“WHAT JEHOVAH SAITH—
THAT WILL I SPEAK”

And the messenger that went to call Micaiah spake unto him, saying, Behold now, the words of the prophets declare good unto the king with one mouth; let thy word, I pray thee, be like the word of one of them, and speak thou good. And Micaiah said, As Jehovah liveth, what Jehovah saith unto me, that will I speak. And when he was come to the king, the king said unto him, Micaiah, shall we go to Ramothgilead to battle, or shall we forbear? And he said, I saw all Israel scattered upon the mountains, as sheep that have no shepherd; and Jehovah said, These have no master: let them return every man to his house in peace. And the king of Israel said to Jehoshaphat, Did I not tell thee that he would not prophesy good concerning me, but evil? And Micaiah said, Therefore hear thou the word of Jehovah: I saw Jehovah sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him on his right hand and on his left. And Jehovah said, Who shall entice Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramothgilead? And one said on this manner; and another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit, and stood before Jehovah, and said, I will entice him. And Jehovah said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go forth, and will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said, Thou shalt entice him, and shalt prevail also; go forth, and do so. Now therefore, behold, Jehovah hath put a lying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets; and Jehovah hath spoken evil concerning thee. And the king of Israel said, Take Micaiah, and carry him back unto Amon the governor of the city, and to Joash the king’s son; and say, Thus saith the king, Put this fellow in the prison, and feed him with bread of affliction and with water of affliction, until I come in peace. And Micaiah said, If thou return at all in peace, Jehovah hath not spoken by me. And he said, Hear, ye peoples, all of you.

I Kings 22:1-36,28

GUARD THAT WHICH IS
COMMITTED UNTO THEE
The fact that nothing has appeared in the papers recently from Freed-Hardeman College does not mean that we are not carrying on as usual. We are in the midst of an unusually fine session of school. We have a splendid enrollment of students from more states than are generally represented. We are more interested in the quality of our students than we are in their number. We have never had a finer body than the one in attendance this year. Everything is running as smoothly as a well-oiled piece of machinery. There has not been a serious case of discipline so far this session. We have good order, good conduct and good work.

In our student body there are a number of intelligent and consecrated young men preparing to preach the Word. Several of them are already splendid preachers, but they feel the need of more extensive preparation. So, on Sundays, many of them are out among the churches preaching and back in school during the week carrying on their courses of study. They are, therefore, getting both theory and practice at the same time. Among this number is Bro. M. Kang, a Korean who is preparing to carry the gospel to his own countrymen. The school will gladly do for any other foreigner what it is doing for him, i.e. give him his board and tuition while he prepares to preach the gospel to his own people.

Bible study in Freed-Hardeman has never been made compulsory except that nine Bible credit hours are required for graduation. We have never believed that people should be forced to study the Bible any more than they should be forced to obey the Gospel, but that they should rather be encouraged and persuaded to do so. While there are many sectarian among our number nearly every student takes one or more courses in the Bible. Several large classes recite each day. They are taught by N. B. Hardeman, L. L. Brigance, C. P. Roland and W. Claude Hall. Other classes of special interest to young preachers are conducted.

Nearly all private schools are having their financial troubles during these times. Many of them are unable to pay operating expenses and besides, they have debts. Freed-Hardeman is no exception. While we have been able to pay our operating expenses, interest and some of the principal, yet we still owe enough to worry us a great deal. Because our science department outgrew its quarters we had to have a new science building. A splendid, two-story, brick-veneer structure, well-equipped in every way was erected. It is all paid for but $325.00, which we expect to take care of in a few months. Altogether, we have paid out several thousand dollars on this building, on interest and principal and thus reduced our entire indebtedness to $11,691.64. We had hoped to pay all of this off by the end of this year. We had our plans all made to this effect but Alas! "The best laid plans of mice and men gang aft aglee"—go oft astray—as Bobbie Burns said. At the last moment they failed and now this much desired end must be deferred.

It is our plan at present to wait until next fall and then make an appeal to our friends to help clear the school of all obligations. We have not made a public appeal for help in several years. We have managed to carry the load ourselves, but we cannot pay off this final amount and must ask our friends for help. We will wait, however, till next fall and thus give folks time to get in better financial condition.

We have had propositions from sectarian money-raising concerns to do the work for us for a large percentage of the amount raised, but we have turned them down. We want all the money donated to go for the purpose intended, and will, therefore, take our cause directly to our friends when the time shall come.

N. B. Hardeman
Henderson, Tenn.

December 23, 1935
THE BIBLE AND ITS CRITICS

A general acceptance of the word of God would usher in a state of social and personal happiness such as the world has never known.

N. B. Hardeman

THE BIBLE is either the word of God or it is the work of man. If the latter, it must be reduced to a common level and put on equal terms with books that are the product of human minds. More than that, it must sink to a place below the level of man-made books because, from beginning to end, it claims to be the word of God given by inspiration. It is the only book known to the world that makes such a claim and that has thus far withstood the attacks of all classes of opposition. Books and men are judged by their fruits. The Bible has done nothing but good wherever its influence has been exerted.

The Influence Exerted

It values life, liberty and property as things to be protected and enjoyed. It opposes avarice and greed and oppression in all of their forms. It teaches honor and fidelity in every relation of life. There is not a precept or a line in it that countenances vice and crime, but everywhere and, at all times, it sustains the laws and calls for honorable conduct. It commands children to honor and obey their parents; it sanctions marriage and protects the home. It cares for the poor in distress. It honors womanhood and glorifies a good wife and mother. Within the lids of the Bible are found light and instruction for men in their single capacities and likewise for governments in their collective undertakings. A general acceptance of the word of God would usher in a state of personal and social happiness and strength such as the world has never known. Murder, arson, rape, robbery, perjury and every other mortal sin would vanish from the earth if its teachings were followed. It is indeed a monument of truth and wisdom.

It is strange that a book whose influence upon all classes and conditions of men has been good and only good throughout the passing centuries should encounter those who have put forth every effort to destroy its influence and to banish it from the face of the earth. This hatred may be due to the fact that the Bible does not give a glowing picture of the human family and does not suggest that man came into his present condemned estate through no fault of his own, but rather the reverse. It declares that men love darkness rather than light because their deeds are evil. It, furthermore, holds men accountable for every act done in this body whether it be good or bad and pictures a judgment when all secrets will be revealed and final rendition of our eternal state delivered.

The Enemies Classed

The enemies of the Bible are numerous. First: the Agnostic-the one who says that he does not know whether there is a God or not. It is rather hard to exercise patience toward a full grown man who has never been able to form an opinion on a matter of this kind. Those who can reach definite conclusions regarding other matters seem wholly unable to form a decision on this subject with evidence overwhelming. They can dig into the old mounds supposedly built by Indians and there find some kind of a relic and from it, they can estimate the civilization of centuries gone by, and yet, they are totally blind to all the handiwork of a Creator. Just how anyone can find pleasure in taking from a human heart a living faith and a hope found upon it and put in its place a cold and cheerless doctrine of “I do not know” is more than I can understand.

Second: the Atheist, who denies the existence of God and leaves all things as if they were the result of chance. He lives a negative life, denying all evidences that point to the existence of a supreme being. He goes out into a starless night without God and without hope of a life beyond the grave. But this class does little harm because real sober-minded men give but little attention to what they say.

Third: The Higher Destructive Critic, who seeks to remove the light of eternal Truth a little at a time until finally the world is left in total darkness. They are ever looking for some evidence or apparent contradiction that will rob the world of its faith and hope. These men are usually found in our universities and sometimes in our professed religious colleges. They deny the sonship of Christ and they really believe that He was a bastard. They set aside all the miraculous and whatsoever does not harmonize with their process of reasoning.

The Fundamentals Denied

This kind of a Higher Critic is a close ally of the Evolutionist, which is today, possibly, the greatest menace to the church of our Lord. While many of them claim to have some regard for the Bible and are not brazen enough to deny it in full, they do not hesitate to reject the very foundation of all of our hallowed hopes and holiest desires. Those who teach in our schools supported by taxes imposed upon Christian parents will claim to believe the Bible, but they deny first: the inspiration of God’s book; second: the creation of men in the moral likeness of God; third: that man sinned and was lost; fourth: that Jesus was born of a virgin, fifth: that His blood atoned for sin; sixth: that He was raised from the dead; seventh: that He will come again and raise all the dead; eighth: That there will be a general judgment when the faithful will be rewarded and the wicked punished. This type of man would love to destroy the idea of appearing at the judgment seat of Christ.

The Bible, with these fundamentals rejected, is unworthy of serious consideration and offers no hope for a lost, ruined and recreant race. Let men say that the Bible is not true, if they will; that it is not inspired of God; that scholarship has proved it to be only a human, faulty, product made up of fable, legend and untrustworthy history; nevertheless, the Bible still stands as it will ever stand, the one great Book of God for all time, the book that is its own best defense, that can prove to any honest soul its own inspiration, that will not cease to speak for God, that cannot be taken away, that can ever protect the weak, direct the strong, bring joy and sunshine to the sorrowing, true happiness to the living, peace to the dying and light up the grave with the rainbow of hope.
AN INDUCTION ON THE THRONE OF DAVID

T
HE Word and Work brethren have apparently adopted a diet of "extracts" and "excerpts". They use certain "Elam Extracts" for private consumption (circulation) and "Campbell Excerpts" for public use (in Word and Work).

They have quoted copiously from men who were known to oppose the course they have pursued. The editorial of Alexander Campbell, taken from the Millennial Harbinger of 1849, reverses the repeated claims that have been made that Alexander Campbell believed and taught such speculations. It would verily take some craftiness to pervert such writings as this into favoring the theories of the faction which has grown up in our midst.

Is this the part of Campbell's "mature" writings that R. H. Boll recently said he was "still waiting" for?

THE THRONE OF DAVID

(Alexander Campbell, in Millennial Harbinger, 1849)

An opinion has been occasionally propagated at different periods of the Christian church, that the conversion of the Jews would be effected at once in a national way, and that by a personal and literal return of the Messiah to the literal throne of David, and thus to sit upon the throne of David, and thus to sit on the throne of Israel. This nation was divided into two sovereignties, that of Judah and that of Israel.

This covenant is again alluded to in Ps. 89: 3-4: "I have sworn a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn to David my servant, Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations.”

Before the birth of Jesus, seven hundred and forty years, Isa. 9: 7 says: "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will perform this, and shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.”

Jehovah has also spoken of thy servant's house for a great while to come. (Verse 19) "Therefore now let it please thee to bless the house of thy servant, that it may continue forever before thee; even so will I certainly do this day." (1 Kings 1: 13-29-30) Thus Solomon sat on the throne of David.

This throne was by himself sworn or covenanted to his son Solomon as his successor. Nathan the prophet commanded Bathsheba to put the following words to David: "Didst not thou, my lord, 0 king, swear to thee by Jehovah God of Israel, saying, Assuredly, Solomon thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne?” And what did David respond? “As Jehovah liveth, that hath delivered me out of all my distress, even as I sware to thee by Jehovah God of Israel, saying, Assuredly, Solomon thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne in my stead; even so will I certainly do this day." (Verse 29)

This throne of David was by himself sworn or covenanted to his son Solomon as his successor. Nathan the prophet commanded Bathsheba to put the following words to David: "Didst not thou, my lord, 0 king, swear to thee by Jehovah God of Israel, saying, Assuredly, Solomon thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne?” And what did David respond? “As Jehovah liveth, that hath delivered me out of all my distress, even as I sware to thee by Jehovah God of Israel, saying, Assuredly, Solomon thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne in my stead; even so will I certainly do this day.” (Verse 29)

This throne of David was by himself sworn or covenanted to his son Solomon as his successor. Nathan the prophet commanded Bathsheba to put the following words to David: "Didst not thou, my lord, 0 king, swear to thee by Jehovah God of Israel, saying, Assuredly, Solomon thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne?” And what did David respond? “As Jehovah liveth, that hath delivered me out of all my distress, even as I sware to thee by Jehovah God of Israel, saying, Assuredly, Solomon thy son shall reign after me, and he shall sit upon my throne in my stead; even so will I certainly do this day.” (Verse 29)
thron of David in the Old and New Testaments.

But it is proper here to inquire, Did, or did not, the Lord Jesus Christ obtain a throne in heaven, on his ascension; and If so, what throne is it? We propose the question for the sake of form, and to give to our minds the proper direction, rather than as to insinuating and doubt as to the fact of his coronation. It will be, I presume, admitted by every Bible student that the Lord Jesus Christ, "born to be a king," but not on earth, did, on entering the heavens, ascend to a throne, a crown, and a kingdom. Let us turn over again the leaves of the Old Testament prophesies.

David foretold that his son would be a king and sit upon his throne, not on earth, but in the heavens.

"Why do the heathen rage, and the people imagine a vain thing? The kings of the earth array themselves [Herod and Ionitius Pilate, Caesar's representatives and vice-gerents], and the people take counsel together against Jehovah and his Anointed, saying, Let us break their bands asunder, and cast their cords from us. He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: Jehovah shall deride them. Then have I set my king upon my holy mountain. Zion. . . Ask of me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost part of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a scepter of iron, thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessels." (Ps. 2)

We have here the authority of the whole Jerusalem church, with all its spiritual gifts for interpreting this passage and for applying it to Jesus as Jehovah's anointed King in the heavenly Zion, the proper antitype of the city and throne of David. Despite of Caesar in his representatives, Herod and Pontius Pilate, Jehovah placed his King upon the holy hill of Zion. And who is this King but David's son and David's sovereign? Now, according to the angelic annunciation (Luke 1:32), did not Jehovah, the God of Israel, give to him the throne of his father David?

But we have other writings in Jewish writings as explicit, and perhaps, more direct and striking, than even these. What diligent student of official grandeur of the Lord Jesus does not ponder with delight upon the One Hundred and Tenth Psalm?

"Jehovah saith unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool. Jehovah shall send the scepter of thy strength from Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing [volunteers] in the day of thy power [gubernatorial authority]. In the beauty of holiness from [more than] the womb of the morning, thou hast the dew of thy youth. Jehovah hath sworn, and will not repent: Thou art a priest forever, according to the oracle, and a king over one nation and people, for any national, temporal, or spiritual purpose?"

But the emphasis recently laid upon this assumption is such as to call for still further exposition of its baseless character. From the passages quoted we note the significant fact that the throne of David is once and again said to be "established forever." Now, that it continued till the birth of "David's son and Lord" would certainly be implied in fact that it was "established forever." That "the scepter should not depart from Judah until Shiloh come," I need scarcely say is relied on by the so-called "Christian world" universally as a strong proof of the hlesiaship of Jesus of Nazareth; for till he came that throne or scepter of Judah ceased not. But after his death, Jerusalem and the nations fell into ruins; and according to Hosea, they have ever since been "without a king, and without a prince, and without a sacrifice, and without a pillar, and without an image, and without a teraphim." (Hos. 3:4) Now, unless Jesus be King, and unless the throne of David be raised to heaven, how can it be said that the throne of David was established forever? For eighteen hundred years that throne has fallen down and been without a king, unless in the person of Jesus of Nazareth!

Still there is a stronger argument, or at least one more explicit, than even this. It is as flat a negation of this neophyte assumption as I can imagine. It is that cited by Isa. 33:17. "For thus saith Jehovah, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel." I own it may be translated, "There shall not be cut off a man from David before me"-that is, He will always have a representative. Now, according to the oracle, so explicit, so definite, and so intelligible, David's son and David's Lord reigns upon his throne, as royal representative.

But one fact is not seen by those neophytes who assume so much on this subject. It is this, that David's throne was originally the throne of God, and David was but his representative. Jehovah himself was King of Israel, and when Israel repudiated him he gave them in his anger what they sought-that is, "a king like other nations"; but he would merely deputize him and authorize him by an unction in his name, thereby constituting him "the Lord's anointed." This is the mystery which none of these theological adventurers have yet been taught.

David and his sons were God's only anointed kings, and just as exclusive and alone, as Jesus of Nazareth is his only begotten Son and heir of the throne in the heavens; therefore, with literal and exact truth after his resurrection he said, all sacerdotal, political, regal, and divine authority, in heaven and earth, were his, and only his, and his forever. God reigned on earth in the persons of Judah's kings on David's throne. But after the Jews said, "This is the heir; come, let us kill him and seize the inheritance," he translated the throne of David to heaven and placed his Son upon it, and there it will continue as the seat of the Lord Jesus Christ till all his enemies fall before him.
FACTIOUS disputes in denominational circles and in churches of Christ continue to be frequent. Churches of Christ should set an example in matters of good order and unity but they do not always do so. Preachers should be promoters of peace and harmony among brethren but in too many instances they are fomenters of strife in congregations that leads to open division. Thoughtful men who love the cause of Christ look on and search for factors in the shameful confusion that may help to analyze a situation which is more directly harmful to the church than the blathering of unbelievers.

Christians

We are informed by the daily paper that in Topeka Kansas three members of the police force attend a service of the Christian church. They do not attend in order that they may hear the gospel or add to their growth in the grace and knowledge of the Lord. They go under official orders “to preserve law and order there”. When a policeman spends the week protecting society from the unlawful and vicious element, he should at least have an opportunity to drop in among a group of worshippers and enjoy the soothing and inspiring effects of divine worship on the Lord’s day. But in this case it is not so. Three policemen get orders from their superior to (“go to church”). The members have assembled in the name of Christ and the three policemen arc sent in to keep them from violating the “law and order” that ordinary unbelieving citizens are supposed to respect seven days in the week. These three policemen must be utterly disgusted. On first impulse, I would vote them a medal of honor if they should put the whole outfit in jail and hang a quarantine Sign on the door of the church building.

Policemen

Apparent there are two factions in this church as “both factions” have requested police protection from the other. The fracas is over “a board of directors election”. These misguided religionists have gone to the wrong place for help. A policeman cannot get at the seat of the trouble. He may keep them from killing one another but that will not be of any value to the cause of Christ. Such church members would do the cause of Christ less harm dead than alive. I haven’t been consulted but am taking the liberty to make some long range advice on my own. Buttering into situations is really a part of my business. My first suggestion is that they send the policemen back to headquarters and call in Paul. He can do them some good. In the first place, Paul says nothing about “a board of directors election”. He “appointed for them elders in every church”. By reason of age, wisdom and experience, these men are qualified to rule the church, overseeing its various activities for the good of all. The church which is foolish enough to substitute majority rule for the rule of a scriptural eldership is liable to need some policemen. The majority rule idea is a builder of factions. It is a call for division. The factious spirit is the arch enemy of “law and order” in religion. The Author of the faith is the Prince of Peace and his followers should be examples of respect for law and order. “Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity.” “Be at peace among yourselves.” “Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called sons of God.” I do not think that Jesus referred to policemen in this beatitude. “Let all bitterness, and wrath, and anger, and clamor, and railing, be put away from you, with all malice: and be ye kind one to another, ‘tenderhearted, forgiving each other, even as God also in Christ forgave you.” “Finally, be ye all likeminded, compassionate, loving as brethren, tenderhearted, humbleminded.” If a member of the church does not know these texts he is inexcusably ignorant. If he knows them but scorches them he is not a Christian and has no business in the church. He ought to either get out or be put out of the fellowship of all who love the Lord.

