and positive duty of Christians toward those who create trouble.

Today there seems to be a disposition on the part of many to neglect preaching on the first principles. We heard a Christian remark not long ago that he hadn’t heard a sermon on the establishment of the kingdom in ten years! A few years ago Brother M. C. Kurfess wrote a tract stressing the need for a continued emphasis on the first principles. Any gospel preacher who takes it for granted that the world knows the first principles, and spends his time altogether on other phases of the gospel, should, by all means, read this tract. It will help him to realize the vital importance of this type of preaching. No Christian college should afford, it can never accomplish the results that a more balanced program of sermons might. In fairness to the preachers, however, it should be said that the professional sect-splitter isn’t found nearly so often in the pulpit as in the pews.

III. THE SWEET-SPirit SPECIALIST

This brother is sometimes a bit crudely (albeit accurately) described as a “sob-sister.” His pious and sympathetic soul is vexed at the old meanings in the church who are always jumping on dear Brother So-and-so for his unscriptural teaching. “Love”, “tolerance”, and “spirituality” are the key-words in this type of preaching. He specializes in extending sympathy to those who are in error and who are making havoc of the cause of Christ. From his lips you never hear an exposure of false doctrine, nor the duty of Christians to “mark them that are causing division”. He had so much rather tolerate and sympathize with them. It is much easier.

That the love and spirituality of the church should be cultivated and increased is not open to argument. In many places the lack of spirituality is positively appalling. But a gospel preacher cannot afford to let this obvious need blind him to the danger of false doctrine and church-dividing doctrines; nor can he afford to become so lopsided on “love” as to neglect preaching on the plain and positive duty of Christians toward those who create trouble.

Today there seems to be a disposition on the part of many to neglect preaching on the first principles. We heard a Christian remark not long ago that he hadn’t heard a sermon on the establishment of the kingdom in ten years! A few years ago Brother M. C. Kurfess wrote a tract stressing the need for a continued emphasis on the first principles. Any gospel preacher who takes it for granted that the world knows the first principles, and spends his time altogether on other phases of the gospel, should, by all means, read this tract. It will help him to realize the vital importance of this type of preaching. No Christian college should feel that it has done its duty to the young preacher within its walls until a copy of this tract has been placed in his hands.

Let the minister of Christ beware of specialization. It is his duty to preach a full gospel. Any over-emphasis on one part of the gospel that causes the neglect of another part is a perversion of the gospel. This, in embryo, is precisely the principle that caused Martin Luther to espouse the doctrine of “salvation by faith only”; it also caused John Calvin (specializing on the sovereignty of God) to preach his horrid doctrines of Election and Predestination.

We do not say that any considerable number of Christian preachers are guilty of specializing but we do believe there is a definite trend toward specialization.
THE TRADITIONS OF CATHOLICISM

According to Catholic Authorities the Bible Is an Obsolete Book. An Institution Modeled After the Roman Empire in Law and Government Has No Use for the Bible.

O. C. LAMBERT

When the power of Catholicism was broken by the Reformation and their prohibition of Bible reading could no longer be enforced she resorted to a campaign of disparagement of the sacred book. Though not entirely effective, it has no doubt deterred millions of Catholics in obeying the command of Jesus to “Search the Scriptures.” They make Paul falsify when he said: “The holy scriptures ... are able to make the wise to salvation.” (2 Tim. 3:14) The Bereans were commended for searching the Scriptures daily, a useless thing to do if the following quotations from Catholic authorities are true.

I. DO NOT NEED THE BIBLE

“It is that of having for a foundation authority in all ages, for a means of deciding all doubtful points, not a book alone, or a book with authorized interpreters, simply the authorized interpreters of the faith such as the Apostles were, with a book, perhaps, to help them, but still not absolutely needing that book for the discharge of their office any more than the Apostles did for theirs.” (Plain Facts, 33)

“They (Apostles) consigned to unwritten tradition many revealed truths, and thus made the Church from the beginning independent of the writings.” (History of the Church of God, 253)

“The Bible was not intended to be a Text Book of the Christian religion.” (Catholic Facts, 50)

II. BIBLE DOES NOT CONTAIN THE TEACHING OF JESUS

“The very nature of the Bible ought to prove to any thinking man the impossibility of its being the one safe method of finding out what the Saviour taught.” (Question Box, 67)

