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Guard that which is committed unto thee
Hanging on the walls of the chapel of Freed-Hardeman College are the enlarged pictures of Barton W. Stone, Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, Walter Scott, “Raccoon” John Smith, Benjamin Franklin, Robert Milligan, F. G. Allen, Dr. T. W. Brents, Moses E. Lard, J. W. McGarvey, Tolbert Fanning, David Lipscomb, T. B. Larimore, J. C. McQuiddy, M. C. Kurfees, F. W. Smith and A. G. Freed. These men are among the leading representatives of the Restoration Movement from its beginning down to the present. They sought to lead men back to Jerusalem, back to the Apostles, back to Christ. They were not perfect either in knowledge or in practice, but in general, and in most particulars, they had the correct theory of Christianity.

Because Freed-Hardeman College believes they taught the great fundamentals of the gospel correctly it has placed their pictures on the walls as an inspiration and encouragement to the “rising generation” to follow them as they followed Christ.

Freed-Hardeman College stands, in general, for the great principles for which they contended. It is trying to lead the church and the world back to the great ideals that they labored to attain. It has no patience with modern innovations, theories or speculations. It condemns all hobby-riclers, cranks, and factions in the church and stands four-square for the “ancient order of things” as taught by Christ and the Apostles.
M ost of his mighty works were done around about the sea of Galilee. Here he fed the five thousand and wrought many miracles. Upon the water he walked; he stilled the raging tempest, and from a boat spoke a series of parables. Being human as well as divine, he grew tired and weary and, after having been among the surging sea of humanity, he sought to be alone with only his disciples. He traveled north and then crossed the river Jordan eastward-bound until he came to Caesarea Philippi. During this period of retirement he entered into a conversation with his disciples. Knowing they had been mixing and mingling with the great crowds that stood upon the shore, he asked them saying: “Who do men say that I, the Son of man, am?” Without hesitation they answered: “Some say that thou art John the Baptist; Some, Elias; and others, Jeremias; or one of the prophets.” It will be observed that the estimate of Jesus as expressed by his fellows and by those who lived during his day and had direct and first hand information concerning him, put him in a class, not with the lower, nor with the mediocre of humanity, but they all recognized that he belonged to the super class. To fully appreciate this it is well to note the characters with whom they identified him.

Public Opinion
John the Baptist was a man of whom the prophets had spoken; his father was a priest and his mother was a cousin of Mary, the mother of Christ; he was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother’s womb. It was John whose clarion voice broke the silence of the wilderness of Judea and invited the multitudes to hear his call to repentance. It was John who baptized the Savior and who saw and bore record that Jesus was God’s Son. Some of those about the Sea of Galilee thought Jesus was John the Baptist.

Elias hailed from Mount Carmel and was ever a terror to wicked kings and to such outlandish women as Jezebel and her kind. It was Elias who challenged the prophets of Baal, four hundred fifty in number, to determine who should be their God. He towered above his fellows like old Mt. Herman above the Lebanon range. Some thought Jesus was Elias. Others, not quite so definite thought him to be Jeremias or one of the prophets. Although, living in a small and despired village out of which no good thing could come, he had within two or three years of his ministry so impressed the multitudes that, without exception, they placed him among the greatest of all the ages.

It has ever been rather strange to me that Christ made no comment whatever upon the various opinions thus expressed. My curiosity would have prompted me to inquire as to their reason for thinking I was John, Elias, or Jeremias. But the silence of our Lord emphasizes an important matter, viz; it makes no difference what others may think concerning him. Christianity is an individual matter and directly personal. What Thomas Payne, Thomas Jefferson or any one else thinks about him should in no wise affect my hope of salvation. “Every tub sets on its own bottom,” expresses a fundamental principle of Bible truth. Hence, ignoring the sentiments and opinions of men he asked; “But whom say ye that I am?” This was a direct and straightforward challenge to them and it intended to elicit their confession.

Fundamental Fact
Peter ever bold and impetuous accepted the challenge and said; “Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God.” By their silence all others gave consent. Whereupon Christ pronounced a blessing upon Peter. Well may one ask, for what? The answer is for stating him to be the Christ the son of the living God. This is the fundamental fact upon which all of our hollowed hopes and fondest desires must forever rest. If Christ be God’s son the Bible is true and our hopes are well founded. Christ is the central figure of all the Bible. He is the antitype of all the types and he is the substance of all the shadows of the Old Testament. He is indeed the historic character of the new covenant and the only hope of salvation to the lost, ruined and recreant race of mankind. I am not especially interested in Jesus, the man of Galilee, nor in Jesus, the great teacher and philosopher, but my supreme interest centers in Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God. Upon this great fact, as its foundation, the church must stand or fall.

Credible Testimony
There are ever present those who deny the truth of Peter’s confession and, while admitting that such a character lived upon the earth, they boldly assert that he was only a man. The effort of all phases of infidelity is to rob Christ of his divinity and thus undermine that institution bought by his blood and made alive by his spirit. Suppose we place Peter and a modern infidel on the stand to testify, and that we accept or reject their testimony as would any court in our land. Ask each the following:

1. Did you live at the same time and in the same country as did Jesus of Nazareth?
2. Were you personally acquainted with him, and did you have first-hand information regarding him?
3. Did you hear him teach and see him perform miracles, wonders and signs among the people?
4. Did you see him after his resurrection from the dead and were you a witness to his being taken up by a cloud out of sight?

To all of these Peter answers, “Yes” with the positive assurance. Then ask Peter his conviction regarding Jesus, and hear him answer; “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” All of this is competent evidence and it gives to Peter’s testimony the highest degree of credibility.

Examine now the infidel by asking the same questions. To each he is forced to answer, “No.”

He must admit that he never lived nearer, in time than almost two thousand years, and in space around eight thousand miles from Jesus. He must acknowledge that he never saw him nor heard him. Neither had he ever seen anybody that had seen some one personally acquainted with him who is called the Christ.

Of course the infidel cannot testify to his resurrection and ascension. He is therefore incompetent and his denial of the Christ as the Son of God is wholly incredible and unworthy of serious consideration. Peter’s confession is endorsed by Jehovah himself who said time and again: “This is my beloved Son”. John says: “I saw, and bear record that this is the Son of God.” Many others there are who likewise confirm Peter in saying: “Thou art the’ Christ, the Son of the living God.”

(Continued on Page 20)
Editorial

IS THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN WORTH ANOTHER DOLLAR TO YOU?

The issue of the Gospel Guardian that you now hold in your hand is the sixth number of this magazine—it has been published six months. Already it has lived longer than some predicted and hoped that it would. It is a fact that nothing could please a certain contingent of brethren more than for the Gospel Guardian to be discontinued. But we do not aim for their hopes to be realized nor their desires, in that eventuality, to be gratified. The editor has labored hard to establish it, and that without remuneration or reward other than the good conscience he has in serving the cause that the Gospel Guardian has espoused. And with the same determination, unrelented, he will strive for its continuance on the same high standard of quality, both in material make-up and spiritual content, that has characterized its chartered course.

The publication of the Gospel Guardian at the subscription rate of one dollar has been an experiment. No other magazine known to me, religious or secular, even with successful financial organizations back of them, has ever attempted it. But the aim of this magazine was not profit—therefore, we attempted its publication at a popular one dollar price in order to enlist a large volume of subscribers. But at the end of a six months period of faithful, conscientious effort, we face the fact that the Gospel Guardian cannot be produced for $1.00 a year, and we do not believe our readers, whose interests in this magazine are mutual, expect or even want to get it below cost of production. It seems, therefore, that the reasonable, fair and equitable thing to do is to raise the subscription rate—just the simple request that each subscriber pay the cost of his magazine.

Had I even a small fortune, or any individual resources above an actual living, I would give all of it to publish the Gospel Guardian and send it at my own expense to every gospel preacher in the land. That is my desire, and that I am doing and find joy in the doing. The editor has labored hard to establish it, and that without remuneration or reward other than the good conscience he has in serving the cause that the Gospel Guardian has espoused. And with the same determination, unrelented, he will strive for its continuance on the same high standard of quality, both in material make-up and spiritual content, that has characterized its chartered course.

The subscription rate has been $1.00 for six months, and $2.00 for a year. This rate will be available if fifty preachers will join Brother Overby in securing one hundred paid subscriptions, the job will be performed. There are half that many who are on the editorial and contributorial staff of the magazine and it should go without saying that they will join in such a movement.

If any apology is felt by any to be necessary for this frank and straightforward statement, charge it to the undying love of the editor for the magazine and the Cause it seeks to promote. May we hear from you?

TO THE PREACHERS

I am fully persuaded the Gospel Guardian is filling a niche in the walls of Zion, not occupied by any other paper. True to its name, it is a Guardian of all that is dear to the lovers of the Old Paths. It is waging the fight that should have long since begun—a deadly combat against the evils of speculations; in short, its hand is against every false way, that would undermine "The faith which was once for all delivered to the saints." (Jude 3).

"Preach the word; be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching," is the solemn charge to every preacher. There is no place in the Lord’s ranks for cowards, shirkers, deserters, and compromisers—no, the ranks must be filled with men of courage and of undaunted faith in the word of God.

Here is a plea to all staunch friends of the Guardian who are so justly lauding its plea, to translate those commendations into actions. The circulation of any paper, depends largely upon the support of preachers. They are in position to do more for it than others; due to their many contacts with the brethren.

I am willing to be one of fifty preachers to send in one hundred subscriptions, within the next three months. This will place on the list five thousand readers. Fifty others should send in fifty subscriptions each; and fifty more should send in twenty five each. This can easily be done, and it will solve the financial problem—the iron weight that weighs so heavily over the head of the editor of any religious paper.

Merely making announcements will not do this—this is good, but it is not sufficient. Do not make announcements, and advise that subscriptions should be sent in; no, tell them you are taking them, and will send them in. In takes personal work to solve the problem—nothing can displace this—it will work like a charm: try it.

Coleman Overby, Muskogee, Oklahoma.
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REBUILDING THE WALLS

NEHEMIAH came to Judea to do a constructive work. And he did it in record time. He conferred neither with friends nor foes, until he had personally surveyed the ground. But it was a public work and his enemies eventually learned of his plans. If some of our “constructive” brethren had been there, they would have advised Nehemiah to confine his activities exclusively to building the walls of Jerusalem, and under no circumstances to fight, not even to arm himself, or make any show of militancy.

Military Preparations

Nehemiah did go right on building, with never a let-up nor a let-clown. But the time came when he must fight. His men must be prepared to fight on a moment’s notice. So they worked with their weapons in one hand and their building instruments in the other. Why these military preparations? His enemies were responsible for that!

We could go right along doing positive preaching only—that is, preach the truth and let others alone, if they would let us alone and let our work alone. Nehemiah’s enemies would not do that. Neither will the enemies of the truth today. If false doctrines were never taught, they would not have to be combated. If nobody preached the preaching of “faith only” in the face of the command today.

It requires much time to remove error than to plant the truth. In the New Testament times the general rule was that only one teaching was needed to make a convert. Were it not for so much erroneous teaching, that rule would work as well today.

Why should Brother Boll expect to be exempted from opposition because of his religious connections? Is not an enemy within the ranks more dangerous and worthy of greater punishment than one without? The devil is the author of all false doctrine. We cannot preach the truth and let the devil alone, for the simple reason that he does not let us alone. He interferes with the work of building the gospel walls. We must not only fight, but win the fight.

Belittling the Issue

Nehemiah’s enemies made light of the thing he was trying to do. But secretly they did not regard it lightly, for they were having meetings and planning their opposition. The Boll group encouraged the idea that what one believed about the millennium was a light matter, and got away with it for nearly twenty years—long enough to build a full-fledged sect within the boundaries of the church. But R. H. Boll never quite admits that it is not essential. Like many other of his issues— it and it isn’t. He has a double standard on the question: As it applies to the opposition, it is a light matter—they should not oppose his teaching. But to his own group he describes the antmillennial faction as a monstrous thing. Really, I do not see how he can consistently fellowship such a “sect”! Perhaps he will yet solve that troublesome question by disfellowshipping us—after expressing fears for so long that somebody was going to disfellowship him.

If our opposition to his teaching makes us such an undesirable sect, and yet we are standing in faith and practice just where we were when he found us, it does look like he would give us credit for great patience in allowing him twenty years in which to build up a group believing strange doctrines in our midst! I have heard of a theory that people bring things upon themselves by fearing that they may happen. A person may fear a disease until he contracts it, so the theory goes. Brother Boll is the one who started all the talk about disfellowship. He has harped on it. It has been an ever-present fear in his mind. From recent pronouncements against the opposition, it looks like he might execute his own fears by disfellowshipping us!

Unequally Yoked

From the way he talks about those who oppose him, it is evident that R. H. Boll cannot fully and freely fellowship them. Wonder why he has clone so for so long, and what is causing the delay? Does he distrust his abilities in new fields? Does he yet hope to deceive more and more of the elect? He has preferred to work under cover. He delights in issuing statements in which he avoids the real issues, and tries to make it appear that there is really nothing between us. Then he paints terrible pictures of his opposition— whose chief sin seems to be opposing his doctrines, as if there were any more virtue in following one’s convictions on one side of a question than upon the other side. He not only prefers to work inside a group which is repulsive to him, but he wishes to have exclusive rights. Promoters have rights, but opposers do not. Very well then, we promote the teaching that Jesus is now seated on David’s throne; therefore, he has no right to oppose that teaching. If all the favors are for the affirmative side, we will be glad to affirm.

Truth and Error Incompatible

A false teacher is one who teaches false doctrines. It does not matter whether he is inside or outside the ranks. R. H. Boll could not give up Brother Boyer when he was proclaiming Holiness doctrine within our ranks. Moreover, he blamed those who opposed these doctrines. But when Brother Boyer stepped over into the Holiness ranks, and taught the same doctrines, it made all the difference in the world. Does fellowship then depend upon religious names and denominational boundaries?

If Brother Boll can fellowship Holiness doctrine in our ranks, why can he not fellowship it in Holiness ranks? Is it the doctrines or the ranks that count? I can stand Holiness doctrine in Holiness ranks much easier than in our own ranks.

How R. H. Boll can pretend to be an editor and maintain his self-respect without any attempt to answer many of the things which have been said about his theories in recent months is an inexplicable mystery. Not a word has he uttered through his paper about the tract written by John T. Hinds, “Christ on David’s Throne.” Yet that tract demolishes his theories, leaving not one stone upon another. The broadsides of J. M. McCaleb against Don Carlos Janes and R. H. Boll are disastrous in their effects. I specify these two attacks, because he cannot claim that either were written in a bad spirit. He is very touchy about the spirit in which his opposers write. In these writings he poses “as a sheep led to the slaughter; and like a lamb dumb before his shearer, so opened he not his mouth.” But it was not because that “in his humiliation his judgment was taken away” for the Word and Work keeps coming out, and Brother Boll keeps writing.
and he keeps describing the sinfulness of the "sect" with which such men as John T. Hinds are identified—but for some strange reason he neglects to answer their argument.

He can ignore more arguments and absorb more punishment than any man I have ever known. He has perfect inhibition editorially. His control was not so perfect at Winchester, Ky., when the castigation was oral. It required the services of his friends to keep him seated. How anybody can follow a man who ignores so many arguments against his position is even more inexplicable. He does have a motive for repression—his self-appointed role of martyrdom. But his followers have no recompense for the loss of self-respect in following a champion who will allow the very foundations of his doctrines to be shaken continually, and answer not a word.

To assume that the most profound argument against his foolish theories is persecution; to draw in his head like a turtle and feed his soul upon his own mistreatment—never was anything but a baby act, and why anybody ever fell for it, and called it piety, is the third of this series of inexplicable mysteries.

Sounding the Trumpet

Some prominent preachers make a big hue and cry of bravery. And it is remarkable how long a preacher can fail to preach the whole truth, without the hearers discovering the fact. It may not have happened when Nehemiah was building the walls, but it happens today, that a workman will run to some point in the wall where there is no attack, sound his trumpet and put on an exhibition of fighting that impresses the multitude. They can get to be very formidable in dealing with some false doctrine which is not represented in the audience, nor even in the community. They can take some phase of a controverted subject upon which there is no controversy and make a big noise, but they neglect to preach about those points on which the people are disturbed. They preach fervently on the establishment of the kingdom on Pentecost, to which the Boll group can utter a loud amen, but they avoid the issue of Christ being now on David's throne. They discourse eloquently upon the second coming of Christ, which pleases the Boll group, but neglect to discuss what he will do when he comes—where the whole issue hinges—the time is exhausted before they reach that point.

THE LEWIS COLLEGE ARTICLE

ATTENTIOS is called to the article by John T. Lewis on pages 48, 49, 50. Brother Lewis is entitled to a medium through which to discuss these matters, and President Ijams, or any of the brethren associated with him, is tendered the space to reply, if they wish it.

WHO IS A BOLLITE?

Who is a Bollite? Nobody, if we wait for anybody to admit it, not even E. L. Jorgenson and E. V. Wood. There are, indeed, varying shades and grades of sentiment on the mis-called, but so-called Boll issue. There are out and out followers of R. H. Boll, or his teaching-who are premillenialists. Then, there are sundry degrees of neutrality ranging from genuine indifference to armed and barbed neutrality. The openly avowed following of R. H. Boll is comparatively small. Premillennialism is a major issue—not because of the size of the Boll group, but for two reasons: (1) It is an issue throughout the whole religious world, almost every church in Christendom (? being troubled with it. In the Baptist church there are such leaders as J. Frank Norris and Ben M. Bogard, who advocate the theory. Norris alone has one hundred followers to where Boll has one. The Norris church in Fort Worth has (or did have) as many members as there are Boll followers everywhere. (2) The issue within the ranks represents more than the small number of open advocates of the ism itself—the main worry and cause of concern is the widespread spirit of compromise which is identified with the question.

A vowed premillenialists in the church are not the only ones, therefore, who may be classified as "Bollites." Sympathizers with the Boll group belong to that classification as much as do the advocates of the theory. There is a tremendous weakness of attitude on the part of a great many in the church toward false doctrine. This is partly due apparently to the desire to hold the premillennial group—Boll and his Louisville party-in fellowship. These are all indirectly Bollites—they are sentimentally Bollites.

All the neutrals in the church are Bollites—that class of members among us led by J. N. Armstrong, G. C. Brewer, Claud F. Witty, Flavil Hall, et al, who say that they do not believe the doctrine but whose sympathies seem to lie wholly on that side. They insist that they are not Bollites, yet they go out of their way to favor the Boll group and to criticise and abuse anyone who opposes that group. They render more valuable assistance to the Boll group than if they were openly members thereof. What their true religious complexion is and where they will finally fall is, indeed, a puzzle. It does look like we could take a man's word for it as to whether he is or is not this or that, but in the present picture it is altogether possible that others may be able to judge more accurately what a man is than he can judge for himself.

Man's triune nature is composed of intellect, emotions and will, which together determines what he believes, how he feels and what he does. Judged by these elements of nature, what is the status of the Boll admirers among us? Intellectually, they aver that they do not believe the doctrines. Is their faith one hundred percent? Believing these doctrines false, yet insist in that it makes no difference, they consider them as indifferent and nonessential. If they were not so anxious to maintain peace at any price they could see that these doctrines are not harmless. Any false doctrine does harm. It is not safe to believe any lie in religion-who will affirm that it is? How can any doctrine that quibbles over the establishment of the kingdom on Pentecost and its existence during all the intervening time, be harmless? It is a fundamental error. It is a materialistic doctrine. Its history discloses that there is not a more damaging and hopeless doctrine in its effects upon the minds of men. Then, is not the faith of these negative? Believing the doctrine false, they are yet not moved to do anything about it. No impatience is stirred in their hearts. They will fraternize with these theories and have all other Christians to do so. They will not only not oppose these doctrines which they admit to be false, but they will criticize anybody who does oppose them. Yea, they will criticize us for opposing them far more than they do the Boll group for promoting them. From the intellectual standpoint they cannot be classed as one hundred percent against these false doctrines. A fifty-fifty score is the best that can be accorded them even in belief.

Emotionally, they are surely with the Boll group. They never say a word for those who oppose these doctrines—that is, in connection with the opposition. They never help or encourage those who preach, write and debate against these "admittedly peculiar beliefs," more truly named false. Instead, they harp on piety, spirituality, sweet-spiritedness, of the theorizers, and charge that those
who oppose them are more to be blamed for the division than the promoters of the thing. In sentiment they classify themselves in words and even in their silence that they are one hundred percent pro-Boll.

Volitionally, the line has not been drawn, for there has been no general disfellowshipping. The “will” has not been fully exerted, or expressed. That is the question of this article. When it becomes necessary for this question to be settled in act as with the music and society questions in every place as in Louisville already—which way will these neutrals fall if and when the line is drawn?

The result of the poll is that we find these brethren about fifty-fifty on the score of intellect, one hundred percent pro-Boll in sentiment, with the will or volition unformed. Add to this the fact that men are often ruled more by sentiment than by faith; that the wish is often father to the thought and you may be able to predict the course of the neutrals in the church on these and other vital questions.

Caution should be exercised in judging the motives of others, but their actions and expressions are public property. Those who believe a doctrine is false yet show that their sympathies are all with those that teach the doctrine and against those who oppose it, need not be surprised that they are judged to be more for the doctrine than against it. Instead of becoming angry when they are thus judged, rather let them examine themselves and see if they can explain their own attitude, so inexplicable to others.

DEBATING THE CONSEQUENCES

The following telegram recently appeared in the Gospel Advocate from Los Angeles, California: “G. C. Brewer, affirming, meets Dr. J. C. Coleman, of Los Angeles, Feb. 28, 29, at Central Church of Christ. (Proposition) Resolved, that Communism or Sovietism, as it today reigns in Russia contemplates world revolution, and as a means to that end seeks to destroy the Christian religion.”

The readers have not forgotten that it was Brother Brewer who has so strenuously objected to our pushing the consequences of Premillennialism on those brethren who espouse and teach those theories. He says one may hold a theory without espousing its consequences and that the consequences, therefore, should not be charged to the one so teaching. But the foregoing proposition that Brother Brewer debates with Dr. Coleman is based solely on the consequences of Russian Communism and Sovietism. The negative of his proposition is not required to deny Christianity—he only denies Brother Brewer’s proposition that Communism destroys Christianity. His opponent could therefore believe the Christian Religion and still deny the proposition provided he does not believe that the proposition destroys it.

Now, some of us believe that Premillennialism does for Christianity just what Brother Brewer believes Communism does. Why, then, should we not debate it? Does Brother Brewer attach more importance to Communism, Sovietism, World Revolution, and questions that involve many political angles, than he does to issues that directly involve the kingdom and reign of Christ and the scheme of human redemption? It does seem so, for he will debate the former and will not debate the latter. Brother Brewer is not afraid to debate. ‘He has told that he not only believes in it but likes it—and knows how to do it. Why, then, will he not debate Premillennialism? Must echo answer-why?

I now propose to affirm in discussion with either Brother Boll or Brother Brewer the following proposition: Resolved, That Premillennialism As Taught By R. H. Boll And Others Contemplates World Revolution In Order To The Establishment Of A World Kingdom By Jesus Christ On The Earth And In Its Consequences Tends To Destroy The Christian Religion.

Here is a straightforward proposition. Brother Boll should not hesitate to deny it, for he surely believes Premillennialism as taught by himself. If Brother Brewer believes the affirmative side of it, then he should debate it as he did Communism. If he does not believe it, then he sustains the same relation to this proposition that his opponent did to the proposition he affirmed on Communism, and he should have that much courage. He cannot object to discussing it on the ground that it is charging the consequences for he debated the consequences of Communism. He cannot object to discussing it on the ground that it is debating with brethren for he has himself challenged the brethren for a debate on the Budget System. On what ground will either Brother Boll or Brother Brewer refuse to discuss this proposition?

WITH the clouds of war hovering over the nations of Europe and possibly threatening the whole world again, it is to be greatly deplored that some brethren will write articles that even point in the direction of Christ’s engaging in carnal warfare. It is distinctly noticeable that many such advice from Jesus and the apostles has been conspicuously absent from their articles. They arrive at their conclusions by deduction, patriotic furnishings, and other belligerent warlike ratiocinations rather than New Testament teaching. It has also been noticeable that those who would defend the Christian’s participation in war have either been to war themselves or have had relatives in the service. It seems like an effort at self-justification. I sympathize with any man, young or old, who has seen and experienced the horrors of war, but I do not sympathize with the effort to lend to it New Testament sanction. No matter what one might do under this or that exigency-no man can produce the Scripture that gives a Christian the right to go to war much less to make it a war time duty. I know that Paul said “Be subject to the powers that be” but Paul refused to be subject to them on certain questions. The question, therefore, is how far shall a Christian be subject to the powers that be? To prove the Christian’s duty of war participation the answer would have to be—in everything for if not in everything, one exemption grants others, and the premise is gone.