Tragedy

Tragic turbulence in churches of Christ is too frequent and too serious to be overlooked, or ignored. Saying nothing about it in the name of a false piety is not the cure for it. The situation calls for some outspoken treatment, which will naturally produce some heated reactions. The truth often does.

I have had a good deal of experience with factions in the church and my observations have been rather wide. The temptation is great to attempt a composite picture of a disrupted church using material drawn from many places and furnished by many actors, some of them bad actors. A typical case might run something like this. In a typical town, there is a typical church of about two hundred members with a typical eldership, maybe a little above average. They are in need of a preacher. One is introduced to them and sampled. The sample tastes pretty good. He is young enough. Age handicaps a preacher with some churches more than sin does. He is a good talker, bristles with energy and the general impression is that he is a go-getter. So he is employed and moved in. It is true that he has had a good deal of trouble elsewhere but then the church there was so glad to get rid of him, they cover it up and even give him a recommendation of a sort. His sample is good and his precedents are not examined. The church has a new preacher. He is a good mixer, crowds increase and the membership grows to three hundred in a few months. The new preacher gets or takes most of the credit for it. He is ambitious and full of schemes and the time comes when a difference arises between him and the eldership of the church. Eventually they decide to change preachers and he decides to change elders. The war is on. His mixing qualities come in handy. He plays on the sympathy of a large part of the membership. Petitions are circulated. Business increases at the telephone office. Hot demands are made for the elders to resign. It looks like there might be bloody noses and even the police get interested. And this is religion!

Look in some time later. The preacher has gone. The elders are still there but are a sad looking lot and have a lot less to oversee than they did before. A substantial part of the membership remains with them but a lot have left for another part of town where they are working with all the energy that factionists can. Most of it is spite work. Practically all the new converts the preacher made left.

LAW AND ORDER IN THE CHURCH

A Composite Picture of a Disrupted Church. A Quarantine Sign should be Hung on a Church where Faction, Strife and Anarchy Reign. This Church Busting Business Ought’to Cease.

CLED E. WALLACE
Petitions

There are a few ridiculous sidelights to our tragedy. There are no character qualifications for signing petitions. When a petition starts around for the removal of an elder-ship, anything from idiots to thieves can get on it. Peti-
tion circulators in such a mess would sign up the devil. “For where jealousy and faction are, there is confusion and every vile deed.”

The preacher didn’t have a thing to do with the trouble. He is as innocent as Moses among the bulrushes. He took the credit for the increase in membership but had nothing to do with the division. He made inflammatory speeches and biting remarks, his friends held meetings, made de-
amands and passed resolutions but he had nothing to do with the trouble.

The preacher will be so busy expounding his inno-
cence and defending himself that henceforth he will not have much time to preach the gospel. The churches that employ him will suffer some uneasiness over the situa-
tion.

Propaganda

As for the faction that pulled off, they did not leave, they were driven out. The Midianites and all the children of the East were after them. They are as busy as ants enlisting the sympathy and support of neighboring church-
es and tantalizing editors with bushels of propaganda de-
signs! to prove that they are “The Church of Christ”.

Reports of their success would lead one to believe that the days of miracles are not over.

This church-busting business ought to cease. What a preacher or a faction gets nuts of dividing a church cannot be worth the price paid for it.

Finally, I may get a few letters from widely separated localities demanding that I tell whether “you are talking about us”. I warn you in advance that I will probably say, yes.

PRESENT DAY PERILS’AND PROBLEMS

Religious, as well as social and political, problems have not been the same in every age and generation. Martyrdom and persecution was the price of being a Christian ‘in the first century of the church. Later came a millennium of papal assumption, accompanied by tyranny, superstition, and ignorance. Emerging from that enlightened era came Protestant creeds, orthodox clenominationalism, religious confusion. Then the plea for a return to the ancient order of things. But the people were blinded by Protestant creeds, Lutheran, Calvinist, Wesleyan, and general orthodox views, and those who would lay aside party names, party creeds, and party doctrines, to “speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where the Bible is silent,” were opposed by reli-
gious prejudice and intolerance hardly imaginable today.

Tolerance

While prejudice exists today in milder form, yet there is a “tolerance” being preached that would amount to sign-
ing an armistice with all error and declaring peace with Satan himself.

The peril today is compromise in doctrine, general in-
difference in religion, and worldliness in the church. The recent press announcement of the union of Congregational and Christian Churches, with a set of human by-laws and resolutions nothing short of a new creed to govern the united bodies. illustrates the present-day tendencies toward compromise. The spirit of indifference finds sufficient illus-
tion in the common sentiment expressed in nearly every religious conversation that “it makes no difference what one believes if his heart is right,” which is about as rational as saying that it makes no difference what disease one has if his health is good!

Revelry

While these are the influences prevailing generally in religion, there is one that more vitally affects the church from within. It is not the problem of prejudice and intoler-
ance of the world toward the church, but of worldliness in the church. An alliance with the world and mammon threat-
ened the church at Pergamum. An alliance of the same nature threatens the church today-ancient perils in mod-
ern churches. Money and pleasure are the two absorbing interests today. An avalanche of worldliness threatens to engulf society, including the home and the church. Mem-
ers of the church freely patronize the dance, play cards, engage in promiscuous mixed swimming at public bath-
pools (which would be better named “cesspools,” mor-
ally), and frequent the vulgar movie and vaudeville, the parent of all the moral laxity and social corruption of to-
day.

“What harm is there in such things?” is the echo of the question of silly Christians bent on doing everything the law will allow. The word harm is too mild to express it. Danger is the word that ought to be swung as a sign with red lanterns on both sides of it over such places as a warning to those who patronize them innocently. Dancing is based on the lust of the flesh. Argument is hardly neces-
sary to sustain the assertion to normal people. It appeals to that part of human nature that needs no emphasis, but constant restraint. Nobody dances merely because he or she “dearly loves to dance”. Proof: Regulations requiring brothers and sisters or husbands and wives to dance to-
gether, barring other partners in the dance, would soon put (lancing “out of style”. Mixed swimming is no better. Good sense anti! common decency condemn the idea of men and women swimming together in such scanty attire that it amounts to no attire. Such pageantry of nakedness is repul-
sive to the moral sense of people who yet possess modesty.

Cards

What about card playing? A deck of spot cards has always been associated with dens of vice and gambling. If a mother claims the right to play cards in the parlor in a game of “social gambling,” she cannot consistently ob-
ject to her son’s making the same use of a pair of dice in the backyard—his parlor-with his companions. A whisky bottle in a Christian’s pocket, though it contained nothing but “soda pop,” would not be a good recommen-
dation if carried around. A pack of spot cards is as much out of place in a Christian’s hand as a whisky flask in his pocket. Christians who love the Lord and his church, who regard their Christian influence as precious to the salvation of others, will cease to engage in practices that are not con-
sistent with the dignity of their profession and which re-
proach the worthy name by which we are called.

Cinema

Behind all of this worldly drift and moral decline is the grotesque influence of Hollywood. Can anything good come out of Hollywood? It has become a synonym for scandal. Yet Christian parents fail to see that the “movie caste” is casting the character of their sons and daughters. And not infrequently do we hear some Christians say that they attend the movie for the “moral” of the picture. About like going to the garbage can for a good biscuit!

Paul’s admonition to the Romans will serve as a fitting final word: “Be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind.” In fashion with the world or in favor with God-which?

-F. E. W., Jr.
A RIFT IN THE CLOUDS

S. P. Pittman’s Apology for Unsafe Teachers and Weak Policies on Fundamental Issues Forms into a Threatening Cloud of Compromise. But J. N. Armstrong’s Excoriation of Denominationalism Comes as a Rift in the Clouds.

JOHN T. LEWIS

To perform major operations in removing these cancerous side the beaten path”. Now I have picked up a few gems.

Yet the clouds of which I speak were pictured by Brother S. P. Pittman, of David Lipscomb College, in the November “Truthseeker,” published at Searcy, Arkansas. In speaking of the “Truthseeker” Brother Pittman says:

“Again, it is not the ‘Searchlight,’ seeking out the evils in the world. nor is it the ‘Iconoclast,’ demolishing right and left. Were the paper to seek for the defects especially, some startling discoveries would be recorded. Teachers would be found who are incompetent; preachers, unfit to preach the Gospel. If the truth were known about congregations, many would be found sleeping or dozing; if, about policies, many would be found unsafe or inexpedient.

“But the other side of truth-seeking is Construction—not so much the finding of flaws and defects, as the finding from the Scriptures, the real source of truth, those principles that will heal breaches, enliven lethargic laborers in the vineyard, and produce more effective methods of teaching and maintaining the true standard of Christianity.

“Truth is so many-sided, so kaleidoscopic, that in seeking for it, we should hold before truth-seekers its many phases. It is to be hoped that if some one should find a gem in the ‘Truthseeker,’ critics will not be permitted to pounce upon the writer for expressing that bit of newly discovered truth—new to him, at least, in a different word from that usually employed. To stifle unconventional expression might be, in the long run, to stifle much truth.”

Stop and think brethren, if the truth were known, we have incompetent teachers in our colleges, preachers in our pulpits unfit to preach the gospel, and congregations sleeping or dozing, with policies unsafe or inexpedient. So declares Brother Pittman and to make the clouds still more threatening, and menacing, he thinks the mantle of charity should be thrown over this whole cancerous condition, and all should be kept covered up. He would also stigmatize any paper or preacher that would dare uncover and condemn these conditions, and “Iconoclast, demolishing right and left”. I believe the method of procedure which Brother Pittman suggests to correct the deplorable conditions that he mentions is unscriptural. The scriptural way is not to cover up sins. What we need today is men at the head of “our” colleges, editors of “our” papers, and men in “our” pulpits who are not afraid of the light, nor afraid to perform major operations in removing these cancerous conditions from the spiritual body of Christ, along with all the mistletoe attaching itself to the body. As long as darkness broods over the face of the deep, the earth or world was in a chaotic condition. “And God said, Let there be light: and there was light”. Along with light came life and order. Light, the truth, is what we need today, in “our” schools, in “our” papers, and in “our” pulpits.

The Beaten Path

While Brother Pittman would keep the columns of the Truthseeker closed to the “Iconoclast,” who would dare uncover and condemn the evils that are weakening, if not destroying the Church, he would keep the paper as an open forum to exhibit any “gem of truth picked up outside the beaten path”. Now I have picked up a few gems of truth that Paul left in the “beaten path”–the gospel path—the only path a gospel preacher has any business traveling. I here “exhibit” them in the columns of the Gospel Guardian as the only possible cure for the deplorable conditions that Brother Pittman says we would find, “if the truth were known”.

The first “gem” that I “exhibit” from the “beaten path” is I Cor. 5:9-13: “I wrote unto you in my epistle to have no company with fornicators; not at all meaning with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous and extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world; but as it is, I wrote unto you not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such a one no, not to eat. For what have I to do with judging them that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Put away the wicked man from among yourselves.”

The second “gem” is from 2 Thess. 3:6: “Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and nor after the traditions which they received from us.”

The third “gem” I exhibit is from Gal. 2:11-13: “But when Cephas came to Antioch, I resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned. For before that certain came from James, he ate with the Gentiles; but when they came, he drew back and separated himself, fearing them that were of the circumcision. And the rest of the Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulations.”

Dealing with Denominationalism

Doubtless if Paul were living today, he would be considered by many an “Iconoclast, demolishing right and left,” or a “critic” ready to “pounce upon” any one who would “seek to exhibit a truth found outside the beaten path”. These are the clouds. The rift in the clouds was the good article Brother Armstrong had in the Truthseeker for January, under the heading “Denominationalism”. I here give some extracts from Brother Armstrong’s article.

“As I have already said, those who claim to be free Christians must be glad to grant to denominationalists, put it down to their credit, every truth they hold; it should be a cause of rejoicing that they do hold truth. Fairness here will open their hearts to truth. But to compromise with them is to leave them in their errors and to lose an opportunity to do them good-to save them. As the lamented RI. C. Kurfees used to say, ‘Truth in all ages has flourished in the soil of controversy.’ However, it is a universally recognized rule in controversy that the issue shall be so concluded, save the single point in dispute.

“Conceding every truth each disputant holds is finding the issue. Often there could be no debate, were the disputants fair with each other; the issue would be too slight to debate over it. Granting, in a controversy, that one could be in error and that one is open to teaching is a mark of a good teacher.
“The problem of dealing with denominationalism is ever with us. In Israel’s day specific instructions were given them as to how they were to deal with erroneous religions around them. ‘Ye shall surely destroy all the places where-in the nations that ye shall dispossess served their gods, upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree; and ye shall break down their altars, and dash in pieces their pillars and burn their asherim with fire; and ye shall hew down the graven images of their gods; and ye shall destroy their names out of that place.’ (Deut. 12:2-3)

“Thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto them: neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son. For he will turn away thy son from following me, that they may serve other gods; so will the anger of Jehovah be kindled against you, and he will destroy thee quickly.” (Deut. 7:2-4)

“God knew the power of association and that His people by yoking up with the peoples about them-making marriages and covenants with them—would partake of their life religiously and morally—that Israel would be turned away from following God by the peoples about them.

“As Israel was in danger of being turned away from God and His holy ways by forming alliances, making covenants and marriages with their neighbors, so the same danger lies in wait for God’s people now in their forming alliances, covenants, marriages, with other religious people of their times.

“The denominationalism of today is a deadly enemy of simple Christianity.”

It is certainly refreshing to know that Brother Armstrong believes in honorable controversy. If I may be permitted to add to the immortal words of the lamented M. C. Kurfees, I will say that truth has flourished only in “the soil of controversy”. The truth was planted in the field of controversy by our Lord, and the soil was saturated, and enriched by the blood of the apostles as they fought for it in the fields of controversy. Read the life and journeys of Paul, you can almost hear the thrust, and see the flashes of his sword, which he said was the word of God.

I want to say amen to what Brother Armstrong says about the evils of denominationalism. If what he says is heeded, it will keep denominational teachers off the faculties of our Bible Colleges, it will keep gospel preachers out of pastors unions, and possibly out of civilan clubs and it would keep church members out of the chairs, or from otherwise helping in the modern farcical denominational union meetings. But if the scriptures Brother Armstrong quoted were used in fighting denominationalism, we would have the “Iconoclast, demolishing right and left.” Of course Brother Armstrong does not mean for us to tear down meetinghouses, and destroy the sectarian altars of worship by physical forces, but with the sword of the spirit—the word of God.

Read again from Brother Armstrong’s article:

“Thousands of young people have gone from as ‘loyal’ churches as exist into great eastern and northern cities, enough of them to have made strong congregations in all these cities. But where are they? Because they were not grounded in the faith; because they did not see much difference between churches; because they had been led to believe that, after all, it was only a matter of ‘preference’ as to which church you belong to anyway, they have gone into all the churches in Christendom—yes, our children are doing it. ‘Our people’ do not know what undenominational Christianity is. Counting ‘noses’—so many in Bible classes, so many in church attendance, and so many ‘additions’—has become our long suit. I am told that young men and young women can even graduate from our colleges and never hear a discussion of the merits of the instrumental music question. It is said these same young people never are shown a contrast of denominationalism and simple Christianity. I know how busy we keep in our schools from morning till night, week in and week out, with our regular work. I know how many things we see that young people need to be taught and how full of work we are always. But there is a pressing need of the teaching of the simplicity of the gospel to the whole church.”

Placing Responsibility

My! What an arraignment! Do you say Brother Armstrong has overdrawn the picture? I do not believe he has. Therefore, let gospel preachers, elders of the church, editors of our religious papers, and the presidents of our Bible Colleges answer this question: Who or what is responsible for this deplorable condition and ignorance among “our people”? I believe Brother Armstrong hit the proverbial bull’s eye when he said: “Counting ‘noses’—so many in Bible classes, so many in church attendance, and so many addition—has become our long suit”. He might have added “responses”.

I have believed and taught for more than a quarter of a century that the modern Sunday School is the hopper through which hundreds of young people are poured into the church without knowing what the church is. I also believe putting the emphasis upon the modern Sunday School, with all its denominational flavor, over the New Testament worship, is the toboggan upon which congregations all over the country are rapidly sliding into denomination-alism.

I believe the presidents of “our colleges” should join Brother Armstrong in a signed statement, and have the statement published in all our papers, that henceforth no young man or woman shall ever graduate, and leave one of our Bible Colleges without hearing a “discussion of the merits of the instrumental music question,” or any other question disturbing the peace and harmony of the church. And certainly they should be shown or taught a contrast between denominationalism and simple New Testament Christianity. It would be reassuring to read a signed statement from the presidents of our Bible Colleges to the above effect. Will, or shall we ever read such a statement? We will see.

If F. B. Srygley is “in his dotage” we could wish that some other writers would reach theirs. His writings in the Gospel Advocate were never more virile and are as always, of sound counsel. In a recent editorial on “Where Have the Disciples of Boll Gone” he points out that R. H. Boll’s chief work seems to be in recruiting the Adventist and Holiness ranks. The missionaries who have apostatized were either trained by Boll in his school or were connected with his party and, hence, sent out under his influence. There is McHenry and Martin who several years ago went to the Adventists. O. S. Boyer has just recently joined the Holiness. Gruver, in China, has embraced “Holy Spirit baptism” and “direct spiritual workings and manifestations”. David L. Cooper, 0. E. Phillips, J. F. Smith and his two sons, Earl and Virgil, all became disciples of Boll before they strayed from the faith. Then last, and perhaps least, is Frank M. Mullins of Dallas, who espoused in a recent issue of his paper the cause of “divine healing”.

Should all of this not cause people to stop and think and ask, What gets the matter with men who accept the Boll doctrine—see how they go? Another thing: Do you know of one preacher who accepts the Boll theories who is a straight-laced, gilt-edged gospel preacher?-Editor.
THE Editor of the Baptist and Reflector tries his hand at defending denominationalism. This defense is rather broad in its nature. Any denominationalism in religion, or party, in religion can take the editor’s language and defend its existence and program. It arouses my sense of humor to watch a Baptist editor make an effort to defend the Methodist, Presbyterian and Christian Churches, even if he does not call them by name. Take a look at this:

Denominationalism as the expression of mere prejudice and opinions is an evil: but as the expression of convictions respecting what the Word of God says it is not an evil. Even a denominationalism in which some errors are involved is preferable to that hazy, insipid non-denominationalism which has no clear-cut, redemptive gospel beliefs. And when denominationalism is the expression of known and revealed truth, it is a matter of loyalty to God in organized form to be accepted, defended, proclaimed and lived at whatever cost. There is such a denominationalism in the world. We know about it in the South.