The Bible does not pretend to be formulary of belief, as is a creed or catechism. There is nowhere in the New Testament a clear, methodical statement of the teachings of Christ.” (Question Box, 66)

III. CATHOLIC DOCTRINE NOT IN THE BIBLE

Concerning the Immaculate Conception:—“Of course if one is to take nothing as belonging to the Christian faith but what is plainly or unquestionably stated in the Bible, one will not believe or accept it.” (Plain Facts, 85)

“So in the New Law Catholics believe some things not in the Scriptures.” (Question Box, 75)

“By what right do you teach doctrines not found in the Bible? ...”

“Because the origin of our faith is not in the Bible alone, but the Church which gives us both the written and the unwritten word.” (Question Box, 75)

IV. BIBLE READING MAKES UNBELIEVERS

“The Reformation produced, indeed, an exaggerated individualism, which by declaring every man equally competent to find out the doctrines of the Saviour from his own private readings of the Scriptures, has led many to the utter denial of Christ and His doctrines of faith and morality.” (Question Box, 95)

V. WHERE CATHOLICS GET THEIR TEACHING

“And history shows only too plainly that the Church in their sense, of the term, has varied in its doctrine, taught dogmas at various times and at various places at the same time, inconsistent with each other, and therefore to a considerable extent erroneous.” (Plain Facts, 34)

“When the Church studies the ancient monuments of her faith she casts over the past reflection of her living and present thought and by some sympathy of the truth today with that of yesterday she succeed in recognizing through the obscurities and inaccuracies of ancient formulas the portions of traditional truth, even when they are mixed with error.” (Cath. Ency., XV., 10)

“This infallibility is to control the vagaries of Tradition, for Tradition, of its very nature, tends to exaggeration, as we find in the legends of ancient peoples. Exaggerated, they destroy themselves, but in the bosom of God’s Church these truths forever retain their character unchanged and unchangeable.” (Explanation of Catholic Morals, 69)

“Instead of attempting to repress totally a practice which was misguided indeed, but which showed an instinctive reliance on higher powers, the Church in many instances took the religious customs with which the people were familiar, and made these Christian customs.” (Externals of the Catholic Church, 205)

“It is interesting to note how often our Church has availed herself of practices which were in common use among pagans ... Thus it is true, in a certain sense, that some Catholic rites and ceremonies are a reproduction of those of pagan creeds.” (Externals of the Cath. Ch., 156)

“We need not shrink from admitting that candles, like incense and lustral water, were commonly employed in pagan worship and the rites paid to the dead. But the Church from a very early period took them into her service, just as she adopted many other things indifferent in themselves, which seemed proper to enhance the splendor of religious ceremonial. We must not forget that most of these adjuncts to worship, like music, lights, perfumes, ablutions, floral decorations, canopies, fans, screens, bells, vestments etc. were not identified with any idolatrous cult in particular; but they were common to almost all cults.” (Cath. Ency., III., 246)

“The use of the ‘aqua lustralis’ with which the Romans sprinkled themselves or were sprinkled by the priest shows that the same symbolism existed among the heathen.”

“A like custom, beautiful and natural; in itself, though, of course it may degenerate and often has degenerated into superstition, has been adopted by the Church, water and salt are exorcised by the priest and so withdrawn from the power of Satan.”

“The use of holy water among Christians must be very ancient, for the Apostolic Canons (forged in the fifth century. —Catholic Dictionary, 43) contain a formula for blessing water that it may have power ‘to give health, drive away diseases, put the demons to flight,’ etc. But there does
not seem to be any evidence that it was customary for the priest to sprinkle the people with holy water before the ninth century.” (Catholic Dictionary, 403)

“St Patrick labored with great prudence. He did not rudely assail or alter customs and ceremonies which might be tolerated; many of them even were converted to Christian purposes. As the pagan temple, when purified and dedicated, was employed for Christian worship, even so pagan practices, divested of their superstitions, might be retained as Christian. This was the wise policy ever recommended by Christianity, and was ably carried out by Patrick. The days devoted from old time to pagan festivals were now transferred to the service of the Christian cause.”