If war is incompatible with Christianity, then a Christian’s participation in it is impossible. It would comport far more with the gospel of Christ for our preachers to be exhorting Christians to follow Christ and the apostles even to prison and martyrdom than to be instilling within them the spirit of militarism, war and hell. No, I am not a patriot—I am a Christian. Were I a citizen of Germany, France, Italy, or England, still I would strive to be not a patriot, but a Christian. God help us in time of war to remain Christians, live or die.

ALMOST WHAT THE BIBLE SAYS

SOMETIME ago H. L. Olmstead attempted to defend, in the Word and Work, the song: “I Know That My Redeemer Liveth And On The Earth Again Shall Stand,” and he said that notwithstanding the objections to the song that it still reads that way in Job. 19:25. We called Brother Olmstead’s attention to the fact that it does not read that way in Job or anywhere else in the Bible. Job said: “For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that He shall stand at the latter day upon the earth.” And He did stand upon the earth in the latter day—the statement in Job March-April 1936 THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN 5
being made several centuries before the coming of the Messiah. We hoped Brother Olmstead would correct his misrepresentation of Job’s language, but he did not.

Now comes G. C. Brewer (to the disappointment of all who were hoping that he had quit helping the Premillennialists) to Brother Olmstead’s rescue and in the Gospel Advocate defending the same song, he avers that it is “almost what the Bible says.” For a Premillennialist, or a Digressive, or an outright sectarian to talk about what the Bible almost says would not be surprising, but when a man who is looked up to as a gospel preacher, trusted to defend truth against error, talks that way, things have surely come to a pretty pass. How can the Bible almost say anything that it does not say? If it can, then the Ninth Article of the Methodist Discipline is almost what the Bible says for it says faith only and James just said not by faith only. In precisely the same way the song Brother Brewer loves is almost what Jab said, for the song says “on the earth again shall stand” and Job did not say again shall stand! Yet Brother Brewer says that he “wines” when he hears people criticize something the Bible says. So do I; and I wince when I hear them sing something it does not say and talk about what it almost says. Agrippa was almost persuaded to be a Christian. I suppose we should wince if we should hear someone say that we was not a Christian. Another thing amusing to some, disappointing to others, but disgusting to me, is that Brother Brewer uses the same illustration of President Roosevelt passing through on the train without getting off at the station that J. Frank Norris used in Fort Worth. I do not know which one borrowed it from the other but the use made of it is equally full of sophistry.

Brother Brewer says that he is not a Premillennialist but that he does not aim to let them take away his Bible and his hymn-book. Thus he elevates his uninspired hymn-book to an equal place with the Bible. If he will get him a prayer book, his liturgy will be complete.

And as for the “poetic license” to sing songs with an unscriptural wording, I suppose if R. H. Boll will set his doctrine to music or poetry that it will then be all right-he can operate under the poet’s license.

I would have no one think that I seek opportunity to take personal piques at Brother Brewer. Such is not true. The joy of his best friends could not exceed my joy if he would quit apologizing for these errors and “speak things that befit sound doctrine” ; yea, “sound words that cannot be condemned”, but until he ceases his excursions, I aim to try to see to it that he does not belittle the issue nor discredit the fight that has been made. The battle has been too hard and costly to allow a few apologists to rob us of the victory for the truth.

ABOUT RELIGIOUS DEBATES

HUGO McCORD

A METHODIST preacher, having one-sidedly studied sprinkling, crowed lustily for a debate with immersionists. In a newly found strength he defied “any or all--with no holds barred.” After an encounter he wrote an article “about religious debates” in which he deplored such, saying they profited little and were evil in results. How his sprinkling fared in the debate, that couldn’t possibly have influenced this debate lover’s change? Before the debate, “He who won’t debate is a coward and knows his doctrine is weak ;” after the debate, “Expediency should determine the wisdom of a discussion; most are bad.”

Judge Ben Lindsey for awhile loved debates, thinking they would help his doctrine; since meeting Bro. Brewer that thing so valuable for a time has been put in the discard.

Dr. Norris prized debates so highly he was willing to meet Bro. Wallace at Fort Worth, and at Dallas, and anywhere. After one discussion the market quotations somehow crashed overnight; so much was lost in one market fall that he was cured of buying any more debate stock.

A fox terrier could make the chickens and cats scatter; “I want to fight; I’m brave; others are cowards.” After a two minute round with a bull clog : “I don’t believe in fighting.”

Many who are simple Christians to-day are such because of debates; yet some of them, preachers and others, now cannot think they are wise. So with denominational leaders, recognizing they were losing ground by debates, immediately decided discussions are wrong. Now that Bro. Boll knows he has lost ground by debates he decides that “promiscuous debating, especially among brethren, is productive of evil rather than good.”

And look at the punch pulling phrases in that compromising statement : (1) “promiscuous” debating--just who will decide what and whose debates are “promiscuous”? (2) “especially among brethren”--the Jerusalem council was among brethren; Paul could withstand Bro. Peter face to face ; and he that converteth a brother (premillennialist or otherwise sectarian) from the error of his way shall save a soul from death and hide a multitude of sins.

When a gospel preacher loses his love of contending earnestly for the faith, “especially among brethren,” something is wrong. But has Bro. Boll lost such love? Admittedly he has lost it where both s-ides are presented. But has he lost love of contending earnestly among brethren where only his side is presented? The Word and Work is full of earnest contentions, “especially among brethren,” for pre-millennialism. Rather promiscuous too.

As to the ability of debates to advance truth and to strangle error there can be no question. As to the ability of debates to maintain error and smother truth, there are many questions. All people in all times have recognized the wisdom of debates. The old Roman Senate, England’s Parliament, our Congress, the holy non-striving apostles all recognized the healthy value of oral debate. A movement that wants free speech for one party only is on feeble grounds. To padlock one party and to free the other isn’t quite fair and doesn’t bespeak confidence.

Of course all admit that when rancor, bitterness, and unchristian conduct enter a debate, harm is done. But that fact doesn’t condemn debates; it only hints him who indulges, and the audience sees it.

Not many people, says Bro. Boll, are able to see the truth and to condemn error after a debate. If that thought were true, how much more does it condemn a preacher, urging people to attend his tent meeting, and giving them one side of the matter, and then refusing a debate.

Bro. Boll says neither debater is able to weigh both sides of a subject, but is trying to oppose “every point and argument of the other side.” No, a Christian debater does not that. He weighs both sides many hours before the debate. Paul had weighed both sides before his Mars’ hill argument. And the Christian debater instead of opposing “every point” agrees with his opponent on as many points as possible; he wants not to disagree but to agree on as many points as possible. And he will emphasize that feature.
ANOTHER MUSIC ARGUMENT

EVERY few years the mechanical music folks spring what they consider a new and unanswerable argument. In a recent issue the editor of the Christian Standard presented the following:

A PARALLEL CASE

Taking up further the difficulty that some brethren have with the use of the instrument in worship, it is important to notice that what Jesus said to the woman of Samaria about places of worship is quite definitely a parallel to the words of Paul about singing upon which our friends so much depend. We refer, of course, to Eph. 5:19.

Jesus said to the woman, “The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.” Paul said, “Singing and making melody in your hearts.” If it is true that making melody in the heart excludes making melody on an instrument, why is it not equally true that “worship in spirit and in truth” excludes worship in a particular building?

In one case the emphasis is upon the spiritual action and any accompanying physical action goes unmentioned; in the other case the same situation obtains.

As a matter of fact the evidence in the conversation with the woman of Samaria is stronger than that in Paul’s letter to Ephesus, for Jesus specifically refers to the houses of worship at Jerusalem and Gerizim—and with disapprobation.

We are not, of course, opposing either church houses or instruments. We are simply trying to show how one Scripture passage is to be interpreted in the light of the other. Why should brethren be counted renegades if they read Paul as they read Jesus?

For two arguments to be parallel, they must be similar in all essential points. We are still searching for the first point of similarity in the above. “In one case,” he says, “the emphasis is upon the spiritual action and any accompanying physical action goes unmentioned.” I suppose he means the mechanical instruments are involved in the command to “make melody in the heart,” but just not mentioned! And with what physical action does a church house “ accompany” worship in spirit and in truth?

Jesus shows that the place of worship is not an element of the worship. Paul tells what to do in one element of worship, and mechanical instruments are not another way of doing the thing Paul commands—for the thing Paul commands is “making melody in the heart.”

Mechanical instruments do not have to be ruled out. There is only one way they could get in by showing that they are indispensable to doing the thing Paul said do. If this could be shown, the parallel would not be needed.

One cannot worship without worshipping at some place. It is the place where the command is obeyed, but the place selected has no importance, is not an act of worship, and does not accompany the worship. Where is the parallel? Jesus named two elements of acceptable worship: I. The right manner—“in spirit;” 2. The right act—“in truth.”

The editor of the Standard brings in an unscriptural element and attempts to make it parallel with the place where the worship is to be rendered—he is doing the very thing the Lord told the Samaritan woman not to do i.e., making the place of worship parallel with the elements of worship!

Baptism necessitates water. There is no importance to the place. It may be done in a running stream or in a baptism. The Methodist might with better logic claim that sprinkling is parallel with the baptism, for they do both have some water in them. One is an incidental in doing what is commanded. The other is doing something not commanded. There is even less connection between instrumental music in the worship and the house in which the worship is rendered. To what common denominator can these dissimilar thing-s be reduced? The Standard editor’s train of thought has been wrecked because the rails have spread-his track is not parallel!

When is a thing an addition to the worship? The answer is: When another element is added. The New Testament prescribes the loaf and the fruit of the vine as the elements of the Lord’s Supper. The table on which they are set is not an element, and constitutes no addition, but to put meat and milk on the table along with the loaf and wine would introduce other elements, and would constitute an addition. The one cup is one element—the fruit of the vine. Three elements—such as orange juice, lemonade, and grape—would be three cups (elements). Incidentally, I have never known a church to have more than one cup—one element. Plates and vessels containing the elements do not involve an addition—but meat and milk would. So with the singing; a songbook is not an addition for it is not an element of music—the one who uses it only obeys the command to sing, nothing more. But what about the instrument? It is another kind of music—another element, the doing of a thing not commanded, not an aid, but an addition.

Effort to parallel, seats, lights, and meeting houses with elements of worship is the sheerest sort of sophistry. True, James said if one should come into the assembly he should be told to sit thou here (and that is evidently chapter and verse for a seat); and true, too, in the upper story of the house in which the disciples met to break bread and where Paul preached in Troas, there were many lights (which is chapter and verse for both houses and lights), it is yet true that these things are not parallel for in them no element of praise or act of worship consists. Things that are incoordinate cannot be paralleled with things that are coordinate. Instrumental music and singing are coordinate, being kinds of music, the former being the kind not prescribed, and the latter being the kind which the Lord commanded. The song book is not coordinate with sing and does not sustain the same relation to it that instrumental music does. This is where the illustrations about walking canes, eye glasses, seats, lights, and other things incoordinate with the thing commanded, fail to illustrate. They are not parallel. What the editor of the Christian Standard needs to do is to study the simple coordination of words. And since he has virtually conceded that there is no New Testament authority for instrumental music in the worship, he should do with it, what the Standard has been about to do with the U. C. M. S.-junk it!!
My Dear Brother McCaleb:  

October 30, 1935

In the last number of the Firm Foundation I note your article devoted to Don Carlos Janes, as a former one was more especially devoted to the case of R. H. Boll. In this article you say that Brother Janes does not any longer represent the faith of the brotherhood, except of a small factional part of it. Now, Brother McCaleb, will you kindly tell me what that brotherhood faith is? Where is it stated according to appearance, but judge righteous judgment.” (John 7:24.)

If not, what special differences are those that so alter the faith? I can tell you in a few words what my faith is. I believe in God’s word as the standard of truth and doctrine, all of it, nothing but it. I believe in Jesus Christ as Lord and Son of God, who is now seated on God’s right hand, having all authority in heaven and on earth. I believe in the gospel, the power of God unto salvation, and in the necessity of obedience to it, just as you do. And as to all matters of Christian work and practice as you do. I have not separated myself from my brethren. I have never demanded of any that they must believe as I do in any matter not directly affecting the great fundamentals above mentioned, in order to fellowship and recognition. I have not subscribed to any human theory, nor adopted the name ‘Premillenarian,’ nor have I in any wise drawn a line on my brethren for any of the differences current among them. I want to stand so that any who separate themselves from me must necessarily renounce the ground of true unity and nonsectarian, undenominational Christianitv. And while I have never asked Brother Janes where he stands on any matter, I feel assured that he stands as I do as to these things. In what, then, does the faith of the brotherhood differ from this as to it a different faith? Your accusation that those who believe like Brother Janes on prophecy are factional is wholly unjust. If I teach what I believe to be the Bible teaching on any subject (say prophecy) and some brethren who happen to be in power object to it and demand that I give up or else be ostracized—does that make me factional? Such is the situation as I understand it.

I am truly sorry and surprised to see you join in with that sort of movement. The principle of this is far more weighty than even the doctrinal points involved. If for every difference we must cut fellowship, I see nothing ahead except disappointment, and certainly to the displeasure of Sister Boll. According to Gal. 2, Paul was careful to keep in harmony with Peter and others, and made a trip all the way to Jerusalem to see if all were preaching the same things. If you will give it an honest look, square in the face, Brother Boll, your attitude is this:

“Teaching What I Please”

If I believe it is in God’s word, I may teach whatever I please; others have no right to object; if they do, it is wicked, and they have joined a “movement.”

So far as they go, I am sure your fundamentals, which you have expressed, would be accepted by the entire brotherhood, and I mean by “brotherhood” particularly the 6,226 churches to which Brother Janes makes his appeal; but they are too brief. There is much more that comes within the fundamentals. The Servant exerts the instance of “the resurrection of the dead,” which ought to be included. Instead of one, your teaching requires three resurrections—one at the coming of Christ and one at the end of the thousand years for the wicked only. But if there are two, there must be a third. Many saints will have lived and died during the thousand years. The first resurrection is passed already, so they cannot be in it; they cannot be raised at the end of the thousand years, for that is for the wicked only; so they must have one of their own, which makes three resurrections.

Not only in regard to the essentials, but also the whole scope of the Scriptures, I think we are under limitation; while you claim unlimited freedom, and that we must not object or we become a “sect” and “creed bound.” If outside of these essentials, some of which you have named, you place no restrictions on your own and yet expect others to hold to you in good fellowship. Fairness requires that you grant the same freedom to all others. In regard to the South American brethren, this was the position you actually took, saying that you could not disfellowship them. Thus you have opened the door for the whole round of denominational errors to come trooping in; and you are helpless, for the moment you attempt a restriction you become sectarian and guilty of being “creed bound.”

Incidentals vs. Essentials

The Christian-Evangelist has for a motto: “In essentials, unity; in opinions, liberty; in all things, charity.” A good motto, if properly guarded; but the danger point is in
the statement: “In opinions, liberty.” There is no restriction on these opinions. Opinions are allowed only in so long as they do not interfere with the essentials. But these opinions gradually took precedence over the essentials and undermined the faith of the Evangelist constituency. This I perceive to be your danger. Already your views on the prophecies are giving color to the essentials, as was pointed out in the article to which you refer.

As to Brother Janes, you ask: “When, please, did he change his faith?” I think it was gradual. One outstanding step showing a radical change was when he and Brother Jorgenson excluded certain brethren from the Highlands Church. John told me of this action; but there soon after it occurred, and Brother Jorgenson told me the story in detail, and the Scripture he used to justify it was Rom. 16: 17, 18. I listened sympathetically, but said little. There was a very close relation between him and me and also our families, and I disliked to express disapproval; and, too, the situation was not so clear to me then as now. Besides, I had gone back to the homeland with my mind made up to stay out of the controversy, so I tried to dismiss it. I could not believe, however, that Rom. 16: 17, 18 applied to those brethren, and that they were serving their own belly instead of Christ. I think both sides were conscientious in what they did; but as I now look back at it impassionedly and I trust impartially, there was no excuse for thrusting in the object of a debate into the Highlands Church, especially since there would have been to contend for the use of the instrument in the worship. They were excluded because they would not submit to a new teaching not necessary to be accepted and because they stood for the same faith all once held in common. If any must go, those holding the new teaching were the ones to go. They should have said brethren, Christians can be Christians, and rather than cause trouble in the church, whatsoever they believe. We are not to be a sect, but to keep saved.

If you really are indifferent whether others accept your teaching, then let me ask: Who is it, really, who is making this new teaching a test of fellowship? Of course, you object to a creed, or statement of belief, for you have stated one of your own. But the meaning of essentials, or fundamentals, is that they are of first importance and second matters. All else must be measured up and held in check by them. In New Zealand, I am told, certain brethren have caused discord among the churches by featuring their opinions about the state of the dead. I am sure you will agree with me that trouble ought not to be raised over so impractical a question as this. While every one is free to have his own private opinions about such matters, they should not interfere with the harmony of the churches on matters of faith. The doctrine about a millennium is much of the same nature. At most it can be only a brief resthouse on the way to the eternal, “happy summerland of bliss.” To be joyfully and hopefully ready for whatever is in store for us is the chief thing, while we keep busy telling sinners what to do to be saved and Christians what to do to keep saved.

**Parallel Argument**

*If, by objecting to your teaching, we become a “sect” and “creed bound,” you are both “creed bound” and in a sect already. Wait a minute, please, before saying this is “wholly unjust,” and I will show you how it is. It is so plain that I am sure you will see it so soon as it is pointed out. When the organ began to be introduced into some of the churches, there was much objection. These objectors were accused of causing division and of forming a “sect.” They were also accused of being “creed bound.” They asked for escape from being in a “sect” and of being “creed bound” is to fall in with the organ and society people, taking in also the unbaptized into church membership; for when you begin to object, you at once get back into a “sect” and are “creed bound.”*

During student days “Daddy” Graham, the president, decided to read Revelation in the morning chapel services. After the seven letters to the churches, his comments were few. The only one I distinctly remember was once, looking up over his glasses, he said: “This is all very wonderful.” If we venture out much beyond this, we get into deep water and must “take up arms against a sea of trouble.”

If I have said anything, Brother Boll, that ought not to have been said, or the right thing in the wrong spirit, please attribute it solely to inability and not from design.
“THE BOLL-McCALEB LETTERS”

Jessie P. Sewell Comments in the Gospel Advocate on the Boll Movement from the Viewpoint of J. M. McCaleb. He sees that “The Responsibility for the Agitation, Confusion, Bitterness, and Division, lies at their Door” and Brands their Prophetic Teaching a Dangerous Theory.

I have read as carefully as I am able the letter of R. H. Boll to Brother McCaleb and Brother McCaleb’s reply as published in the Gospel Advocate of March 5, 1936. In my judgment, Brother McCaleb has gone to the very heart of this entire situation. He has done so in a very clean and scriptural manner. His presentation is in the spirit of power and love. Let us hope that Brother Boll will give it fair, patient, careful and prayerful consideration. If he will do this, surely he will be enabled to see that, with everything said in favor of his peculiar views which he, with his unusual mind, has been able to say, and even granting that his every contention might prove true when the Lord comes, still he cannot be justified in pushing these views as he has done and is now doing. Such views, since the days of the apostles, have constantly caused confusion, disension, and division. They have ever directed attention from the fundamentals of the gospel and essential Christian living and service. They do so now.

“Division Lies At Their Door”

Neither Brother Boll’s interpretation of the Scriptures, nor mine, as to what Christ will do when he comes, will affect the outcome in the least. The eternal purpose of God will be carried out just as it was when Christ came first. The Jews had fixed for themselves an interpretation of the prophecies concerning what the Messiah should do when he came. When he came, he fulfilled the prophecies, but he failed to fulfill their interpretation of those prophecies. They rejected him. He did not turn aside, defeated, because they rejected him. He went right on, worked out the purposes of his Father, and provided salvation for all men for all time. When he comes again, he will carry out the desires of his Father, and all of the prophecies of God’s word as to that great event will be fulfilled, whether Brother Boll’s interpretations are correct or mine, or whether both are incorrect. What we understand and believe about it will have no effect on what will be done, and can in no way contribute to our preparation for it. Then why teach and teach, preach and preach, write and write about it? Why not believe the words of the Bible with our whole hearts and trust our good Father to work it out in the very best way and be prepared to accept it as he fulfills it at the time? Surely Brother Boll and his followers can see, after reading Brother McCaleb’s good letter, that the responsibility for the agitation, confusion, bitterness and division lies at their door. No one of us objects to them having their present, or any other, interpretation of these prophecies as their own private opinions, and I will never teach, preach, or write them again. Why not prosecute his talents wholly to leading people to Christ and helping them to prepare for the joys of Christ’s second coming?

“Identical With Those Held By Jews”

Just one other thing. The Jews rejected Christ because he would not be an earthly king and establish an earthly kingdom, in fulfillment of their interpretation of the prophecies, and not because he did not fulfill the prophecies. And I am afraid that if Brother Boll continues to develop interest in, and zeal for, his interpretations, which are in spirit and principle very nearly identical with those held by the Jews when Jesus came to earth, and Jesus should not, at his second coming, fulfill his interpretations, but on the other hand ‘should call his saints to dwell with him in a “city whose builder and maker is God,” he and many of his devout followers would insist on going on to Jerusalem and waiting for Christ to come again to establish an earthly kingdom. It should call his saints to dwell with him in a “city whose earth for nearly two thousand years have missed all of the wondrous blessings which are in Christ because of it, and for the same reason will be unprepared for his second coming. Why not let it die?—Jesse P. Sewell, In The Gospel Advocate.
MARKING THE MARKERS

In the fifth item of his analysis of the basis of fellowship, in the March number of Word and Work, R. H. Boll refers to Rom. 16: 17, "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." He says that this surely includes those who persist in "drawing the line." He means that those who draw the line are guilty of causing divisions.

Thus Brother Boll reverses the figures of Paul, for "marking" and "drawing the line" are parallel. Paul did not teach that those who draw the line are disturbers of the churches; Brother Boll teaches that. Rather, Paul teaches that the line should be drawn on those who cause the divisions by their teaching of false doctrine.

"Drawing the line" is perhaps a misleading phrase. If Brother Boll has in mind the picture of somebody drawing a line on a sheet of paper, or on a blackboard, it is not a proper expression. Those who mark false teachers are not drawing a new line, as on a board. It is more like tracing a line. The false teacher makes the mark of division. Those whom Paul exhorted were merely to recognize the line made by the causers of division.

If those who disclaim belief of, and oppose, the teachings of R. H. Boll are causing division, then he should mark us and avoid us! Why does he not carry out the command of Paul against us, instead of spending his time expressing fears that somebody is going to disfellowship him? Let him forget his fears and opinions. He either believes that we are guilty of causing division or he does not. If he does, he should disfellowship us; if he does not he should stop whining.

A Gradual Process

Nobody has any choice in bringing about disfellowship, except those who teach divisive doctrines. You do not make a line or draw one by avoiding them-you merely recognize the line already made, and regulate your conduct accordingly. Formal withdrawal recognizes the break in fellowship that already exists.

The process is gradual, in so far as real fellowship is concerned. Formally, there has been no disfellowshipping. Actually, it has been going on silently for a long time, consciously or unconsciously, in the minds of individuals, and no power can prevent it. When a man makes up his mind that he will not give of his means to promote the teaching of speculative theories, he has dealt a personal blow at real fellowship, although he may not realize it. When another makes up his mind that he will insist upon having a preacher who believes those speculative theories, he has done the same thing. Nobody can regulate what goes on in the minds of individuals.

The followers of R. H. Boll have done more disfellowshiping than anybody else, for the simple reason that they have had more reason to do so. For many years it made little or no difference to most people about these theories-except the ones who were seeking to promote them.

Brother Roll was ambitious to promote his teachings. He knew who was friendly to his teachings, while others did not. He looked to getting men friendly to his beliefs in the mission fields, into the schools, into churches where there was already a following. To be consistent with his recent utterances he should disfellowship those who are opposing his doctrines-thus, according to his views, causing division-the only reason he does not, is that he wants to do some more undercover work.

One-Way Peace

He cries for peace, but it is a one-way peace that he desires. He wants peace to work while those who oppose his doctrines rest. The darkey caught up before the judge for stealing chickens is always ready for peace. He is willing to drop the matter. But Brother Boll wants to drop the matter without bringing back the chickens! He will not even agree to stop stealing chickens-that is, making prose-lytes to his foolish theories.