The Clear-cut Issue
We all know that there are Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian and other denominational bodies in the South. It is conceded that they all teach some truth. But the editor misses the point so far that there is very little point in what he says. He seems to argue that there can be “no clear-cut, redemptive gospel beliefs” without denominational expression. The New Testament is full of “clear-cut, redemptive gospel beliefs” and the New Testament church expressed them. The Baptist Church and the Methodist Church consists of and including all “known and revealed truth” as this Baptist editor sees the matter. Sow let him tell us what “known and revealed truth” the Baptist Church expresses that the Baptist Church does not express. If there is any “known and revealed truth” the Methodist Church, or any other denomination expresses that the Baptist Church or the Baptist Church is short on expression. If the editor of the Baptist and Reflector thinks the Baptist Church is an expression of all “known and revealed truth” then he ought to be glad for everybody else to take out and join the Baptists so they can get and express the whole thing. In my judgment he is going to have a hard time making the bed and the blanket fit in denominationalism. Any denomination which expresses only a part of “known and revealed truth” covers too little ground to be identified with the New Testament. If it expresses all “known and revealed truth” it covers all the ground it is no longer a denomination but can be identified as the body of Christ. If “known and revealed truth” is to be parceled out among denominations to be expressed “in part” then a Christian ought to at least be allowed to join as many denominations as he thinks is necessary to express as much of the “known and revealed truth” as he wants to express. There ought to be some way for a man to be free to express the whole truth without spreading out so much.

The Monstrous Fallacy
The editor thinks that denominationalism “is a matter of loyalty to God in organized form to be accepted, defended, proclaimed and lived at whatever cost” when it “is the expression of known and revealed truth”. But the real point, which exposes the whole monstrous fallacy, is that the church existed and functioned as “the pillar and ground of the truth” and its members displayed “loyalty to God in organized form” hundreds of years before modern denominationalism was ever thought of. A simple Christian who has obeyed the gospel, accepts the New Testament as his guide in religion, belongs to nothing but the body of Christ and stays out of all denominations, has all the truth that the denominations have and all that they do not have, and is free to express all “known and revealed truth” without party interference. What does the Baptist and Reflector think of this? If Paul was a Baptist, for instance, the Baptist and Reflector ought to make that point clear and not caper around all over creation making excuses for people who differ from Paul.

Denominational Carriers
The Editor of the Baptist and Reflector goes on to say:

To the extent that denominationalism embodies New Testament truth it is the carrier of New Testament Christianity. Projects independent of such, claiming to be Christian, have not lived long, or at least lived effectively very long. Movements which have proved to be a permanent blessing to men have had their genesis in denominational circles. The Great Commission has not been and cannot be really carried out except through organized denominational agency. Destroy Scriptural denominationalism, and the gospel program, which holds the only hope of remaking either individuals or society, would come to a standstill.

“Sew Testament Christianity” does not have to be carried in “denominational” vessels. The New Testament church consisting of and including all Christians was a very effective “carrier of New Testament Christianity” before
there were any denominations. “The Great Commission” was “really carried out” very effectively before there ever was any such a thing as “organized denominational agency”. The gospel was preached in all creation under heaven in Paul’s day. The reason we have to have such agencies now is because religionists put more faith in the wisdom of men than they do in the power of God. Speaking of “Scriptural denominationalism”, we find no such thing in the Scriptures. The Baptist and Reflector should cite a few references. Even one would be enough. How can denominationalism be “Scriptural” when no Christian in the New Testament belonged to one or ever heard of one? Plainly, does the Baptist and Reflector think the Methodist Church is “Scriptural”?  

The trouble with these denominational agitators is that they have more faith in “Movements” which “have their genesis in denominational circles” than they do in “the gospel program” which the New Testament teaches. If everybody would do all that the New Testament teaches and nothing else, denominationalism in religion would come to a standstill,” quickly.

The condemnation of denominationalism lies in the fact that any man who defends it has to either ignore or pervert the New Testament. The Baptist and Reflector is no exception.

CAN HE PROVE THE POINT?

C. E. W.

EDWARD J. CAIN, Evangelist of the Christian Church, thinks it is “far-fetched interpretation” that gets any instrumental music out of “making melody with your heart” in Ephesians 5:19. He goes on to say in the Christian Standard:

“I am ministering to a church that uses instrumental music and has been doing so for twenty-five years, and so far hold the position that we may use instruments, but do not want to use any far-fetched interpretation to bolster up my position.

“I try to keep my mind open to truth and if I ever come to believe our brethren without the instrument are right in their contention I will gladly join forces with them. However, they must prove their point.”

“Our brethren without the instrument are right in their contention that the New Testament teaches that Christians should sing praises to God. “I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also.” (1 Cor. 14:15) “Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord.” (Eph. 5:19) The brother admits that an instrument must be fetched from afar to get it into this passage. Our contention is that Christians should do what the New Testament teaches, all that it teaches, and nothing else. “Learn not to go beyond the things which are written.” (1 Cor. 4:6) We have proved our “point”. Singing is not playing. Brother Cain’s “contention” is that “we may use instruments” but he cites no proof. I think he should make some effort to prove his “point”. I have cited some clear scripture references to prove my point now let him cite just one to prove his. It is his practice which is in question not mine. T can “bolster up my position” with plain texts of scripture. T have never seen an effort made to “bolster up” his that did not employ an extensive use of “far-fetched interpretation”. It isn’t exactly fair or courageous for the brother to call on us to prove a negative. He should affirm his practice. The truth is that the teaching of the New Testament had nothing to do with the introduction of musical instruments into the worship of the church. A worldly spirit brought it in. The arguments in its defense are all afterthoughts and about as strong as the ones a Methodist can urge in favor of infant sprinkling.

T IS the business of the mechanical trouble-shooter to find what is wrong with the machine that is not functioning properly. It is his problem to find the cause of the strange noises and unnatural knocking which indicates that things are not as they should be. A little trouble shooting is in order now, in the church. Some strange noises are coming from men in responsible places. Their preaching and writing have a suspicious sound. As far as the gospel goes they cannot “frame to pronounce it right”. They would remind a fowl-hunter of cold-trailing or rabbit chasing. What is the matter with them?

The factor of fundamental unsoundness in the faith seems to be one trouble with the speculators. McHenry and Martin went to the Adventists; O. E. Phillips has gone with the digressesives; Smith, Boyer and Gruver have gone wild over miraculous manifestations which has justified the prophecy that they will land with the Holy Rollers or something like. Some of the worst actors in Texas have thrown their influence with Dr. Norris, Ben Bogard and the Fundamentalist Baptists. Dr. Wood, Earl Smith, Frank Mullins and Chas. M. Neal have been conspicuous in their support of Dr. J. Frank Norris, Baptist, in his debate with a gospel preacher. In this debate Dr. Norris denied gospel teaching on the possibility of apostasy and baptism as a condition of remission of sins. Are these men sound in the faith? They are not. They think they are contending for the faith when they are preaching the national conversion and restoration of fleshly Israel and a thousand years’ reign of Christ on earth, instead of preaching the gospel. They seem to have forgotten what the gospel is.

“What attitude has the Word and Work and the Louisville group of premillenial agitators taken toward these things? If they have uttered any re-proof or remonstrance at all it has been so mild as to be negligible. They pussy-foot around with heretics about like a small boy who would like to go swimming with the other fellows but doesn’t, because his Mama told him not to. If a man is too easy on heretics, the suspicion is that he has a streak of disloyalty to the gospel. Some faithfulness of Word and Work about the crop of disloyalty to the gospel. Some faithful brethren years ago warned the editor of Word and Work about the crop he would get from his sowing. Since it is beginning to ripen he ought now to tell us all what he thinks about it. Brother Jorgenson says that Brother Bell is too busy, transcendent, or something, to read what his critics say about him. Maybe Brother Jorgenson will take this up into the clouds and show it to him. He ought to come down and take a look around and see what is happening.—Sword Swipes.
The Kingdom of Christ

A Citation of Scriptures Showing that the Kingdom of Christ began on the First Pentecost after the Resurrection of Christ and a Refutation of Both Premillennial and Pre-Pentecost Theories.

WILL M. THOMPSON

1. The articles heretofore, I have noticed some of the outstanding proof texts, used by the Baptists, in support of their position on the Kingdom Question. All arguments have been refuted; the cobwebs, so to speak, have been removed; and I shall now proceed with the proof that the Kingdom of Christ was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ.

The Kingdom of Christ consists of the following:
1. Christ enthroned as King.
2. The New Testament as the law that governs his subjects.
3. The territory or realm of his reign is heaven and earth.
4. His subjects are believers out of every nation that have been baptized into the sacred name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and are governed solely by the conditions or requirements revealed in the New Testament.

Christ is King

In Psalms 11:4 David declares “the Lord is in his holy temple; the Lord’s throne is in heaven, his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men.”

In Psalms 132:11 he says: “The Lord hath sworn in truth unto David, that he was to reign over the house of David or that the throne of David is his throne. (I Kings 2:12)

Again in Psalms 89:34-37 it is said: “My covenant will I not break, nor alter the things that have gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my Father that I would build for him an house. (I Chron. 28:5)

We next turn or direct your attention to Acts 2:29-33, for the fulfillment of these prophecies. On the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. “Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; He, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we are all witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.”

From the foregoing scriptures, we can plainly see that Christ, on the first Pentecost after his resurrection, took the throne of David, which was to be established in heaven. He was on that day exalted at God’s right hand, and from that time was to establish his kingdom and to rule upon his throne. The government, on that day, fell upon his shoulders. He was enthroned as King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and from that day henceforth, established the kingdom and to rule upon his throne. The government, on that day, fell upon his shoulders. He was enthroned as King of Kings and Lord of Lords, and from that day henceforth, established the kingdom of our Lord, either deliberately or ignorantly repudiates and contradicts the oath of God. The apostle Paul says he spoke by himself because he could swear by no greater. We have the promise and oath of God that are the two immutable things by which it’s impossible for God to lie, as witnesses against an antepentecost Kingdom.

The Realm of His Kingdom

1. The New Testament Is the Law. In Hebrews 9:15-16, we learn that this testament went into effect after the death of Christ, the Church being
a New Testament institution cannot go behind the death of Christ. 

2. The Territory or Realm of His Reign is Heaven and Earth.

In Matt. 28:19-20, just after the sinless Son of God arose, he declared emphatically that all power in heaven and earth was given unto him. And in Ephesians 3:14, the Apostle Paul declares “For this cause I bow my knees, unto the father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named.” Thus we see that his reign embraces heaven and earth as the territory.

3. Subjects of His Reign.

In Matthew 28:19-20, the commission is given, and this commission is to all nations. And, per Mark 16, the gospel was to be preached to every creature. Hence, every creature out of all nations that hear the gospel believe in Christ and are baptized into the name of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, and observe the commandments of the Lord, are subjects of this kingdom.

The foregoing proof-texts prove conclusively that we have a king enthroned, with the New Testament as his law, heaven and earth as his territory, and obedient Jews and Gentiles as subjects, and this shows all the elements necessary to the kingdom of our Lord.

4. In the Kingdom,

The brethren at Colosse were in the Kingdom. (Col. 1:13) They could not be in that which did not exist. Hence, the Kingdom of Christ was in existence when Paul wrote the Colossian letter. Again, the Apostle John in Revelation 1:9 declares that he and the seven churches of Asia were in the kingdom. John wrote the book of Revelation, according to the best of authorities, about A.D. 96. Hence, from this testimony, we can readily see that the Kingdom of Christ was established somewhere prior to the end of the first century, and this destroys the Advent or future Kingdom theory.

Paul, in Hebrews 12:28, declares that he, with others, had received the kingdom which could not be moved. That is, the everlasting or eternal kingdom, and this is the only kind of kingdom that Christ was ever promised or that he was to establish.

The Church and the Kingdom

Ephesians 2:14-17: “For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances, for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace; And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the Cross. Having slain the enmity thereby: and came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.” From this scripture, we learn that Christ died to make one new man, and that one new man is composed of Jews and Gentiles.

They are brought together in one body, and that body is the church, over which Christ is head. (Col. 1:18) We learn further, from this scripture, that reconciliation unto God for the Jew and the Gentile is in the one body. That body being the church, as Paul positive states, neither Jew nor Gentile can be reconciled unto God outside that body or Church. The only way revealed in the Book Divine for one to be saved or reconciled is to become a member of this church that Christ built, and any theory that teaches to the contrary is antagonistic to the teaching of inspiration, and in substance declares that Christ died in vain.

Ephesians 1:20-22: He was set at God’s right hand on the Day of Pentecost. (Acts 2:34) Hence, he was made head over all things to the church on that day, and any theory that goes behind the Day of Pentecost for the establishment of the Church or Kingdom of Christ has a body without a head.

Ephesians 5:25: Christ gave himself for the Church. That is, he died to make it. (Acts 20:28) Christ purchased the church with his own blood.

The kingdom, or church, is heaven-born and blood-bought. Any theory that taches that man can be saved and not be a citizen of the Kingdom of Christ or a member of his body is forced to the inevitable conclusion that man can be saved without the blood of Christ, and that, therefore, he died in vain.

**REVERENCE FOR GOD’S WORD**

J. PAUL SLAYDEN

The apostle Paul, ready to depart and receive the crown of righteousness, “charged Timothy in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus which shall judge the living and the dead and by his appearing and his kingdom: preach the word, be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long suffering and teaching.” (II Tim. 4:1-5) His warning against perverting the word is ironclad. He said: “But though we or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema.” This was emphasized by repetition. He then said that the gospel, which was preached by him, was not after man, that he did not receive from man, that he was not taught it, but that it came through revelation of Jesus Christ. (Gal. 1:8-12) Apostles and angels measure up fairly well with uninspired preachers, and if preachers preach any gospel different from that which came from Jesus Christ those who hear should reject it immeasurably.

The son of God made remarks about God’s word which impose a reverence for it, that no one can fully appreciate, making him fear and tremble as he undertakes to teach the way of salvation—the best work that any mortal can attempt to do. In the temple he said to the Jews: My teaching is not mine but that which sent me. If any man will to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself. He that speaketh from himself seeketh his own glory: but he that seeketh the glory of him that sent him, the same is true and no unrighteousness is in him. (Jno. 7:16-18)

Concluding his instruction about the Holy Spirit, he said: “Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall not speak from himself: but shall guide you into all the truth: for whatsoever he shall hear, these shall he speak: and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come. He shall glorify me: for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you.” (Jno. 16:13-15) One may strain his imagination till it fritters and quakes, but he will obtain no incentive to reverence for the word of God that will remotely compare with the obligation imposed by the Lord in this message.

Preaching only God’s word now will make of those who accept it, what it made of sinners, when it was proclaimed by the apostles. Every one of the disciples who sat at the Master’s feet to learn of him, had his lips sealed as to the gospel by the Lord, just before he ascended to heaven; and no preaching was done by them till the day of the Pentecost, when they were all filled with the Holy Spirit.

If all had reverence for the Word there would be one body, one faith and one baptism, which is plainly mentioned in connection with one God, one Lord, and one Spirit.
CAN WE PREACH THE GOSPEL AND LET OTHER PEOPLE ALONE?

Anything that Sounds Like Religious Controversy in Pulpit or Papers Gives a Certain Class of Brethren Spiritual Meninaitis. But the First Martyr in the Church Was its First Debater. The Bible Was Taken from the People by Compromise but Can Never Be Restored by That Method.

JOHN T. LEWIS

The question that forms the head-
ing for this article is based on the stereotyped phrase heard by every gos-
pel preacher in every “neck of the woods”. Its twin sister is “preach the
gospel in love,” which is used to mean,
preach nothing antagonistic to anybody. Of course, that kind of preaching will
never save any one, not even the one
that does the preaching. “For am I now seeking the favor of men, or of
God? or am I striving to please men?
if I were still pleasing men, I should
not be a servant of Christ”. (Gal.
1:10) By deceptive phrases the gos-
pel too often suffers in the house of its
friends.

The First Challenge
God created man an intelligent being,
and recognized his intelligence by
speaking to him and giving him a law,
in the keeping of which the welfare of
man was involved. But no sooner had
God spoken than his Satanic majesty
appeared on the scene and challenged
God’s word through the best medium
at his command in that early age-the
Serpent. God has spoken to man, the
devil has challenged his word. This
is the issue-the battleground. Around
this fact the war has raged for six
thousand years, with the defenders of
God’s word on one side and the chal-
lengers on the other side. Therefore,
ever since the creation of man these
two great powers have been engaged in
a life and death struggle for the
mastery of man’s soul. It is well, there-
fore, to study their methods of ap-
proach. God approaches man only
through his understanding, or reason-
ning faculties. The devil uses different
methods of approach; his is through
the emotional, and baser appeals to the
lusts, passions, and weaknesses of man.
The devil, therefore, has the advantage
in the struggle in that he offers man
anything that he wants, whereas God
offers only what is for man’s eternal
good.

The Spirit of Compromise
The most deadly weapon the devil
has ever used in this warfare has been
the spirit of compromise, his last re-
sort when all other methods have failed. There is a species of fish in the ocean
which emits an inky substance that
colors the water and conceals the move-
ments of this fish whenever an enemy
approaches. Just so the enemies of the
truth have saturated the church with
the spirit of compromise which con-
ceals their purposes from thousands of
good conscientious people whose emo-
tional nature predominates their reason-
ning faculties. Therefore, anything
which smacks of religious controversy
either in the pulpil or the papers gives
that class of brethren spiritual mени-
tis, which so impairs their mental equi-
librium on spiritual questions that they
will blantly declare and contend that
the defenders of the truth are the
“troublers in Israel”.

The First Debater
Just as the devil challenged God’s
word as soon as he had spoken, so he
assaulted the church as soon as it was
established. The first efforts of the
devil’s cohorts in religious discussion
are recorded in Acts 6:8-10. “And
Stephen full of grace and power,
rought great wonders and signs
among the people. But there arose cer-
tain of them that were of the syna-
gogue called the synagogue of the Lib-
erties, and of the Cyrenians, and of
the Alexandrians, and of them of Cil-
cia and Asia, disputing with Stephen.
And they were not able to withstand
the wisdom and the Spirit by which he
spake.” Their defeat was so crushing
and humiliating in this controversy that
the devil never has believed in debating
since. His emissaries were so enraged
over their defeat that they suborned, or
hired, witnesses to swear away Ste-
phen’s life. So Stephen, the first de-
bater in the church became the first
martyr in the church.