“The feast of Samhain, or the moon, co-incided exactly with All-Saints Day. The fires of Mayday, in honor of Baal, were transferred to the 24th of June, in honor of John the Baptist. The convert in the baptismal font where he was immersed, saw the sacred well at which his fathers had worshipped.” (Life of St. Patrick, 73)

“It has been and always will be the intent and tradition of the Apostolic See to make a large allowance, in all that is right and good, for the primitive traditions and special customs of every nation.” (Gr. Ency Letters, 308)

“The Church assimilates and sanctifies Roman Civilization.—From its foundation the Church had gradually absorbed the best of the life, the organization, the institutions, the laws, the learning, and whatever else of good and worthy there was in the Roman Empire. What the Church thus took to herself she transformed and sanctified, so that, though Roman in its source, it was Christian in its form, influence, and tendencies. To the treasure of ancient civilization the Church joined the great and luminous truths of God’s revelation. Thus doubly armed with the great legislative and intellectual acquirements of antiquity and the practical and saintly precepts of Christianity, the Church began to build up from Teutonic and Roman elements the most perfect nations and the grandest civilization that the world has ever known. So numerous were the difficulties of this formidable task that any other institution save God’s Church must have lost courage and despaired.” (History of the Church of God, 379).

It is easy to see that an institution modeled after the Roman Empire in its laws and governmental machinery, and which is a crazy-quilt patchwork of paganism in its doctrine and belief would have little use for the Bible!

A NEW CATECHISM FOR CALVINISTS

The following epitome of absurdities, involved by Calvinists, is from Matthew's and Franklin's Debates, pages 396, 397 and 398. It is a glance at some of the more prominent passages of Scripture that no man can reconcile with Calvinism.

1. Can a man “fail of the grace of God,” unless he was once in grace? Heb. 12:15.
2. Can a man be “renewed to repentance again,” unless he had once repented? Heb. 6:6.
3. Can a man “destroy a brother for whom Christ died” without destroying one of the elect? Rom. 14:15.
4. Are not those whom the “Lord bought” elect persons? and if they bring upon themselves swift destruction is it not bringing swift destruction upon the elect? 2 Pet. 2:1.
5. Can a man have his part taken out of the book of life, unless he had a part in it? Rev. 22:19.
6. Can a man have his name blotted out of the book of life, if it was never in it? Rev. 3:9.
7. Can a man “count the blood of the covenant wherewith he was sanctified an unholy thing,” and do “despite against the spirit of grace,” and not fall from grace? Heb. 10:29.
8. Could Esau have a birthright unless he was one of the elect, and if he was one of the elect could he have lost his birthright? Heb. 12:16.
9. Could Judas, one of the elect, fall by transgression, and be lost, without diminishing the elect? John 17:12.
10. Could Paul have “become a castaway” without diminishing the elect? 1 Cor. 9:27.
11. If Christ came into the world, that “the world through him might be saved,” can it be true that he passed by any portion of the world without giving the least opportunity to be saved? John 3:17.
12. Can it be true that “God concluded all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all, and the God passed by a part of mankind,” without having any mercy upon them? Rom. 11:32.
13. Can it be true, as the Scriptures say, that “Christ died for all;” that “in Christ all shall be made alive,” and yet that Christ only died for a part? 2 Cor. 5:14-16: 1 Cor. 15:21.
14. Did the grace of God appear to all men, and yet did God pass by a part of mankind? Tit. 2:11.
15. Is it the will of God that all men should be saved, but did he nevertheless ordain some to wrath? 1 Tim. 2:4.
18. Did the holy Jesus say “He that believeth not shall be damned,” knowing that one part of mankind could not believe? Mark 16:15.
19. Did Paul tell the Hebrew Christians to “fear, lest a promise being left them of entering into his rest, of them should seem to come short of it,” knowing all the time that they could not come short of it?
20. Is it true, as Peter says, that “God is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance,” and that God never granted the privilege of repentance only to a part of mankind? 2 Pet. 3:6.
21. Is it true that God has no pleasure in the death of the sinner, and yet that he unchangeably ordained a portion of mankind to wrath? Ezek. 18:23.
22. How can the Gospel be good news of great joy to all people, when it contains not one particle of love, mercy, or salvation, only for a part of the race? Luke 2:10.
23. How can it be that “God is no respecter of persons,” as Peter says, and yet that he passed by a part of mankind, without offering to save them? Acts 10:33.
24. How are the holy attributes of Jesus to be sustained, when he says "How often would I have gathered your children, but ye would not," when he knew they were ordained to wrath all the time? Matt. 23:37.
25. How can God judge the world according to the Gospel, when the Gospel never offered one blessing, only to a part of the world? Rom. 2:16.
26. How can the wicked "despise the riches of the goodness of God," unless God has been good to them? Rom. 2:4.