When he stops teaching his theories, the opposition will automatically stop, and there will be peace. We tried peace for nearly twenty years. We know from experience that it will not work. Brother Boll kept on working and making converts to his doctrines. He made a poor showing, but that is chargeable to the doctrine. He had plenty of time and opportunity. The fight must go on.

Undercover Men

The nature of the Boll doctrines can be seen from the method of promotion. They are not frank. They will not answer legitimate arguments. They will not fight-except in their own way, under cover! The outstanding sin of Bollism is that it has made cowards out of hundreds of preachers! Why did Brother Witty claim that he was not a Premillennialist when he was at Dallas last year?

Will he claim, or will Boll claim, that Witty was mistreated and driven to take an extreme position? Then, what do you think of a man who is so easily tossed about by every wind of opposition? Why are they so weak that they cannot "take" opposition?

If R. H. Boll thought opposition made full-fledged Bollites out of mere sympathizers, he would welcome opposition. It reminds one of the argument that the "wets have always relied upon, that prohibition increases drinking.

Shrewd But Cowardly

Why do so many Boll sympathizers say, "I don't believe the doctrine, but I think Brother Boll has been mistreated." That has for years been the trademark of the Boll sympathizers. In many instances it just means that they are walking in the footsteps of their leader-they prefer to work under cover. There is a certain shrewdness about it. R. H. Boll owes all his success to his undercover methods and to his self-assumed martyrdom. In fact, the doctrine is so complex and unwieldy, and to the uninitiated, undesirable, that it can probably be promoted in no other way.

But what about the self-respect of a man who espouses a doctrine that has to be promoted by indirection and deception? Few understand the doctrine in its entirety. It has been promoted by sentiment. But how can anybody get their consent to be on the other side of a proposition to their convictions? It must be unpleasant to be lined up with a cult for which one feels so apologetic that he denies being identified with it. What hope is there for a movement that has to be promoted in the dark? It must have a demoralizing effect upon the followers before they become fully accredited members. One should be suspicious of any theory that cannot defend itself in the open-particularly a theory in religion!
E V E R Y day in every way the Word and Work and its sympathizers are becoming sweeter and sweeter and sweeter-on things and men that the New Testament anathematizes. They purr sympathetically where Paul would rebuke sharply. They apparently feel bitterness only toward those of us who oppose their fanatical theories. Doctor Wood and his boys, Chas. M. Neal, Frank Mullins and Earl Smith are sweet on Norris and Rice, noisy Fundamentalist Baptists. Horace Wood reports that “it other J. F. Smith is here for this week. He is doing some excellent teaching. We are being revived by these soulful messages.” This report is from Dallas and Brother Smith is pastor of 3 digressive churches. Brother Boller departed from the faith for fellowship in a fanatical Holiness sect. Stanford Chambers is sweet on him and “in a most kindly spirit” it is “exercised by a large measure of sympathy for him because of the unwarranted and unbrotherly attacks made upon him.” The “unbrotherly attacks” on Brother Boller were made by loyal men who reproved him for his departure from the faith. H. L. Olmstead thinks that those of us who believe that Christ is now seated on David’s throne as the New Testament clearly teaches” who believe that there will be one general resurrection of the dead and cannot accept the premillennial program of Word and Work; that we are a “new cult” comparable to that of “Aimee Semple McPherson and others.” Brother Boller comes out with a long article on religious debates and concludes that “there is no poorer method of seeking to arrive at truth than a debate, especially oral debate”. He even mentions the great debates of the giants, Campbell-Rice, Campbell-Purcell, Wilkes-Ditzler and Harding Moody and suggests that they could only result in confusion for the listeners. “They never settle anything” says Brother Boller. Baptists and Methodists were in favor of debates until experience taught them that “the cause of truth” suffered in debate. Brother Boller now agrees with them. Their cause has suffered in debate and Brother Boller’s cause has suffered in debate. They are merely mistaken in identifying their cause with the cause of truth. Eye witnesses affirm that Brother Boller and his party suffered greatly at the Winchester debate and Brother Neal lets out a groan periodically which indicates that his suffering is not yet over. Norris is still hurting but the cause of truth seems to be faring pretty well. It is a highly suspicious circumstance when a man decides that the cause of truth suffers in debate after his party has been thoroughly whipped in public discussion. Does he quit debating? No, of course not. He just carries on his side of it without an opponent. One objection that Brother Boller urges against debates is that “it is a battle.” Well, of all things! Warfare was one of Paul’s favorite figures in setting forth the attitude and activities of Christians. “Contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints.” “Fight the good fight of faith.” The Word and Work condemns Jesus, Paul, Stephen, Campbell, Wilkes and Harding. It has up to date been mighty nice to Norris, Boyer, Smith and Gruver. We suppose it has “a large measure of sympathy for” them. Such pussyfooting around when vital issues are at stake isn’t more than three inches short of disgusting. Speaking of “marking,” these brethren are marking themselves very clearly in about every issue of Word and Work that comes from the press. The hands may be the hands of Esau but the voice sounds very much like Jacob’s.

Baptist And Reflector Perverts Peter’s Parable

The following question appears in the Baptist and Reflector:

“Did you know that moral reformation as a substitute for regeneration is no better than washing a sow? (2 Pet. 2:22)” You missed the point altogether. It is a wicked thing to pervert the scriptures. Peter did make use of the figure of a dog turning to his own vomit, and the sow that had washed to “wallowing in the mire,” but he did not use it as a comparison between “moral reformation” and “regeneration.” Some had “escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ” and had “again” become “entangled therein and overcome.” Concerning them the apostle declares that “the last state is become worse with them than the first. For it were better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after knowing it, to turn back from the holy commandment delivered unto them”. Then he added: “It has happened unto them according to the true proverb, The dog turning to his own vomit again, and the sow that had washed to wallowing in the mire.” It is obvious that the washed sow is not merely a morally reformed man but one who has escaped corruption through the knowledge of the Lord, a saved man. The descent again into the wallow is falling from grace. If the retort is made that the washed sow is still a sow, it is the fallacy of pressing a figure further than the writer intended, and perverts his purpose and use of it. A man who has been born again is still a man, a sinner saved by grace. Ordinary understanding of the use of figurative language would save some teachers from ludicrous and absurd blunders.

“Moral reformation” certainly can not be substituted for “regeneration.” There is not enough decency and morality in the whole world to save even one man, without Christ. Jesus himself earnestly insisted that a man must be born of water and the Spirit to enter into the kingdom of God. The Baptist and Reflector is committed to the error that a man so born can never so far apostatize as to be lost. Simon Peter is committed to the truth that the washed sow can again return to the

ASSOCIATE EDITORIALS

WHAT I SEE IN THE PAPERS

The Religious Press Seethes with Denominational Errors and Theological Heresies and Outright Misrepresentations of Bible Teaching. The Editors of these Papers Seem to Specialize in the Art of Dodging the Truth.”

CLED E. WALLACE
mire, or the “escaped” man can become “entangled” again.

The tragic power of a theory to blind even brilliant men to the plain truth is appalling. Peter is clear on the point and yet some seem unable to see it. We call on Paul and James to flood the point with additional light. “So then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh: for if ye live after the flesh, ye must die: but if by the Spirit ye put to death the deeds of the body, ye shall live.” (Romans 8:12, 13) If a brother, a man saved by grace, lives after the flesh, He must die. This is not physical death. Maybe the Baptist and Reflector can tell us what kind it is. When he does maybe he can then understand Simon Peter better.

James says: “My brethren, if any among you err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, that he who converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins.” (James 5:19, 20) Here is a brother wandering from the truth and becoming a “sinner” that needs saving from death. Tell us, if this sinner is not saved from death, will he die? He will die physically whether or not he is saved from “death.” Paul, James and Simon Peter all teach that a Christian must sow to the Spirit, to live after the flesh: for if ye live after the flesh, ye must die; but if by the spirit ye put to death the deeds of Christ.” On page 70 of this book life.

That is quite good for a Methodist Bishop. He was evidently a more “intelligent reader of the Scriptures” than the present editor of the Baptist Standard is. The Standard puts it this way:

“Pentecost was not the birthday of the church as is proved by a number of passages in the gospels. There has been more fanaticism and more unsupported wild teaching connected with Pentecost than with any other day or occasion in all the Bible history.”

In this the Standard editor runs right smack into the Methodist Bishop and some of the ripest scholars in his own church. If anybody were out with the authority to quarantine against “fanaticism and more unsupported wild teaching connected with Pentecost” how would they hang a sign on the editor of the Standard sure! Since he has mentioned “a number of passages” we would be glad for him to cite one before, on or after Pentecost that even mentions the Baptist Church.

Bishop Merrill also learned that when Christ comes he is going to raise the dead and judge the world and that there is no place in the divine plan for a thousand years’ personal reign on earth. Some of our own wild, fanatical brethren could learn more from him than they can from Frank Norris, if they would cool off and listen to him.

Baptist Counterfeiting

The editor of the Baptist and Reflector does a lot of wild shooting but occasionally he gets a shot in the bull’s eye.

“Christians need a defense against the many religious counterfeits of the day. Only by being thoroughly grounded in the Word of God can people adequately distinguish between things that differ and become definitely a lie on the side of truth against error.”

Dr. John possibly used “Christians” absent-mincedly or maybe it was a typographical error. His habit is to talk a lot more about Baptists than he does Christians. Baptists and Christians are not the same with him at all. Baptists are a lot better than just ordinary Christians. Some “people” who are “thoroughly grounded in the Word of God” have noticed that it says nothing about “Baptists” and makes no mention of the Baptist church.

It is a first class “defense against the many religious counterfeits of the day” such as party names, human creeds and denominational churches like the Baptist church. They are all a lot younger than the New Testament. If Dr. John deems it expedient to make “a defense” of the Baptist church it will be interesting to watch him mishandle “the Word of God.”

A Symptom Of Heart Trouble

A WRITER in the Christian Standard asserts that Col. 3:16 and Eph. 5:19 “in no wise forbid the use of instrumental music.” He might as well say that “they in no wise forbid” interpretative dancing. When these innovationists start somewhere in religion they are not satisfied to follow the inspired signboards. They want to take every bypath the signboard does not say not to take. It is a crazy way to travel. Paul said he prayed with the spirit and with the understanding. When a man prays is he authorized to burn incense also because the scriptures authorizing prayer “in no wise forbid the use” of incense? If this is the best proof the advocates of instrumental music have for their practice they ought to be ashamed of themselves. They “have need again that some one teach” them “the rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God.”

This same writer thinks that “most of the trouble over this and such-like questions is due to heart trouble.” (Italics his.) We agree. There is a stubborn disposition in the hearts of many to offer to God any sacrifice in worship they want to whether God has authorized it or not. This stubbornness is a serious ailment and hard to cure.

A WRITER in the Baptist Standard says that “The music program of heaven as found in Revelation includes both vocal and instrumental music.” Yes, and the prayer program of heaven includes the burning of incense! Now find either instrumental music or the burning of incense in the worship program of the New Testament church.

The Baptist World Alliance

D R. GEO. W. TRUETT, President of the Baptist World Alliance, covers the first page of the Baptist Standard and flows over a column on the inside with Christmas and New Year Greetings to “my fellow Baptists throughout all the world.” He uses such expressions as “our Baptist family,” “our world Baptist Brotherhood,” “our Baptist people” etc., about a dozen times in this greeting. The New Testament is a rather large book and is a
complete guide for Christians. Paul and other writers of that inspired book did not use such expressions as Dr. Truett uses, even one time. Dr. Truett seems to realize this for he says that we would each most humbly and earnestly voice the salvation that Paul voiced to his fellow Christians in Rome. That is right. Paul was just a Christian and saluted his “fellow Christians.” Wonder why he didn’t at least say something about “our Baptist family”? By the way, who was President of the Baptist World Alliance when Paul wrote the book of Romans? Maybe Dr. Truett or the Baptist Standard can tell us.

Church Membership

The editor of the Baptist Standard says, “Baptists believe that churches of the New Testament were organized solely to secure the effectual cooperation of followers of Jesus Christ in advancing his teachings and spiritual blessings among men. We believe that every one who joins a church should be saved before applying for membership. We believe that salvation is an indispensable prerequisite to proper church membership and that without it church membership is a sham and a mockery.”

The Baptist Standard has things pretty badly mixed up. Paul says that Jesus established the church that he might reconcile both Jews and Gentiles “in one body.” This body is the church (Eph. 2:15, 16; Col. 1:18). They are reconciled “in one body” then how can they be saved outside of it? If a man is saved, he doesn’t have to join the church. He is already in it because he is saved. When God saves a man he adds him to the church, making it unnecessary for him to “apply for membership.” “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” (Mark 16:16) “For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body.” (1 Cor. 12:13) A man becomes a member of the “one body” at the same time and in the same way he is saved. A man who knows as much about a lot of things as the editor of the Baptist Standard does, ought to at least know this much about what the New Testament teaches.

What Baptists Believe

The editor of the Baptist Standard tells us what “Baptists believe.” “Baptists believe that every person on earth who has repented of sins committed and trusted Jesus Christ for pardon is a child of God, saved, a Christian and member of God’s family who will all at length be gathered in heaven.” Baptists believe that many of the children of God are not in the family of God at all. Or else the family of God is something else besides the church. The church is “the house of God” “the household of God” etc., but people can be Christians outside of it. We have here a “person” who “is a child of God, saved, a Christian and member of God’s family” who has never been baptized, does not belong to the church and “will at length be gathered in heaven” with the redeemed whether he ever obeys God or not. He may live a life of sin and shame but he will go to heaven anyway according to Baptist doctrine.

Peter was not a Baptist for he taught Christians that they must “give the more diligence to make your calling and election sure” by adding the Christian graces. Paul warned Christians that “if ye live after the flesh ye must die.” He also says that Christ is the Author of “eternal salvation” unto all them that obey him. Baptists teach that it is unnecessary to obey him in order to enjoy eternal salvation. The difference is glaring. The Baptist Standard calls on “Baptists to emphasize this doctrine and let the world know that it is a vital part of our faith.” Very well, but while they are doing it let Christians “emphasize” the fact that it is no part of “faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints” that a Christian can betray Christ and live after the flesh and at the same time maintain his prospects of heaven undimmed. “If ye live after the flesh ye must die.”

The Christian’s Part

Simon Peter, apostle of Jesus Christ, preached the first gospel sermon under the great commission, on Pentecost. He convinced a multitude of unbelievers that Jesus was both Lord and Christ, according to covenant promise that God made to David that he would raise up one and set him on his throne. Under painful conviction, the murderers of Jesus asked a famous and vital question: “Brethren, what shall we do?” It was in answer to this question that Peter told them all to repent and be baptized that they might receive the remission of their sins (Acts 2).

Years later Simon Peter wrote some letters to these Christians to help them in their struggles against the world, the flesh and the devil. He outlined to them the obligations they must meet in order to reach heaven. He reminded them of their precious faith; that God had granted to them all things that pertain to life and godliness and had given them exceeding great and precious promises; and that they had escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. Although in possession of these immeasurable blessings from God, he assured them that their “calling and election” was not sure unless they made it so. After reminding them of what God had done, he proceeds to add: “Yea, and for this very cause adding on your part all diligence.” There is a part that the Christian must perform to make his calling and election sure. It is his part and must be attended to. The simple lesson in divine addition that Simon Peter gives Christians contains faith, virtue, knowledge, self-control, patience, godliness, brotherly kindness and love. Concerning them Peter says that those who have them and abound are not “idle nor unfruitful” but all who lack them are “blind.” Christians make their calling and election sure by doing these things and “thus” enter heaven.

The Christian who lacks these things is sure to stumble and not be able to enter in. Take a look at the man who lacks these excellent things nientionetl by the apostle. Read the list in 2 Peter first chapter and know that the man who lacks them is an unbeliever, a coward, ignorant, unsteadfast, ungodly, cruel, unreliable and hateful. Does God in what is called “regeneration” miraculously plant these virtues into the heart of the converted man? Then why did Peter say “adding on your part?” If a Christian can lack them, can he go to heaven without them? If he cannot lack them, then why the warning and exhortation of the apostle? It is a plain matter of Bible teaching that a Christian must give diligence to make his calling and election sure. That is his part that cannot be left to God.

Defending Denominationalism

Some striking sentences appear in an article by Curtis Lee Laws in the Watchman-Examiner. The subject of the article is “Does Baptist Loyalty Mean Narrowness?” Such articles afford a good opportunity to emphasize some vital truth.

A great deal of the popular laudation of undenominationalism has its origin in indifference to Christian truth instead of a deeper devotion to the cause of unity. This is true of a lot of modernistic propaganda looking to the union of various parties in one vast ecclesiasticism with a vague platform of generalities. The creed of such an affair would ignore much “Christian truth” or present it in an emasculated form. It would suggest the New Testament mainly by contrast. There would be little suggestion of identity. No man,
however, has ever possessed “a deeper devotion to the cause of unity” than the apostle Paul. He accepted and preached all “Christian truth” without belonging to a denomination, and there is not even one peculiar denominational principle in all his fourteen epistles. The Watch-Examiner and others might ponder this fact before going too deeply into the defense of denominationalism.

Dr. Laws deplores the fact that “We do not often hear a sermon on Baptist principles.” That is cause for more gratitude than regret. Paul never preached a sermon on “Baptist principles” in his life. He was a Christian without being a Baptist and there is no reason why others cannot and should not be. It is freely admitted by all parties that it is not necessary to be a Baptist to be a Christian. These extra degrees are clearly unscriptural and hinder the “cause of unity” that all Christians should be devoted to. Suppose we all just follow Paul as he followed Christ. Such examples will not lead a man into the Baptist church or any other denomination.

It is difficult to see how a minister can justify his position in a denominational pulpit if he does not teach the distinctive views of that denomination.

He simply cannot do it. And even “if he does ... teach the distinctive views of that denomination” he cannot “justify his position in a denominational pulpit” by anything the New Testament says. The ministers of the New Testament did not occupy positions in denominational pulpits. It was against their principles, “The distinctive views of that denomination” and all others are clearly contrary to all the New Testament says in “the cause of unity.” According to Paul “There is one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism and one God.” Men who have divided the body of Christ by teaching the distinctive views of their denominations, all of which are foreign to the New Testament, are the chief enemies of “the cause of unity.”

If the existence of the Baptist denomination can be justified, the advocacy of its views is imperative.

The New Testament says nothing about “the Baptist denomination” and no Christian in the New Testament belonged to it. How then, since unity is desirable, can it be “justified”? There is nothing in the New Testament to make the advocacy of its views imperative.” A man who knows the New Testament and is loyal to its “cause of unity” finds it “imperative” to oppose such “views.” It is difficult in the light of the New Testament “to see” why any Christian should feel it “imperative” to advocate or defend the distinctive views of any denomination, inasmuch as the whole denominational system is an astounding perversion of the whole gospel scheme. As to narrowness, a denomination is confessedly narrower than the body of Christ, inasmuch as it does not include all Christians.

What Can Be Done About It?

THE Western Recorder, the Baptist and Reflector and some other Baptist papers seem to be in somewhat of a predicament as to what they ought to use to fill their space. The Western Recorder thinks that a lot more space ought to be used “for the discussion of Baptist doctrine and polity” and a lot less “for comparatively unimportant or even trivial articles” that threaten to make Baptist papers “little more than organized bulletins.” The Baptist and Reflector observes that “the nature of the case these papers carry (and rightly) more denominational stuff than formerly” and understands “that a few preachers have thought that the paper discussed Baptist doctrine and polity too much!”

It may be that an outsider like me who is not handicapped by being smothered under a lot of denominational boards and tangled up in a lot of party machinery might help a little by humbly offering some simple suggestions. There is almost a sigh in the Baptist and Reflector’s remark that “Baptist life and organization are more extensive and complex than in other years.” Well, I should say as much. Possibly “Baptist life and organization” has ignored Paul’s warning to be careful lest “your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ.” The complexity of the affair seems to be the chief occasion for the perplexity of it. My genuine sympathy is aroused when the Baptist and Reflector groans thus under a heavy burden:

Moreover, the Baptist papers in a year carry an immense amount of other material of general denominational interest, as State Convention and Southern Baptist Convention announcements, hotels and rates, etc., etc., and carry it free of charge.

No wonder Baptist papers do not have much space for the simple gospel when their pages are all cluttered up with such things. The problem seems to be how to balance the “denominational stuff” and “Baptist doctrine and polity.” The New Testament church and the gospel are not identical with either. The New Testament says nothing at all about “Baptist doctrine and polity” and as for the “immense amount of other material of general denominational interest” “the Baptist papers” have to “carry” “in a year.” Paul and other New Testament writers never even heard of it. It is “more extensive and complex” than the simplicity of the gospel can possibly warrant. There is nothing I can do to relieve the situation except to point out to these harassed editors that they might crawl out from under the pile of boards, break away from party shackles and see how it feels to breathe some pure air in Christ Jesus. “Preach the word.”

More Baptist Misinformation

He joined the Baptist church while young and lived faithful to the end. (Baptist paper)

He went to a lot of unnecessary trouble. According to Baptist doctrine a man can be saved and go to heaven without either joining the Baptist church or living faithful to the end.

Without faith the Bible is a closed book to any student. (Baptist paper)

On the other hand some of the Bible was written expressly to convince unbelievers. Why preach to unbelievers at all? John says of his gospel: “Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name.” (John 20:30-31)

Without faith we are outside the range of the operation of the Holy Spirit. (Baptist paper)

According to my information, Simon Peter preached the sermon recorded in Acts 2 to a crowd of unbelievers and “when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart.” In this case the Holy Spirit operated on sinners through the gospel to make them believers. Unbelievers were within “the range of the operation of the (Continued on Page 47)
THE METHODIST DENOMINATION

John Wesley, Not Jesus Christ, Was the Founder of the Methodist Church. According to the Testimony of Methodist Historians the Wesleys, Kirkham and Morgan Were the First Methodists. What Claim, Therefore, Can the Methodist Church Make to Being the Church of Christ?

E. G. CREACY

In a previous article, a brief history of the Baptist denomination was given. The New Testament church is not a denomination. The church and denominationalism are not the same. The church is sixteen hundred years older than the oldest protestant denomination. Denominationalism is not from heaven, and it is a menace to true religion. It is division, and is classed with the works of the flesh. (Gal. 5:19, 20) The Methodist Church, like the Baptist Church, is a human denomination—a sect.

Authentic Methodist History

Methodism was founded by an ordained priest in the Episcopal Church, or Church of England, in the year 1729. Mr. McTyeire, who was one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, wrote a history of Methodism, hence his work is authentic. He said (page 13) “The history of Methodism cannot be given without a biography of John Wesley. To him belongs the distinction of founder. Great men by a natural law come forward in groups, but to insure the success and unity of a movement, there must be a solitary preeminence. While Charles Wesley, George Whitefield, John Fletcher, and Thomas Coke were mighty auxiliaries, it is around John Wesley that the religious movement of the eighteenth century, called Methodism, centers.” John Wesley, the founder, around whom Methodism “centers”! Christ is not the founder of the Methodist Church and it cannot be claimed that it “centers” around him. Mr. McTyeire further declares (page 57) that “the first Methodist were the two Wesleys, with Robert Kirkham and William Morgan.” Seventeen hundred years before Christ and the establishment of his church, the first Methodist appeared, and the genesis of the Methodist denomination. Seventeen hundred years before the first Methodist, people were Christians, members of the body of Christ, which is the church of Christ. (Eph. 1:22, 23) The apostles were Christians, and thousands of others were Christians in the first century, but the first Methodists were the Wesleys, Kirkham, and Morgan! It is evident, since thousands were Christians-saved people-seven-hundred years before the first Methodist, that it is not necessary to be Methodists to be saved. What claim can Methodist make to being the church of which Christ is the head? (Col. 1:18) And how can they claim to be the church purchased by the blood of Christ? (Acts 20:28) God’s word (the seed of the kingdom, Luke 8:11) produced Christians in New Testament times, and not Methodist. It follows that something more than God’s word is necessary to produce Methodist.