But because this is a fact shall we
selfishly agree with the devil that re-
ligious controversy is wrong, and that
Stephen was the “troubler in Israel”? Around the first altar was commit-
ted the first murder, but does this
prove that religion is wrong?
The death of Stephen was the sig-
nal for the most determined and merci-
less persecution against the church that
was ever waged against any institution
on earth; but the persecution “fell out
rather to the progress of the gospel”.
The church was never hindered in its
spiritual growth and development as
long as the devil assumed the role of
a lion and fought in the open. But
it was an evil day for the church when
the devil fled from the field of perse-
cution and open controversy, and like
a chameleon transformed himself into
an angel of light, and fashioned his
ministers into ministers of righteous-
ness, draped in robes of humility and
piety, and sent them down the corridors
of time scattering his compromising
propaganda. By this method he con-
vinced the church that departure from
God’s word was an issue until he got
the situation completely in hand. He
then substituted for the elders of the
church the Roman hierarchy, and for
the church itself he substituted Roman
Catholicism, which hung as a pall over
the church, which smacks of religious controversy
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denominational churches are filled with both devout and scholarly people is freely granted. But honesty and scholarship are not standards. For Christ personally taught that worship to God to be acceptable must be not only sincere but according to the specifications of truth. (Jno. 4:24) He also taught that worship founded on human doctrines was vain. (Mt. 15:9) Hence, the final test of worship acceptable to God is what Christ says, and not what seems good to us.

Denominational religion differs in all essential points from the New Testament Church.

1. In Origin.

The Church recorded in the New Testament was of Divine conception and origin, being built by Jesus Christ (Mt. 16:18), as the Spirit carried out His authority (Jno. 16:13, Mt. 28:18), working through the preaching of the apostles. (Acts 2) Centuries later the human denominations were created gradually, strictly as the products of human ideas.

2. In Creed.

Men of God-hence, members of His church—are "completely furnished unto every good work" by the "scripture inspired of God". (2 Tim. 3:16-17) Thus, the scriptures of God constitute the creed, discipline, and manual, of His Church. On the other hand, the whole framework of denominationalism rests upon creeds and disciplines written by uninspired men. These interpretations and rules are in addition to the scriptures which God furnished. But the passage above alludes to affirming that God's men are furnished completely by the scriptures. The very existence of denominational creeds denies that scriptural statement. Men thereby say, "We are not furnished completely by the scriptures." Therein is a fundamental and radical difference in the two systems.

3. In the Laws of Entrance.

Men became members of Christ's Church by faith in Christ (Rom. 10:10), repentance (2 Cor. 7:10), confession of Christ (Rom. 10:10), and baptism into Christ. (Rom. 6:3) Upon such obedience, they joined nothing, but were added by the Lord to His Church. (Acts 2:41-47) But denominations teach the doctrine of Salvation by faith in Christ and that men then join such, all of them having different laws for the joining. Here is revealed a manifest difference in the Divine and human entrance requirements.

4. In Duration.

Christ said the gates of Hades should not prevail against His Church. (Mt. 16:18) That Church was referred to in Heb. 12:28 as the "kingdom which cannot be shaken". But denominations will be destroyed. They were not planted by the Lord, but admittedly by men, and will, therefore, "be rooted up". (Mt. 15:13)

5. In The Name.

Christ's Church wore and now wears only Divinely authorized names. Denominations wear humanly conceived names of party brand. We are told to "do all in the name of the Lord" (Col. 3:17), but the various sects differ in that they operate in sectarian names.


A final difference is in the fact that the New Testament Church recognizes no head but Christ, legislating through His own word. Party churches look to human heads for laws, interpretations, and government. Christ being "head over all things to the church" (Eph. 1:22-23) there is no room left for other heads. NOW, since denominational churches differ from the Church of our Lord in origin, creed, laws of entrance, duration, names, and headship, it follows that such a system of religion is in competition with Jehovah's system in practical effects. Such a state of affairs necessarily labels denominationalism as sinful merely on the ground of being different from the Lord's system.

Denominational religion is sinful because:

1. It Causes Division.

The very existence of the different religious parties proves the point of division. The Lord's creed, in Rom. 16:17, tells us not only to mark those that cause division, but also to "turn away from them". Though good people are led to believe that denominationalism is proper, on the other hand Christ prayed for unity. (Jno. 17:20-21) Any system which tends to defeat that Divine prayer is manifestly and necessarily sinful.

2. It Causes Unbelief.

In John 17:20-21 Christ clearly explained why He prayed for unity—"that the world may believe that thou didst send me". Thus, if unity promotes belief, division produces the opposite effect-unbelief. Since denominationalism is actual division, it causes unbelief and infidelity.

3. It Hinders Progress.

The Lord said: "Every city or house divided against itself shall not stand." (Mt. 12:25) The Christ simply states a truth of life that has always been true—division causes any group of society to falter in its progress. If the denominations propose to represent the cause of Jesus Christ, their representation in a divided state hinders the very cause they propose to promote. Surely any system thus hindering the King's cause is sinful.

4. It Separates Man From God.

How could a system with the professedly noble aim of serving Christ have such a terrible effect? Here is the answer. It must be conceded that denominationalism is outside of, in addition to, and opposed to the teaching and will of Christ. As a system it goes beyond the teachings of Christ-being unauthorized, causing the very evils He prayed against: division and infidelity. The Book says, in 2 Jno. 9, "whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God." Hence, it logically follows that the man who seeks to serve God in such a system does not have God—separates himself from God by being in something that "goes beyond".

These two systems of religion-Divine and human—are thus spread out clearly before you. You can solve the problem so far as you are concerned by getting out of the human system and entering the Divine on its stated terms. Many good people are unknowingly living in open rebellion to God's plan.
THE BAPTIST DENOMINATION

Baptists Unscriptural in Origin, Name, and Doctrine; and They are Wrong in Every Position and Practice Peculiar to Baptists.

E. G. CREACY

The Baptist church (or churches) is a human denomination. The church revealed in the New Testament is not a denomination. The word “church” is said to be used one hundred and ten times in the New Testament. Eighteen times it is used in a general or comprehensive sense—excluding all the saved; all Christians; and, ninety-two times it is used in a local sense—a congregation. Christians worshipping at a given place. A denomination does not claim to include all the saved—the whole church—but it does include more than a local church or congregation. It is too big at one end of the line, and it is too little at the other end of the line! There is no place in the New Testament for a denomination. It is a “plant” the Father has not planted, and will be “rooted up.” (Matt. 15:13)

Baptist Origin

The Baptist church is not mentioned in the New Testament, and we have to come sixteen hundred years this side of the Bible to find it even mentioned by men. Dr. George A. Lofton, who was one of the greatest Baptist scholars the denomination ever produced, declared it was not until the seventeenth century the general denominational name Baptist was adopted. (Smith-Lofton Debate, page 10) Henry C. Vedder, the great Baptist Historian, in his book, “A Short History of the Baptists”, page 201, said: “With the first decade of the seventeenth century we reach solid ground in Baptist history. Before that we must proceed by conjecture from one isolated fact to another, and many of our conclusions are open to doubt; but after 1610 we have an unbroken succession of Baptist churches, established by indubitable documentary evidence.” On page 4, in his introduction, Mr. Vedder said, “The history of Baptist churches cannot be carried, by the scientific method, farther back than the year 1611.”

Baptist Succession

Some Baptists a few years ago made great claims for “Baptist church succession”. In the year 1855, the “Christian Review”, the leading Baptist Quarterly, raised its voice in the following protest to such childish claims: “We know of no assumption more arrogant, and more destitute of proper historic support, than that which claims to be able to trace the distinct and unbroken existence of a church substantially Baptist from the time of the apostles down to our own.” I have, in debates with Baptists, offered a liberal reward for a book written prior to the seventeenth century, that says anything about a Baptist church. However, Baptist debaters continue to argue for the ideal of “succession.” and according to their theology, one must be baptized by an “ordained Baptist minister,” who administers the rite by the authority of an orthodox Baptist church, in order for the baptism to be scriptural! If this is necessary to valid baptism, it follows that none of the “Baptists” are scripturally baptized, for the first Baptist church in America was founded by Roger Williams, who in 1639, was immersed by Ezekiel Holliman, who in turn immersed Holliman. Mr. Williams, the founder of American Baptists, was immersed by an alien—his “baptism” therefore was invalid—it was not administered by an “ordained Baptist minister”, nor by the authority of a Baptist church! This fact alone automatically destroys Baptist “succession”.

Foreign Baptists were derived from the Anabaptists, the first distinct church being formed in Holland about 1608. In 1611 this church issued “a declaration of faith.” No distinct Baptist church organization can be found prior to 1608. Baptist debaters have been put to the test on this point, and only embarrassment to them is the result.

Finally, the impossible part of the task for Baptists in seeking to trace a “succession of Baptist churches” back to the apostles, would be to find a Baptist church at that end of the line. No such a thing as a Baptist church is mentioned in all the New Testament, and if all ecclesiastical history did exhibit an unbroken line of Baptist churches back to the death of John, the last apostle, it would lack one vital link of uniting such a church with the work of the Holy Spirit through the apostles, because all was completed before John died. That end of the line is the most important, and there silence reigns. This is abundant proof that such a thing as a “Baptist church” is unscriptural.

John The Baptist

The usual Baptist argument runs about like this: John was a Baptist, and that all he baptized were for that reason Baptists! John baptized Christ, and that made him a Baptist!! Christ, a Baptist, organized the church with the material (Baptists) prepared by John, and therefore, the church was a Baptist church!! Such presumptuousness in thus sectarianizing the work of John and Christ is typical Baptist doctrine. It must be an unscrupulous method by which such an unscriptural organization should be exhibited to seem to have a connection with Christ. The argument (?) assumes the thing to be proven. It is the same argument that would prove (?) Peter was the first Pope! and, it is the way denominations prove (?) that they are Christian institutions. To contend that Christ was a “Baptist” because John the Baptist baptized him is silly. Might as well say that because a blacksmith shoes your horse, the horse becomes a blacksmith!

John was never called “a” Baptist, but always “the Baptist” and his disciples were never called “Baptists”, nor were the disciples of Christ ever so denominated. In the New Testament only one was ever called “the Baptist”. He was thus called because he baptized, and for no other reason. “Baptist” was his official title—it signified his office of a baptizer. The title “Baptist” cannot be scripturally applied to any one who does not baptize. Christ never baptized any one (Jno. 4:2), and he was not therefore a Baptist. Since a Baptist is one who baptizes, by what rule of logic did Christ become a “Baptist”? And, why are the “lay members” of the church called “Baptists”, when they never baptized any one? Baptist debaters forget to answer this question. To call people “Baptists” when they have never baptized, is to make a sectarian name out of the term.

The Baptist church is purely a sect of human origin, using the term “Baptist” in an unscriptural and sectarian sense. It has come to mean invariably one who has joined the Baptist denomination.

Baptist Doctrines

Not only are the Baptists unscriptural in name, but they are unscript-
tural in their doctrines. They claim to accept no creed but the Bible. The claim is untrue. In 1724 the Baptists adopted the “Philadelphia Confession of Faith,” which is the commonly accepted creed of most Southern Baptists; while in the North the “New Hampshire Confession of Faith” is generally adopted. The Frank Norris kind of Baptists are emphasizing the importance of subscribing to certain articles of faith. The Baptist use of a creed differs somewhat from the use made of creeds by Methodist and Presbyterian denominations. Baptists do not place a creed in the hands of their members, but they are disciplined strictly under the hidden rules and significance of “Baptist doctrines” as set forth in the above mentioned creeds.

The name, the tenets, and the practices peculiar to Baptists are unknown in the Bible. In debates with Baptist preachers it is difficult to get them to “come out” and state clearly their peculiar doctrines, and I have used the following chart successfully in showing up their doctrines, by calling upon them to avow or repudiate them!

1. Hereditary Total Depravity.
2. Infant Regeneration.
3. Ante-Pentecost Kingdom.
5. Faith Alone.
6. Impossibility of Apostasy.
7. Voting on Reception of Members.
8. Baptist Church Succession.
9. Democratic Form of Church Government.

The Baptist church is at variance with the Bible on all these points. There is not one peculiar Baptist doctrine that is the truth. And, there is not one good thing a person can receive in the Baptist church that he cannot have out of it. The Baptist church is exalted above heaven, according to their teaching, for one can be saved and go to heaven without baptism, but he cannot be a member of the Baptist church without it.

In the Fundamentalist, J. Frank Norris reports his meeting in Lexington, Ky. “I was happy to see such a large number of preachers on the platform… Among the distinguished visitors present was Dr. C. M. Neal of the Neal-Wallace debate. It was the first time I had ever had the joy of meeting him personally, and since both are Premillennialists we find common ground for happy fellowship”. And since both of them had the same experience in debate they also had common ground for comforting each other.

---

A SABBATH QUESTIONNAIRE NO. 3

W. W. FOSTER

Q. Did the cross of Christ abolish the Sabbath?
A. Yes. “Blotting out the hand writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us and took it out of the way nailing it to his cross.” (Col. 2:14)

Q. Are we left in doubt as to what ordinances were “nailed to the cross”?
A. No. Paul names some of them in Col. 2:16. “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy clay or of the new moon, or of the sabbath days.”

Q. Did God break his covenant that he made with all the people at the time of the transaction of the thirty pieces of silver and the potters’ field?
A. Yes. “Having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one body the cross, having slain the enmity thereby.” (Eph. 2:15-16)

Q. Was the Sinai covenant, that is, the ten commandments written on two tables of stone, included in the covenant that was abolished?
A. Yes. In the 7th chapter of Romans.

1st: That the tenth commandment of the decalogue was here called “the law”.

2nd: That “the law” as used by Paul in this connection, refers to the ten commandments.

3rd: That the ten commandments are therefore the law from which the death of Christ has delivered us.

Q. Are the ten commandments spoken of in this manner anywhere else in the Bible?
A. Yes. “Who also hath made us able ministers of the new testament; not of the letter, but of the spirit: for the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life. But if the ministration of death, written and engrafted in stones, was glorious, so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses for the glory of his countenance; which glory was to be done away: How shall not the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory. For even that which was made glorious had no glory in this respect, because of the glory that excelleth. For if that which is done away is glorious, much more that remaineth is glorious. Seeing then that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech. And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face, that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished: But their minds were blinded: For until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the old testament; which veil is done away in Christ.” (2 Cor. 3:6-14) Read also Ex. 34:28-35.

In Gal. 4:10 to 5:19 Paul’s charge against observing “days and months and times and years” would cover, it seems, any division of time. He tells these Galatians who desire to be under the law and have been observing “days, months, times and years” a story which he calls an allegory. The purpose of an allegory is the same as a parable, that is, to teach a lesson by a comparison. The story was of Abraham and his two sons, one by a bondwoman Agar, and one by a free woman, Sarah. By his bond wife, Ishmael was born of the flesh, a natural birth, or natural reproduction. But Isaac was brought into the world by a miracle in fulfillment of a promise. These two women and their sons illustrate the two covenants.

Summing up we have the following:

1. Christ died in our stead and delivered us from the law.
2. As a woman is released from her husband at death, so we are released from the law by the body of Christ, and can be married to another, that is, Christ.
3. That the law from which we are delivered says, “Thou shalt not covet”, which shows that the ten commandments is meant.
4. That the covenant written on stones was glorious.
5. That the ministration of the Spirit was more glorious.
6. That the glorious covenant (Sinai covenant written on stones) is “clone away” and “is abolished”.
7. That the Sinai covenant is compared to “the bondwoman and her son” and should be cast out.
8. That the covenant of promise is compared to the “freewoman and her son”.
9. That Paul says we are not children of the bondwoman (Sinai covenant) but of the free (the new covenant).
10. That to keep the days of the Sinai covenant causes us to lose all the effects of Christ and the grace of God.
IN THE “Open Forum” for readers in The Christian Evangelist, Nov. 28th 1935, appears a letter “From the Convention President,” L. N. D. Wells, to “Editors, The Christian Evangelist,” which doubtless voices the feeling of many who see the failure of the “International Convention” to be really representative of our digressive brethren. We quote a few extracts with brief comments that our readers may see how these erring brethren are facing certain problems which their huge religious organizations are making them heir to. The problems that face all human organizations today—educational, industrial and political—are taxing to the breaking point the powers of their promoters to keep them functioning adequately, and to make them serve the needs of those whose interests they are supposed to conserve. Whatever may be said favoring the existence of organizations of a purely secular nature, we are more and more convinced that human organizations to promote religious interests are entirely inadequate to man’s spiritual needs, and through their ever growing complexity are becoming obviously more of a burden and a problem, than a cure for any of the ills common to religious interests. The fears and anxiety of Mr. Wells are apparent from the following quotations.

Nothing Worthwhile

1. “I am very anxious to make our next International Convention out- standingly worth while.”

Thus deposes the president in his first sentence. Personally, I doubt that any of them have been worth while so far as Christianity is concerned, in fact, I’m sure that they have been actually detrimental to primitive Christianity. Mr. Wells himself admits that there as yet been none “outstandingly worth while”. Too, the president says he is “very anxious” to make these improvements. These promoters of human organizations in religion have brought these anxieties upon themselves, and I’m of the opinion that such cares and anxieties will multiply so long as they remain away from New Testament ground. Mr. Wells then invites his readers to make “any constructive suggestions for the improvement of our International Convention,” asking for eliminations, additions or alterations; but admonishes that he is asking for “constructive criticism”. Now, I think it would be a splendid opportunity for Bro. Errett and the Standard brethren generally to see that Bro. Wells gets plenty of mail, for undoubtedly the Cincinnati brethren could offer much “constructive criticism”. Or, possibly, this scribe is wrong in thinking Bro. Errett is sufficiently interested in the “International Convention” to make any suggestions.

Not Representative

2. “I am anxious that the next convention shall be thoroughly representa- tive of the Disciples of Christ.”

It would seem from that statement that other conventions have not been “thoroughly representative” of the Disciples, and such confession is here implied. I think here in San Antonio there were very representative Disciples who were unable to get on the program, and thus had no voice in helping to make the convention representative. I suggest that a number of representatives from in and around Cincinnati be placed on the program of the next International Convention as a gesture toward thorough representation; for, are they not of those who spell “disciples” with a big “D”? But, with all advice, the committee on program arrangements will likely hand-pick the speakers, whose utterances will be in keeping with the desires of the managers of this huge man-made, religious organization trying to function in God’s spiritual affairs.

Inadequate Emphasis

3. “I am anxious (still “anxious” T. B. T.) that the things for which we have stood throughout the years shall have adequate emphasis.”