When our Calvinistic friends have learned and fully digested this “Shorter Catechism,” we may make them a “Larger Catechism.”

(Copied from “Writings of Benjamin Franklin” pages 93, 94, and 95.)
A NEW CRITERION OF FELLOWSHIP

The Gospel of Christ Contains No Non-essentials. This Contention Has Been the Peculiarity of Churches of Christ. A Retreat from This Position Finds No Refuge Short of the Fold of Denominationalism.

M. O. DALEY

The run of explanations, apologies, and declarations, appearing in our papers in recent months brings to light the fact that a “new doctrine” has been born into our doctrinal family, or, did we “adopt” it? Through the years we have stoutly contended that the gospel of Christ contains no non-essentials—that every item in it is essential to salvation—and the contention has been accepted as a peculiarity of the church of Christ by the denominational world. This “new doctrine,” as defined by its self-elected announcers is that doctrines not taught in the Bible, may be believed and taught so long as they are not made conditions of salvation; that until they are so made, they must not be made a test of fellowship.

We have all along contended that the gospel of Christ is neither more nor less than “all the counsel of God” (Acts 20:27) and is the sum total of “all the words of this life” (Acts 5:20) and is “God’s power unto salvation” (Rom. 1:16) his announced presence comes as a surprise to us—and to the denominational world as well. His announced presence calls for a determination of his status, since our teaching throughout the past denies his legitimacy. It is admitted that a united teaching of a thing does not make the thing taught true. Then, in this case, if our teaching is untrue, and we accept the “new” addition, a complete revision of our “family” roster becomes necessary. Candor, therefore, suggests a restudy of the question.

I. ESSENTIALS AND NON-ESSENTIALS

May we so classify gospel requirements? If we may, then the floodgate of the wildest speculation conceivable is thrown open to its onrushing tide, equalled only by the devastation wrought by a wholesale denial of all essentials. We have always held that our faith and practice must be regulated by the Bible requirements—what we believe, and what we do, is therein revealed, and that every thing not thus revealed is forbidden. Here has ever been the battle ground in our controversies with denominational churches on the Baptism and Apostasy questions; and with the Christian Church on the Music and Missionary Society questions. So successfully and so persistently have we waged the battle here that the whole sectarian world has acknowledged us the holders of the field and the guardians of it. What must be their joy, and our embarrassment, should we surrender—and surrender we must, if this new doctrine is true. A retreat from our position finds no place of refuge short of the fold of denominationalism.

It will not save the situation by claiming that the hurtful results above mentioned are not involved in the claims of this “new doctrine.” Observe, please: If the belief of and the teaching of doctrines that flatly contradict God’s word, and makes Christ’s claims unfounded, and voids the very foundation upon which kingly authority is built, does not effect the salvation of such teachers, then the prohibitions of the gospel are meaningless, and are, therefore, non-essential. The originators of this “new doctrine” affirm that the gospel of Premillennialism as preached by some among us, is false, is “another gospel.” But in spite of that fact, and the further fact that God has threatened eternal woe upon “any man”, or “Angel” who adds to or takes from, or “preach any other gospel,” they affirm that they have obeyed the “essentials” of the gospel, and that in spite of their present perversion, and departure from divine simplicity, they are immune to God’s judgments and shielded from a broken fellowship.

II. DOCTRINES AND COMMANDMENTS OF MEN

Having convicted the originators of this “new gospel” of contending for a gospel of essentials and non-essentials, I go further and charge them with teaching that human additions may be made to the gospel of Christ without affecting its saving power. When Christ affirmed that “man lives by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God” (Mat. 4:4) he places heaven’s veto on human addition to God’s word. How then, may we conclude that we can “live” on less or more than “every word of God”? He who teaches error, though he may teach some truth, teaches less or more than “the truth.” He who condones such teaching and apologizes for the teacher by claiming that the truth saves though mixed with error; that the error mixed with the truth and not made conditions of salvation, does not pervert the truth, nor prevent the truth in the mixture from saving, is preaching a “new doctrine” among us.