Wesley—A Sinner

Methodism had its rise in the Church of England, it is therefore a daughter of that church, and a granddaughter of the Roman Catholic Church. This fact cannot be successfully refuted. Mr. Wesley came to America in 1736 to convert the unsaved, though he was himself an unconverted man! He remained in America about one year and returned to England. Mr. McTyeire, on page 107 of his book, quotes Mr. Wesley as follows: “It is now two years and almost four months since I left my native country, in order to teach the Georgia Indians the nature of Christianity; but what have I learned myself in the meantime? Why (what I least of all suspected), that I, who went to America to convert others, was never myself converted to God. * * * * This, then, have I learned in the ends of the earth—that I am fallen short of the glory of God; and my whole heart is ‘altogether corrupt and abominable’, and, consequently, my whole life (seeing it cannot be that an ‘evil tree’ should ‘bring forth good fruit’); that ‘alienated’ as I am from the life of God, I am a ‘child of wrath’, an heir of hell.” Facts disclose that the Methodist Episcopal Church was founded by a sinner—an heir of hell.

The Discipline

Every member of the Methodist Church has subscribed to the Discipline. Many do not know what the Discipline contains. Certain questions are asked those who join the Methodist Church, a sample of which is given: “Will you be subject to the discipline of the Church, attend upon its ordinances, and support its institutions? Answer.

I will endeavor so to do, by the help of God” (Par. 666). It is noticeable that nothing is said about being governed by the word of God, nor supporting the institution (church) of Christ. According to the Discipline (page 3) it was founded on the experience of a long series of years as “our Form of Discipline,” and recommended to the members of the (Methodist) Church. The Discipline declares that it contains the “doctrines and discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South.” It is “doctrines” (plural), but in the Bible we read of “sound doctrine” (Tit. 2:1), “doctrine of God” (Tit. 2:10), “apostles’ doctrine” (Acts 2:42), and “doctrine of Christ” (2 Jno. 9). It is doctrine (singular), not doctrines. Whenever we read in the Bible of “doctrines” (plural) it is “doctrines of devils” (1 Tim. 4:1), and “doctrines of men” (Col. 2:22). In the Methodist Discipline, it is “doctrines” of the “Methodist Episcopal Church.”

DISCIPLINE VS. BIBLE

Discipline

“Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort”—Art. 9.

Bible

“By works a man is justified, and not by faith only” — Jas. 2:24.

The above is just a “sample” of the difference.

Paragraph 117 of the Methodist Discipline discloses that one of the duties of Presiding Elders is “to take care that every part of the Discipline be enforced”, but not a word about the word of God being observed and enforced! Is this some of the “liberty” of which Methodist boast?

The Methodist denomination is just a little more than two hundred years young, and throughout these years, many changes have been wrought. Every few years, the Discipline is “officially” revised. The time was when Methodist preachers would attempt to defend their doctrines in open debate, but they have long since learned that it cannot be done. The scripture that says, “prove all things” is meaningless to them. With an air of dignity, they all with one accord, cry aloud that it is a heinous sin to engage in controversy. That is placing Christ in bad light, for he was the world’s greatest controversialist, and Stephen, the first Christian martyr, died while engaged in heated debate. Paul, a great controversialist, admonished the Corinthians to imitate him. The truth is, Methodism cannot be defended by the word of God.
THE INSTRUMENTAL MUSIC INNOVATION

The Use of Mechanical Music is Not Within the Scope of New Testament Teaching. Its History and Fruits Are Evil and its Use Wholly Unscriptural.

E. G. C.

Mechanical instruments of music are now used in the worship of most religious bodies, but it has not always been so. Only in recent years has the use of such music in worship come to be accepted without question, even by denominational bodies. Denominations now using instrumental music, introduced it over the protest of their most pious leaders and profound scholars.

John Calvin, the founder of the Presbyterian denomination, said that musical instruments in worship would be no more suitable than burning incense, and the restoration of the other shadows of the law.

John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, said he had no objections to them in Methodist chapels, provided they were neither seen nor heard.

Adam Clark, the great Methodist commentator, said he believed instrumental music in the worship was against the will of God.

C. H. Spurgeon, the world-renowned Baptist preacher, speaking of mechanical instruments, said: “We do not need them; they would hinder rather than help our praise.”

Alexander Campbell declared that to all spiritually minded Christians, instrumental music in the worship would be as a cowbell in a concert.

J. W. McGarvey said it was one of the latest corruptions of the Roman apostasy.

The present day exponents of instrumental music are mere pygmies as Bible scholars in comparison with the above mentioned characters. Under the leadership of spiritual and mental dwarfs, actuated by worldly show, people have been led into a very loose attitude toward the worship of God. A strict adherence to God’s word in all things pertaining to “life and godliness” is the only right principle in service to God.

What the New Testament Says

Matt. 26:30: “And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives.” (Parallel, Mark 14:26)

Acts 16:25: “But about midnight Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns unto God, and the prisoners were listening to them.”

1 Cor. 14:15: “I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also: I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also.”

Eph. 5:19: “Speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord.”

Col. 3:16: “Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; in all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God.”


This is the extent of New Testament teaching on music in worship, and who intent on doing the Lord’s expressed will, would ever draw from the New Testament the idea of instrumental accompaniment in such praise? Christ, in the great commission (Matt. 28:19), commanded the observance of all things he had taught the Apostles, and the Holy Spirit guided the apostles into all truth. (Jno. 16:13) Since the Holy Spirit did not guide the apostles into the use of mechanical instruments of music in worship, it is evident the Lord did not command or teach it; its use cannot be in truth; and since we are to observe what Christ commanded, we cannot scripturally practice “mechanical music” in worship to God.

There are three elements of acceptable worship: (1) Worship must be directed unto the right object—God; (2) Worship must be rendered in the right spirit—sincerely; (3) Worship must consist iii the right act or acts—in truth.

The truth directs only vocal music (singing) in worship. Christ, quoting from Isaiah, said: “But in vain do they worship me. Teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men.” (Matt. 15:9) Since instrumental music is not in truth, and is not commanded by Christ, it classifies as the “precepts of men.” It follows that the use of mechanical music in worship renders the worship vain in the sight of God as empty as a “sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal”. John said: “Whosoever shall hearken and shall not hearken not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God; he that abideth in the teaching, the same hath both the Father and the Son.” (2 Jno. 9) Instrumental music in worship is not in the teaching of Christ, and it is a fearful thing to not abide in the teaching of Christ. Such is the case when we elect to worship God with instrumental music.
ANY CASUAL observer today cannot help seeing that there are two schools of thought developing among gospel preachers. One believes that since the gospel is God’s power to save the world, preachers should know what the gospel is before they begin to preach, and should present it in a fearless, uncompromising spirit as a “savor from life unto life,” or a “savor from death unto death.” This class of preachers assumes neither a dictatorial, nor an apologetic air; but preaches the gospel as a life or death proposition both to the preacher and to the world.

The other school has developed a kind of sentimentalism which is mighty popular with the masses. They think “it is too big an undertaking and unscriptural for some in the church to try to bring all the rest up to their views or withdraw from them.” That is we cannot all know the truth, therefore can only preach our views, and since one has as much right to his views as the other, we have no right to “mark and turn away from” any who are draped in the robes of humility, and appear to have the spirit of Christ. These two positions are antipodes. Both of these attitudes toward God’s word could be wrong, one of them must be. Therefore we are beyond the pale of a possibility of being hurt by “unkind personalities.” I refer to that courageous, indomitable, and uncompromising apostle to the Gentiles-Paul. I will begin with the beginning of his preaching. Immediately after his conversion he began to preach in Damascus. “And he was certain days with the disciples that were at Damascus. And straightway in the synagogue he proclaimed Jesus, that he is the Son of God.”

And when many days were fulfilled the Jews took counsel together to kill him; but their plot became known to Saul. And they watched the gates also day and night: but his disciples took him by night, and let him down through the wall, lowering him in a basket.” (Acts 9:28-30) Paul fled to Arabia, later returned to Damascus, and after three years he went up to Jerusalem. “And he was with them going in and going out at Jerusalem, preaching boldly in the name of the Lord: and he spake and disputed against the Grecian Jews; but they were seeking to kill him. And when the brethren knew it, they brought him down to Caesarea, and sent him forth to Tarsus.” (Acts 9:28-30) “...and sent him back to Tarsus where he was reared.”

THERE was a lack of any noteworthy understanding, calle d unto him Barnabas and Saul. And the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit. What a word. Of course that is not in our religious vocabulary today, however we might look the word up and we would have a better idea of Paul’s manner of preaching. The brethren sent him home-back to Tarsus where he was reared.

JOHN T. LEWIS
it, they would at least feel kindly toward them. Let us see, “And when there was made an onset both of the Gentiles and the Jews with their rulers, to treat them shamefully and to stone them, they became aware of it, and fled unto the cities of Lycaonia, Lystra and Derbe, and the regions round about: and there they preached the gospel.” (Acts 14:5-7) Now let us see what happened to Paul at Lystra.

“But there came Jews thither from Antioch and Iconium: and having persuaded the multitudes, they stoned Paul, and dragged him out of the city, supposing that he was dead.” (Acts 14:19) After this they returned to Antioch, in Syria, whence they had been sent on their journey, and as soon as they returned they got into a “dissension” with brethren from Jerusalem. See Acts 15:1-35.

AFTER THE council at Jerusalem, which vindicated Paul and Barnabas in the “dissension” that came up in the church at Antioch, the church sent Paul and Silas on a second missionary journey. They went over into Europe where they established one of the best churches we read about, at Philippi. But how were they treated at Philippi? “And the multitudes rose up together against them: and the magistrates rent their garments off them, and commanded to beat them with rods. And when they had laid many stripes upon them, they cast them into prison, charging the jailor to keep them safely: who, having received such a charge, cast them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks.” (Acts 16:22-24)

When Paul and Silas were released from prison they went to Thessalonica. And instead of “preaching the gospel in love,” (?) “Paul, as his custom was, went in unto them, and for three sabbaths days reasoned with them from the Scriptures.” His reasoning was such, that the city was “set on an uproar,” Paul and Silas were accused of “turning the world upside down,” and were immediately sent away by night unto Berea. (Acts 17:1-10) How did Paul leave Berea? Surely by this time, lie had learned how to keep in the good graces of the Jews. “But when the Jews of Thessalonica had knowledge that the word of God was proclaimed of Paul at Berea also, they came thither likewise, stirring up and troubling the multitudes. And then immediately the brethren sent forth Paul to go as far as to the sea.” (Acts 17:13-15) Those who conducted Paul out of the city brought him to Athens. At Athens Paul jumped on the worship of the Athenians, and charged them of worshipping God in ignorance. Can you conceive of such audacity in a gospel preacher, accusing people of worshipping in ignorance? How could Paul ever hope to reach people, or leave them feeling kindly toward him by charging them with ignorance in their worship? You could hardly blame the Athenians for calling him “this babbler,” and “a setter forth of strange gods,” instead of writing him up as “Doctor” or “Judge” Paul.

It seems strange that after the treatment and experience Paul had on his first two missionary journeys that he could not learn: “All honest, sane people have some ground for what they believe, and therefore were entitled to his gentleness, kindness, courtesy and respect.” But, no sir, under no consideration would he show a conciliatory spirit toward other religions—not even the religion of his fathers, the kind he had before his conversion. Well, that spirit kept him in trouble all the time. On his third missionary journey he stayed at Ephesus three years, “teaching them publicly, and from house to house,” and “admonishing every one night and day with tears.” But read the 19 chapter of Acts and see what an uproar he caused there. Luke speaking of the mob said: “Some therefore cried one thing, and some another: for the assembly was in confusion; and the more part knew not wherefore they were come together.” (Acts 19:32) Paul finished his third journey in Jerusalem where he was arrested, thrown into prison, and remained a prisoner the rest of his life, two years in Caesarea, and two in Rome. Brethren what kind of spirit did Paul have? Did he preach the gospel in love? Take the witness, and deal kindly with him.

I am sure if Paul were on earth today he would be accused by thousands of Christians (?), as he was accused by the Jews in his day, of being a “pestilent fellow.” It is a certainty that “we” would not want him to preach in “our church,” especially if “we” had gotten to where the denominations would recognize “us.” But all we have studied is what Luke said about him. We will now let Paul speak for himself.

MARVEL that ye are so quickly removing from him that called you in the grace of Christ unto a different gospel: which is not another gospel: only there are some that trouble you, and will pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, as an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema. As we have said before, so say I now again, if any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than that which ye received, let him be anathema. For am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God? or am I striving to please men? if I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ.” (Gal. 1:6-10) Brethren what kind of a spirit is it in man that would cause him to call down the curse of Almighty God upon either men or angels that would preach a different gospel from what he preached? That is the Spirit that dominated the indomitable Paul’s life and teaching. Name it, brethren, you who are always talking about the Spirit of Christ. I will tell you what it was not. It was not a spirit of sentimental, not certain, stand - for - nothing - ism. Then to add insult to injury (?) Paul told the Galatians that he was neither seeking the favor of, nor striving to please men, and if he were he “should not be a servant of Christ.”

In 2 Thessalonians 1:7-9, Paul says: “And to you that are afflicted rest with us, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of his power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus: who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his might.” Paul was telling those who were being persecuted for Christ, that they would rest with him, when God “recompensed affliction” to their persecutors, and that will be when
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the Lord comes to destroy those who know not God, and all who “obey not the gospel of our Lord.” Paul not only called the anathema of God down upon those who would dare pervert, or preach a different gospel from what he preached; but declared all those who “obey not the gospel” will go to hell. Brethren, did Paul have a vindictive, domineering, intolerant spirit? Or was he “preaching the gospel in love,” and as a life and death proposition? Do you say Paul was inspired, and could know? Exactly so, he said: “For I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ.” (Gal. 1:11-12) If the gospel Paul preached was from God, and those who pervert it will be cursed, and all responsible beings who do not obey it will be condemned, then does not preaching the gospel become a very serious matter? Paul felt that way about it, therefore he said to the elders of the church at Ephesus: “Wherefore I testify unto you this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I shrank not from declaring unto you the whole counsel of God.” (Acts 20:26-27) The statement, “I shrank not,” carries the idea that it takes courage to preach the gospel. It takes no courage, however, to preach sermons in which you are always talking about “the spirit, and love of Christ,” and lambasting those who preach otherwise; but never touching the cancerous conditions, and their causes, which are eating out the very vitals of the spiritual body of Christ. Paul says: “Or know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither fornicators, idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with men, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God.” (1 Cor. 6:9-10) What could please the above class of people more than to hear a preacher always preaching about “the love of God,” and stigmatizing, as dictatorial, and intolerant, those who would dare to preach about the vengeance of God?

Paul said of his own preaching: “And I, brethren, when I came unto you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, proclaiming to you the testimony of God. For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified. And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.” (1 Cor. 2:1-5) This is how Paul said he preached when he was at Corinth. But he found two classes of hearers at Corinth. “And when they opposed themselves and blasphemed, he shook out his raiment and said unto them, your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean: from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles.” And he departed thence, and went into the house of a certain man named Titus Justus, one that worshipped God, whose house joined hard to the synagogue. And Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue believed in the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized.” (Acts IS:6-5)

THE GOSPEL, as preached in the apostolic age, was not neutralized by sentimentalism, it cut people to the heart and caused them to cry out and want to know what to do, or it enraged them against the one preaching it. “Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Brethren, what shall we do?” (Acts 2:37) “Now when they heard these things, they were cut to the heart, and they grieved on him with their teeth.” (Acts 7:54) Therefore when a preacher goes to a town today to “hold a meeting,” and leaves the card players, dancers, public bathers, and moving picture, or theater goers in the church, with the denominational world, and people in general singing his IMGcke, or theater goers in the church, they knew was a lie, yet they have the same aberrations they had, therefore Paul’s kind of preaching and writing is the only kind that will save the church today. I close with another quotation from Paul. “For such men are false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for even Satan fashioned himself into an angel of light. It is no great thing therefore if his ministers also fashion themselves as ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works.” (2 Cor. 11:13-15) What kind of spirit did Paul manifest by warning the church at Corinth against such teachers? Was it the Spirit of Christ? Do we have such teachers today? In fighting the good fight of faith, what did Paul fight? “Henceforth let no man trouble me; for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus.” (Gal. 6:17) Brethren what caused those marks to be branded on Paul’s body? Was it for “preaching the gospel in love”? Paul following the spirit of his Master never resented a personal injury or insult; but he was withering on perverters of the gospel, and those who would “handle the word of God deceitfully,” either of which will accomplish the devil’s work—destroy the soul of man.

WHO DO MEN SAY—

(Continued front Page 1)

Finally, old Caiphus said unto Jesus, “Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed?” And Jesus said, “I am.”

Infidels make all these falsifiers and charge them with promulgating what they knew was a lie, yet they have the efferonty to pose as a friend of Jesus and to declare him to be a great and good man, honest and honorable in all respects. Such palaverers and feigned piety are disgusting to sensible people. There can be no middle ground about the matter. Jesus Christ was either God’s Son or he was the greatest impostor and the basest deceiver the world has ever known. He posed as God’s Son and made not only his friends, but also his enemies and even the demons to say: “Truly, this was the Son of God.” It is far easier to believe in the “Rock of Ages” than it is to try to have faith in the ages of the rocks.

If we turn away from Christ as God’s Son, we may well ask: “Lord, to whom shall we go?”
WAR - THE LOGIC OF THE INEVITABLE

History Is Replete with the Glorious Examples of Men who Met the Challenge of the Inevitable — Daniel, Paul and Every Christian Martyr.

T. B. THOMPSON

We are continually being challenged by what seems to us to be the inevitable. Those who cringe under that challenge may never see their names listed in the book of martyrs, nor yet with the leaders of great epochs in world progress. Even admitting that the law of expediency might take precedence over our better judgment in purely human affairs, it by no means follows that in matters religious, where God's word and promise are involved, we may for one moment consider the propriety or consequence of an act; our duty being to do the will of God and leave the inevitable to Him.

History is replete with glorious examples of men who met the challenge of the inevitable. Among those names prominent in the history of religious freedom, who dared to bravely accept the challenge of the inevitable, are, Huss, Wycliffe and Luther. These great men knew only too well the price of opposing the Catholic hierarchy, yet, their desire for religious freedom for the world's posterity implanted within them that same spirit expressed by Paul: "But I hold not my life of any account as dear unto myself, so that I may accomplish my course, and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God." (Acts 20:24)

Opposition and Debate

One of the inevitable things which we may expect to encounter is that wherever the gospel is preached we will have opposition. If Jesus and his apostles could not present the gospel in such manner as to preclude opposition and debate, how may we hope to do so? Opposition and debate were the inevitable result of the work of New Testament preachers. It is, therefore, no compliment to a gospel preacher today to say that he can preach the gospel and not engender opposition and criticism. One of two things must be true: (1) he either is not preaching the gospel fully, or, (2) he can excel, in manner, the preaching of Christ and the apostles. I certainly do not want to maliciously stir up strife; nor do I want to fail to preach a full gospel; neither feel that I can excel New Testament preachers in the manner of presenting the truth. I must therefore shoulder the responsibility the inevitable lays before me. Paul saw the inevitableness of making enemies by preaching the truth (Gal. 4:16), yet he swerved not from his course, nor apologized for the same. It is true that his course finally brought to him the inevitable—the executioner’s block—but that only lends point to this essay; I'm afraid that our fear of the inevitable furnishes color for a great deal of our preaching. Paul, like Daniel of old, even though, humanly speaking, the result looked dark, knew naught but to carry on in faithfulness before God, leaving the ultimate results with Him. This same fear of the inevitable is seen in the failure of some evangelists to report meetings in which there are a very few additions, while at the same time managing to get in two or three reports of meetings wherein are large numbers of baptisms—the fear of the effect upon next year’s calls for meetings; we are wise to the logic of the inevitable when our personal interests are at stake.

Design of Baptism

We are so prone to conserve our interests and avoid opposition that we unconsciously leave the wrong impression upon people. Recently I heard a gospel preacher make a good speech on personal work in winning souls. He was discussing the matter of handling those who object to baptism upon the ground that to accept the same would imply that some loved one is lost; and this I must admit is one of the most precarious questions to handle under such circumstances. That no promise to the unbaptized is implied in the full acceptance of the design of baptism, is inevitable. In order to escape the full force of the circumstances, and try to hold the attention of the one whom we are trying to teach, we may say of the unbaptized loved one, "we hope they are saved." Question: Can one in reality be Scripturally baptized while at the same time believing that a loved one was saved without such obedience? Can we hope-desire and expect—that one is saved without baptism without expressing doubt as to what the Bible teaches on the design of baptism, as we do on the teaching of the Bible that God is no respecter of persons? (Acts 10:34) Is there not in all this a tendency to cast doubt on God’s word, as also to bring people into the church without conversion? Should we not plant and water and leave the results with God? (1 Cor. 3:6) To try to avoid the inevitable consequences of baptizing we may accomplish our course, and the ministry which I received from the Lord Jesus, to testify the gospel of the grace of God.” (Acts 20:24)

(Continued on Page 23)
The more I see of the nature and effects of Premillennialism the more I am convinced that it constitutes the second great defection of the Restoration movement. Those lining up with the movement are definitely sacrificing all right to fellowship with those who are fighting to promote the pure doctrine of the New Testament church. We are told that Jesus came to establish an earthly kingdom, but on account of the Jews' rejection of such a kingdom it was postponed. It is hard to see just why the Jews rejected that kingdom if indeed it was an earthly one, since that was the kind they were expecting. Then, how can we assure ourselves that they will not do the same thing if and when that offer shall be renewed, seeing they once rejected it?

I have thought it might be interesting to those studying this question to see the "Brief History of the Millennial Theory" as written by one H. M. Riggle, and published by the Gospel Trumpet Company in 1918. I give it in full.

The idea of a millennial reign proceeded from Judaism, for "among the Jews the representation was growing, that the Messiah would reign a thousand years upon the earth. Such products of Jewish imagination passed over into Christianity." —Neander's History of Christian Dogmas, Vol. I, p. 248.

"The Jews generally believed that the Messiah would establish a literal or earthly kingdom. And even some of them believed that Messiah's reign would last a thousand years." Before the death of all the first apostles, the Jewish notion was received in the teaching of an ungodly heretic by the name of Cerinthus.

In Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, Book III, chap. 28, is preserved a fragment from the writings of Caius, who lived about the close of the second century. This extract gives us the following account of Cerinthus' heresy. "But Cerinthus, by means of revelations which he pretended were written by a great apostle, also falsely pretended to wonderful things, as if they were shown him by angels (it seems we have heard that only those whose hearts were just right would be able to comprehend God's present truth, or receive certain special revelations-T. B. T.), asserting, that after the resurrection there would be an earthly kingdom of Christ, and that the flesh, i.e. men, again inhabiting Jerusalem, would be subject to desires and pleasures." Eusebius says of Cerinthus: "Being also an enemy to the Scriptures, with a view to deceive men, he said 'that there would be a space of a thousand years for celebrating nuptial festivities.' One of the doctrines that he taught was, that Christ would have an earthly kingdom."

This is the true origin of the millennial theory among Christians. The reader will observe how lightly Caius speaks of Cerinthus' idea of the kingdom of Christ being set up on earth after the resurrection. He says this doctrine was something which Cerinthus pretended was shown him by angels. Caius must, therefore, have believed the orthodox teachings of the Scriptures that Christ's kingdom was set up at his first coming. Observe also that Caius calls Cerinthus "an enemy to the Scriptures" and one who had "a view to deceive men." This language he used with special reference to the one thousand years this millenarian claimed would be spent in sensuality. Notice also that he believed in an earthly kingdom.

Cerinthus lived in the days of the apostle John. We will now call your attention to the attitude of the beloved apostle toward this millennial teacher. Irenaeus, who was born about 120 A. D. and who was acquainted with Polycarp, the disciple of John (Eusebius' Eccl. Hist., Book V, chap. 24), states that while John was at Ephesus he entered a bath to wash, but when he found that Cerinthus was within he refused to bathe there, left the buildings, and exhorted those with him to do the same, saying, "Let us flee, lest the bath fall in, as long as Cerinthus, that enemy of the truth, is within."—Eusebius' Eccl. Hist., Book III, chap. 28.

Let this be a rebuke to modern millennial advocates. They claim their doctrine is well founded in the Revelation of John. But John called the founder of their theory "that enemy of the truth."

"Cerinthus required his followers to worship the supreme God... He promised them a resurrection of their bodies, which would be succeeded by exquisite delights in the millenarian reign of Christ... For Cerinthus supposed that Christ would hereafter return... and would reign with his followers during a thousand years in Palestine." —Mosheim's Eccl. Hist., p. 50.

"Cerinthus required his followers to retain part of the Mosaic law, but to regulate their lives by the example of Christ... and taught that after the resurrection Christ would reign upon earth, with his faithful disciples, a thousand years, which would be spent in highest sensual indulgences. This mixture of Judaism and oriental philosophy was calculated to make many converts, and this sect soon became very numerous. They admitted a part of St. Matthew's gospel; but rejected the rest, and held the epistle of St. Paul in great abhorrence." —Gregory and Ruther's Church Hist., p. 30.