Instead of “the things for which we have stood.” I suggest that, for a change, these folks substitute the “things” the Lord has taught; but if it is to be like that the first change would be the failure of the Convention to con- vene. If these erring brethren were standing for the things the Lord has taught they would not have to attend the convention to see where to place the “adequate emphasis”. Possibly it would be well if more emphasis were placed on the Great Commission, and less on recognizing those religious bodies that disbelieve what the Lord has plainly taught, even the Jews who refuse to accept Christ, as was voiced in the San Antonio Convention.

Anxiety for the Plea

4. “I still believe in the plea of the Disciples.”

This strongly implies that some have left that plea. To believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and faithfully preach what he says would contribute much to clarifying the religious atmosphere, for, who knows just what the plea of the Disciples is? Who speaks with authority, The Evangelist or the Christian Standard? In the same paragraph, Bro. Wells grows exceedingly anxious.” Hear him: “I am exceedingly anxious that a deeply spiritual note shall be dominant throughout the entire convention.” I have long thought that the spiritual note is sorely lacking in these conventions, where so little attention is paid to what the Spirit says, and now the president, who certainly knows, says he is “exceedingly anxious” that the “spiritual note” be given a place on the program of the next convention; maybe the program committee could arrange that. There is, I was about to overlook, an intimation that the “spiritual note” is present at the beginning of the convention, but is unable to stay throughout the whole proceedings, since our brother says, “throughout the entire convention.” Usually the political element grows more and more apparent toward the close of the convention, which likely accounts for the retirement of the “spiritual note”; for, whatever man organizes and operates usually involves much political maneuvering.

As a gesture to the malcontents and uncontrollables the president says, “If you will give me your minto the matter, I promise that it shall have serious consideration in preparing for the next convention.” I suggest to Bro. Errett and the Standard that now is the time to get the next convention so pre-ar- ranged that all the Disciples who use the big “D” can feel at home “throughout the entire convention.”

A New Commission

5. “I further promise that all constructive criticism which would have bearing will be turned over to our com- mission on Structure and Function of the International Convention.”

THE FAILURE OF HUMAN DENOMINATIONS

T. B. THOMPSON

CONTRIBUTORIAL
Thus reads the concluding sentence in the letter. Possibly here is the “joker” in the gesture—the fly in the ointment. Whatever of “your mind” you feel disposed to send in, know that it must be “constructive” and must have “bearing”. If the president decides that your criticism has these two elements, he will then send it to “our commission on Structure and Function,” and here I can offer no consolation to Bro. Errett and the Standard that their suggestion for an “International Convention outstandingly worth while,” or one “thoroughly representative of the Dis-
tinction for an “International Convention and the Standard that their sugges-
tion is outstandingly worth while,” or one 

**S. BOYER has taken up with the Pentecostal Holiness people, whose headquarters are in Springfield, Missouri. He is circulating a tract in which “the things for which we have stood throughout the years shall have adequate empha-
sis,” and in which “a deeply spiritual note shall be dominant throughout the entire convention.” I can offer no advice or consolation, that such suggestions will be heeded. My observation is that when a suggestion gets into the grip of a committee, it must be of such a nature as to feel very much at home, or else it goes straight to the waste basket.

**Laboring in Vain**

Now, some may object to such treat-
ment of religious matters. Of course, there is a certain strain of seriousness that runs throughout such matters, but, on the other hand there is a very notice-
able and appreciable humorous element to those who know the strain and anxi-
ety under which men labor who are set for the defense of human machinery in religion. Their apparent inconsis-
tency in trying to reconcile things irre-
concilable, presents to the mind situa-
tions that permit of thoughts in the lighter vein. It reminds us that even great men can make religious monkeys of themselves. Man can not govern man; his attempts have all failed, even in the affairs of nations. How can man govern man in the realm of spiritual affairs? He knows nothing of spiritual laws except as he learns them of God. The folly of trying to build up institutions and organizations for man’s spiritual benefit is as ludicrous as a bunch of children trying to construct a sky-
scraper office building. When will man learn that his ways and God’s are not the same, and the foolishness of God is wiser than men?

---

**PROVE THE SPIRITS WHETHER THEY BE OF GOD**

**G. K. WALLACE**

*Mr. Spiritualist* 

S. BOYER has taken up with the Pentecostal Holiness people, whose headquarters are in Springfield, Missouri. He is circulating a tract in which “the things for which we have stood throughout the years shall have adequate empha-
sis,” and in which “a deeply spiritual note shall be dominant throughout the entire convention.” I can offer no advice or consolation, that such suggestions will be heeded. My observation is that when a suggestion gets into the grip of a committee, it must be of such a nature as to feel very much at home, or else it goes straight to the waste basket.

**Leagueing in Vain**

Now, some may object to such treat-
ment of religious matters. Of course, there is a certain strain of seriousness that runs throughout such matters, but, on the other hand there is a very notice-
able and appreciable humorous element to those who know the strain and anxi-
ety under which men labor who are set for the defense of human machinery in religion. Their apparent inconsis-
tency in trying to reconcile things irre-
concilable, presents to the mind situa-
tions that permit of thoughts in the lighter vein. It reminds us that even great men can make religious monkeys of themselves. Man can not govern man; his attempts have all failed, even in the affairs of nations. How can man govern man in the realm of spiritual affairs? He knows nothing of spiritual laws except as he learns them of God. The folly of trying to build up institutions and organizations for man’s spiritual benefit is as ludicrous as a bunch of children trying to construct a sky-
scraper office building. When will man learn that his ways and God’s are not the same, and the foolishness of God is wiser than men?

---

**THE BAPTISM OF THE SPIRIT**

T HE purpose of the Spirit baptism shows beyond a doubt that it is not for today. Its purpose was: (1) To bear witness to the apostles so they could bear witness to the world (Jno. 26-27): (2) Teach you all things and to bear witness to the world (Jno. 14:26): (3) Cause to remember all Jesus said (Jno. 14:26): (4) Convict (Jno. 16:18): (5) Guide to all truth (Jno. 16:13): (6) Declare things to come (Jno. 16:13): (7) Endue with power. (Luke 24:49)

---

**A Challenge**

T HE man who affirms that he has the baptismal measure of the Spirit is hereby challenged to show what advantage he has over those of us who make no such allegation.

The Spirit was to teach all things. Name something that He has taught you that I do not know or cannot find out by reading the Book.

The Spirit was to convict the world of sin. Cite a case of conversion where the word was not preached. He was to guide to all truth. What truth do you have that I do not have?

I have as much power as any man who avers he has the baptismal measure of the Holy Spirit. Go with me to the hospital and I will heal a sick person every time you heal one. You heal the first one. Then we will go to the cemetery and when you raise one from the dead I will raise another. Again, I challenge the claimant of the Spirit baptism to do one supernatural thing.
THE PREMILLENNIAL RESURRECTION THEORY

There is no Time or Place for a Millennium Between Two Future Resurrections and Judgments of Premillennial Fancy.

W. CURTIS PORTER'

While the doctrine of two future resurrections and judgments, with a thousand years intervening them, is necessary in the structure of Premillennialism, the word of the Lord declares plainly that both the righteous and the wicked are to be raised in the same hour. In John 5:28, 29 Jesus said: "Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth: they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life: and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." It would hardly be possible for a plainer statement to be made than this. It involves the resurrection of all men. Not simply a resurrection of the righteous, nor yet a resurrection of the wicked, but it includes all that are in their graves, both righteous and wicked. Some will come from their graves unto everlasting life; for others it will be a resurrection unto damnation. And there is nothing here to indicate a long period of time between them, or that they are to come forth in two distinct resurrections; but everything to indicate a general resurrection for both classes of men. Both are to arise in one hour! "The hour cometh," said Jesus, "in the which all are to hear the voice of the Son of God and arise from their graves. So in this hour that is coming both the good and the wicked will be called forth to their eternal rewards. That leaves no place nor time for a millennium between two future resurrections and judgments of the righteous and the resurrection and judgment of the wicked.

Dispensational Hours

Just recently a writer in the Christian Leader, Flavil Hall by name, who has a chronic case of Neutralitis, endeavored to come to the rescue of Premillennialists on John 5:28, 29. He is one of the strongest apologists for those who have brought the trouble into Israel that we have today. He claims not to believe Premillennialism, but almost every article he writes contains a defense in some way of the advocates of the theory. I do not recall any apology he has ever made for those who are opposing the theory that has divided the church of the living God. Instead he constantly complains about such opposition and praises those who are of the defection. Yet he claims not to believe Premillennialism! Well, we could hardly say he is "on the fence". Perhaps he has one foot slightly over on the Lord's side, just enough to keep him from landing squarely in the middle of the Premillennial past, but the entire weight of his body is hanging to the side of the trouble makers. He would just as well release the hold and complete his fall, unless he can in some way be filled with enough courage and conviction to cause him to pull himself over to the Bible side of the question, for the rest of us know his location anyway. But let us consider his defense of Premillennialists.

The hour of John 5:28, he claimed, could not be used to prove a general resurrection for both the righteous and the wicked, because in John 5:25 Jesus said: "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear it shall live." Since the dead in this verse are the ones who are dead in sin, and the resurrection from that death is a spiritual resurrection, this of course refers to the conversion of sinners. But this was to be in the hour that was coming. Yet all are not converted to Christ in one hour's time. The work began on the first Pentecost after the Lord's resurrection and is continuing yet; so the hour in this case has already embraced 1900 years, and there is no reason to decide that the hour of verse 28 could not include 1000 years. And to all advocates of Premillennialism, and to the pussy-footed sympathizers, this settles it. But it has not settled it at all.

We well know that the word "hour" as well as the words "day" and "moment," are not always used in their literal sense. (But since Premillennialists are such literalists it looks like they might find something literal in these expressions sometime. They don't believe in "spiritualizing the word" but they will "spiritualize" the word "hour" into a thousand years in order to make room for two distinct resurrections). Of course, sometimes such expressions refer to periods of time, but such is not always the case. The circumstances surround a word in a given case, and the related teaching of the Bible, must determine whether it is used in a literal sense. In John 5:25 the word "hour" is evidently used in the sense of dispensation or long period of time. It is similar to the use made of it by the Lord in his conversation with the woman of Samaria. To her he said: "But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshipers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth." (John 4:23) He simply declared to her that "locality" would mean nothing in the age of true worship for all men (though Premillennialists would yet establish the locality in Jerusalem), but that true worship would consist of worship in spirit and truth. He was contrasting the Jewish law and age with the law of Christ and the Christian age, and used the word "hour" in a dispensational sense just as he did in John 5:25. But that is no reason to decide that the same use is made of the term in John 5:28. In fact, circumstances prove it otherwise, for if the word "hour" here means one thousand years, and the righteous are raised preceding the Millennium and the wicked when it is finished, neither of them would be raised in this hour. There would have to be three hours involved. The righteous would be raised in a time preceding this hour, and the wicked in a period that follows it. But Jesus said both would be raised in this hour. If it means a thousand years, the righteous must be raised after the Millennium begins and the wicked before it is finished, and that is contrary to the structure of Premillennialism.

Same Hours Nat Dispensational

Jesus gave the parable of the virgins to teach us the necessity of watching and being prepared for the Lord's coming, and following that parable he concluded with these words: "Watch therefore, for ye know neither the day nor the hour wherein the Son of man cometh." (Mat. 25:13) To this may be added his language in Mark 13:32: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." These Scriptures, with many others that might be given, declare Jesus is coming in a certain day, or certain hour. No man knows the day nor the hour. The terms here cannot be used in a dispensational sense. If they are so used, we could know the hour in which he is coming, for even
Premillennialists say he is coming at the close of this age and before the beginning of what they call the millennial age. So he would come in the hour in which we live. But we know not the hour of his coming, and the word is therefore used in its literal sense. And as he is coming “in an hour” that we know not should we decide that his “coming” will embrace a thousand years or more? Well, perhaps that would include the time in which Premillennialism says he will come first “for his saints” and then “with his saints”. That will make necessary three advents of the Lord, instead of two, but what does that matter to those who are wedded to such a theory? But the fact remains that the word of God says he is coming “in an hour”. And since he is coming to judge the world (Jude 14, 15), why may not the resurrection and judgment of John 5:28 take place in the same hour? The thing accomplished in the hour of John 5:28 is the purpose of his coming, and why make the hour of his coming literal and the hour of the judgment a millennium?

At Time Of Trouble

Daniel makes a prophetic statement that shows a general resurrection for all men. He says: “And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time: and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.” (Dan. 12:1, 2) This statement, like the Lord’s in John 5:28, 29, reveals to us the truth of a general resurrection. Those who “sleep in the dust of the earth” shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.”

Separated Before The Judge

The picture of the judgment given by Christ in the record of Matthew forever settles the matter of two resurrections and judgments. That is, it settles this for all people who are willing to believe plain statements of Scripture. Of course when men become wedded to some speculative theory they pay but little attention to anything that is in conflict with their whims. But let us read the divine record at this point. “When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory: and before him shall be gathered all nations; and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.” (Mat. 25:31-33) Here the Lord is pictured on the judgment throne with all nations gathered into his presence for judgment. We have no picture here of a vast multitude of righteous only, but it is a mixed multitude of people. Some are represented as sheep, and some as goats, and they are separated while in the presence of the judge on the throne. Those on the right hand are invited to “inherit the kingdom” prepared for them from the foundation of the world, and those on the left hand are told to “depart * * * into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels”. (Verses 34-46) Now, if the doctrine of Premillennialism be true, this looks no more like the judgment scene than a picture of a peacock would look like twin calves. It is altogether out of harmony with the theory of two resurrections and judgments intervened by a thousand years. If the righteous are raised and rewarded when Christ comes, and then reign with Christ for a thousand years, with the resurrection of the wicked coming at the close of that period of time, there could be no separation of the two classes before the throne of judgment. When the righteous are raised and the wicked are left dead (if such thing should be), the separation is completed; and it takes place before the saints go into the presence of the judge and a thousand years before the wicked go into his presence. After such resurrection no further separation would be necessary or possible. But Jesus says they will be separated “one from the other” after they are gathered before the Lord.

Hence both classes of men must go into the presence of the judge at the same time. This necessitates one resurrection for all mankind.

Or will Premillennialists contend that after the resurrection of the wicked the righteous are intermingled with them to make this separation possible? There must be a separation take place in the presence of the judge somehow; so how will they get it unless they mix them up again after the millennium is over? But that will never do, for this separation takes place before the saints “inherit the kingdom”, and we are told by our erring friends that the saints inherit the kingdom at the beginning of their millennium. So this separation occurs before the fantastic “thousand years” gets going, and it makes it imperative that the wicked be raised before the millennium (?) instead of after it is over. Otherwise they could not be separated from the righteous while gathered before the judge. And it will not do to make this a separation of living nations only, the dead not being included, for in that case we would have to have three judgments: one for the living (wicked and righteous), one for the righteous dead, and a third for the wicked dead. So whichever way they turn this picture of the judgment explodes Premillennialism.
AND THIS IS RELIGION

Nearly Every Man Feels Himself Qualified to Speak on Religious Subjects—Presidents, College Professors, Business Men, Writers, Actors and Artisans all Fill Periodicals with Interviews on Religion. The Less They Know of Certain Questions the More They Want to Talk About Them.

YATER TAN-T-

Midnight in August. A bright moon overhead. Pale fleecy clouds drift slowly across her face as if to shut from her view the travesty on religion that is taking place below. A camp meeting is in progress—an old-fashioned camp meeting. A sobbing scream pierces the night air, followed by shrieks of indescribable agony. Flickering torches cast unearthly and grotesque shadows over a scene of wild disorder. Half a dozen preachers are screaming at the top of their lungs. Women with hair falling dishevelled about their shoulders are swaying, jerking, falling to the ground-pouring out torrents of unintelligible sound from their throats. Prayers and singing mingle with wailing and mourning to create such a bedlam as one would expect to find in no place but a madhouse. A dozen mourners are at the bench, sweat and tears streaming from their faces. Occasionally one of them will leap high into the air, emitting piercing shrieks, then fall to the ground in a frenzy, foaming at the mouth, rolling, kicking, jerking, twisting in a manner sometimes ludicrous, often obscene.

Emotionalism

The scene described has been enacted thousands of times in varying degrees within the memory of people not yet middle-aged. Wild and unrestrained emotionalism, a complete abandonment to the frenzy and passion of a violent orgy of feeling was thought to be the very essence of religion. Until a man had seen some vision, heard peculiar voices calling him, had an unnatural dream, or experienced some hallucination he was not thought to be converted. Conversion was in the nature of a convulsion. Unless a man could relate an experience that would (in the light of our day) reflect on his intelligence he would not be admitted to church-membership.

Today we see a great difference. The study of psychology in our schools and colleges, the gradual and ever-increasing advance of knowledge and insight into the workings of the human mind, coupled with the higher average intelligence of church-going people have practically eliminated the old-time mourners’ bench with all its kindred evils of an emotionalism gone to seed. Wider social contacts have provided a more wholesome outlet for the pent-up emotions that formerly found no expression except in the hysteria of a “big-meeting”. Outwardly at least the world has progressed beyond the stage where the cramp colic could be mistaken for the Holy Ghost working on a man’s “innards”.

But while the nauseating exhibitionism of a former age is past, we wonder if the philosophy of religion back of it has changed at all. What brought about this former burlesque of religion? Was it not the belief that religion is something which must be handled with an entirely different set of faculties from what we use in the ordinary affairs of life? “Heart-felt religion”, a term often on the lips of expositing exhorters, seemed to imply that religion was something entirely of the sentiment and emotion—that logic and reason had no place in its comprehension. It was something “better felt than told”. Consequently any man with a fair-sized emotional heritage could become an authority in the field of religion. He might be as iliterate as a South Sea island headhunter and as ignorant of the Bible as a Tibetan lama, but if his emotions were well oiled he could qualify. Knowledge of the Bible was unimportant—feeling was the only vital thing. We believe a close analysis will reveal this same philosophy rules the sectarian world today.

Sectarianism

There were three churches in Fleatown—Methodist, Baptist and Presbyterian. Religious ardor was running at low ebb, so the pastors of these three churches decided to hold a joint service to attempt a revival of their expiring charges. The program was arranged so that each pastor would speak thirty minutes on the subject “What My Denomination Teaches, and Why”: and at the end of each talk there would be a ten-minute period for questions from the audience.

A huge crowd composed of members from all three churches gathered for the service. The Baptist pastor spoke first, contending that the Baptist church was the church of the New Testament; that she could trace back an unbroken line of succession to John the Baptist; that immersion was the only baptism; that it was impossible for a child of God to be eternally lost, etc. The Presbyterian pastor followed him, contending that the Presbyterian church was the church of the New Testament; that sprinkling and pouring were the only lawful ways of baptizing (the Presbyterian church U. S. forbids immersion); and that the baptism of infants was not only permitted, but commanded. Finally the Methodist pastor spoke, declaring that the Methodist church (South) was the church of the New Testament; that the child of God is in constant danger of apostasy; that any form of baptism is valid, etc.