The doctrine that truth and error can be mixed without voiding the truth in the mixture, makes idle gestures of God’s warning against such mixing which abounds in both Testaments. Truth is a unity—a perfectly harmonious system. As such, it is “the gospel of our salvation,” “the perfect law of liberty.” Error, because of the demand for consistency, is systematized. Between the system of truth and the system of error there is no common ground—they will not blend. Any attempt at blending by the hand-picking process demanded by this new doctrine, results in a re-built gospel, which damns rather than saves, according to Paul in Gal. 1:6-12. Jesus also warns of the disastrous results of such attempts by saying: “In vain do you worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men” (Mat. 1.5 :9). All systems of religion contain some Bible requirements—no one would accept them if they did not. But they are Bible truths “turned into a lie” (Rom. 1:25). Satan is the originator of this blinding process (Gen. 3:4).

III. A FALSE SYMPATHY

This “new doctrine” is, if possible, more dangerous than the admittedly false doctrine for which it apologizes. It seeks to cover it with a mantle of sympathy. Since sympathy is the weaker side of ourselves, the “new doctrine” is the more dangerous of the two. It blinds us into compromising for the sake of peace. This, the “new doctrine” urges. Brethren, there are some things which are too expensive to own, and too costly to buy. We cannot afford to pay the price for this peace so sympathetically urged.

The solemn warnings of John finds their perfect application in the case in hand. Hear him: “Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God.” The doctrine apologized for, according to the apologizers themselves, does trans-
THE FIRST GOSPEL SERMON

Taken from the Master Sermon Builder. This Example of Preaching Should Be Followed Rather than Later Methods of Homileticians. Straight-forward Preaching of the Facts of Second Chapter of Acts Is the Present Need.

G. K. WALLACE

This sermon is an old one. It is not original with me. I have taken it from a master sermon builder. His name is Peter and the sermon is found in Acts, the second chapter. It should be carefully repeated to every generation and brethren who know it should be repeated. It is the second chapter. It should be carefully repeated to every generation and brethren who know it should be refreshed with it occasionally. This chapter logically divides itself into five parts-the day, audience, speaker, sermon, and the results.

In the study of this chapter we find the beginning of the execution of the great commission. The new birth is fully explained. Verse thirty-eight is the greatest commentary ever written on John three five.

The Day

The clay upon which these events occurred was the first day of the week. Pentecost always came on that day. In Leviticus 23:14-15 in this passage we are told that Pentecost was to be the morrow after the Sabbath. The morrow after the Sabbath could only be the first day of the week.

Most all days that are observed by men are so kept by virtue of what occurred upon them. Many days are held sacred because they represent some great event. The Sabbath day was kept by Israel because they had been delivered from Egyptian servitude. (Deut. 5:15) Some of the things that cause us to reverre the first day of the week are as follows:

1. After the death of Christ, He repeatedly met with His disciples, on the first day of the week. (John 20:19, 26)
2. The Holy Spirit was given on this clay. (Acts 2:1-4)
3. The first converts under the New Covenant were made on this clay. (Acts 2:37-47)
4. Christ arose from the dead on the first day of the week. (Mark 16:6; Luke 24:1-6)

There is, I am told, an international effort being put forth by Sabbatarians to prove that Jesus Christ did not arise from the dead on the first day of the week. They say he arose on the Sabbath. We are reminded that Luke says, “They came into the tomb ... and they entered in and found not the body of Jesus.” Therefore they conclude that Christ arose on Saturday. However, in this chapter (Luke 24) this heresy is completely annihilated. Note these facts as they appear in order in this chapter.

1. “But upon the first day of the week.” V-1.
2. “Two of them were going that very day.” V-13.
3. “It is now the third clay.” V-21.
4. “Christ should suffer and rise again the third clay.” V-46.

It cannot be denied that the “third day” of verse 46 is the “third clay” of verse 21 and the “day” of verse 21 is the same “day” of verse 13 and the “clay” of verse 13 is the “day” of verse 1, the first day of the week-the day Christ arose.