"For though the floods of the nations and the vain superstitions of heretics should revolt against their true faith, they are overcome, and shall be dissolved as the foam, because Christ is the rock by which, and on which, the church is founded. And thus it is overcome by no traces of maddened men. Therefore they are not to be heard who assure themselves that there is to be an earthly reign of a thousand years; who think, that is to say, with the heretic Cerinthus. For the kingdom of Christ is now eternal in his saints." —Commentary on the Apocalypse, by Victorinus, one of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

Thank God for this testimony of history! Observe, dear reader, how
dissolved the modern millennium teachers clinging to the doctrine of their founder. Cerinthus taught that “Christ would have an earthly kingdom”; “after the resurrection there would be an earthly kingdom of Christ;” the resurrection would be followed by “exquisite delights in the millenary reign of Christ”; “Christ would hereafter return... and would reign with his followers during a thousand years in Palestine.” The principal difference is that most of his modern followers have dropped the idea of sensuality.

But how did the early church regard the doctrine of Cerinthus? They declare that he was “an enemy to the Scriptures, with a view to deceive men.” They called him a “heretic.” They termed his doctrine “vain superstition of heretics,” and called all who believed and advocated the same “madmen.” The apostle John called Cerinthus “that enemy of the truth.” They taught that “they are not to be heard who assure themselves that there is to be an earthly reign of a thousand years.”

What was the doctrine of the early church according to history? “Christ is the rock on which, and by which, the church is founded.” “The kingdom is now eternal in his saints.” “It was the universal feeling among primitive Christians that they were living in the last period of the world’s history.”

Enc. Brit., 9th Ed., Vol. VIII, p. 534. The reason they believed this was because the New Testament was their faith, and this is the doctrine of the New Testament throughout. No wonder Cerinthus and his followers rejected part of St. Matthew’s gospel and “held the epistle of Paul in great abhorrence.” Just so do modern millennium teachers dwell very little in the plain Gospels and Epistles to prove their doctrines, but speculate in prophecy and revelation.

Having seen that Cerinthus and his false doctrine were rejected by God’s church, we will now come to the next chief advocate of millenniumism, Papias, who lived in the first half of the second century, Eusebius, under the heading “The writings of Papias,” says of him: “The same historian also gives other accounts, which lie says he adds as received by him from unwritten tradition, likewise certain strange parables of our Lord, and of his doctrine, and some other matters rather too fabulous. In these he says there would be a certain millennium after the resurrection, and that there would be a corporeal reign of Christ on this very earth; which things he appears to have imagined, as if they were authorized by the apostolic narrations, not understanding correctly those matters which they pronounced mystically in their representations. For he was limited in his comprehension, as is evident from his discourses.”—Eusebius’ Eccl. Hist., Book III, chap. 39, p. 115.

Historians generally tell us that Papias was a very zealous advocate of this imaginary reign of Christ on earth. “The first distinguished opponent of this doctrine was Origen, who attacked it with great earnestness and ingenuity, and seems, in spite of some opposition, to have thrown it into general discredit.”—Waddington’s History, p. 56.

“This obscure doctrine was probably known to but very few except the Fathers of the church, and seems, in spite of some opposition, to have thrown it into general discredit.”—Waddington’s History, p. 56.

“Christ would hereafter return and would reign with his followers during a thousand years in Palestine.”

We here insert the following from Eusebius’ History, Book VII, chap. 23, under the heading “Nepos and His Schism.” “He taught, that the promises given to Holy men in the Scriptures, should be understood more as the Jews understood them, and supposed that there would be a certain millennium of sensual luxury on this earth. Thinking, therefore, that he could establish his own opinion by the Revelation of John.... He (Nepos) asserts that there will be an earthly reign of Christ.”

“Though millenniumism had been suppressed by the early church, it was nevertheless from time to time revived by heretical sects.”—Dr. Schaff’s History, p. 299.

“Nowhere in the discourses of Jesus is there a hint of a limited duration of the Messiahian kingdom. The apostolic epistles are equally free from any trace of Chiliasm.”—Enc. Brit., Art. “Millennium.”

To sum up the uniform voice of history, the theory of a literal kingdom and reign on the earth was gathered from Jewish fabulous “apocalypse,” “unwritten tradition,” carnal misapprehensions, pretended visions, supposition, and “Jewish imaginations.” Its advocates were said to be very limited in their understanding, and “of the simpler sort.” Millenniumism had the worst heretic in the first century for its founder, and its chief advocates thereafter were rejected by the early church. From time to time it was reviled by “heretical sects.” The vain, worldly expectation that the Messiah would establish a literal kingdom caused the Jews to reject him and his spiritual kingdom. They wanted only an earthly kingdom; hence rejected and crucified the Son of God. As soon as the church began to apostatize and to lose the glory of the spiritual kingdom, vain ambitions awakened the old Jewish desire for a literal kingdom. And so it has come to pass that at this time of dead formalism we have a multitude of men teaching the same error and false hope that crucified Christ nearly nineteen hundred years ago; namely, a literal kingdom of Christ.
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QUESTIONS of this nature should always be determined by the language of the Bible, and the language used by inspired men is of such nature that the idea of two resurrections and judgments is forever excluded. If we could take the word of God and read therein about the days of judgment for the world, we could well consider the matter of embracing the theory of Premillennialism. But where in all the book divine can we read of the days of judgment? That all the world is to be judged is plainly taught by the Lord, but there is no indication that the judgment of the righteous and the judgment of the wicked are to be one thousand years apart. If the Bible spoke of the days of judgment, we would know that different days would be intended: there would have to be at least two—there might be more—judgment clays. But such language is not found in the book of God. Instead, God’s word speaks of the day of judgment. And this is an invulnerable fact that faces the advocates of Premillennialism today. Remember that it is not the days of judgment but the day of judgment that the Bible mentions.

One Future Judgment Day

Since then there is only one day of future judgment for the world mentioned in the Bible if we find that this day (not days) is the judgment day for both the righteous and the wicked, it will settle the matter before us for all who are willing to take the Bible instead of a theory. And that very thing we do find to be true. The righteous are to be rewarded in that day. We turn to the language of the apostle John in 1 John 4:17: “Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment.” This statement points to that time to which all statements in the Bible point as the day of judgment. So regardless of when the wicked are to be judged, the righteous are to be judged “in the day of judgment.”

If we should discover that the wicked will be rewarded also in the day of judgment, then we know it is the same time the righteous are judged and that a Millennium cannot intervene the two. And we do learn from the word of the Lord that the wicked will be rewarded at the same time. Note some statements made by Jesus in the eleventh chapter of Matthew. “But I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon at the day of judgment, than for you.” (Matt. 11:22.)

W. CURTIS PORTER

THE PREMILLENNIAL JUDGMENT THEORY

The Theory of Two Future Resurrections and Judgments with a Thousand Years Intervening is Blasted into Atoms by an Array of Scriptures that Prove Beyond Any Doubt to Unbiased Minds that the Resurrection and Judgment of the Living and the Dead, the Righteous and the Unrighteous, Will Occur at the Same Time—at the Second Coming of Christ.

but we find the expression, “the clay of death” is a contraction. Take Eccl. 7:1 for example. Here Solomon says “the day of death” is better “than the clay of one’s birth.” Note the two expressions used in contrast. “The day of one’s death” might be contracted into “the day of birth.” And “the clay of death” has thus been contracted. It is a contraction of “the day of one’s death.” So the statement simply means that “the day of one’s death” is better “than the day of one’s birth.” It is not a general statement like “the day of judgment.” Similarly we often read of “the clay of his death.” (Judges 13:7; Jer. 52:11.) But where do we ever read of “the day of one’s judgment” or “the day of his judgment”? The cases, therefore, are not parallel. The word of the Lord informs us that “it is appointed unto men once to die,” but nowhere can we find the statement that “he hath appointed a day in which the world will die.” We do read, however, that “he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world.” (Acts 17:31.)

The World To Be Judged At Same Day

The expression “the world” is used in various ways in the Bible. Sometimes it simply means the world of the world. (Mat. 16:26.) And it is used to signify the evil things of the world. (1 John 2:15.) It also oftentimes signifies the earth. (John 21:25.) The wicked portion of mankind is also referred to by the term. (John 15:18, 19.) And all men are included in the expression sometimes. The meaning of the term in any given case must be determined by the context. When Paul beheld the idolatrous worship in Athens he said: “And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men everywhere to repent: because he hath appointed a day, in the which he will judge the world in righteousness by that man whom he hath ordained ; whereby he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead.” (Acts 17:30, 31.) From this we see that “the world” is to be judged in “a clay” that God has appointed. What can be the meaning of the “world” in this case? It must refer
to men, of course, but does it refer to wicked men only? No, for verse 30 shows it to mean “all men.” God has commanded all men to repent because he has appointed a day in which he is to judge the world. The statement continues by telling us that God gave assurance of this to “all men.” So the judgment of this verse cannot be limited to the unsaved part of mankind.

In the second chapter of Romans Paul discusses this matter quite freely. He says: “But after thy hardness and impenitent heart treasurest up unto thyself wrath against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God; who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life; but unto them that are contentious, and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness, indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish, upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile; but glory and honor and peace, to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile: for there is no respect of persons with God.” (Rom. 2:5-11.) It seems that this could hardly be misunderstood. Those who fail to obey the truth are to be rewarded with tribulation and anguish; those who continue in well doing are to be rewarded with eternal life. But when are these rewards to be given? Paul continues right on with this thought and in verse 16 he tells us when it is to be: “In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel.” It is not to be in the days when God shall judge the secrets of men—the secrets of the saints to be judged in one day and the secrets of sinners in another day; but it is to be in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men. Consequently the secrets of men, of all men, are to be judged in the same day, and in that day the wicked will receive tribulation and anguish and the righteous will receive eternal life. The good and the bad will all be there in that day.

And the apostle Jude, adds his testimony to this fact. His testimony also includes the testimony of Enoch in his prophecy. “And Enoch, also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, “Behold, the Lord cometh with thousands of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.” Jude 14,15.)

The purpose of the Lord’s coming is here manifest. He is not to come, according to this testimony, to raise and reward the righteous to reign with him for a thousand years over the world before he judges the world; but he is coming to execute judgment upon all. Premillennialists cannot postpone the judgment of the ungodly to some other period of time, unless they can get the book of Jude out of the Bible, for he says they are to be judged at the Lord’s coming. This cannot be twisted into what speculators call “the second phase of the Lord’s coming,” after his saints have met him in the air and he comes with them. The thing that Premillennialists call the second phase of his coming occurs before the Millennium of their theory begins, and if Jude refers to the second phase of that coming, the ungodly are judged before the millennium; and that destroys their position that the wicked will be judged when the Millennium is over. The Bible actually specifies the time of the judgment. “Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts.” (1 Cor. 4:5) So the time for the judgment is when the Lord comes. The force of his words cannot be sidestepped by saying that this is the time for the judgment of the righteous only, for at this time Paul says the Lord “will bring to light the hidden things of darkness.” Surely that statement cannot be a description of the character of the saints! When the Lord comes it is time to judge the hidden things of darkness, and we can be sure the Lord will judge them when it is time to do so regardless of the speculation of Premillennialists.

In Rev. 1:7 we have this statement: “Behold he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him; and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him.” I cannot see how this statement might be improved upon. John says that when the Lord comes with the clouds “every eye shall see him.” Do the wicked have eyes? Well, they are to see him then for every eye shall see him. Not only will they see him after he arrives, but they will see him as he comes. And the apostle John, seemingly knowing that there would be men who would not be satisfied with the statement that every eye shall see him, went on to declare, “and they also which pierced him.” No one can claim these men among the righteous; neither that they will be living when the Lord comes. They are among the unrighteous dead and yet they are to see the Lord when he comes with the clouds. This necessitates their resurrection when the trumpet sounds as the Lord descends. And as if meeting the arguments of Premillennialists John added, “and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him.” If the wicked dead are not to be raised till a thousand years after his coming, this could not refer to them; and if the judgment of the living wicked is not to occur until the Millennium is over, there would be no reason for them to wail—they would still have plenty of time to get ready.

All Judged At Coming Of Christ

“All charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom.” (2 Tim. 4:1) No discrimination here is made between the righteous and the unrighteous. Christ will judge the quick (living) and the dead at his appearing. Had Paul said the Lord will judge the righteous living and the righteous dead at his coming there would have been some ground for the Premillennial theory of two resurrections and two judgments, but it happens that Paul was not defending Premillennialism when he wrote to Timothy. Will there be any living wicked when Jesus comes? Oh, yes, no one has ever questioned that fact. Then they will be judged at that time, for the Lord will judge the living at his appearing. So there will not be a millennium between the Lord’s coming and the judgment of the wicked. For the wicked to be judged at Christ’s coming they must be raised then, for surely they will not be judged a thousand years before their resurrection. And their resurrection, therefore, will occur at the coming of the Lord, and the theory of two future resurrections is blasted into atoms.

Not only will all the living and dead, righteous and unrighteous, be judged at the coming of the Lord, but they will all be rewarded at the same time. We may first note that the righteous will receive their rewards of glory at the appearing of Christ. Paul said: “When Christ, who is our glory shall appear, then shall ye also appear with glory in his kingdom.” (Continued on Page 27)
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THE FLOOD-GATES OF DIGRESSION

The Christian Churches and Their Pastors Who so Frequently Insist That There is no Difference Between Themselves and Churches of Christ, Except the Music, Are Nevertheless Identified with All of the Evils of Denominationalism from Affiliation with the Council of Churches Down to Women Elders in the Church. It Goes to Prove the Long Time Plea that One Innovation Opens the Flood-gates to Them All.

G. K. WALLACE

I. THE COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Those who take the Wichita, Kansas daily papers often see the names of the preachers of the Churches of Christ in Wichita connected with some announcement of the Council of Churches. This takes place against our will and without our consent. We are not affiliated with this council and are very much opposed to it. This council is a sectarian organization and rules its subjects with a high hand of ecclesiasticism.

The Christian Church, which falsely claims to be like the Church of Christ except the music, is identified with this heresy. However, they are gaining nothing and are now beginning to learn that they are being dominated by what Dr. Kershner calls “the Calvinistic brethren.”

Dr. Kershner Complains

Dr. Kershner, Dean, School of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, and writer for the Christian Evangelist, official publication of the liberal element of the Christian Church, complains about the Council after this manner: “The election of Dr. Holt as president of the Federal Council for the next two years makes a process of rotation among the five most influential members of the Council which is an excellent index to the policy of the organization.”

Evidently the Dr. does not like it because some of the preachers of the Christian Churches have not been elected as president of this Council. “Of course, there are,” says the Dr., “some twenty or more churches represented in the Council. Some of these, like the Disciples, have more members than the Congregationalists or the Northern Baptists. They do not, however, have the wealth or influence of these organizations.”

So when it comes to being elected president, one must have wealth and influence. This is 3 direct violation of the first part of the second chapter of James. Just read this scripture: “Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness.”

Then denominational control by the major groups has become the policy of the organization.

Policy Of The Organization

What is the policy of this organization? Let Dr. Kershner answer, “What is apparent to the thoughtful observer is the fact that the denominational control on the part of major groups has become the policy of the organization.”

The Dr. does not like it because his group is classed with the Holiness, Pentecostals, or what have you?

The Federal Council of Churches that has slighted the churches without wealth and influence has elected Presidents from the following denominations:

(1) Methodist; (2) Baptist; (3) Methodist; (4) Presbyterian; (5) Congregationalists; (6) Methodist; (7) Baptist; (8) Methodist.

You understand, however, that there are Northern Methodists and Baptists, and Southern Methodists and Baptists. There is a “Mason-Dixon line” running through these churches. Such distinction shows them to be sectarian. There should be no sectional nor geographical boundaries among people who profess to follow Christ. The Bible does not even mention any of the above named group. Their doctrines and practices are antipodal to the gospel of Christ.

Politics Govern

How is this council governed? “Politics,” says the Doctor. Mr. Kershner, are you going to accuse these great preachers with such a sordid motive? We thought this organization was to be the very purest example of Christian cooperation and now you destroy our faith by shouting, “Politics.” He says, “It is not a matter of selecting men, independent of church affiliation but following the rules of ecclesiastical politics.”

“It all furnishes a very instructive lesson as to the place of minority groups in denominational cooperation.” This we have known all the time. The large Sectarian Churches will not “play” with you unless you “play” their way. Yes, they will cooperate if you do as they say.

Brethren it is disgusting to the point of nausea when our preachers and members fraternize with denominations and their preachers. “Every plant that my Father planted shall be rooted up.” Let us be busy rooting up this foolishness and strive to destroy the works of the devil. This religious organization does not belong to the Lord. We are commanded to “have no fellowship with the unfruitful workers of darkness.”

II. WOMEN ELDERS

The Christian Evangelist, Christian Church paper, laments the fact that the Christian Church has so few women on their church boards. The Editor says, “It is an indication that conceit has not yet been knocked out of masculinity that there are so few women on the official boards of our churches.”

Another writer in the same paper says, “We have an equal number of women and deacons***. There is perfect harmony and all that old prejudice and feeling of ‘let your women keep silent in church is gone.’

Still another writes, “I have been advocating equal rights of authority for women and men in our churches. ****I recommend, electing 0 men elders if they are spiritually and educationally qualified.” It seems that many Christian preachers have no idea of the teachings of the Bible or else they are so filled
with the spirit of self-will that they have no respect for the will of God. Just how does the Bible read along these lines?

The Two Pauline Possesses

1. Paul says, “permit not a woman to teach nor to have dominion over a man but to be in quietness.” (1 Tim. 2:12) Yet in the fact of this, equal authority is advocated.

2. Again Paul says, “As in all churches of the saints, let the women keep silence in the churches for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also saith the law. (1 Cor. 14:34). According to the editor of the Christian Evangelist, Paul needed the “conceit knock-ckcl” out of him. However, we believe, it is the young editor who is conceited. Paul says, “If any man (this would include our editor), thinketh himself to be a prophet or a spiritual let him take knowledge of the things which I write unto you, that they are the commandment of the Lord.” (1 Cor. 14:37). The above mentioned editor is the one who is mistaken as Paul spake by inspiration.

3. Advocating women for the eldership is almost too silly for reply. When the Holy Spirit laid clown the qualification for an elder He said, “The bishop (elder), therefore must be ***.” There are certain things one must do to be saved. One must be born again. (John 3:5) One must believe in Christ. (Heb. 6:8) One must repent. (Luke 3:3) One must be baptized. (Acts 2:38; Mark 16:15, 16). These things must be done. Even so, to qualify as an elder one must be the husband of one wife. (1 Tim 3:2). We would like to know how the dear sisters will qualify in this respect. Paul says this must be. One could just as easily set aside faith from the things necessary to salvation as to set aside the above qualification for an elder.

The Restrictions Considered

It is likely that you have thought by now that we too violate the above scriptures in that we have women teachers. Not so. The Bible authorizes women to teach. The prophet said women would teach in the Christian age. (Joel 2:28). The New Testament commands her to teach. (Titus 2:3-5). Luke says she did teach. (Acts 21:9). However, she is told not to teach and to keep silent. (1 Cor. 14:34, 35; 1 Tim. 2:11, 12). Does the Bible contradict itself? No. Since woman is told not to do the thing she is commanded to do it becomes a matter of place. Where may she teach and where should she be silent?

She is to be silent in the church but what is the church? The word church is used in the New Testament to mean:

1. The church as an institution. (Matt. 16:18; Col. 1:18, 24).
2. A local congregation. (1 Cor. 2; Rev. 1:14; Rom. 16:16).
3. The assembly. (1 Cor. 14:23).

The assembly is not an institution. It is not the body of Christ. It is just a public meeting of the church. This is the church in which a woman is told to keep silent. (1 Cor. 14:23, 34, 35). When this assembly is dismissed this “church” does not exist. When there is no such “church” (assembly), 1 Cor. 14:23, 34, 35 does not apply. A class taught either before or after this assembly is not the place where women are told to be silent. In such a class she may teach and in so doing does not violate 1 Cor. 14. If a woman teaches her children at home she is still a member of the church as an institution but she is not teaching in the assembly.

There is a restriction on woman’s teaching even in a class. She is not to have dominion over a man. (1 Tim. 2:11, 12). Surely no one will be so simple as to think that a woman is having dominion over men while she is teaching a class of children.

JUDGMENT--
(Continued from Page 25)

him in glory.” (Col. 3:4) The “when” and the “then” of this statement are unmistakable in their meaning. When Christ appears then the righteous enter glory. Peter confirms this truth: “And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.” (1 Pet. 5:4) And the apostle of love looked forward to that day and said: “Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it cloth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.” (1 John 3:2)

But the foregoing point will be at once conceded by Premillennialists. They claim the righteous will be rewarded at the coming of the Lord, but not the wicked. Yet the New Testament just as plainly teaches that the wicked will get their rewards at the same time. “And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day.” (2 Thes. 1:7-10)

The coming of Christ and the rewards for the wicked are plainly marked out in this Scripture. The Lord will “take vengeance” on them that obey not the gospel “when he shall be revealed from heaven.” And the wicked “shall be punished” with everlasting destruction “when he (the Lord) shall come to be glorified in his saints.” When the saints are glorified, and when believers admire him in that day, then the wicked “shall be punished.” The glorification of the -saints and the punishment of sinners will both occur in that day when Christ shall come. If Premillennialism be true, and the wicked are not to be punished till a thousand years are over after the coming of Christ, then he will not be taking vengeance on them when he is revealed from heaven, and the language of the apostle Paul is one of the most misleading statements ever made.

But Paul was not a Premillennialist, and neither was Christ who gave utterance to the following words: “For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every man according to his works.” (Matt. 16:27) Are the wicked to be called men? and have they done any kind of works? If so, they are to be rewarded when the Son of man comes in his glory; for “then he shall reward every man according to his works.” In this case the word “then” cannot be misunderstood: it refers to both the righteous and the unrighteous. When the saints are rewarded the sinners are also-then every man is rewarded. And it refers to the time of the Lord’s second coming. The same principle of truth is found in the Lord’s words in Rev. 22:12: “And behold, I come quickly: and my reward is with me, to give every man according as his work shall be.” It will take the Premillennialists more than a thou- sand years to eliminate the wicked from these statements. They prove beyond any doubt to unbiased minds that the resurrection, the judgment and the rewarding of the living and the dead, the righteous and the unrighteous, will occur at the same time—-the second coming of Christ our Savior.

THE NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATES:
Six Months, One Dollar; Twelve Months, Two Dollars.
HAVE WE REALLY ABANDONED ENTERTAINMENT?

The Trend Toward "Special Numbers", Choruses. Quartets, Duets, Solos, in Our Assemblies Aside from Being Inconsistent with our condemnation of the Entertainment Methods of the Denominations, is Incompatible with the Spirit and Purpose of Congregational Praise and is Sure to Result in a Perversion of the Worship.

JACK MEYER

As a people we have made much of the point that our public assembly worship is entirely free of all entertainment features. It has been our practice to point to the excesses of our neighbors with their orchestras, bands, choirs, contrasting all of that with the simplicity of our own services. We have abhorred such worldly indulgences, stressing that the purity of worship is thus corrupted, that the Christ is thus lost sight of, and that worldly pride and grandeur have obscured the art of worship in spirit and in truth. We have constantly pointed to the costly and extravagant show places otherwise known as church buildings as erected by the worldly sects, coupling these with their elaborate ceremonies, and have insistently cried that all such is in the spirit of worldly show, dazzling of eyes, and entertainment, that crowds may be drawn. It would be difficult to find a preacher among us who has not used these points and all of such preaching and reasoning have revolved about that word entertainment! How many things have we found in our neighbors' worship that have been subjected to that charge of entertainment! 

Stressing A Fundamental

Please do not stop and exclaim in disgust: "Another one of our modern preachers going 'broadminded'!" The above paragraph merely states facts, with which we are all thoroughly familiar, and which I preach this day with all my heart, as it is my aim to continue preaching. As a matter of fact, it is my conviction, born of observation and experience, that we need to preach these things more today than even a few years ago. It is plain to me that we will always need to stress as a fundamental principle that we may have in public worship nothing that is or appears to be in the spirit of entertainment, if we would have our worship please our Lord. That was settled once and for all in Gal. 1:10. Surely the principle of pleasing men or God as given in that verse will apply to all that we do. Consequently, we abuse the spirit of worship if we have in it anything that is done primarily to draw a crowd, parade our ability, or entertain. Rather, everything included in worship must be designed to teach, edify, convert, draw people nearer God. Now, if we have preached the sentiments of the first paragraph of this article and have practiced, or tolerated without our disapproval, anything that is the very opposite of these sentiments, we not only contradict our preaching and oppose God's plan, but also give our neighbors an excellent chance to say: "Well, they condemn some of our entertainment features, and then turn right around and have some of the same things or similar things for the same reason."