Each pastor at the end of his address was asked this question, “Do you believe that a man can live a Christian life, worship God acceptably, and go to heaven when he dies through some other denomination just as well as he can through yours?” All three pastors gave an emphatic affirmative.

Now just ordinary common sense should reveal the fact that if any one of these churches is the church of the New Testament both the others are human churches, and therefore wrong; that no man can worship God acceptably and live a Christian life in a human church as well as he can in the divine church; that if immersion only is baptism, no man has obeyed this command who has merely been sprinkled; that if the doctrines of any one of these churches is right, every doctrine of the other churches that opposes is necessarily false.

But this is religion we are talking about. And in religion common-sense, logic, and statements of scripture are not the real basis of belief and practice. It all depends on how a man feels. And if he feels like one church is as good as another then that settles the point. The appeal to emotionalism is final! Not long ago we had an otherwise very estimable old gentleman announce to us with considerable heat that “I wouldn’t give what I feel in
here (indicating with a vigorous thump a portion of his anatomy mainly occupied by the lower portion of the left lung) for all the Bibles in the world!"

**Presumption**

An eminent statesman lay dying. His life was worth much to the nation. The physician in charge called in a lawyer, a newspaper editor and a college president. He took them into the sick man’s room, and solemnly asked them to prescribe for his patient. They looked at him as if he had suddenly gone mad. What had come over him? He well knew that not one of them had ever studied medicine; they could not even tell what was wrong with the dying statesman, much less prescribe a remedy for him.

In amazed perplexity they left the room, and walked across the street to the lawyer’s office to discuss the strange conduct of the doctor. Scarcely were they seated, however, when there came a knock at the door. A small, serious-looking man was ushered in. Briefly he stated the purpose of his visit. He had been told he had less than a year to live. While he had never made any pretentions to religion, he felt that he was unwilling to cross the Great Divide in his present condition. The lawyer was his close friend, and he wanted advice from him. Should he join a church? if so which one? What did the lawyer think about baptism?

The lawyer gave his ideas about baptism.

The editor gave his.

The college president gave his.

This little incident reveals vividly the attitude of the average man toward religion. Not for anything would he try to prescribe for a sick body without having studied medicine. But boldly and arrogantly he will prescribe for a sick soul without ever having looked inside a Bible. Why this attitude? Does it not arise from the deep-seated (perhaps subconscious) belief that religion is purely a matter of the feelings and emotions? That knowledge of the Bible, logic, and reason are unnecessary either to a discussion of, or to the experience of, real religion? That what a man feels is vastly superior to anything the Bible may say about it.

They couldn’t answer a single question about what the Bible really says concerning the things they discuss. But does that deter them? It does not. In fact, after reading their published statements, one is inclined to suspect that the less they know about any given subject the more they want to talk about it.

**Application**

This false philosophy of religion and this unfortunate condition of knowledge and talk being in inverse ratio are not confined to men of the world.

A well-known gospel preacher admitted that he had not studied the premillennial theory an hour in all his lifetime, and in almost the same breath asserted that he doesn’t think there is any particular harm in the theory, and trying to create an air of tolerance for those who teach it. While it may be true that a mere hour’s study might have sufficed to show him the evil of the theory (one doesn’t have to eat the whole egg to find out it’s rotten), it is scarcely credible that in one hour’s time a man of even his superior ability could have traced out every tenet of premillenialism to its legitimate conclusions and logical consequences and found them all harmless. We are forced to conclude, therefore, that his opinion was based neither on knowledge of what the theory teaches nor of what the scriptures teach, but purely on his feeling in the matter. The appeal to emotionalism again!

Religion is a matter of both the head and the heart—both the intellect and the emotions. Emphasis of one to the exclusion of the other is not only dangerous, but is a rank perversion of the New Testament concept.

**THE STATE OF NEUTRALITY**

**J. B. NELSON**

**NEUTRALITY** is the state of being neutral. And neutral as defined by Webster is: “Taking neither side; having no decided character or action; neuter.” In secular affairs one has a perfect right to be neutral because he is the sole dictator of his mind and acts. But in matters Divine he has no mind of his own. His mind must become the mind of Jehovah. (Is. 55:8; 9) We must think and act as God directs and not as we may desire. Neutrality has no place in the teaching and practice of the word of God.

Old wicked Ahab who was dominated by his idolatrous and wicked wife put much fear in the minds of the Israelites. Many of them were too cowardly to take a stand for Jehovah when put to the test. Elijah said: “How long go ye limping between the two sides? If Jehovah be God, follow him; but if Baal then follow him.” (I Kings 18:21) What did the neuter say when Elijah made the demand? “The people answered him not a word.”

**THERE has not been a time in all** of my years of ministry when the church needed indoctrinating as now. A pious neutrality is finding fertile soil in the minds of uninformed, over-pious church members. Neutrals do not sit on the fence long; they will soon fall into the drift of sectarianism. The unanchored boat drifts. Truth anchors the soul to God.
When Occasion Demanded Paul Could Jerk Out Piercing Words with the Ease a Texas Ranger Jerks Out His Bulleted Weapon—A Veritable Cyclone of Cutting, Burning, Christlike Words.

HUGO McCord

" we were bold in our God to speak unto you the gospel of God ."

So Paul, the lion hearted asserted to the Christians at Thessalonica. (I. 2 :2)

He was not bragging about his loyalty nor advertising his courage. To him boldness in preaching was not a variable element that some preachers could have and other acceptable preachers might omit. There was no such distinction among God's preachers as the "fighting petrel" and the "sweet-spirited minister of Christ". If a man were God's preacher he was bold in his sermons; not a boldness to be boasted of, but a positively necessary quality; not to be proud of but to be exercised in godly fear. As Paul continued his writing to the Thessalonians he set forth what he meant by a bold preacher. What did Paul's boldness include?

Much Attention (vs. 2)

"... we were bold in our God to speak ... with much contention." When the occasion demanded it the apostle could jerk out piercing words with the ease of a Texas Ranger jerking out his bulleted weapon. See Paul as he stood before Elymas the sorcerer; even his pointed glare, much more intense than that of a good bird dog on point, was enough to make the sorcerer quake in his boots. Luke was so impressed that in his brief record he found place to record: "But Saul, who is also called Paul, filled with the Holy Spirit, fastened his eyes on him, ..." (Acts 13:9) Wouldn't you hate to stand before such determined fiery eyes? But what was much worse was that veritable cyclone of cutting, burning, Christlike words coming fast from that critical school teacher (in the back pew) when I am laboring at a rhetorical effusion that will bring flatteners to shake my hand; when I try to reach a "sweet" sermon-I am trying to please the wrong audience! It's the Unseen Auditor that trieth our hearts. And if I keep Him continuously before me, I won't have to worry about the "method" of preaching, whether or not to personate, how harsh to be. I won't have to worry about being a soft-soaper or a straight-shooter. All that will take care of itself if this pushes me: "not as pleasing men, but God, which trieth our hearts.”

Not as Pleasing Men, But God (vs. 4)

Not only is "much contention" an element in Coeur de Lion preaching, but something else too: who is to be pleased by the preaching? Many of us have quite the wrong angle of the matter. When I am thinking how this grammatical construction will "set" with that critical school teacher (in the back pew) when I am laboring at a rhetorical effusion that will bring flatteners to shake my hand; when I try to reach a "sweet" sermon-I am trying to please the wrong audience! It's the Unseen Auditor that trieth our hearts. And if I keep Him continuously before me, I won't have to worry about the "method" of preaching, whether or not to personate, how harsh to be. I won't have to worry about being a soft-soaper or a straight-shooter. All that will take care of itself if this pushes me: "not as pleasing men, but God, which trieth our hearts.”

For Paul to have pleased men he would have had to omit preaching against fornication and idolatry; for God's preacher today to please men he will never preach against flippant divorces, drinkers, "carders," promiscuous theater goers, and dancers. (Someone remarked that modern automobiles are invading ball rooms: stream-lined dancing, with excellent knee action.) Too, can't you hear a "good" sister whispering to Bro. Paul before service, "I've brought my dear friend, who worships Bacchus and Diana, with me to hear you preach; now don't say anything to hurt-don't get on his toes." Paul's answer is in print: "For neither at any time used we flattering words, ... God is witness: nor of men sought we glory, neither of you, nor yet of others, ... If I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ." (I Thess. 2:5; 6; Gal. 1:10)

"We Were Gentle Among You" (vs 7)

An analysis, no matter how superficial, of Paul's boldness in preaching would be perverted and incomplete without another item. His boldness included not only much contention but much tenderness. "But we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children: so being affectionately desirous of you, we were willing to have imparted unto you, not the gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were dear unto us... As ye know how we exhorted and comforted and charged every one of you as a father doth his children..." (I Thess. 2:7, 8, 11) With humble obedient children of God, Paul had long suffering and was as gentle as a mother with her firstborn; but with the stubborn rebellious church members and aliens Paul had much contention.

This paradox in preaching, tenderness and boldness teamed together; gentleness and contention in the same minister, is likewise found in our Lord. To those who needed it Jesus could hurl word-arrows with deadly poison on the points: "Ye fools and blind: hypocrites!... ye serpents, generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?" But the same Christ would be the gentlest of mortals, would pour forth compassion "passing that of women" to a humble penitent: "Woman, where are thine accusers? hath no man condemned thee... Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more."
A CHRISTIAN CHURCH WANTS UNION

If the Christian Church Really Desires Divine Unity The Way to it is Clear and Simple-Eliminate the Unscriptural Practices which are the Causes of the Separation and Unity in the Things of the Lord will be the Immediate Result.

C. A. NORRED

The recent announcement relative to the proposed union of the First Christian Church, Graham, Texas, and the East Side church of Christ of that city makes the ears tingle on the part of some of us who are acquainted with the background. Graham dates back to 1857. From the time of its organization it has held a strategic place in the affairs of its section. At a comparatively early date the plea for “the ancient and apostolic order of things” was favorably established in that pioneer city. Unfortunately though the wave of Progressionism which swept through the churches so many years ago swept the church there to the side of innovation. Any persons remaining true to the New Testament ideals were somehow so circumstanced that their influence for the faith was not obviously far-reaching. Then to make bad matters worse the slowly forming group avowing the New Testament order fell under the domination of the no-class brethren. The result was that over a long period of years gospel results in Graham were just about as lean as the lean kine of Egypt. Something like fifteen years ago though some economic developments brought to Graham a number of newcomers among whom were several persons who were not satisfied with anything short of aggressive activity in the work of the Lord. The result was the formation of the church on the east side of town. Progress was somewhat slow but there was a gradual and substantial growth. Consequently the church has come to the point that it is attracting favorable attention on the part of the public.

A Selfish Proposal

And during this time the First Christian Church has been carrying on. Among other things a handsome structure was erected at a favorable location and a creditable parsonage provided. But some new arrivals in the city disappointed some members of the First Christian Church by going to the church on the east side. Former attendants at the First Christian Church cast their lot on the east side. Crowds at the First Christian Church were reported to be shrinking very noticeably. Then came a proposal from the First Christian Church that the two churches get together. At this writing about all that has been established definitely is that while avowing a desire that the two churches combine the First Christian Church has expressed the desire that instrumental music in the worship be retained in the proposed new group.

A Necessary Discrimination

When persons begin talking of the union of religious groups there is great need to avoid the egregious blunder of supposing that mere agreement among religious persons is acceptable to the Lord. The Catholics are agreed among themselves but we know that that agreement is not such as is pleasing to the Lord. Further, there might be an agreement for the sake of numerical increase. Or, again, there might be agreement based upon the mere economic consideration that the running expenses of one church would be cheaper and preferable to administering two groups. But such programs of agreement fall short of the Lord’s approval. Although this may not be the proper place to undertake a sermon on divinely approved oneness among Christians it might be well to observe a few essentials in this question. First, agreement pleasing to God must be an agreement of the Spirit. (Eph. 4:3) A fleshly unity based upon carnal considerations of any sort is therefore at best only a travesty on the thing expected by the Lord. Secondly, the divinely approved oneness among Christians is one that arises from the Christians’ oneness with God and the Lord Jesus Christ. (John 17:21) Denominational merging, sectarian coalescence, is not the thing desired of the Lord-the unity approved of the Lord is that which is accomplished by the Spirit and by the Christian’s agreement with the Lord.

Some Immediate Factors

It might be well to remind all concerned that the divergence represented by the First Christian Church in Graham and the church on east side has not always existed. There was a time, and not so far back, when those professing the restoration of “the ancient and apostolic order of things” were in perfect agreement on the points now in question. But some brethren began urging that changes ought to be made to meet changed demands of society. Under this plea the Missionary Society was pushed among the churches, instrumental music was introduced here and there and the spirit of compromise more and more injected into the work of the churches. Those favoring this new order soon came to constitute a new group generally referred to as Progressivists, or Progressives. This compliance with public demand continued until affiliation in denominational activities became the order of the day. Then open membership, and its repudiation of New Testament conversion, was espoused by a large element of this new group. All along though the friends of the New Testament order have endeavored to remain true to the work begun and have refrained from any participation in the new and unscriptural practices. From this it is clear that the differences separating the First Christian Church and the churches avowing the New Testament order, are the unscriptural creations of the group friendly to the order represented by the First Christian Church.

Removing the Cause

And it is germane and appropriate to say that these division-creating practices of the group in question are admitted by their proponents, very generally, as things which might be omitted without violation of the divine will. In short it is generally admitted among the persons of this group that a vigorous and earnest prosecution of the work as represented by the church on the east side would entail no neglect of duty to the Lord and would afford a program in which all concerned could conscientiously engage. If therefore the members of the First Christian Church really desire a divinely approved unity the way to such seems obviously clear and simple. If they will simply eliminate the unscriptural practices which they have created and which are the causes of the separation as it actually exists unity in the things of the Lord will be an immediate result.
COMMON GROUND IN RELIGION

With Due Respect for Myriads of Good Moral People, Denominationalism is Nevertheless the Gigantic Religious Evil of All Times. Everything that Distinguishes Them, Even the Speech that Betrays Them, Should be Abandoned.

P. W. STONESTREET

COMMON faith (Titus 1:4) suggests common ground, which it is but a paraphrase for common reason, for religious doctrine and practice. Since "faith cometh by hearing . . . the word of God" (Romans 10:17), it is common in the sense that it is equally available to all in a land of Bibles. And since the Bible says the same thing to all, no one has a monopoly on faith. People only have a monopoly on their peculiar opinions.

Man-made Union

Religious union of prominent denominations is frequently proposed and discussed in the press these days. But since there was no Biblical reason for founding denominations, there can be no scriptural ground for such a federation. Aside from a possible economic advantage that might accrue from such a union, it could only result in a man-made union that would be as far from the unity for which Christ prayed in John 17 as are the present man-made divisions. Religiously, "it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." (Jer. 10:23)

The fact that much of the religious world does not occupy common ground does not prove that common ground does not exist; it only proves that a part of the religious world either does not realize that the Bible is common ground or else disregards it. The only hopeful omen, therefore, in such proposed mergers is that some of the victims of denominationalism are dissatisfied with the situation, which may lead to a scriptural investigation by which they can learn that God is not the author of denominational confusion.

It is a grievous sin for an individual or an organization to promulgate doctrines that cannot be defended upon the principle of common ground and it is down right mockery to plead for religious union on any other ground than that to which all responsible persons sustain a common relation. With becoming modesty, therefore, any one may assert that observing the teaching of Christ and his Apostles is essential to salvation while no one but a sectarian egotist could claim that observing the doctrines that are peculiar to denominationalism is essential to salvation.

No Biblical truth that a denomination may happen to teach is peculiar to that denomination, for the reason that others teach that truth also. Only the doctrines and commandments of men, however ancient or modern, are peculiar to denominationalism. Hence, a federation of them could in no sense eliminate the evils of denominationalism. On the contrary, if its influence were increased by that combination, its evils too would increase commensurately. So, with profound personal respect for the myriads of good moral people who are members of denominations, denominationalism itself is a gigantic religious evil—not a moral evil.

Essentials and Incidental

The word of God, which is the seed of the kingdom, is common ground. Let no religionist have the temerity to ask another to stand with him on any other ground. This principle applies to both essentials and incidentals. The only difference in its application is that common ground with respect to incidentals is broader than it is with respect to essentials. By essentials is meant what God commands people of this age to do; by incidentals is meant simply the methods and conveniences of obeying God. Concerning incidentals, human choice is not divinely restricted, except as that choice may involve something wrong in itself. Therefore, common ground with respect to incidentals forbids human opposition, except as they may involve something wrong in themselves.

God's word that is divinely applied to the people of the Christian dispensation marks the limits of common ground in religion. Beyond these limits no man has a scriptural right to teach. Like the false prophets of old, teachers can only assume such a right at their own peril and the confusion of their followers. Hence, the importance of observing this principle, both with respect to essentials and incidentals.

Church identity

Fortunately, the church revealed in the Bible is easily identified. It is never by inspired approval, designated in the Scriptures in sectarian terms. Yet, it is variously designated therein, and in some respects is like all the figures divinely applied to it; otherwise, only one form of designation would have been necessary to identify it. In the light of all its scriptural designations, people who fail to identify it, are unfortunately looking in vain for a denomination or something else, for Christ distinctly says: "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself." (John 7:17)

The teaching referred to in the foregoing quotation involves the identity of the church and all things that pertain unto life and godliness; and by doing "His will" God adds the obedient to his church, the very church that many other people fail to identify because their vision is obscured by the evils of denominationalism. Why some people are so blinded by sectarianism that a Christian can use all the designations of the church in the New Testament and even then they do not admit that they can quite identify that one religiously. The difficulty is with them in only being able to comprehend the language of Ashdod in the matter of church identity, and not in God's several forms of designation.

The Scriptural Concept

The scriptural concept of the church of which Christ is head is of such unity as to be illustrated by the physical body. More perfect unity cannot be imagined: "So we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another." (Romans 125)

The foregoing quotation neither refers to a single denomination, nor to any federation of them, but it is exclusively said of the church revealed in the Bible, of which all Christians are members, and the church that many sectarians fail to identify. Hence, the only scriptural procedure for designations is to drop all that distinguish them as denominations, even the speech that betrays them; then obey the gospel of Christ and religious unity will automatically follow without any man-made federations. Thus, on the principle of common ground in honor to God, the world may be taken for Christ.
The Catholic Church in its campaign to belittle the Bible contends that the Catholic Church is independent of the Bible; that they do not need the Bible; that it does not contain what Jesus taught; that the Catholic doctrine is not in the Bible, but was borrowed from paganism; and that Bible reading makes unbelievers. We will now see that they also contend that the Bible is not plain, in spite of the statement of Paul that those who read may understand (Eph. 3:2:3); that the Bible is a dead letter; that it is a wreck; that the Apostles had no authority to write; and that it is not inspired; and that human laws are equal to divine ones. But the strongest statements we find with reference to this matter are to the effect that the Pope has been commissioned to tell something he does not know, and to help God say something he could not say, and that after all that, we cannot understand what the Pope says.