The Audience

The audience was composed of “Jews, devout men, from every nation under heaven.” There are many devout men who need converting. If some brethren, whom I know had been present on Pentecost and heard Peter as he said, to these devout souls, “Ye men of Israel, hear these words: Jesus of Nazareth, ... Ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay (Verses 22-23) they no doubt would have said, “Now Peter, you are too hard. These men are such devout souls. You should not call them lawless—that is not the spirit of Christ.” However, they were lawless even though they were devout.

The Speaker

The speaker was none other than the apostle Peter. And such little tact did he use. Perhaps he had never studied the proper manner of approach! He told his audience that they were lawless, and had crucified the Son of God. Surely, he should have waited until he had preached six or eight days before mentioning baptism. I heard recently of one of our modern preachers preaching twenty years without mentioning it. But Peter did not know any better. He should have had this brother as his instructor. We need more men who will follow the example of this inspired preacher, instead of studying later methods of approach. Some are always talking about the proper manner of approach but never approach. A straightforward and earnest statement of gospel facts is what the world needs today.

The Sermon

The sermon hinged around the following points:

1. The fulfillment of prophecy.
2. Jesus of Nazareth-approved of God.
3. The Crucifixion of Christ.
4. The resurrection of Christ.
5. The exaltation of Christ.

The masterful discourse which was built around these points cut these people to the heart. “Now when they heard this they were pricked in the heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Brethren what shall we do? And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of sins and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.”

The Results

Three thousand were baptized. It is no trouble to tell exactly how many people will be baptized in a meeting. “They that received his word were baptized.” Every person who receives the word of God will be baptized. “And all the people when they heard, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected for themselves the counsel of God, being not baptized of him.” (Luke 7:29-30)

When people will not be baptized they are rejecting the word of God.

“And the Lord added to the Church daily those that were saved.”
THE OBLIGATION AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL

We Have Become So Engrossed in Movements, Centralization and Officialism as to Overlook the Value of the Individual in the Scheme of Human Operations. The Pioneer Work of Restoring the Ancient Order of Things Was Motivated by Persons with Deep Sense of Personal Responsibility Rather than the Work of Some Organized Party. Moved by this Sense of Duty They Built Brush Arbors, Rented Halls and Schoolhouses, and Talked the Truth Wherever They Found a Listener.

C. A. NORRED

I often chuckle to myself as I recall the account a certain friend once gave me of his first efforts in the gentle art of cooking. As I recall the story he had made up his mind to cook biscuits. Then after carefully studying the cook book he began assembling his ingredients. Then after having heated the oven he slipped in his pan. But with that impatience that is a characteristic of the amateur he could not forego an early look into the oven to see how his creation was coming along. To his amazement he found that he had failed to put in any flour! Almost invariably when I relate this story someone will remonstrate that that is one mistake one could never make. But I wonder if it is not true that we are making a somewhat similar mistake in forgetting the individual in the scheme of human operations. Is it true that we are becoming so engrossed in our consideration of movements, centralization, and officialism as to overlook the value of the individual?

I think of the individual as a person who while functioning as a constituent element of any essential group and in conformity with every correct and righteous principle is, first of all, so deeply conscious of individual obligation and responsibility as to be at pains to perform every duty and discharge every obligation. And having thus defined the individual I insist that the individual is the prime factor in human operations.

INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITY

1. We begin to perceive the importance of our theme when we observe that most of the deeds related in the New Testament are distinctly designated as the results of individual labors.

The planting of the church in Samaria was the result of individual labors. (Acts 8:4-13) Philip was not sent to this task by any church nor pledged support by any group—throughout the incident it is made clear that he was moved by a sense of personal duty and a love for souls.

The church in Antioch, Syria, was planted by men who acted in the capacity of individuals (Acts 11:19-21) Yet it has been contended that the Antioch church started as a mission of the Jerusalem church! The persons starting this church were driven from their homes and for some reason resorted to Antioch. But even in their disturbed state they could not forget their duty to give the gospel to others. The planting of the church was the result.

2. And the successes of the gospel since New Testament times disclose the same activity of the individual.

The pioneers in the work of restoring the New Testament order were persons motivated by a deep sense of personal obligation. Even a casual glance at the account of the labors of Campbell, Scott, John Smith, Benjamin Franklin and others will verify this.