Preaching And Practice

Let us submit our song services to an inspection and see if we preach one thing and practice another just at this point. It is generally admitted among churches of Christ that singing in assembly worship is for the purpose of teaching, admonishing, making melody with the heart and accompanying instrument. It is admitted that if our assembly worship is in the spirit of honor and reverence for God and dependence upon Him, then the singing must be in furtherance of those ends. Now, while little or nothing is said in the New Testament as to how many shall sing at one time, it will also be admitted that our practice has been to have congregational singing, as avoiding some evils into which our neighbors have fallen and as affording the best opportunity for all to take part in as much of the service as possible. Under this plan we have the fewest possible chances of having some modern abuses, and the best possible chance of promoting worship by the whole assembly in that particular item. And surely, if we have preached the sentiments outlined in the first paragraph of this article, congregational singing all of the time will be the more consistent course to back up that preaching. At least, if we invite all to sing every hymn, none could accuse us of injecting any of the spirit of entertainment into the worship. None could say: "You preach against entertainment in worship, and then have features which look mighty like the thing you condemn."

Perversion Of Worship

That being true, friends, is it wise or even consistent to follow the trend as found in so many places today: to have "special numbers," choruses, choirs, quartets, solos, in our singing in assembly worship? Do you say that these practices are not pursued in the spirit of entertainment? Well, if one who indulged in such things would deny that such was the spirit and motive of his participation, I would take his word for it, not being able to read his heart. But, let us press the point just a little as to general practice. Just what is the purpose of having any group less than the whole assembly invited to sing? Really, just what is the purpose? In a neighboring church where this was done one time I asked the leader of the quartet just what was the idea. He frankly (and I admire his honesty) admitted: "Entertainment, to increase the crowds." My hat is off to that brother's honesty. But may the Lord save His church from such perversion of worship. "Let us have grace, whereby we may offer service well pleasing to God, with reverence and awe," is the very opposite of such practices. That was offered to the audience! I believe that there are any number of honest brethren who would admit that their choruses, quartets, and solos are for the same purpose.

Suppose we have "outsiders" present at our services, and they are people who delight in reverence in worship, who are earnest in seeking the truth, though mistaken in their human doctrines, and who are also disgusted with the worldliness and entertainment of the public worship of the churches to which they belong. Picture such people now in one of our services. Think of what great good such people could exert in the cause of Christ could they only be converted. Consider that they have noticed the difference in the worship of their own people and that of churches of Christ, and are favorably impressed with the utter lack of show (Continued on Page 47)
Experimenting WITH GOD

Miss Pickford’s Perspective of the World Is no More Than a Merchandise Mart with God as One of the Articles. A Human Being is Impudent Who Condescends To Try God.

HUGO McCORD

THOUGH Miss Pickford’s articles, “Why Not Try God?”, have many fine statements she has, this writer thinks, utterly the wrong angle of approach. That angle is portrayed in her title, “Why Not Try God?”. It is the viewpoint of: “I’ve tried everything else I can-empirically and spiritually-now I’ll at least try this last straw. If otherwise I could have been happy I’d never have been pushed to this last extreme. I’d never have known God under any but desperate circumstances. I only look for God in adversity and don’t have any use for him if I can prosper without him.”

A Merchandise Mart

Miss Pickford’s perspective of the world is no more than a merchandise mart with God as one of the articles. Humans fumble through subsisting on this and that; but they are not satisfied; their health weakens. Is there no hope? The clerk finally asks, “Here’s an article you haven’t tried-named ‘God’; why not try it?” What a poor angle at which to look at the Maker! Can he be put in a class with the things he made? The One in whom we live and move and have our being is not one of several market choices. The living God can never be a static store article. “He is above all, and through all, and in you all.”

To this writer’s mind Miss Pickford’s attitude violates: “Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.” Hers is the attitude of trying God. “I’ll try him to see if he can make me happy; if he doesn’t I’ll try something else.” Such a conception forgets how little and puny we all are! How every creature is frail and subject to the I Am that I Am! “It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers.” We are all weak and undone without God. There is no such thing as such a creature sitting down, putting a hand in a grab bag, and trying God if we pull him out.

Trusting Versus Trying

Simply to try God is insufficient. “…for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.” A human being is impudent and out of place who condescends to try God. “Nay but, 0 man, who art thou that repliect against God? Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the potter power over the clay, of the same lump to make one vessel unto honor and another unto dishonor?”

Jesus did not try God. His spirit, instead of the “trial and error” method, was “I must be about my Father’s business.” The true philosophy of life is surely this: “For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.” And he did it in prosperity and adversity: at a marriage feast and when he sweated blood; when God was with him and when God forsook him! That’s faith! That’s the real principle practised. Besides which, how pitiable is “Why not try God?” A much better title for a series of articles than Miss Pickford’s would be Christ’s statement: “Lo, I come to do thy will, 0 God.”

Miss Pickford’s viewpoint isn’t as admirable as that of the honest skeptic. He doesn’t worship God because he isn’t sure of him. But Miss Pickford believes he exists but only uses him as a last resort, in a desperate extreme. If everybody had that doubting faith what a world this would be! Children would not be taught of the great Governor of the universe; lawlessness would be grotesque in its horrors; civilization would tumble in a day! Rather than try everything else first, and God last, ‘twould be better for the world, for lives, for souls, if every human being would be “about his Father’s business.”

Experimenting-A Parable

Once there was a great drugstore—so big that all the people of the world traded there. On the shelves were many and sundry remedies advertised as guaranteeing happiness. One bottle, branded “Liquor,” was ever more popular. “Drink your troubles away” was a slogan. “This bottle makes you a millionaire—costs just 79c pint.” Two gentlemen, riding, high and comfortable on their private freight car, had divided a millionaire bottle. Said one, as they passed cities and rich farms, “I’m thinking of buying the last three towns we passed through.” The other, “You can’t if I won’t sell to you.”

But thousands of people found that “Liquor” was a deceptive remedy. It always left one with a headache, body aches, and heartaches. And one could not drink and suffer to himself. The fake medicine for happiness fooled the victim and hurt other people too!

Another product, on a big shelf, was “Sex Pleasures.” This too had a ready sale. And likewise, thousands had learned that, for lasting happiness, it was unreliable. Its attractiveness was no more enduring than a snowflake: white, alluring for a moment; then dirty slush in a gutter, repulsive.

A patent medicine, wildly acclaimed, was “Money.” Many who knew the futility of “Liquor” and “Sex Pleasures” were victims of this patented hoax. Anything they would do for “Money,” thinking it would bring happiness. Old King Midas was a famous one trapped by this quack. Eastman found it powerless to make life bearable. Nobody ever did attain peace of mind by laying up this medicine. Additional of the medicine cramped it more and more; were never satisfied, much less satiated. The love of “Money” was a root of all evil instead of all good.

Quite an expensive product in that big store was a drug named “Power”. A few men, Alexander of Macedon, Napoleon of France, et. al., were able to buy it. But they all felt they had been cheated; “Power” failed to guarantee happiness, not even ease of mind; nay, it pushed happiness further away than ever.

“Fame,” so ardently sought, and advertised as “Certain Happiness,” was a forgery. Colonel Lindbergh suffered untold agonies after a free bottle of “Fame” was given him.

Came into that drug store one day a man, sickish, despairing. He had tried many remedies from the store but was more unhappy now than ever. The store clerk, Miss Mary Pickford, wondered what she would suggest now. High on a secluded shelf, seldom recommended, she espied a product branded “God.” She knew little about it herself, but this hopeless man had tried everything else; $0, as a last resort, she quaveringly asked the customer, “Why not try ‘God’?”

What a remedy! How different from all the others. The other remedies were costly, some exorbitantly so. But this one was free. Why hadn’t it been recommended before? All other remedies left bad after effects; this never brought repercussions, but only “joy unspeakable”.

“Why not try ‘God?’ All other remedies hurt one’s neighbors; but ‘God’ hurt nobody. Other remedies failed utterly to procure happiness; this remedy had never failed one time.

How ridiculous that a remedy as “God” should be last in recommendation.
THE EVILS ATTENDING THE DANCE

A Practice Once Under the Ban of All Denominations and Outlawed by All Decent People Now Sanctioned and Even Sponsored by Many Religious Bodies. Their Excuses for Doing So and the Age-old Questions of What Harm There Is in It Have Been Answered a Thousand Times. It Is a Sensual, Devilish Institution Which No Christian Can Patronize.

L. R. WILSON

In recent years dancing has become the most universal form of indoor entertainment at all social gatherings. From its popularity one would suppose that there could be no other sort of social "recreation." Gatherings of every kind, whether it be a civic organization, a lodge, a school, a presidential party, or, as in many instances, a church social, or what not, the dance seems to be the only "recreation" that will satisfy.

A young man may be brilliant and destined to do great things, but if he is not a good dancer, he is ostracized from "good society" by the socially elite. On the other hand if he is a good dancer and a passionate lover regardless of his lack of other qualifications he is a "riot." Because of such attitudes, many of our young men have felt that the most important thing in life is to be a good dancer and an ardent lover.

There was a time when the denominational churches banned dancing. Then came a time when they winked at it. Now it is "supervised" and sponsored by many of the most popular sects. Their excuse for doing so is that they must do "something" to hold their young folks. Wonder why they do not build "petting booths" in the church houses, to "hold" them? Unquestionably, this would attract more young people.

"But where is the harm in dancing?" This age-old question has been asked thousands of times and as often answered. Yet it continues to be asked and the answers ignored. "Show me the harm," goes the well-worn phrase, "and I'll quit it." Sure, who wouldn't? But showing them "There's the rub." It is just about as easy to show a blind man the sun as it is to show a person what has been appropriately called the "moving bedroom." Drive out any night you wish between ten and two o'clock, and count the cars parked on the side of the roads, with lights turned out. If you will take the trouble to observe, you will find that the largest number of these cars are parked on roads that lead directly to the dance halls.

"No harm in the dance." Hmm! Wonder how many young men ever came into contact with Christian young women on the dance floor and through such contacts were led to Christ? All those who have first-hand knowledge of such cases please write me; as I have my first case yet to learn about. On the other hand, it is a well-known fact that thousands of young people have started on the downward road to ruin at the dance floor.

More than a decade ago, brother E. C. Fuqua, then of Fort Collins, Colorado, in his Sacred Studies wrote a treatise on the question, "Is Mixed Dancing Legitimate?" In this treatise he said, "Seventy-five per cent of the fallen women of this nation are said to have been recruited from the dance or introduced to a life of shame through means of the enticement of the dance. The dance halls are universally known as the chief feeders of prostitution. They are invariably visited by denizens and agents of the underworld who lurk there for prey because of the richness of the field there provided."

Women of disrepute are always found at the public dance. There is no way to keep them out. They may be equally as well, or even better, behaved on the dance floor than many of the elite. This only makes it the more dangerous. Here they go to prey upon the young men; and their subtlety beguiles the unwary. They are wolves in sheep's clothing. Do you think it safe for your boy or your girl to mix with these moral lepers? Do you think that they can always pick out these degenerates, veneered with cosmetics, pretty clothes, and cunning ways?

Maybe some think that the picture here drawn is too black. It is true that the evils here set forth are in the extreme. Nevertheless, they are the legitimate fruits of the dance. It is a corrupt tree and all its fruits are corrupt. It never bears any other kind. In many instances the fruits are destroyed before maturity, thus preventing the extreme evils to which the dance inevitably tends. But it is not the fault or praise of the tree that the fruits do not mature. Talk about wholesome dancing? All dancing is sensual and devilish. You might as well talk about a wholesome saloon.

Who ever heard of a band of dancing Christians leading a revival in the kingdom of God? In proportion to one's love for the dance the less will be his love for the church. The better dancer the person is the poorer Christian he is. You might take all the dancing Christians in the world and group them together and you couldn't scare up enough religious zeal in them to conduct a prayer meeting.

Mothers sometimes give their girls dancing lessons; and if anything is said about it they apologize by saying, "They are so clumsy; I'm just doing it to make them more graceful; and, too, it is a good, healthful exercise. I never intend for my children to dance." A father might as well teach his boys to be good fighters, on the ground that it makes them more active and healthful, then argue that he never intends for them to fight. Many mothers spend more to give their daughters dancing lessons—though they do not intend for them to dance—than they ever give to have them taught the Bible. I had rather my daughter be as clumsy as a cow than to be the most graceful dancer in Hollywood.
CAUSES AND EFFECTS OF DIVORCE

L. R. W.

ANY questions are asked about the Bible teaching on divorce. It is not so much what the Bible teaches with which the parties are concerned in most instances, but how to salve their conscience while evading it. Christ’s language on divorce could hardly have been put in simpler terms. He said, “Whosoever shall put away his wife, except for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and he that marrieth her when she is put away committeth adultery.” (Matt. 19:9). If I were to try to explain His meaning, as I am frequently asked to do, I would not know how. I can think of no terms that would make clearer His meaning than the language He employed.

Many people, make such a mess of their marriage that Solomon would be stumped to know how to get them out of their predicament. The primary trouble is that few people ever think of what the Bible teaches until divorce is the only way out, as they see it. The advice of a preacher is always an after-thought. Yet, it is an every day experience with the preacher to be called upon to solve marital problems that refuse to be solved. All our thunderings against the evils of divorce, the folly of marrying with a view to reform, the dangers of marrying outside the church, etc., fall on blissful ears, until these colossal blunders have been committed and the painful results have to be faced. The parties then rush to the preacher to know what to do. The “pound of cure” is much preferred to the “ounce of prevention.” It would not be so bad if the “cure” was real. But it is one of those diseases that can not be cured.

Although one has made an egregious blunder in marriage, separation and divorce can be prevented in most instances. Rarely is all the blame on one party. Each party is so reluctant to surrender a single right, usually, that conditions become intolerable. A lesson that all should learn early is that other people have rights that must be considered. Merely because two people do not agree is no reason for endless wrangling—not to mention divorce. If marriage bonds are dissolved, what guarantee has one that another marriage will be better? A little kindness and consideration by both parties will settle most of the difficulties.

Christ made allowance for divorce on one ground but only one when He added the clause, “except for fornication.” This would be meaningless if He had not intended it as an exception. The frequency with which one party proves unfaithful is appalling. Often times both parties are equally guilty. They are so attracted by the new and forbidden that they can not (?) resist. A man’s own wife may be beautiful and sweet, yet he may “fall” for his neighbor’s wife who is very dumb and homely. Nevertheless she is new to him. She may become “shopworn” and detestable within a very few weeks but as long as the “new” lasts she is very appealing. He probably would not give his wife’s little finger for a cow pen full of such women: yet he will endanger his own happiness and the happiness of his wife and children together with that of his neighbor’s entire family—so to say nothing of the eternal judgment—all for a few sips at Cupid’s bowl.

We are peculiar creatures. The things that we can’t have are the things that we most crave. If a mother tells her child not to put beans up its nose she may be sure that this will be the very thing that it will want to do. Adults are only grown-up children. The Lord knew that monogamy was best for mankind, hence, He forbade coition outside of wedlock. The fact that it is thus forbidden is, with a great many, a strong incentive to try it. Thus, the strange and the forbidden are the impelling forces in dissolving most marriage contracts. After the barrier has been broken down and the new wears off the individual loses interest in a particular case and begins looking for other adventures. It is just one of those strange paradoxes where, “when you get what you want you don’t want it.”

The saddest thing about a story of this kind is that the parties never get through paying for their folly. While sowing their wild oats they forget about the reaping. Somehow they have an idea that their case will be an exception—that they will be able to escape the universal law of God by gathering grapes of thorns and figs of thistles. Untold millions have thus tried to mock God and, without an exception, all have paid the penalty. Yet, millions more persist in the same folly. When Paul said, “Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth shall he also reap,” he expressed an awful truth. The most tragic part about it is the reaping is always many-fold more than the sowing. It would not be so bad if one could sow his wild oats for a few months then pay for his folly and be through with it. But one may sow to the flesh for a very little while and never get through paying for it. Indeed, we seldom, if ever, get through paying for any of our sins. We may think that we are through only to find that the accumulated interest in later years amounts to more than the original payment.

Not only is fornication a heinous sin before God but it is down-right foolish. It forever destroys the peace and happiness of a home; it is the most frequent cause of separation and divorce; it brings on expensive court litigations; frequently it disrupts one’s business and destroys his earning power; it makes orphan children, from whence our growing army of criminals find their greater number of recruits; it oftentimes completely wrecks the lives of the guilty parties. Why any person would make such a sorry mess of his life is regrettable; but why members of Christ’s body—people who profess faith in, and love for Him—become so warped in their thinking and conduct is horrifying. It is enough to make the angels weep.

Parents, teachers and preachers should recognize the seriousness of divorce and try to prevent its tragedies. This business of marriage is serious. With many it is just a novelty and adventure, which, they imagine, can be given up at any time with no particular harm to any one. When the thrill of it passes they must find others; if they can’t find new ones and yet maintain their homes they will wreck them, regardless of the cost.
THE PROBLEM OF ORGANIZED COOPERATION

Does a Congregation Have the Right to Assume More than it Can Do? Since Brethren Have Begun to Establish Institutions They Have Vacillated Between One Plan and Another of Operation Neither of Which the Scriptures Give Hint. If the Lord Had Intended that His Work Be Done on a Bigger Scale than Can Be Handled by the Local Church He Would Have Designed a Bigger Organization.

O.C. LAMBERT

A GREAT many Christian duties are to be performed by individual Christians. The only cooperative organization divinely authorized is the local congregation. There are some duties that may be performed by a congregation or by individuals. After we have done our full duty as congregations or individuals there may still remain much to be done but our responsibility is coextensive with our ability. We, have a responsibility to feed the hungry but when we have reached the limit of our ability in that respect we are not held responsible for the millions who may be just as hungry and just as deserving. In a like manner there is a limit to the ability of a local congregation and beyond this the Lord does not expect us to go.

Pooling Resources

I have no right to assume more than I can do and demand of my brother that he help me, for he has a right to assume his own duties. Just suppose that every Christian should decide to assume more than he does. Do local congregations have a right to assume more than they can do? Do they have a right to assume burdens for other congregations? If the Lord had intended that his work be done on a bigger scale than can be handled by a local congregation would he not have designed a bigger organization? Should congregations or Christians who have done all they can as congregations or as individuals worry or have an uneasy conscience because much remains to be done?

There is not the necessity for pooling the resources of congregations as is sometimes thought. It is usually because congregations have no conception of their abilities and responsibilities. They are seeking to make things too easy for themselves. It is usually admitted that a Christian has responsibilities at least equal to that of a Jew. Having a better covenant and better promises it seems to me that if there is any difference, a Christian’s responsibility would be greater. Every Jew was required to give a tenth for the support of the priests. A tenth was not all they gave. What they gave for the poor and for their many offerings seem to have been in addition to the tenth. Nine Jewish families according to the divine plan could support a priest and his family. Eighteen families could support two. Forty-five families could support five preachers and their families. If we do no more, forty-five Christian families could support five preachers of the gospel. We no doubt have many congregations containing ninety families which could support ten preachers and their families. We may have a few which could support fifteen or twenty! Is it not a reflection on us when we have to comb the brotherhood in order to get a sufficiency to support one brother? When a preacher should go to a certain destitute place to establish the cause, there are hundreds of congregations which could assume the responsibility for his entire support and besides this send other men to other places. It is my judgment that when congregations begin to talk of “cooperating” with other congregations they are trying to avoid doing their full duty.

Interlocking Machinery

When New Testament churches contributed to the support of Paul or to the relief of the distressed they did so as individual congregations. They had no get-together meetings, no interlocking committees nor any other machinery tying the congregations together.

Last year twenty-five thousand people applied for orphans for adoption in the United States and seventeen thousand failed to get them. This shows that there is now only one orphan for every three persons who would be glad to provide a home. A childless home needs children just as badly as an orphan needs a home. I know of one congregation where this was emphasized to some extent and as a result eight or nine children were adopted. There were no orphans available in that particular locality and practically all the children had to be secured in another state. One lady traveled over several states before securing a child. The number of homes needing children probably about equals the number of children needing homes and the reason for the dearth of children is probably the practice among religious institutions of maintaining orphan homes. These homes then have an excellent pretext for scouring the country for funds. These funds are collected by people who have never been heard of before by the congregations. Regardless of the misgivings a Christian may have with reference to the scripturalness of the institution or of the management of it, he usually is loath to voice them for fear of damaging the innocent children. It is parallel to the bank robber who carries away with him the young lady bookkeeper. He knows that every one will hesitate to shoot for fear of hitting the young lady.

A Nominal Eldership

Since the brethren have begun to follow the nations around us in establishing institutions of this character, they have vacillated between two plans of operation. One plan has a board of regents residing at different points. The other plan is to put it nominally under the eldership of some congregation. Neither plan is satisfactory. If there had been any need for either plan surely the Scripture would give us some hint of it.

The first mentioned plan creates an organization which does not even profess to be a congregation through which to do work which should be done either as individuals or as congregations. It is “taxation without representation.” This board decides to spend several hundred thousand dollars for buildings. The congregations that are expected to support this have no voice in the matter. The local congregation is no more than a filling station for this unauthorized organization. If a
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THE CATHOLIC BIBLE
O.C.L.

THE Latin version of the Catholic Bible is commonly called Jerome's Vulgate. It is not so, in fact, for the reason that it has been revised countless times since his day. Curiously enough, the name Vulgate means in the language of the people. But the living Latin soon drifted away from the Latin of Jerome until in a few centuries the people of Italy itself spoke a different language. This natural drifting away from the language into which their Bible had been translated admirably aided the Catholic Church in bringing in their innovations unobserved. The Vulgate had by that time become a misnomer. Jerome made his version about the beginning of fifth century, centuries before the Reformation, and only the learned (usually priests) could read the Bible. The Catholic Church took severe measures to prevent its being translated into the vernacular. It was only after the Reformers had put out millions of Bibles in the different languages of earth that the Catholic Church put out vernacular versions in self-defense, but not without footnotes. They showed plainly that they were not willing for the Lord to converse with the people in words of His own choosing! The point I wish to emphasize in this article is that despite the fact that Catholic speakers and writers who say they object to the Protestant versions because they are not correct renderings of the Scriptures they do not claim that they have ever had a correct copy of the sacred writings, either in the Latin or English! I would like to remind the reader of a matter that was revealed in a former article. How that after the Vulgate had been revised countless times by the infallible (?) Catholic Church, that the Council of Trent about the middle of the sixteenth century declared that the then accepted Vulgate was "true, lawful, authentic and unquestioned" (Cath. Dict., 853), and that "that nobody might dare or presume to reject it on any pretence." (Cath. Ency., XV., 370), that before forty years had elapsed it was completely rewritten by Pope Sixtus V, but before it had been completely distributed Sixtus died, and after a rapid succession of Popes, Pope Clement VIII, recalled them and hastily substituted another in its place that has been in use until the present generation. The Catholic Encyclopedia records at length the lie that Clement and his advisers affixed to their edition which remained until the present generation. But my assertions will be worthless so I will give quotations from Catholic scholars who could not be accused of being unable to represent the Catholic Church.

"In declaring the Vulgate 'authentic', i.e., officially guaranteed, the Council did not imply that it was in every respect an absolutely accurate rendering of the original text, but that it was free from error in faith and morals, and was substantially faithful to the original Scriptures." (Question Box, 69).

"Thirdly, the Vulgate even in its purest form is not declared to be perfect. Such perfection was, indeed, attributed to it by some Post-Tridentine theologians, but was utterly denied by many Catholic scholars at the time (Hody, p. 509 seq.), and now probably would be affirmed by nobody. Franzelin sets this exaggerated view aside as little better than fanatical.