The Bible Not Clear

“That the text of the Bible is not clear and conclusive on many points of doctrine on which it does treat, is sufficiently proved by the very discordances of those who attempt to deduce doctrine from it without any other aid.” (Plain Facts,’ 23)

The Scripture A Dead Letter

“The Scripture being a dead letter cannot explain or interpret itself.” (Explanation of Catholic Morals, 69)

“A dead and speechless book.” (Question Box, 67)

Apostles Had No Authority to Write

“Is it not strange that if Christianity were to be learned from the Bible only, that Christ himself never wrote a line or ever commanded His Apostles to write; for their divine commission was not to write, but to preach and teach the gospel…”

“Again, it has ever been practically impossible for men, generally, to find out Christ from the Bible only.” (Question Box, 70)

They Teach Bible Not Inspired

“The Protestant starts with the unproved assumption that the Bible is the inspired word of God.” (Question Box, 66)

“For one thing, do they (Protestants) know for sure who wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews, or even the Gospels themselves? May it not have been some quite irresponsible or merely private author?” (Plain Facts, 27)

“The contrary, we do not in any way, presuppose that the books of the New Testament are inspired, but only that they are genuine, authentic documents written by honest men.” (Question Box, SO)

“There seems, for instance, to be no obvious reason, as has been remarked, why the writings of Mark or Luke, even if we are sure we have them, should be inspired any more than those of any other of the early Christians.” (Plain Facts, 51)

They Think the Bible is a Wreck

“We have, then, no guarantee that there were important matters of Christian faith which are not to be found in the Bible at all... our Bible record is fragmentary. If we act honestly, we must confess that we have no certainty, if we proceed on these lines, that we have the whole of the Christian faith, or ever can obtain it; it is something which the Apostles, but which has, now to a great extent been lost; we have some pieces of it, but not with any certainty the whole. It is, as has been said, merely a wreck which has come down to us.” (Plain Facts, 23, 24)

Human Laws Equal Divine Laws

“Akin to these divine laws is the purely ecclesiastical law or law of the Church. Christ sent forth His Church clothed with His own and His Father’s authority...To enable her to carry out this divine plan she makes laws, laws purely ecclesiastical, but laws that have the same binding force as the divine laws themselves...For Catholics, therefore, as far as obligations are concerned, there is no practical difference between God’s law and the law of the Church.” (Explanation of Catholic Morals, 26)

The Pope Helps God Express Himself


“We may, however, take the words of Scripture and make an application of the m which was not originally intended. In other words, we may accommodate the sense to the needs of our own discourse or the subject we wish to illustrate.” (Catholic Dictionary, 8)

“The Scriptures give us, beyond doubt, to a certain extent, a human expression of the truth which it presents, since the truth is developed and by a human brain acting in a human manner, but also, to a certain extent, divine. Since this human development takes place wholly under the action of God...Guided by a clear sense of the living and luminous truth, which it bears within itself, by its likeness of faith defended at need against error by the divine assistance, the living magisterium strives, explains, argues, and occasionally subtilizes in order to bring forward texts which, if they lack an independent and absolute value have an ad hominem force, or value, through the authority of the authentic interpreter, whose very thought, if it is not, or is not clearly, in Scripture, nevertheless stands forth with a distinctness or new clearness in this manipulation of Scripture, or by contact with it.” (Catholic Encyclopedia, XV, 9)

The Pope Tells World What He Does Not Understand Himself!

“With reference to 1 Cor. 15:29—‘No one knows with certainty what is meant by this obscure text of St. Paul.’” (Question Box, 369, 1913 edition)

“The Apocalypse is one of the most obscure portions of Holy Writ, and no one pretends to be able to interpret it with any certainty.” (Question Box, 502)

“With reference to Rev. 13—‘It is impossible to say who the man is that St. John refers to.’” (Campion’s Hand Book, 137)

“Do not say you do not understand the Bible...Don’t understand the Bible? Who does? Neither priest, bishop, nor Pope for all that matter.” (Why Catholics Should Read The Bible, 5)

We Cannot Understand the Pope!

“Undoubtedly your reason would never find out such a mystery, which even when known by revelation is still utterly beyond the comprehension of man.” (Question Box, 38, 1913 edition)
THE GODDESS OF FASHION DEBASES HER SUBJECTS

As Well Talk of Ebon's Pall as the Light of a Church Filled with Cigarette-smoking, Card-playing, Dancing, Beer-drinking Mothers and Daughters. When Women of the Church Take to these Habits We are Doomed to Disaster.

L. R. WILSON

The most potent argument that young people can offer for many of their practices is, "Everybody else is doing it." In most instances this is the only argument necessary to carry their point. Whether the deed be right or wrong matters little, if it be in vogue. Shortly after Moses returned from Sinai's summit where he received the decalogue, Jehovah gave this solemn prohibition: "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil." (Ex. 23:2) Very little attention however has ever been given to this injunction, for the simple reason it does not suit our fancies. Regardless of any Divine command we heedlessly follow the herd.

Young people are not the only ones who feel that they must be in fashion. A large per cent of the more mature are equally bent on "keeping up with the Jones". If they have a German poodle, "raised under a bureau," "a dog-and-a-half long and a half-a-dog high," the rest of us want one, too. We are so afraid that others will get ahead of us that there is no extreme to which we will not go to be "in style". To be "out of style" is very depressing. It is, with many, the sign of a lack of "culture".

Fads and Fashion

A fashion is the result of crooked thinking—perhaps I should say, a "lack" of thinking. When some one of "prominence" distinguishes himself by wearing something—or doing something—different, the "fad" immediately spreads like wild fire. If the Prince of Wales were to attend an opera and for some reason not wear a bow tie, every man present would take off his tie and put it in his pocket before he left the theatre. If the Prince of Wales were to attend an opera and for some reason not wear a bow tie, every man present would take off his tie and put it in his pocket before he left the theatre. If the Prince of Wales were to attend an opera and for some reason not wear a bow tie, every man present would take off his tie and put it in his pocket before he left the theatre. If the Prince of Wales were to attend an opera and for some reason not wear a bow tie, every man present would take off his tie and put it in his pocket before he left the theatre. If the Prince of Wales were to attend an opera and for some reason not wear a bow tie, every man present would take off his tie and put it in his pocket before he left the theatre.

Again, Paul said, "Use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh." (Gal. 5:18) But many Christians (?) would not surrender an ounce of their liberty if the whole world were to go to the Devil. Again, Paul said, "Use not your liberty for an occasion to the flesh." (Gal. 5:18) But many Christians (?) would not surrender an ounce of their liberty if the whole world were to go to the Devil.

Hell and Hollywood

The center of most fashions in this country, today, is Hollywood. In the past twenty years Hollywood has dumped more filth and slush upon the country than all the criminals in the past hundred years. Examples of women smoking, drinking, jesting and the unseemly sex affairs presented have done more to corrupt our young people, destroy our homes and lower the standards of morals in general than any other force in the land. The subtle and universal appeal—so adequately financed and gloriously presented—is a deadly force. Many talk about "the morals" of the picture show. That there are some morals presented will not be denied, but the bad so far eclipses the good that the inevitable effect is a deadly poison.

The deadly fashions of today—dictated by the licentious stars and directors of Hollywood—are nowhere more pronounced than in sororities and fraternities at our colleges and universities. Listen, parents: When your children go away to college and write back that they have joined some sorority or fraternity, nine times out of ten you can put it down that they are lost. The smoking, dancing, drinking and many times gambling, together with the general environment always present, are sufficiently strong to wreck the spiritual life of nearly every one who tries it. The exceptions are rare, indeed. The sororities and fraternities are contaminated to the core with Hollywood's muck.

Women, Beer and Cigarettes

Women often argue that they "have as much right to smoke, drink and swear as the men have." Such logic is refreshing! I marvel that Plato never thought of this choice bit of reasoning. Because a certain class of men go out and drink slop till they become beastly sick and wallow in their own vomit many of our women would do the same thing—then justify themselves by saying that they "have as good right to do so as the men have". Liberty to do a thing is not always a reason for doing it. I have a right to jump off a house and break my neck, but this is no reason why I should. Paul said, "Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling block to the weak." (I Cor. 8:9) But many Christians (?) would not surrender an ounce of their liberty if the whole world were to go to the Devil. Again, Paul said, "Use not your liberty for an occasion to the flesh." (Gal. 5:18) Peter likewise warned against "using your freedom for a cloak of wickedness." (I Pet. 2:16)

(Continued next page)
FOUR thousand years the world
looked forward to the Coming of
Christ. It was heralded by all the
prophets as the hope of the race. Every
event in Old Testament history was
made to converge into the design of
His Coming. It was the event of su-
preme importance. Any doctrine, the
consequences of which make the Lord’s
first coming as a failure, is pernicious,
and cannot be ignored as some are
wont to do.

We want in this article to contrast
the Lord’s first coming in both man-
ner and purpose with what the Bible
has to say concerning His second com-
ing. The text suggesting the basis for
such a contrast is Heb. 9:27-28: “And
inasmuch as it is appointed unto men
to die, and after this cometh judg-
ment; so Christ also, having been once
offered to bear the sins of many, shall
appear a second time, apart from sin,
to them that wait for Him unto sal-
vation.”

The First Advent
Our text declares that Christ “was
once offered to bear the sins of many”.
This is the foundation of the Gospel
of Christ. Paul preached that Christ
died for our sins, “according to the
Scriptures”. God’s law had been vio-
lated. Death was required as a pen-
alty. Christ died in our stead. That
is the doctrine of atonement.

The scriptures declare that Jesus
came into the world to destroy the
works of Satan. “To this end was
the Son of God manifested, that he
might destroy the works of the Devil.”
(I John 3:8) The destruction of
the works of the devil was the very pur-
pose of Christ’s first coming. Premil-
lenialism teaches that Christ will come
again to accomplish that purpose. A
mighty carnal war will be waged by him
at the time of His second appearance,
in their scheme, for the purpose of ac-
complishing what he came the first time
to do, viz., put down Satan, destroy his
works, and establish His Kingdom.
That means that he failed to accomplish
this at the time of His first advent;
that instead of conquering him was con-
quered, and instead of being exalted
and crowned in His ascension to the
Father, He went home in defeat and
humiliation. What other conclusion
then such a doctrine have?

That is not all. Christ came into this
world and was made flesh and blood in
order “to bring to naught him that
had the power of death, that is, the
devil”. (Heb. 2:14) Premillenialism
Teaches that He will triumph over
Satan and bring him to naught, at his
second coming; again proving that they
regard the first advent of the Lord a failure. Such consequences
cannot be over-looked, nor excused
with any regard for truth.

The Bible not only declares that
Christ came into the world the first
time to “destroy the works of the devil”,
and to “bring Satan to naught” but according to the scriptures he suc-
ceded in accomplishing this. Paul
declares in Col. 2:15 that He “de-
opiled the principalities and the pow-
ers, and made a show of them openly,
triumphing over them in it.” and in
Eph. 4:8 he said: “when He ascend-
on high, He led captivity captive and
gave gifts unto men”.

Jesus said: “But no one can enter
the house of the strong man, and spoil
his goods, except he first bind the
strong man”. Jesus came to destroy
the works of Satan. (I John 3:8) This
he could not do without binding Satan.
(Mark 3:27) He accomplished his pur-
pose. (Col. 2:15) Therefore Satan, the
strong man, was bound. Satan has
only the power and privilege that is
yielded to him. “Each man is tempted
when he is drawn away by his own lust,
and enticed.” (Jas. 1:14) “Resist the
Devil, and he will flee from you”. (Jas.
4:7) We have indeed been deliv-
ered from Satan’s power and bond-
age to sin.

The Second Advent
The second coming of Christ will
be “to them that wait for Him unto salvation”. (Heb. 9:27) His promise
is, “I will come again to receive you
unto myself, that where I am ye may
be also”. (John 14:3) When He
comes again, “even so them also that
are fallen asleep in Jesus will God bring
with him * * * then we that are alive,
that are left, shall together with them
be caught up in the clouds, to meet the
Lord in the air: and so shall we ever
be he with the Lord”. (I Thess. 4:14-17)

We shall not know Christ after the
flesh again for “though we have known
Christ after the flesh, yet now we
know him so no more”. (2 Cor. 5:16)
He will not, therefore, return to dwell
in the flesh. Concerning His first com-
ing, Paul says, “For what the law could
not do, in that it was weak through the
flesh, God sending his own Son in the
likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, con-
demned sin in the flesh”. But in sharp
contrast, of his second coming he de-
clares that Christ “shall appear a sec-
ond time, apart from sin”. Those
words can have no meaning if Christ
comes back in the flesh to dwell on
earth.

ROY E. COGDILL

A day or two ago I noticed a boy
about twelve years of age smoking a
cigarette. I thought, how silly. This
was simply the beginning of a bad
habit. Most men acquire the habit of
smoking when only boys, yet in the
“silly age”. A woman never takes up
smoking because she likes it. She
smokes because “ever’body else is doin’
it,” that is, “ever’body else” of a cer-
tain type-the type she wishes to ape.
It is either silly or vicious. The wo-
man who takes up smoking, like the
twelve year old boy, is very silly (al-
tho she thinks it smart); else she does
so as an advertisement. Often times
it is the latter. It is a way that she
has of saying, “All right, gentlemen,
here I am; look me over”. Only a
few clays ago I saw a very nice look-
ing woman sitting at a counter with a
bottle of beer in one hand and a cig-
arette in the other. Without ever see-
ing this woman before, what man could
have a very high opinion of her? Could
any one think of her as a modest,
sweet, pure, refined character? The
answer is obvious. Any woman who
thus presents herself coarsens, de-
grades, and cheapens herself in the
minds of every one, either saint or
sinner.

When the women of the church take
up these vile habits, we are doomed to
disaster. We might as well talk about
the light of ebon’s pall as the light of a
church filled with cigarette-smoking,
card-playing and beer-drinking moth-
ers and daughters.

THE FIRST AND SECOND COMING OF CHRIST

The Mission of Christ Into the World was Fully Accomplished.
He Will Not Be Reincarnated to Dwell on Earth. He Will Come
a Second Time to Award Salvation to Them that Wait for Him.

February 1936 THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN 27
Dear Editor,—

J. D. Boyer, who is the father of 0. S. Boyer, a Brazilian missionary who recently joined a Holiness group, has issued an appeal to the brotherhood for prayers and any other help to bring his boy back to the truth. He blames nobody for the things which have been said in the papers about his son, but says that he has probably been harder on him than anybody else—"because he is 'our boy.'" Because Brother Boyer loves his son, he wants him to go to heaven, but he cannot go to heaven without obeying and abiding in the truth, and having known the truth and departed from it, he does not expect him to return unless his error is brought home to him. That is not love which makes men too cautious to expose error. It is not love that hinders preachers from telling the truth, the whole truth. It is not love that causes parents to withhold all restraints from their children. It is not love that will not reprove them when they do wrong. Love is not a sickly sentimentality that makes cowards of people. Love is an impelling principle that guides men into all the world to warn men of their danger in living in sin and rebellion. God hates sin because he loves the sinner. He hates false doctrine because it is destructive to those who believe it.

Brother Boyer Speaks Out

Brother Boyer in making his appeal for help in saving his son from error, says, "I do not believe that he or any one else has ever been led closer to our dear Lord by the doctrine of premillennialism." This was not an uncalled for rebuke. It is generally known that his son first embraced the teachings of R. H. Boll, and later the Holiness doctrines. If 0. S. Boyer were the only one who had followed this course, at least in part, the connection would not be so apparent. But many who have accepted premillennialism have shown marked leanings toward Holiness beliefs on the subjects of Holy Spirit baptism and divine healing and speaking with tongues. In reinterpreting the whole Bible to sustain his theory of the meaning of one verse in Revelation, R. H. Boll recasts I Cor. 13. The perfect knowledge will come with the millennium. Thus the main text relied upon to show that the miraculous features of the first age were to vanish away is removed. Perhaps R. H. Boll himself can relinquish this text without changing his views on miracles. He is very adept in manipulating his views. But it may be that some of his students are not efficient. With 1 Cor. 13 removed, perhaps they are more susceptible to the contagion of Holiness doctrine, toward which there seems to be quite a trend at the present time.

Reinterpreting the Bible is apt to weaken the structure of faith somewhere along the line. Does Boll insert his millennium in the beatitudes? Will the meek inherit the earth during the millennium? Other premillennialists so apply this scripture. But men need the motive of "inheriting the earth" now in this life as an incentive to follow meekness now!

Where the Bible Speaks

When men begin to find fault with the expression, "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent," it is a pretty good sign that they are worried about the scripturalness of some position or practice of theirs. In fact, they are desperate, for this expression is not a creed, but reduced to its simple content it merely means doing God's will, with the implication that doing anything else is not doing His will. It is a necessary inference from scores of passages of scripture, both in the Old and New Testaments. It is abundantly true. And if it could not be shown from the Scriptures to be true, it would still be the most reasonable supposition imaginable, in view of the circumstance that human wisdom is too weak, too limited in opportunity, and too much inclined to evil to originate anything worth offering to God. Common sense shuts us up to what He has told us, and that means what the Bible teaches.

Afraid of Disfellowship

The Apostolic Review carries an article by Earl C. Smith, Abilene, Texas, in which he says that the above expression "is a fine rule for one to apply to himself, but it's a very poor rule for one to apply to his neighbor." It is good for both of us, provided we don't apply it to each other. "If we apply that rule to our neighbors," says Brother Smith, "as soon as we find them speaking where we don't think the Bible speaks, we will cast them out of our fellowship. To apply that rule to our neighbors would be to deny them the right to study the Bible for themselves and at the same time stay in our fellowship." Brother Smith has spoken where some of us are very sure the Bible does not speak, in regard to the thousand years reign of Christ on earth, etc. Has he been cast out of the fellowship? or does he just feel cast down? If admonishing a brother about teaching something about which the Bible has not spoken, or seeking to show that the Bible has not taught it "casts anybody out of the fellowship"—then the Bible teaches the casting out, too.