The work in Canada had a similar origin. In regard to early labors in Canada a well known writer in discussing a Canadian pioneer makes the following statements: "We have no information that he came by invitation, nor that he had, like Paul, a Macedonian call. Nor does it appear that he was employed and sent. We are left to conclude that he was impelled by the true and real missionary spirit, which sent the Apostles and early disciples everywhere preaching the Word."

The history of the work in England reveals the same order. In speaking of the work in Great Britain, David King, a pioneer of the faith there made the following declaration: "Our largest comparative success was at the first, without evangelists or highly educated proclaimers of the gospel, and solely as a result of the brethren doing individually what they could."

The work of John Sherriff richly illustrates our principle. Those who have formed an acquaintance with the work of Brother Sherriff in Africa must look upon that work as one of the most marvelous accomplishments in the field of recent gospel labors. Yet Brother Sherriff explained his labors by stating that it had been his resolution that no opportunity, however small, would go unimproved by him. His oft-repeated slogan was: "The Lord is willing to use anyone who is willing to let the Lord use him." Moved by such a consciousness of obligation and responsibility he was enabled to accomplish a service that must constitute an inspiration to all who look upon it.

Look back over history. The beginning work was done by individuals who held a deep sense of duty to the Lord and to those about them. Moved by this sense of duty they built brush arbors, rented halls and schoolhouses, talked the truth in their conversations, and thus they laid the foundations of even present usefulness.

NEGLECTING THE INDIVIDUAL

1. One of the first results of our overlooking the value of personal consecration and individual effort is Clericalism. Freely speaking, Clericalism might be defined as that scheme of things which confines religious activities to a restricted, and supposedly ecclesiastical, circle. In its most flagrant form it reveals itself in the Clergy. But any procedure which restricts religious activities to a supposed inner circle is Clericalism in principle. And this procedure is fastening itself upon us. It is well known that in almost every church the burden of the work is left to a small group. The failure of the individual has created clericalism.

2. A result is worldliness. In many nominally Christian communities the major part of the influence and energy and financial strength goes to carnal things and only the smallest portion goes to the things that are constructive and really worth while.

We are leaving out the flour!
THE POSTMAN'S WHISTLE

It is full of meat, —possibly too strong for some. I hope there will be enough brethren able to receive strong meat to give you the necessary support to keep the good work going. When brethren leave Christ and his gospel and go about preaching something contrary to his gospel, they need spanking. May the Lord help you win the battle. When your present job is finished another will need attention as we are all "so prone to err."

-Austin Taylor, Uvalde, Texas.

I congratulate you on your enterprise.-Edwin R. Errett, Editor Christian Standard, Cincinnati, 0.

I wish to commend very highly the first issue of your magazine "The Gospel Guardian". I am sure it will do much good. I shall be very glad to have a copy of it come regularly to our library so that our young preachers may have access to it.-Jas. F. Cox, President Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas.

I am both amazed and delighted. Amazed over the amount of material it contains and how it is possible for you to publish it for a dollar. Delighted over the firm stand for truth and right which the Guardian occupies. May it continue, is my prayer.-L. A. Allen, Hamilton, Ala.

The brethren in Louisville are certainly pleased with the Guardian—perhaps I should have said some of the brethren are pleased.-J. M. Powell, Louisville, Ky.

The Gospel Guardian is all that one could expect. Here's hoping that it may so completely stamp out the malady of "Bollism" that not even a scar will be left to mar the unity of the Lord's work in his kingdom. I pray for it, and the editors, many years of devotion to the truth.-J. B. Gather, Gainesboro, Tenn.

I am highly pleased with the magazine. The straightforward way in which the writers are dealing with the isms of the day is gratifying. With such writing continued, as I know it will be, I see no reason why the Gospel Guardian should not cause sectarianism to tremble from center to circumference.—W. Curtis Porter, Weatherford, Texas.

In various parts of the country I hear well merited commendations of the Gospel Guardian. Because of its policy and management, its advent marks an important epoch in the history of religious literature in the United States. Even its cover is interesting. While the black and white color scheme of the first edition was very attractive, the blue and white for the second edition is an improvement. It should be on every news stand in the country.—P. W. Stonestreet, Chattanooga, Tenn.