"Forthly, Franzelin admits the lawfulness of holding that texts directly intended to teach dogmatic truth may have been omitted in the Vulgate; and again that when such texts are given considerable alterations may have been made in their form. For example, he grants that we are at liberty in Gen. III. 15 to reject the Vulgate (or supposed Vulgate) reading, 'she shall crush thy head,' and similarly we may deny the correctness of the rendering 'ante luciferum' (Ps. cix. 3), 'fundetur' (Luc. XXII. 20), 'in quo omnes peccaverunt' (Rom. V. 12), 'omnes quidem resurgens' (1 Cor. XV. 21)." (Catholic Dict., 856, 857)

"It (Clementine) was not a perfect text of the Vulgate. The Preface disclaims any such exaggerated praise--nay admits that imperfections have been left 'of set purpose', lest offence should be given to the people, as well as for other reasons. But the Clementine editors rightly claim to have supplied a purer text than any hitherto known, and Vercellone has shown that it is the fruit of long and well directed toil and of great opportunities. The work of correction was continued for about forty years with few interruptions." (Catholic Dict., 853-854)

We will not then be surprised that it is said of the Pope Pius X, that, "He also formed commissions to Codify Canon Law (1904), and to restore the text of the Vulgate." (Short History of the Catholic Church, 247)

"The need of such revision (as was proposed by the pope about twenty years ago) has long been recognized. The time has come when the well established principles of textual criticism should be applied." (Cath. Ency., XV., 515)

"That it has numerous defects has never been denied." (Cath. Ency., XV., 370)

It is easy to see that the Douay version which was translated from the imperfect Vulgate would inherit its defects. But let Catholic scholars give their estimate of the Catholic English Bible.

"It certainly had great faults, for it is disfigured by uncouth and sometimes scarcely intelligible language." (Cath. Dict., 250)

"The text in use at the present day has been considerably altered from that which originally bore the name Douay Bible. The language of the first edition was fairly accurate." (External of the Catholic Church, 318).

There has recently appeared a new Catholic New Testament in which the original language was used instead of the Vulgate. This version upsets many texts, of the Vulgate and Douay and flatterly contradicts these former versions gotten out by this infallible (?) institution. But I will have to tell you of this in another issue.

COOPERATION

(Continued from Preceding Page)

congregation should fail to be ready when they drive up, it would be considered lacking in spirituality. The longer such institutions are borne with the more demanding they will become.

When these homes have been operated nominally by the eldership of some congregation it becomes more like an arrangement made for the purpose of avoiding criticism than anything else. The management under either plan in reality is about the same. The superintendent receives and disburses the money. He receives and disposes of the thousands of dollars worth of supplies. It is possible for things to be mismanaged with the result that the elders of the congregation who are dumb enough to be rubber stamps for this sort of thing are liable to wake up and find themselves ruined financially and the brotherhood disgraced in the eyes of the world.

These homes train the children and get out "on the road." They expect to put on a show in the church building. These homes are sometimes accused if the regular program of the church is not sidetracked to give way for it. They have young grown ladies performing so that a Holiness should be present and ask the difference in that and women preachers, the brethren would be speechless. If we stifle our misgivings, our children will have none.
THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER

About the Only Difference Between the Gospel Preacher Today and the Protestant and Catholic Clergy is that He Does not Wear the Name Pastor or Priest. There is a Growing Tendency Among Churches to Make Pastors and Priests out of the Preachers, Which Calls for Some Vigorous Teaching.

YATER TANT

The job of being a gospel preacher is admittedly a hard one. It is made considerably harder by the misconceptions many brethren have of what his job really is. Churches often employ a preacher without any clear and definite ideas as to what they are hiring him to do. Indeed, sometimes even the preachers themselves seem to have no clear conception of what their scriptural duties and limitations are.

To get at the heart of the difficulty it might be well to look at the work of the gospel preacher in contrast to the functions of the Catholic priest and Protestant pastor. For it is with the duties of these dignitaries that the members most often confuse the work of the Christian preacher. While denying the scripturalness of the denominational pastor system, churches often expect their preacher to do exactly the pastor’s work—about the only difference being he does not wear the name of pastor and is not given the salary the pastor receives.

The Catholic Priest

The Catholic priest stands between his parishioners and God. He is the personal representative of God to the members of his parish. As God’s special agent he is accorded a respect and a veneration that other loyal Catholics do not receive. A devout Catholic will tip his hat to the priest, the same as he does when passing the church house. The priest is a man set apart—he is a superior being. Even in his dress this difference from ordinary men is emphasized and accentuated.

To the priest the Catholic comes once a year (the more devout he is the more often he comes) to confess his sins. He makes full and unreserved confession of every sin he has committed either publicly or privately. He confesses as he would to God—indeed, he considers that he is confessing to God. And when confession is made to the priest extra sums of money to have masses said for the dead—that his suffering in purgatory may be shortened. All this subscription to the priest arises from one basic assumption, namely that the priest has an influence with God that the laity does not, and cannot ever have.

Furthermore, the priest has the power to control every action of his parishioners—even to telling the newly married couple how many children they shall bring into the world. He can forbid their reading of certain books, and command their reading of others. If they disobey he has absolute power to exclude them from the church. He can command them in the use of their time or possessions. At any hour of the day or night, for example, the priest can commandeer a Catholic car without bothering to explain for what or for how long he may want it. And the Catholic has no choice but to submit.

The Protestant Pastor

Among the denominations the pastor occupies a position in many ways similar to that of the Catholic priest—the greatest difference being in degree of power and not in kind. Ordinarily when a pastor takes charge of a church he does that very thing—takes charge. He is the overseer of the church spiritually, financially, and socially. The members of the church are taught to follow the leadership of the pastor; to fall in line with his program; to look to him for guidance in the church work, and to obey without questioning whatever the pastor may command them.

The pastor is the official oiler. It is his duty to keep the denominational machinery oiled and running smoothly. He must be a super politician, harmonizing all the discordant elements in his multitudinous organizations within the church.

Since the priest is God’s personal representative his prayers are more effective than the prayers of the laity. And when a Catholic desires something very greatly he will solicit the aid of the priest in using his influence with God to bring it to pass. When a loved one dies the family will pay the priest extra sums of money to have masses said for the dead—that his suffering in purgatory may be shortened. All this subscription to the priest arises from one basic assumption, namely that the priest has an influence with God that the laity does not, and cannot ever have.

Again, the pastor is the overseer of the flock. He considers it his bounden duty to call not less than once a year on every family in his church. And his calls are not the friendly calls of a brother Christian; they are the calls of a church official. He lets the people know that he is there on official business—that as their pastor he is looking after their spiritual welfare. He is God’s representative and his visit is pitched on that plane.

But perhaps one of the most important phases of the pastor’s work is his raising of money. He must see that his church contributes to the super denominational machinery as his overlords decree. Indeed, in many churches (notably the Methodist) a pastor’s efficiency is judged almost entirely by his ability to raise money. If he is good at shaking loose the shekels from his parishioners he is shifted about from one church to another where the need for finances is greatest. If on the other hand he is a poor financier he is likely to find himself in charge of two or three backwoods churches over across the ridge from Podunk. It is the pastor’s recognized duty to see that the budget of the church is met. If the total falls short of what it should be it is the pastor’s ecclesiastical head that is jeopardized.

The Christian Preacher

Since thousands of Christians have come from Catholic and sectarian influences it is at least understandable, even if not excusable, why they should have the conception of the preacher’s work that they have. In the main their ideas are a hangover from early teachings-teachings which they have never studied the Bible enough to overcome.

(1) The gospel preacher is not a pastor. It is neither his duty nor his right to oversee the flock. The Lord has a group of officers who are qualified and chosen for that very work. When a member is in need of over- sight, spiritual counsel, correction, or whatever it may be—it is the elders’ duty to care for him and not the preacher’s. The preacher, of course, is will-
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THE CHRISTIAN'S LIFE

As the Proof of the Pudding Is in the Eating, so the Proof of Any Doctrine Church Cannot Produce a Superior It is a Failure.

Y. T.

The psychologists have a word for it. They call it “facing reality.” That is the process by which a man strips himself of all sham and pretense and alibis, and with a candid and honest mind looks upon the unpleasant things of life as they really are. There is an inclination in all of us to conceal, deny, or evade the things that cause us pain or unpleasantness of any sort. This is known as “evading reality.” The very rich man doesn’t like to think of his responsibility for the suffering, squalor, and misery of his employees; so he either refuses to let himself think upon it, or else shifts the responsibility to them by declaring his workers are too lazy, shiftless, and trifling to get up and make something of themselves, that they, themselves, are to blame, etc. He is evading reality; he is refusing to face a very unpleasant fact about himself.

And here is the disturbing fact:

Sectarians And Saints

To all outward appearances there is no appreciable difference between the life of the average sectarian and the life of the average Christian. They read the same cheap literature; frequent the same places of amusement; indulge in the same petty gossip; have about the same standards of morality and ethics; spend their time in pursuit of the same trivial baubles of earthly pleasure and wealth; and have about the same attitude toward the church and religion. Indeed, so generally is the similarity recognized and accepted that it is not an uncommon thing to hear some Christian preacher, attempting to show that God requires something more of man than a moral life, make the honest confession (though not intended as such) that, “from a standpoint of ethics and morality alone there are just as good people in the denominations, or in no church, as there are in the church of the Lord.” That such an indictment (for it is an indictment—a terrible one) should be made against the church is deplorable; that it should go unchallenged is worse; but that the members should recognize in the statement nothing but the normal and to-be-expected condition is just-tragic.

As one watches the average Christian making his way toward his place of business on Monday morning he is not struck with the conviction that ‘there goes a man with a purpose in life.’ And the reason such a conviction is not borne to him is that the Christian lacks it himself. He has no really vital sense of being set apart from his fellows; he has no deep-seated belief that he is basically different from the men with whom he brushes shoulders in the street. He has utterly failed to grasp the significance of those familiar words of an early disciple, “But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God’s own possession…."

The Proof Of The Pudding

The proof of any pudding is in the eating. And the proof of any doctrine is in the lives it produces. If the gospel we preach cannot produce lives superior to those produced by sectarian doctrines, then it is an evident fact that our doctrine is not the gospel of the New Testament. “By their fruits ye shall know them” can refer not only to men but to doctrines. And the doctrine of Christ will always produce lives that are the best on earth. If, therefore, the members of the church today do not constitute the best body of people on earth, morally, ethically, and spiritually, it is indisputable proof that they have not followed the doctrine of Christ. Any preaching that fails to make Christ-like character the real end and aim of doctrine is a perversion of the gospel. Doctrine is not an end within itself, but is a means to an end. If sectarian theology can produce lives that morally and ethically are the equal of those produced by the gospel of Christ, then what advantage has truth over error?

A man who believes one verse of the Bible ought to live a better life than the man who rejects the whole book. The man who believes one chapter should be a better man than he who believes only one verse. And the man who believes a whole book should live a better life than he who believes only a chapter. That principle being true, why should not the Christian, who believes the entire book, live a superior life to the sectarian whose theology forces him to reject an occasional passage?

THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN 35

If the church today cannot produce a type of Christian living superior to that produced by the denominations, she has no right to exist.

But perhaps some will say we have missed the mark. Maybe the saints are living more Christ-like lives than the sectarians. But that is still not enough. They must be conspicuously and undeniably above the common level. Christ said to his disciples, “Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven.” Is it not likely that if he were here today, he would make the same declaration concerning his modern disciples and the niotlier religious sects?

Where Have We Failed

1. Incomplete conversions. Too many people have been baptized who are not weaned away from the world. They have not been added to the church, but have added the church to themselves. It is a sort of adjunct—a badge of respectability. They have been baptized because that seemed the smart thing to do to make them respectable citizens—not because they had an overwhelming conviction of their sinfulness and desired to escape its guilt.

2. Tolerance of emotional heresies. We have been careful to guard the church against intellectual heresies. We are promptly, and properly, set to oppose any man who may deny the virgin birth, the resurrection of Christ, the necessity of baptism, etc., etc. We are promptly, and properly, set to oppose any man who may deny their sinfulness and desired to escape its guilt.

3. Confusing doctrinal orthodoxy with righteous living. The sectarian thinks his pious living is a substitute for doctrinal orthodoxy. On the other hand, are there not Christians who give the impression of assuming that doctrinal orthodoxy is a substitute for righteous living; that it makes no difference how they live so long as they believe a whole book; that the knowledge of doctrine is not the same as, and is useless without, the practice of it.
THE CHURCH IN THE ETERNAL PURPOSE OF GOD

The Church Idea Old as Moses

That God purposed the church as far back as the time of Moses may be seen from the following statement of Paul:

"I stand unto this day testifying both to small and great, saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come; how that the Christ should suffer, and how that he first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles." (Acts 26:22, 23.)

1. "How that the Christ must suffer." For what was the Christ to suffer? In Eph. 5:25 Paul says, "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it." That Jesus died for all men is freely admitted, but that he died, suffered, that he might purchase the church with his blood (Acts 20:28) none will deny. Is it possible that God purposed that the Christ should suffer, but had no definite reason in mind for his suffering? Moses said he would suffer; Paul declares he suffered, died, to purchase the church; therefore in the day of Moses it was the purpose of God that the church should be brought into existence through the suffering of Christ.

2. "He should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles." Moses said Christ would do that. But how did he proclaim light to the Gentiles? Paul quotes Isa. 49:6 "I have set thee for a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts 13:47), and in doing so offers Jesus to the Gentiles. So in proclaiming Jesus to them he proclaims light to the Gentiles. But in preaching Jesus to them he declares how they may be "fellow-members of the body," the church. Is it possible that God would purpose that Jesus was to be proclaimed as light unto the Gentiles, and would say so through Moses and other prophets, but would not include the "how" in his plan? Certainly God planned that Jesus should be a light to the Gentiles in bringing salvation to them through the church, and of this Moses spoke. Thus we learn that this mystery, which briefly explained is that the Gentiles are to be "fellow-members of the body," the church, was "hid in God" in the life time of Moses. And though it was not clearly revealed unto Moses "as it hath now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit," he certainly spoke some things concerning it. And Paul plainly says he preached "nothing but what Moses and the prophets did say should come." Therefore, if God sent Paul to preach to the Gentiles this mystery, how they were "fellow-members of the body," the church, and if he preached "nothing but what Moses and the prophets did say should come," it follows con-

THE CHURCH Idea Old as Paul

That the church dates as far back in the purpose of God as the birth of Paul may be seen in the fact that Paul said, "It was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace, that I might proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles." (Gal. 1:15, 16.) But in preaching Jesus among the Gentiles Paul made known to them the mystery, how that they were fellow-members of the body, the church. So when God separated Paul at his birth to preach to the Gentiles, he separated him to declare to the Gentiles how they might be fellow-members of the church. The church had no place in the purpose of God at the time of Paul's birth, God could not have separated Paul to the task of preaching to the Gentiles about being fellow-members of the church. Again, if God purposed, even from his birth, that Paul should preach to the Gentiles about being fellow-members of the church, and Jesus had no idea of building a church, but rather intended to establish an earthly kingdom and reign here in person, it follows that he had no intention of doing the will of the Father as he declares he came to do. (Jno. 4:34, 5:30)

Church Idea as Old as Moses

That God purposed the church as far back as the time of Moses may be seen from the following statement of Paul:

"I stand unto this day testifying both to small and great, saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses did say should come; how that the Christ should suffer, and how that he first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles." (Acts 26:22, 23.)

1. "How that the Christ must suffer." For what was the Christ to suffer? In Eph. 5:25 Paul says, "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it." That Jesus died for all men is freely admitted, but that he died, suffered, that he might purchase the church with his blood (Acts 20:28) none will deny. Is it possible that God purposed that the Christ should suffer, but had no definite reason in mind for his suffering? Moses said he would suffer; Paul declares he suffered, died, to purchase the church; therefore in the day of Moses it was the purpose of God that the church should be brought into existence through the suffering of Christ.

2. "He should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles." Moses said Christ would do that. But how did he proclaim light to the Gentiles? Paul quotes Isa. 49:6 "I have set thee for a light of the Gentiles, that thou shouldest be for salvation unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts 13:47), and in doing so offers Jesus to the Gentiles. So in proclaiming Jesus to them he proclaims light to the Gentiles. But in preaching Jesus to them he declares how they may be "fellow-members of the body," the church. Is it possible that God would purpose that Jesus was to be proclaimed as light unto the Gentiles, and would say so through Moses and other prophets, but would not include the "how" in his plan? Certainly God planned that Jesus should be a light to the Gentiles in bringing salvation to them through the church, and of this Moses spoke. Thus we learn that this mystery, which briefly explained is that the Gentiles are to be "fellow-members of the body," the church, was "hid in God" in the life time of Moses. And though it was not clearly revealed unto Moses "as it hath now been revealed unto his holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit," he certainly spoke some things concerning it. And Paul plainly says he preached "nothing but what Moses and the prophets did say should come." Therefore, if God sent Paul to preach to the Gentiles this mystery, how they were "fellow-members of the body," the church, and if he preached "nothing but what Moses and the prophets did say should come," it follows con-
clusively that Moses and the prophets spoke concerning the church. If they spoke of the church it must have had a place in the eternal purpose of God that at that time.

Church Idea Old as Abraham

There are three terms used by Paul in Eph. 3:6 which are worthy of study in this connection, "fellow-heirs," "fellow-members" and "fellow-partakers of the promise." These are used to explain the mystery which had been hid in God "for ages and generations." (Col.1:26). And either will serve to prove that the church is old in the purpose of God. While the temptation is strong to make a study of each of them, for lack of space I will use only one, "that the Gentiles are fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the gospel".

"Fellow-partakers of the promise," the promise made to Abraham (Gen. 12:3; 22:18). "In thy seed shall all families of the earth be blessed." The Gentiles were to be "fellow-partakers of that promise." The Gentiles were to be "fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus," and that means they were to be fellow-partakers of the promise in the church, as shown in No. 4, God must have had the church in mind when he made the promise of salvation to all nations through the seed of Abraham.

But this conclusion is reinforced by the expression, "through the Gospel." It was part of the mystery which had been hid for ages that the Gentiles were to be fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus through the Gospel. God purposed, as far back as Abraham's day, that the Gentiles were to have these blessings through the gospel. (Gal. 3:8) Therefore the gospel was a part of the eternal purpose of God. But the gospel is the law, the constitution, of the church. Is it possible that God had a purpose with reference to the law of the church, but had no purpose with reference to the church itself? The Gentiles could never know of this mystery, they could never know they were to be fellow-partakers of the promise without the gospel being preached to them. But when the gospel was preached in any community it resulted in the establishment of the church in that community. God purposed that the Gentiles should be told of this blessing and promised Abraham they would receive the blessing in his seed. Since God purposed a blessing, and purposed the proclamation of that blessing, which proclamation resulted in the establishment of the church, we conclude that the church was in the purpose of God when he promised the blessing.
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THE LITERAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE PROPHECIES

The Literal Application of Prophecies Concerning Israel Leaves Them as a People Despised, Broken, Utterly Consumed, Never More to Rise, or Return to Former Estate, Nothing Remaining for Them but Hisses and Curses, Without Hope of National Restoration.

JAMES T. AMIS

The premillennialists insist on a "literal acceptance" of the writings of the Hebrew prophets. It is noticeable that Jesus did not understand this principle when he rendered Mal. 4:5 to the apostles in Matt. 17:10-13, by telling them that the prophecy of the coming of Elijah was fulfilled in John the Baptist; or, do they expect the Tishbite to appear in person before the ushering in of millennium? Luke also, as somewhat clouded on this principle in applying Isa. 40:3 to the work of the Baptist in Luke 3:4-6, for the record fails to portray any grading down and terracing done by John in the region of the Jordan. However they insist on "taking literally" those prophecies concerning the return of Israel to Jerusalem, and the renewal of the Kingdom of David. There are some additional "literal" applications that will necessarily follow.

Conditional Covenant

In Deut. 28:1, Moses' declaration "taken literally," reads thus: "It shall come to pass, IF thou shalt hearken diligently unto the voice of Jehovah, to observe to do all Iris commandments which I command thee this clay, that Jehovah shall set thee on high above all the nations of the earth." Then in verse 15, his declaration "taken literally," should be just as readily accepted: "But it shall come to pass, IF thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of Jehovah-that all these curses shall come upon thee and overtake thee." Then after enumerating curses for thirty verses following, he threatens them with destruction, for those curses "shall be upon thee for a sign and a wonder, and upon thy seed forever." Just how long is "forever?" Another principle universally recognized is, that the failure of one party to a covenant, in refusing to fulfill its requirements, releases the other party from further obligation. This is clearly seen in the above citation.

The covenant of promise to Israel would be made void by their failure to keep his commandments Did they not fail and disobey? "I have spread out my hands all the day long unto a rebellious people, that walk in a way that is not good, after their own thoughts." (Isa. 65:2) In Jer. 13:10-17, God speaks of "This evil people which refuse to hear my words," whom "I will not pity, nor spare, nor have mercy upon them: but will destroy them." In Ezek. 33:21-29, when Israel boasts of the inheritance of the land through Abraham, God reverses his promise and declares he will "lay the land most desolate, and the mountains of Israel shall be desolate." "Taken literally," that means that, In Jer. 14:21, the old Prophet prayed Jehovah to "break not thy covenant with us," evidently realizing that God would be justified in disregarding the covenant after Israel had broken it repeatedly. Even though God had made all those promises to Israel, he made them contingent upon Israel's faithfulness, and he is not a nation that men may trifle with his decrees. Here is another passage to be "taken literally," in Jer. 8:13, "I will utterly consume them (Israel) ; and the things that I have given them shall be taken away from them." Jesus corroborated this prophecy in Matt. 21:43; "The Kingdom of God shall be taken from you (Israel) and given to a nation (people) bringing forth fruits", and where is a promise that after a season of such incumbency by that faithful people, he would turn them out and return the kingdom to Israel? Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are to sit with many from the cast and west (Gentiles), but Israel will be cast out, Matt. 8:11-12. That will be after the resurrection of the Patriarchs, and Israel will not be "taken literally".

Some Literal Illustrations

"Taken literally," the nation of Israel cannot exist again as it was. God was careful to choose for his illustration a vessel of material that, when broken, could not be re-cast or worked over. "The virgin of Israel is fallen. She shall rise no more." (Amos 5:2) This bit of prophetic sarcasm should also be "taken literally": "When I shall bring again the captivity of Sodom and Samaria, then will I bring again thy captivity. When Sodom and Samaria return to their former estate, then thou shalt return to thy former estate." (Ezek. 16:53-55) Sodom is gone forever. Samaria, as such, shall rise no more. Then what of Israel? Hear the threat of Jehovah against Israel: "I will deal with thee as thou hast done, who hast despised the oath in breaking the covenant," verse 59. Note the fulfillment of the threat: "I took my Staff, even Beauty, and cut it asunder, that I might break my covenant which I had made with all the people (both Israel and Judah). And it was broken in that day." (Zech. 11:10-1) All the promises of Israel's supremacy went glimmering when

(Continued on Page 50)
A HOMILY ON BENEVOLENCES

The Evils of Begging Created a Multitude of Eleemosynary institutions Established by the State and Sustained by Revenues Derived from Taxation. The Church Is Not Divinely Pledged to Public Material Benevolence; it Is Not a Glorified Relief Agency; its Resources Relate to Spiritual Values and Lie in the Realm of True Benevolence.

C. A. NORRED

The hum of holiday traffic comes through closed windows, the streets are filled with throngs engaged in shopping, and in spite of the hard commercialism so obviously present a certain good-will and kindliness above the usual order, can be discerned.

The first answer to the question of benevolences was that offered in the institution of almsgiving. Eventually though it was learned that this was about the poorest possible solution of the matter. Begging opens wide the door to fraud, and discourages industry and frugality-and this evil accompaniment tends to pass beyond the mendicant and fasten itself upon his posterity. It is not surprising therefore that begging has not only come to be frowned upon in enlightened society but has been made an offense punishable by law. (And should anyone insist upon the righteousness of the punishable by law. (And should any

As enlightened society suppressed the evil of begging it more and more created the eleemosynary institutions necessary to care for the unfortunate. Naturally those created by the state were sustained by revenues derived from taxation. But soon various groups desired to operate beyond the institutions created by the state-some feeling that certain necessary items were not taken care of, others apparently desiring to use such agencies as means of propaganda. Soon therefore there arose the eleemosynary institutions created by denominations, fraternal groups, etc. Inasmuch though as these groups could not levy taxes they were forced to fall back upon general solicitation— and it must appear obvious that the term solicitation is little more than a euphemism for begging. Then came Tag Day, Drive Week, etc. And this thing continued until the patience of the public was worn to threadbare. Eventually cities began to enact statutes for the regulation of this nuisance, just as they long before had sought to regulate individual begging. The final word as we have it now in this matter is the Community Fund.

Under this plan the groups permitted to solicit are tabulated by the city. Then a general drive is inaugurated. The funds derived in this campaign are then proportionately divided by a central committee.