A Mighty Weak Fence

If we live by the principle that it is necessary to do what God says, and nothing more, in order to please God; and we fellowship those who go beyond what the Bible has taught, neither oppose what they are doing, lest we injure the unity existing by virtue of our wearing the same name, have we not virtually repudiated the principle by which we purport to be guided? We have a blueprint of godliness, but we deny the power thereof by admitting that those who do not follow the blueprint build just as good a house as we. If we allow for one variation from the blueprint, we can allow for two, three, for all variations. In other words, to vary in one point from what the Bible teaches is to open the floodgates for all of denominationalism. Brother Smith cannot afford to disfellowship
any religious group, whether they are now wearing the same name or not. The name is only one point of conformity to Bible doctrine. If it is wrong to disfellowship those “in our ranks” who vary from Bible doctrine, it is just as wrong to continue to disfellowship those in sectarian bodies for doing the same thing. If a fence has just one gap where the stock can freely pass in and out, it is not a fence. It does not hold anything. It cannot exclude anything. It is no fence!

His Creed No Better

Brother Smith’s fence, or creed, seems to be contained in the expression, “the word of the cross”. He says: “Paul didn’t say our message is to be what the Bible teaches, but he said it is to be ‘Christ crucified.’ If ‘our plea’ is anything more or less than “the word of the cross” it will make a sect, if it is preached.”

Brother Smith contends that for us to apply the “where the Bible speaks” rule to our neighbors “would be to deny them the right to study the Bible for themselves and at the same time stay in our fellowship”. But surely he does not expect men to believe “the word of the cross” without reason, without study and examination of the evidences. Even after men embrace the gospel, he should allow for them to grow in faith, or to overcome doubts by which they might be assailed. Will those who occasion to study the “word of the cross” have to go outside of fellowship with him until their study is completed, and then be permitted to come back in, provided they can now fully and freely accept it.

Only Selfishness Excluded

Brother Smith and others of his persuasion are very indefinite about fellowship. How much does he include in “the word of the cross”? It must be very broad. He may spread himself out so thin that nobody can find him. His idea seems to be that it does not matter what men teach or practice, provided they believe in Christ crucified—nd do not get selfish and build a fence about themselves! How does he know what it is necessary to believe that Christ was crucified? Might it not be possible that it is essential to believe something else? Is that not a fence that Brother Smith has built? Did not Paul include a full gospel when he said that he was determined to know nothing but Christ and him crucified? If Paul did not include a full gospel, how much did he include; if he did include it all, that gets us right back to the proposition that we should be guided by “what the Bible speaks”—all that Paul taught and all that the inspired writers taught. If Brother Smith allows one variation, he becomes responsible for all. If I thought nothing was wrong except fences, I would climb every fence I came to. True love cannot be confined behind fences.

More Noble Than the Rest

It is reported that O. E. Phillips of Abilene, Texas, a neighbor and kindred spirit of Brother Smith has identified himself with the Christian Church. Brother Phillips is to be commended for his honesty and consistency. Of course, we are sorry he has gone from us, sorry for the sake of the memory of his good father who died a number of years ago. But the point is that he has gone from us —has been gone in sentiment for a long time. Even before his father died, he had gone from us in spirit. He would not have gone to the Christian Church if his sympathies had not been with that church. If his heart is with them, his body might as well follow. It is more noble and consistent to be where your heart is. We think more of Brother Phillips in the Christian Church than we do of some who share his feelings, and whose position logically suggests that they would be more at home with the Christian Church or some other religious group, but who try to complain and criticise us for wanting to disfellowship them. There are those who are “with” us, but not of “us.”

Very “Slanting”, Indeed!

The Apostolic Review carries this most radical article by Brother Smith with only this comment: “The author presents an unusual ‘slant’ on 0 very vexing situation. But we pass it on because of its vigorous appeal for self-examination.” Leaving the premillennial situation out of it—and we cannot afford to let o situation warp our judgment—does not the editor of the Review recognize in the article of Brother Smith a position with reference to sectarianism that is positively destructive of the fundamental claims of the so-called Restoration movement? There never would have been a Restoration if the men who started it had held the views of Brother Smith. There would not be one long if men held to that view now. The Review could have found this sort of a “vigorouss appeal for self-examination” in the publications of the Christian Church and other sectarian papers at any time in the history of the publica tion of the Review. It is no time to search ourselves for fleas when the elephants have stompeded!

When any kingdom, institution, or movement departs from the ideals upon which it was founded, it is doomed. Our spirit and our goal was to speak where the Bible speaks, and keep silent where it is silent, and to promote this principle by exposing the errors of all speculative doctrines. If our spirit departs and our goal is relinquished, what does it matter whether “the body” lives on or not? All excuse for our existence will be gone!

Yours for Bible Speech and Bible Silence.

A. D. Bunker.

BEGINNING WITH THE NEXT ISSUE WE WILL BE FORCED TO DISCONTINUE THE MAGAZINE TO ALL WHO HAVE NOT SENT THEIR DOLLAR. DO NOT MISS A COPY.

SEND YOUR DOLLAR NOW!

Birds of a Feather:

An educational convention was recently held in the city of Louisville, Ky., attended by school men all over the nation. Lacy H. Elrod, elder of the Central Church of Avenue Christ, Nashville, and Assistant State Superintendent of Education, attended. James F. Cox, elder of the College Church of Christ, Abilene, Texas, and President of Abilene Christian College, attended. Brother Cox went to the Haldeman church to worship, where he knew he would find a true congregation, and was asked to speak. He did so. Brother Elrod went with E. L. Jorgenson and the Boll element and was not seen among those who are loyal to the Truth in the current controversy. “Birds of a feather flock together” and I have heard that a man is known by the company he keeps.
Swamped:

A church advertised through one of the religious weeklies recently for a preacher. So many calls came, that all could not be answered by letter, so the weekly was asked to thank all of them at once. It is dangerous these days to advertise for a preacher-somebody might get trampled to death in the rush. If it were to be answered in person, it might result in a riot. The field is overcrowded, and yet there is room in the ministry for men who will stand squarely for the truth.

Starts From Funeral:

Dan J. Ottinger of Chicago went to Peoria, Ill., to preach a funeral, and finding some brethren, remained to start a church. We should not be so absorbed in the formality of funerals that we cannot see opportunities to good, and it is always an opportunity to tell the truth. It is often said of some churches that they will never grow until there are some funerals. There are some difficult problems involving stubborn men, but it is better for somebody to take a Bible and correct these conditions, than to wait for death to remove the cause. It is too long to wait. To many opportunities are lost while waiting. The thing needed today is courage to deal with the hard cases in the churches. Some elders with ambitions to lord it over a church are difficult to dislodge, but elders can be disciplined just like others. The great shortage is courage to tackle the job. Of course there are some who have the courage to tackle anything, but do not have prudence. On the whole, however, there is a surplus of prudence as compared with courage. Too many Christians today are weatherwise and overprudent.

The List of Preachers:

For several years the Firm Foundation Publishing House has published a booklet bearing the title "List of Preachers of Churches of Christ". This booklet has largely been a contribution of the publisher to the brethren. It represents a service that should be appreciated. The 1936 list stands out as the best service of its kind yet rendered. The booklet has 190 pages, neatly bound in black with silver border. Several distinct improvements have been made in this year's publication, chief of which is the listing by States of all the preachers, in addition to the regular alphabetical list. Then, there are forty pages in the back of the booklet devoted to books, literature and aids needed by preachers, teachers and leaders. All in all, the 1936 yearbook of preachers represents an accomplishment and the publisher should be rewarded with at least the expense of putting it out. This can be done by all preachers and elders sending the minimum amount of one quarter of a dollar, just twenty-five cents, to the publisher at Austin, Texas. This editor gets his free for writing this piece! Send your quarter.

0, Consistency! Consistency!

Everybody who remembers what they see in the papers know that it was G. C. Brewer who objected to debating with the brethren on premillennialism. He said he did not object to debates, for he was, modestly, himself somewhat of a debater who knew all the rules and the icons, but he had never debated with his brethren, unless, he said, the "progressive brethren" should be regarded as "our" brethren which he added in parenthesis, would hardly come to pass in "our generation" (the next generation perhaps may be broader minded?). All of that was before Brother Brewer's fever on the Budget System ran so high. After carrying on a written discussion with his brethren through his department of the Gospel Advocate, which amounted to little less than a wrangle-and in which Brother Brewer engaged in personalities to the extent that almost everything he said in his lost articles, even to the syllables and punctuation marks, carried implied insults and studied sarcasm-he closed by challenging the brethren for a debate on the Budget System! Premillennialism with all its lurking errors, he "did not regard of sufficient importance" to debate even with Norris, much less with the brethren. Besides not being important enough to discuss, debating on Premillennialism with the brethren would only widen the breach! But now in his zeal for the Budget System he draws the lines of cleavage over a mere method, an expedient, a non-essential, by challenging the brethren to debate it with him, and he actually writes out the proposition that he will affirm in debate on the Budget System—with the brethren! After all, Brother Brewer really does believe in debating with brethren, and in personalities too, seeing that he is engaging in both, so the question seems again to resolve itself into whose personalities and whose debates. 0, Consistency! Consistency! Come hither! Where art thou, Consistency?

Worse And More Of It:

A heap can be said about Ernest Wright's apology to J. N. Armstrong which appeared in the Firm Foundation recently. It will be remembered that President Armstrong of Harding College, fired young Wright for "faulty teaching". The President of Harding knew all the time young Wright believed and taught the premillennial theory, but it did not get him fired until the President was put on the spot by public pressure. Young Wright retaliated by telling some inside facts and accusing President Armstrong of playing the policy role. He said that Harding's president was either prior to post on the millennium and other things, looking to the believers interest of his school rather than any convictions he had on the questions. Now, young Wright apologizes only for having been moved by a spirit of retaliation when he said what he did, but he insists that what he said, every word of it, is true! Some apology—worse than the original and more of it; for then some people discounted his statement on the theory that he was probably mad, but now in his sober moments, and moments of repentance, he reaffirms everything he said and adds confirmation to it. Young Wright is not by himself in his opinion of the President of Harding College on this question. There are indeed a great many, and among them some of our ablest brethren, who do not believe J. N. Armstrong has taken a forthright stand on the issues confronting the church today.

In a personal letter to the editor, Yater Tant, of Fort Smith, Arkansas, says: "Brother Joe Blue was here about the first of December. He told me that he had seen L. O. Sanderson in the depot at Little Rock the night before. Both of them were returning from Harding College Thanksgiving pow-wow. Sanderson told Brother Blue that Dr. Armstrong had asked him what he thought of having R. H. Boll come down to give the students "his side" of the controversy. According to Sanderson, Armstrong spoke somewhat as follows: 'I have declared myself now, and the whole brotherhood knows what I teach about these questions. Brother White has just been here and presented his
side of it, now what do you think of asking Brother Boll down to tell the students what he believes about it? Wouldn’t that be the fair thing to do?” Ho-hum. Excuse me while I yawn. I believe your efforts with the dear brother have been fruitless. I’d give it up as a bad job.”

So Brother White was all wrong in thinking that Brother Armstrong invited him to lecture because he wanted his student body to know “what the Word of God teaches on these questions”. He just wanted Brother White to give them “his side” of the controversy. With Brother Armstrong it is not a question of sound teaching, nor of protecting students against error, but a matter of this brother’s or that brother’s “side” of the thing. So he would subject his students to the influence of false teaching under the most favorable circumstances for it to be effective—under the personality of the false teacher in person.

W. L. Totty, of Nashville, odds further testimony to the effect that on a recent trip to his home R. N. Gardner, business manager of Truthseeker (Brother Armstrong’s paper), told his wife that “if I were Brother Armstrong I would have R. H. Boll lecture to the student body of Harding College”. Brother Totty asked Sister Gardner if it would be all right to quote her. She said it would. And Brother Totty does not mind his name being used.

There is no doubt that, without the restraints of public sentiment, just that thing would occur—the student body of Harding College, in trusted by their parents to the stewardship of its president, would be sacrificed to R. H. Boll as an audience and their young hearts mode the soil for him to plant the seeds of his heresies. Brethren, just how do you like the idea of sending our boys and girls to a school guided by such policy? I repeat with added emphasis that “I shall send mine to a school where ‘the record’ is more satisfactory”. Verily, a purging of our colleges than Harding. Loyalty to truth and trust requires that any such teacher be removed and replaced by teachers whose positions are known to be sound, and that without dilly-dallying. Brethren are justified in withholding support from the school that does not do so.

SWORD SWIPES

C. E. W.

ALL true Christians are interested in the growth of the church. The foster it really grows the better. Inflation is not always growth, and can fool a lot of good people. It takes plenty of good food and proper exercise in godliness to bring about substantial growth in the church. You can see what is wrong in this picture. A church calls a preacher. He is a geared-up go-getter, a regular four-wheeled miracle. Miraculous reports adorn the News and Notes department of the papers. The church doubles in membership. Extra chairs have to be brought in to seat the increasing crowds. All of a sudden the bubble bursts. Hatred and strife exist where love and peace once reigned. The church is divided and the preacher leaves. Some are mad enough to fight and others are heart-broken. We have all heard about the cow that always gave a bucket full of milk and always kicked it over. She would be a better cow if she gave less milk and had better manners.

WHO’S to blame when strife and division wreck a church’s influence in a community? “Not I” says the preacher. “Not we” sing the elders. Everybody involved has a flock to glorify, a body of followers to harvest, a mission to complete, a kingdom to conquer. The controversy is the most effective way to keep an eye on the world, to win converts, to provide much needed income, to maintain a certain high profile. Yet certain that this influence is not represented in the faculties of other of “our” colleges than Harding. Loyalty to truth and trust requires that any such teacher be removed and replaced by teachers whose positions are known to be sound, and that without dilly-dallying. Brethren are justified in withholding support from the school that does not do so.

THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN 31

AND a man who will start around with a rebellious petition for members of a church to sign ought to have to eat the thing. If there are abuses that need correction a petition is the most effective way not to get them corrected. Members of a mob, and that is what the average rebellion in a church is, would sign a petition to build a ladder to the moon, if they thought it would serve a factious purpose. Whoever saw a petition anyhow that did not have the names of a dozen or more children on it from ten to fifteen years old? Besides a few other things it is an outrage against childhood. But what does a factious care?

IF you have ever seen a group of elders tight-lipped and white-faced listening to the hisses and boos and jeers of petition circulators in a faction-called meeting, you know what tragedy is! They must either stand their ground or turn the church over to outlaws. If they stand their ground, the outlaws withdraw and start “The Church of Christ” at another location. Then a campaign begins for recognition among neighboring churches, and conscientious editors are subjected to nightmares over what attitude they should take as the thing is pitched into their laps. They could save themselves a lot of trouble by thumbs down on this sort of thing to begin with. A faction without publicity would die as quickly as a weed on a rock.

ANOTHER thing! How many petitions did you ever hear of being circulated to dismiss a preacher? It may be that he should have left years ago but seldom if ever is a petition circulated to get rid of him. The petitions are usually in his favor with the well grounded suspicion that he is aiding and abetting, tacitly, if not otherwise. A preacher who will let a thing like that be done without an effort to stop it . . . . Well, you name him . . . . I’m speechless!
I have read with very profound interest every issue of "The Gospel Guardian", and appreciate it more than I can express in words. It is well edited, well printed and sound to the core. May it ever remain so.

G. H. P. Showalter, Editor Firm


I think the magazine is true to its name. There is a great need today for such a magazine. I admire your courage and the courage of other writers in exposing the teaching of R. H. Boll and others.

Brethren that insist on teaching Russelism and Bollism ought to be exposed and reproved face to face. I speak out against it whenever I have an opportunity, as every gospel preacher should. I hope you will be able to continue this good work of exposing false teaching.-John G. Reese, Business Manager, Harding College, Searcy, Ark.

We appreciate exceedingly the efforts you are making in this field. The Gospel Guardian is ideal both in material workmanship and spiritual content. May you live long is my prayer.-W. Claude Hall, Teacher of Bible, Freed-Hardeman College, Henderson, Tenn.

The January issue of the Guardian is as hot as a bag of mush. Boll and his henchmen will have to say something or play the "martyr". I predict that they will cry "Persecution".-C. R. Nichol, Seminole, Okla.

This is a letter I have had in my possession for some time. I have lost the February number of the Guardian! It sure is fine. I had no idea we had so many good writers in addition to those already writing to "our papers". It would seem that the old papers will have to gird themselves to keep up with the procession.-Victor W. Kelley, Professor of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

I have just finished reading the January issue of the Gospel Guardian. I am glad you published this data. It will, in my opinion, serve a good purpose.-Allen Phy, Glasgow, Ky.

I believe you are undertaking a good work, and we are always willing to help in such work. May you ever be successful in your undertaking.-E. D. Chambers, Afton, Texas.

The Gospel Guardian is the answer to the Premillennialist. Here's my dollar.-T. G. Butler, Lakeland, Fla.

It is a real treat in this age of neutrality, and a mighty good tonic for young preachers. The first copy gave me more inspiration than any paper I've ever seen. More power to you! George W. Dehoff, Richmond, Va.

I am very much pleased with the magazine.-Early Arceneaux, Fort Worth, Texas.

It is like an up-to-date automobile-it has bumpers on both ends. As full of good things as an egg is full of meat, I mean a good egg, of course.-Thad S. Hutson, Parkerburg, W. Va.

Keep the pen going. The magazine is fighting a good fight, and it will tell on this foolishness.-C. A. Buchanan, Portales, N. M.

With my love for the truth, I would not take one dollar for my one copy, after reading it. God bless you and the paper.-Jacob Slonaker, Cameron, W. Va.

The special number of the Gospel Guardian is the most timely contribution to the brotherhood possible. There is therefore no excuse for brethren to remain ignorant about "Bollism." You have done a noble act, and have performed a distinguished service for the cause of our Lord by bringing forward this great catalogue of facts. The facts presented are so plain that I have hope Brother Brewer will see them. I have heard him say more than once that he knew "the facts in the case". But his version does not agree with yours. Should I say, pardon me for bringing in personalities?-Bela L. Watson, Lometa, Texas.
The Voice of the Pioneers on Instrumental Music and Societies
By JOHN T. LEWIS

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

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

Not Merely Historical
This book is not simply a history of men's opinions of things. The copious extracts from the writings of Campbell, Lard, McGarvey, Milligan, Errett, Lipscomb, Sewell, and a host of other great scholars and preachers in the church from the early part of the nineteenth century down to now-present irrefutable Scriptural argument against innovations that divide and destroy the church.

Every preacher, elder, teacher, and student, should have this book and it is within your reach. Price $2.00, 184 pages, bound in cloth, stamped in gold.
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PROPOSITION: “The Bible Clearly Teaches That After the Second Coming of Christ and Before the Final Resurrection and Judgment There Will Be an Age or Dispensation of One Thousand Years During Which Christ Will Reign on the Earth.”

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

A 350-Page Book Price $2.00

– Cloth-bound –
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