Allow me to express my appreciation for the exceedingly good magazine you are giving us. About all that I can say is that it is fine. Don't think for a moment down here we shall tire of straight shooting—we need it everywhere.-W. D. Bills, Waco, Texas.

I am completely unable to tell you how much I appreciate it. You are right, it has a field and a need all its own. This will serve to keep the brotherhood awake to the real issues and problems of the day.—A. C. Dreads, McGehee, Ark.

I want to express my appreciation for your noble fight against "divers and strange doctrines". We need "courageous watchmen on the walls of Zion" who will warn without fear or favor of man. "Turn not aside to the right hand or to the left" and "no weapon that is formed against thee shall prosper".—E. R. Watson, Pecos, Texas.

Here are my heart and my hand and I bid you Godspeed in your worthy undertaking.—Chas. M. Campbell, Hopkinsville, Ky.

Its bold exposure of false teaching of every complexion should give it a welcome by all who contend for the faith. I predict for it a wide reading but plenty of critics. All in all, its launching, its purpose and its aim, is a bold undertaking. May success attend your every effort.—M. O. Daley, San Antonio, Texas.

If the first two issues are a fair sample I consider this the best dollar I have ever spent.—A. C. Brown, Louisville, Ky.

I am thoroughly convinced that the Lord needs more solidity and less diplomacy. The Gospel Guardian seems to be the voice of the hour and I would like to be a subscriber from the first issue.—David H. Bobo, Cleveland, Tenn.

I expected it to be good but it was far better than I expected. * * * I think there is a genuine need for just such a publication. If you can hold up as high a standard as you have started out I think it will undoubtedly meet that need.—L. L. Brigance, Henderson, Tenn.

You have a good magazine and I shall be glad to give it my hearty support.—D. Ellis Walker, Montgomery, Ala.

That is my idea of a paper. I have no doubt about its success. It is certainly a trumpet with no uncertain sound. -Floyd A. Decker, Bonham, Texas.

I want to congratulate you on your new venture. What you are starting is fine and just what the brotherhood is needing. -John J. Hart, Detroit, Mich.

I bid you good speed in your purpose of combating a growing error and of setting forth the true teachings of the New Testament. These subscriptions constitute my endorsement of your project if my endorsement means anything estimable. —E. R. Barnes, President, The Barnes School, Montgomery, Ala. (The endorsement is, indeed, estimable, coming from as great an educator as E. R. Barnes, the son of a great sire and pioneer of the gospel in Alabama—Editor.)

I am well pleased with the issue and deeply impressed with the fundamental soundness and policy editorially. The manifest spirit of moral courage in the introductory issue should recommend it to all lovers of truth.—J. W. Moss, Tusculumbia, Ala.

I am glad to know that you have come out strong in your first issue. Strength to your arm. I believe you will succeed admirably in the grand cause of our Redeemer. May God bless and prosper you in this undertaking.—P. B. May, Terre Haute, Ind.

I am delighted and thrilled with its sound and wholesome teaching. Especially pleased that it not only combats Premillennialism but other evil tendencies of the times as well. I congratulate you and hope for your magazine a wide circulation.—G. W. Riggs, Los Angeles, Calif.

With my present love of the truth I would not take one dollar for my one copy, even after having read it. God bless you and the paper in the Master's service.—Gus Nichols, Jasper, Ala.

Let me congratulate you on the first issue of the Gospel Guardian. Mrs. Km-fees and I are delighted with it and feel that the first issue is worth many times the subscription price per year. If it maintains the high standard of this issue, it deserves and should have, a wide circulation.—F. Kurfees, Louisville, Ky.
Season’s Greetings

Among your gifts for Christmas let us recommend that you include a year’s subscription to The Gospel Guardian.

TWELVE pleasant reminders of your thoughtfulness throughout the New Year for $1.00.

An attractive gift card will be mailed to address given upon receipt of subscription.
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A BOOK EVERY PREACHER NEEDS

The Voice of the Pioneers on Instrumental Music and Societies

By JOHN T. LEWIS

AN IDEAL GIFT TO YOUR PREACHER OR TEACHER
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CHRISTIAN HYMNS

“For Every Purpose in Worship”

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