The Religious Institution

But well-informed Christians often find themselves unable to co-operate unreservedly in a plan created by persons who necessarily acted without broad understanding of religious principles. For instance, many ask why they should be expected to deny themselves and their families and give to a general fund portions of which would be given to competitive groups engaging in commercial activities, such as is true of the Y. M. C. A. and the Y. W. C. A. And this question becomes the more imperative as it is observed that sometimes in these institutions such questionable amusements as card-playing, dancing, etc., are encouraged and taught. Others experience much misgiving at the thought of having funds they could use on their necessities or to spiritual advantage turned to the use of groups who take children away from their parents for sojourn in the woods under the oversight of persons who to say the least are without the experiences of parenthood.

The Mission Of The Church

But the insurmountable difficulty relates to those institutions which function in the realm of religion. Is it proper and right that I should assist in holding the meetings of the Salvation Army? Is it proper and right that I should teach the Roman Catholic religion? Then why is it permissible, pray tell me, that I should do so by supporting such undertakings with my funds? It is not surprising therefore that countless Christians decline to give to the Community Fund.

But what is the church to do in the field of benevolences? When we not only encounter the ever-present call of the needy but fall under the influence of epidemics, and general calamities—what shall we do? Is the church to have no part in general benevolence? We should do well just here to take notice of the truth that the church is not divinely pledged to public material benevolence. To say the very least that could be said, the church of the New Testament period lived in the midst of catastrophes and general calamities as numerous and pressing as we experience today. Yet if the church ever undertook to function in the field of public benevolence the fact is not stated in the inspired record. Also, it must be admitted that we are without the general machinery necessary to such a general function. The individual therefore who would employ the church in the field of public benevolences undertakes a work for which there is no inspired example and for which there exists no divinely approved machinery.

And, secondly, we should bear in mind that we are called to a benevolence supremely above that possible with this poor world. When the world gives its silver and gold it has given all it has to give. It may fill the hungry mouth, it may cover the shivering frame with warming garment, and it may work the hope of a well-fed and comfortable tomorrow—but this, in very large measure, is all it can do. But the church of God can break the bread of life to those who perish spiritually, it can clothe with the garments of a likeness of Christ, and it can fill the heart with the peace that passeth knowledge and a hope of life where life is life indeed. Ours then is the true benevolence, a benevolence in the real values of life.

This field of true benevolence is worthy of our most serious consideration and thoughtful discrimination. In times of distress and major disaster the world is quick to turn to the church for things of material sustenance. And such is easily understood; for the world thinks very largely in terms of food and raiment, even as the multitudes at Capernaum sought Jesus that they might again have bread to eat. And it is disappointing to find even some Christians falling victim to the notion that the church is a glorified relief agency. To be sure, we may share our bread with the hungry and our covering with the needy—but this is regulated by distinct statute; but we have a ministry far beyond this poor field. And it is in this higher field that our real resources should be loosed. Silver and gold are not our gifts to bestow but such as we have, and our resources relate to spiritual values, we can give in profusion and unto eternal life.

Ours is the true benevolence!
PRAYER AND SALVATION

The Alien Sinner’s Prayer for Salvation Is Conditionally Answered in God’s Word; if He Meets the Divine Conditions His Prayer Is Answered Affirmatively; if He Refuses, His Prayer Is Answered Negatively. The Important Matter Now for All Is to Meet the Conditions of God’s Answer.

P. W. STONESTREET

WHAT God has revealed in answer to this question should challenge the attention of all mankind, “for all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God.” (Romans 3:23.) “But God commendeth his own love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.” (Romans 5:8.) Thus, anticipating their needs, God has conditionally answered, even in advance, the prayers of sinners for salvation. But an acceptable prayer, whether mental or vocal, must be by those who hear God and it must be in harmony with God’s will. Fortunately, God has plainly revealed his will as it relates, respectively, to both an alien and a citizen. By alien is meant one who has never obeyed the first principles of the gospel of Christ-faith, repentance, and baptism — by which one is made a citizen; by citizen is meant one who has obeyed these first principles.

Concerning An Alien

What, then, is God’s will concerning an alien sinner? There is so much revealed in this answer, space is not available for all here, so I just quote:

“Commit thy works unto Jehovah, and thy purposes shall be established.” (Prov. 16:3.) The converse is also true: “He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer is an abomination.” (Prov. 28:9.)

More definitely, Christ expresses the divine will thus:

(1) “Except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.” (John 8:24.)

(2) “Except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish.” (Luke 13:3.)

(3) “Every one therefore who shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father who is in heaven.” (Matt. 10:32.)

(4) “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.” (Mark 16:16.)

(5) Peter, guided by the Holy Spirit, preaching under that commission to believing sinners, said: “Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” (Acts 2:38.)

Thus, an alien sinner’s prayer for salvation is already conditionally answered in God’s word. If the sinner meets these divine conditions, his prayer is answered affirmatively; if he refuses to meet these conditions, his prayer is answered negatively, or: “Even his prayer is an abomination.”

The Case Of Cornelius

Cornelius, an account of whose conversion is found in Acts 10, was an alien, though a good one. But with all his sterling moral character, he was an alien, because he had to obey the very same commands that all other aliens had to obey in order to become a citizen of the kingdom of God and to be in covenant relationship with God under the Christian dispensation, as the Mosaic covenant had passed into history at that time. Nevertheless, God heard his prayer (verse 4), but that his prayer was designed to learn God’s will is plain for Cornelius’ statement: “Now therefore we are all here present in the sight of God, to hear all things that have been commanded thee of the Lord” (verse 33); also from his prompt obedience as he learned what to do by the words of Peter, who was Inspiration’s spokesman on that occasion.

At that time the New Testament had not been reduced to writing. It was then revealed orally and in part; and miraculous manifestations of the Spirit had not, therefore, up to that time, been supplanted by that which is perfect (complete)—the written New Testament. Hence, barring the miraculous manifestations of the Spirit on that occasion, which characterized the establishment of spiritual laws but do not characterize their continuity, Cornelius had no advantage over aliens now. He heard the oral gospel message then; now aliens may hear (read) the written gospel message any time. In fact, people now have precisely the same glad tidings in written form that Cornelius had in oral form. Since an alien’s desire (prayer) for salvation has already been conditionally answered in the Bible, the most important matter now for all is to meet the conditions of that answer. True. “A broken and a contrite heart, 0 God thou wilt not despise” (Ps. 51:17); yet, let us not be deceived, “a broken and a contrite heart” will not falter at commands of God. “Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams” is an eternal principle that does not change with dispensations.

The Man Born Blind

It is in point here to notice a statement by the man who was born blind and whom Christ healed: “We know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshipper of God, and do his will, him he heareth.” (John 9:31.)

That statement is absolute in form, but that it is conditional in meaning is seen from the context. A controversy between the Jews and the former blind man was prompted by that wonderful miracle. The Jews accused Christ of being a sinner, and it was in reply to that accusation that the statement was made. If Christ had been a sinner, as accused, he would also have been an imposter; hence, it was to that kind of sinner that the statement alludes, because that was implied in the accusation of the Jews. It has no reference therefore, to God hearing or not hearing an acceptable prayer of an alien then, for we have just observed that God heard Cornelius. Hence, while it is true that the former blind man said what is attributed to him, his statement must be understood in the light of all the Bible teaches on the subject. Hence, while the Bible does not teach that God has heard or will hear the prayers of imposters, it does teach that God has heard the prayers of aliens who were willing to obey God and whose prayers pertained to that obedience. Every case of conversion in the New Testament shows that those converted followed up their de-
COMMON GROUND IN RELIGION No. 2

P. W. S.

The application of the principle of common ground to religious activity is of vast importance. By it one’s attitude toward God’s authority is determined and individual responsibilities are measured, for as surely as the Bible is the word of God, so surely does it furnish common ground for religious doctrine and practice.

While all religious people are parties to religious divisions, yet all are not responsible for such divisions. But how may one determine whether he is to any extent responsible for divisions? By whether or not that one occupies common ground as thus saith the Lord in matters of doctrine and practice. No religious person, therefore, who by his practice and influence encourages a doctrine to which all mankind does not sustain a common relation, can escape relative responsibility for divisions. This applies not only to the religious world at large, but also to Christians—members of the church of God, with all the other divine designations for the church implied in the designation used—who hatch out mere speculative theories that cannot be sustained upon the principle of common ground.

Under this principle, the controversy that exists in a few places over whether individual cups or a less number are to be used in the Lord’s supper should be forever settled by reading and pondering just one verse: “For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink the cup, ye proclaim the Lord’s death till he come.” (1 Cor. 11:26.)

By the mere fact that worshipers are to “drink the cup” is self evident and absolute proof that a material cup is not meant by Inspiration, for to drink the material cup would be suicidal. Hence, only the element contained in the cup is to be drunk.

Other Scriptures might be quoted in this connection, but it is not necessary, for when God says a thing once it is proof. People who are accustomed to speaking of a kettle boiling, when a material kettle never has boiled, ought to be able to understand metaphorical language pertaining to the Lord’s supper.

So, manifestly, the number of material cups to be used in the Lord’s supper is purely an incidental, and whoever exalts an incidental to the place of an essential violates the divine principle of common ground and thereby becomes responsible for division, no difference whether such a test of fellowship is made by those who contend for individual cups or by those who contend against them. The sin is in making a law where God has made none. Nothing is said here about a congregation that does not want individual cups or one that is not financially able to buy them. We are only discussing the sin of exalting incidentals to the place of essentials. For any who possibly cannot grasp figurative language touching the Lord’s supper, I would kindly and encouragingly suggest that justice and mercy are the foundation of God’s throne.

Well, what should be the worshipper’s attitude toward whether or not the Lord’s body was broken? On this point the King James Version reads:

“And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.” (1 Cor. 11:24.) But the same verse in the American Standard Version reads: “And when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me.” (1 Cor. 11:24.)

Now what is common ground on this question in expressing thanks for the bread? Why here it is as clear as a sunbeam: We have the inspired example for giving thanks for the bread without even a hint that we should recite in the prayer that the Lord’s body was broken or not broken.

Hence, let those who conclude that the Lord’s body was in some way broken refrain from saying so in the prayer, that others may be able to say amen, at least mentally; and conversely, let those who conclude that the Lord’s body was not broken refrain from saying so in the prayer, that others may be able to say amen, at least mentally. Thus, by the principle of common ground, another thing is absolutely settled: namely, that God does not require either the negative or the affirmative position recited in the prayer when giving thanks for the bread.

What is common ground on the question as to whether fermented or unfermented wine is to be used in the Lord’s supper? The English New Testament furnishes common ground in the expression “fruit of the vine,” which, because it does not specify fermented nor unfermented, it thereby implies either one or both.

From what scholars tell us, it appears that those who know only the English are as well equipped on this question as those who know Greek and Hebrew, for they tell us the original words were, as our English words are, applied to both fermented and unfermented fruit of the vine. So, according to this, the Revisers had the best of all reasons for not indicating which kind of wine was used in the Lord’s supper. This, then, is another thing that God has left to our choice. The essential element is the “fruit of the vine” as to whether it should be fermented or unfermented is incidental. Let no one exalt this incidental to the place of an essential.

Simon, The Citizen

God’s law to a citizen, a Christian who sins, is briefly stated in the case of Simon, the Sorcerer, as follows: “Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray the Lord, if perhaps the thought of thy heart shall be forgiven thee.” (Acts 8:22.) So the citizen, too, must hear God in order to be heard of God. Thus, the alien and the citizen must hear the law of God as it applies, respectively, to each in order to be heard of God. Under this twofold law of pardon, God has made adequate provisions for the salvation of every soul. Man’s responsibility is to observe that these divine provisions are conditional and to meet these conditions. While salvation is as free as the air we breathe; yet, just as it is necessary to breathe the air to receive its benefits, so is it necessary to accept salvation upon the terms of the gospel to receive its benefits.
Dear Editor:

Trends in religion are reflected in the vocabulary used. For years now we have been hearing much about the need for constructive teaching. If the religious journal carries anything of a controversial nature, some reader writes in to suggest that the need is for something constructive. What do they mean? They do not know, beyond the fact that they do not want controversy. Is preaching faith, repentance, and baptism constructive? Has the cause ever been built faster than when these things were first preached, beginning with Pentecost? Three thousand, five thousand, believers multiplied, thus read the reports of meetings in those days. Has there been a more constructive period in growth in the so-called Restoration movement than the early period when these things were preached and debated all over the country?

Isaiah said, “Cease to do evil, learn to do well.” The excavation comes first. The old habits of sin must be removed before the foundation of good works can be laid. The hearts of those we would convert are not like the man out of whom the evil spirit had been cast—all swept and garnished and ready to receive the truth. But they are filled with error and sectarianism. Rescue a man from the depths of debauchery, interest him in religion, and the first thing that comes to the surface is his stamp of sectarianism. He may not have thought of religion for years, but the moment he gets interested, his preconceived ideas of things assert themselves. The error must be torn down before constructive work can be done. So, practically speaking, all legitimate “tearing down” is a necessary part of any constructive enterprise. It necessarily comes first, and must continue until it is finished.

The Spirit of Christ

No expression has been more abused and misinterpreted than this. Those who emphasize it are not clear as to what they mean. But they think it means no controversy. They use it to cancel out all the good which has been done by preaching the truth. It neutralizes the effect of the gospel medicine. They speculate in their minds as to what Jesus would do, and wind up with a conclusion which flatly contradicts what Jesus did do! One of the greatest drawbacks to religion is people advancing beyond God. The speculator advances beyond what God has said. The innovator advances beyond what God has commanded. And many have advanced beyond Christ in spirit and attitude. They are too kind to offend anyone. Jesus was not that kind. He offended the Pharisees, but when his disciples told him, he said, “Let them alone: they be blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind lead the blind, both shall fall into the ditch.” If it makes people mad to warn them of their danger, it cannot be helped. It is not kind to not warn them. But Jesus was not so much concerned about these blind leaders—he knew there was no hope for most of them—but he rebuked them publicly for the benefit of those who were listening, who were in danger of following these leaders.

Preventive Teaching

Not only must false doctrine be opposed, but it should be opposed early. The main thing to be accomplished is not the conversion of the leaders, but the prevention of the innocent from being led astray by these leaders. It is difficult to turn a speculative father against his own thought-child. Some false doctrines are faith-destroying in their effects, just as sonic diseases are fatal in their after-effects if the victim lives, his health and comfort are gone.

Many people made the mistake of thinking there was nothing to this question of premillennialism but a few minor points about what happened on Pentecost and what will take place when Jesus returns. They thought that one could believe it without its affecting their salvation. I’erhaps it did start that way. Perhaps many are at that stage now in their views. But premillennialism heads straight for materialism. Its nature and tendencies are in that direction. Materialism vitiates all religion. How did Bradleyism end in Texas? Bradley ended a materialist.

Too Many Kingdoms

R. H. Boll has too many kingdoms and manifestations of kingdoms on his hands now for real comfort, but the logical end of his theorizing is to reach the conclusion that nothing happened on Pentecost of any particular significance. He has simply tried to take the doctrines of Russellism and other “isms” and adjust them to the beliefs of those who follow New Testament teaching. It will not work. He has a bigger task than some other premillennialists. Speculation has no place among those who propose to speak with the Bible and be silent with it too. There is nothing distinctive about his teachings. Every church on earth is afflicted with the disease, except the few which are built upon premillennialism. The Adventists and Russellites have no trouble over the question, for it is a cardinal doctrine with them.

Very Fundamental

All false doctrine is speculative in nature and is an advancing beyond the teachings of Christ; but comparatively, premillennialism is very fundamental—a most fundamental error. It is one of the most dangerous doctrines ever introduced into any church. This is just a little fight we are having compared with some of our religious neighbors. Some have worried because we have this fight, thinking it would discourage outsiders from coming into the church. What about the Baptist Church with such fellows as Dr. Frank Norris and Ben M. Bogard combining forces against the old guard? The Christian Church has plenty of it. For the moment other issues overshadow it, but premillennialism is well entrenched in their ranks. The Methodists are having trouble with it. Who is not having trouble with it, except those churches which are composed entirely of premillennialists? And yet there are still those in our ranks who think there is nothing to the issue, and that it should not be discussed. There are none so sleepy as those who are self-doped.

Shall We Let Them Alone?

In the days of Christ the evil spirits said, “Let us alone.” But they were not letting men alone. That was why Jesus did not leave them alone. With the advantage the devil has, it does look like he would be willing to play fair; but he has no reputation for fairness to maintain, so he seeks every advan-
The Neuter Genders

The greatest enemies in this fight are not the out-and-out premillenialists in our ranks, but the alleged neutrals who profess not to believe the doctrines, but whose sympathies are all on the wrong side. Where did the neutrals land in the music fight? Where do the neutrals always wind up, but on the wrong side? It is no wonder that some are neutral, when their support comes from those who do not believe these doctrines. If a man will not stand four-square for the truth when lie is being supported by those who do stand for the truth, what could you expect if the situation were reversed?

The Worst Feature

The most discouraging feature of the fight on premillennialism is not the dangerous nature of the doctrines, but something closely associated with the movement—spiritual cowardice! The greatest danger to the brotherhood today is the widespread spirit of cowardice. If a tithe of this cowardice had been present a hundred years ago, there would never have been a restoration movement. And if the supply is not greatly reduced there will not long be a Restoration worth mentioning.

It is difficult to tell whether the cowardice explains why so many people sympathize with the Boll movement, or whether the Boll movement explains why there is so much cowardice. The truth probably is somewhere between. These two trends may have been born simultaneously—twin blights on a once peaceful and prosperous brotherhood. But it is undoubtedly true that the Boll movement has encouraged cowardice. In the very nature of the case it has placed R. H. Boll in the light of a suppliant for mercy. He cannot come out in the open with his doctrines. It is not that kind of a doctrine. It was not the weakness of Charles Neal that defeated him—it was the nature of the doctrine he was trying to defend.

Movement Threatened

It has made a self-made martyr out of R. H. Boll and apologists out of hundreds of those who follow him—even those who follow him afar off, avowedly only in sympathy. To swallow his theories one necessarily leaves down gaps through which sinister sectarian errors can find entrance. To make a coward out of a man in one connection, necessarily weakens his position generally.
churches, but which ought to be discarded.

**Piety Versus Pugilism**

Hugo McCord sends the following news item:

Via WAVE, Louisville, at 9:30, March 5, Bro. R. H. Boll preached a sermon on “God’s Forgiveness.” A synopsis would run as follows:

Nature knows nothing of forgiveness: she is rigidly governed by law and there is no grace. But God does forgive. How? (1) Wholeheartedly. (Isa. 55:7) (2) Freely (Eph. 2:8,9) (3) Justly-via a judgment on Jesus. Tho God forgives wholeheartedly and freely, he doesn’t condone sin. (IProv. 17:15) Sin is not a small matter; hence, the necessity of the judgment on Jesus. (Jno. 3:16; Isa. 53:4-6; II Cor. 5:21; Eph. 1:7)

God’s forgiveness makes one turn away from a life of sin. The sinful woman was told, “Thy faith hath saved thee; go in peace.” Literally “into” peace.

The spirit of the discourse was certainly spiritual and devout, and no Bible believer could deny that every word was true. But every gospel preacher would say that all the truth was not spoken. There is not a preacher in Louisville (except a rabbi) who wouldn’t agree with every word spoken. Such a sermon in its entirety can be heard any day from a Methodist or Baptist or Presbyterian preacher. It did not in any way set forth man’s obedience to the gospel. True, it was a devotional service; true, it was emphasizing God’s side rather than man’s side of forgiveness. But any sermon that treats of God’s forgiveness of man is surely perverted if it doesn’t give the whole truth, if it doesn’t give the conditions with which man must comply. And to think the only example of forgiveness was the story always used by sectarianists to prove faith only saves, without baptism. Such a sermon, tho good in reverence, and in exaltation of God, did more harm than good. Bro. Boll emphasized that God’s forgiveness is a gift, is not of works-all of which should be emphasized. But he did not emphasize, nay nor hint, that man must obey the commandments; that forgiveness is not of works (which we have done) but is thru the washing of regeneration. Bro. Boll’s sermon was purely faith only as far as practical purposes are concerned.

Just the opposite of Bro. Boll is the brother who would have taken that radio time to “skin the sects” in a dirtily sarcastic and scornful way. That is another extreme. Such is loyalty gone to seed where Boll was niceness gone to seed. One shouldn’t be so loyal and brave that he isn’t kind and meek and pious; on the other hand, one shouldn’t be so nice and sweet and pious that he neglects to declare “all the words of this life”. (My emphasis.) Strict loyalty for God’s word doesn’t root out piety; it includes it; it demands it. Devout piety toward God and good will toward men don’t root out preaching the necessity of baptism; they include and demand it.

**The Elders Speak Again:**

“The attention of the loyal Churches of Christ, Jacksonville, Florida has been called to a rumor abroad in the land to the effect that all churches here have adopted the premillennial theory as a plan of faith and practice. The undersigned take this means of advising all concerned that we are, and always have been, thoroughly fundamental in belief and practice, and God being our helper, shall continue so.

It is true that certain preachers claiming to be followers of Christ are making a diligent effort to establish a premillennial church in our city and have caused discord to the extent that they have surrounded themselves with a few former members of the Church and we understand meet in an outlying section of Jacksonville.

We feel the brotherhood should be given this brief statement of fact.


"W. H. Mobjly, Jr., J. J. Warwick, R. L. Hood, Leaders, Edgewood & Kings Road congregation.

(This is the church where Homer Rutherford preached for a time and later returned to establish his “premillennial church.” It was rumored that he had divided this church—but from the foregoing he evidently failed in some of his aims. The editor knows the men whose signatures appear above and has labored with them. They are dependable men and the churches in which they serve as elders are sound, loyal churches of Christ.-Editor)

**A True Church in New Orleans**

“The Lakeview congregation this week moved into and in future will occupy property acquired at 5531-33 Canal Boulevard in this city. Here one will find the New Testament worship maintained, sinners plainly taught the terms of salvation, and speculative teaching condemned.

Although the youngest in age, we are now the largest congregation numerically speaking in New Orleans. We have made a substantial down payment on property located at above address, which was raised among our own number, and we hope to discharge entire indebtedness without appealing for any outside help.

Brethren loyal to the truth in passing through New Orleans are hereby extended a most cordial invitation to worship with us.”

R. W. Turner.

(For years the church in New Orleans was under the control of Stanford Chambers of Word & Work, R. H. Boll & Company, now of Louisville, Ky. After he left it, the congregation continued under the domination of the leaders of that party. It is a bit of welcome news to know that the New Testament church will now be given a chance to operate in the city of New Orleans and we wish this new congregation well in its launching.—Editor)

**Martyrs Are Made**

R. L. Whiteside struck a keynote in analyzing the effects of a theory:

“Any system of false teaching, if continually preached, will become a rallying ground for a party. Church history is full of proof of this.

“Perhaps we all have some wrong ideas, yet few of us frame these into a system, a philosophy of God’s plans. When a lot of errors have been reduced to a system, then you have the seed of a new party, and the fruit will come if that seed is cultivated. I think here is the ground for serious reflection. There is a vast difference between holding a few errors and formulating a doctrinal system. A religious party is not built on a few isolated errors; it must have a system, a scheme of things, different from others; and just as certainly as people rally around a new scheme, a new system, just that certainly will a new party eventually be formed.

“It is possible for a man to create a personal following and by his power hold them together for a time as a party; but that party will pass away with him unless he or they formulate a system of doctrines. If he formulate that system and have enough opposition for his sympathizers to feel that he is a martyr, they will hold to it all the more tenaciously.

“No matter what Brother Boll thinks and feels about a party, everything is favorable for the development of one. He is a man of considerable strength,
his sympathizers regard him as very pious, and he has published a system of doctrines. Because of the criticisms he has met, his sympathizers have put him in the roll of martyrs. The setting is complete; and if he holds to his present course, a party is certain to result, no matter what he wills or thinks about it. However, I do not think it will be a large party.” . . .

Strange Things Happen

A preacher becomes involved in a church trouble. If he would eliminate himself, another might handle the situation and preserve peace. But the preacher will not withdraw. In fact, preachers who are willing to eliminate themselves do not have church troubles. The preacher thinks he must stay to save the church. He stays and divides it. A peculiar way, indeed, to save a church!

Suddenly this preacher begins writing all the preachers of prominence in the brotherhood to ask questions concerning the elders (although he is against the interference of outside preachers). He frames his questions “in craftiness” to elicit just the answer he wants and which almost any preacher who knows the Bible would ordinarily give. When the answers are in, he claims “all the leading brethren on his side!” Perhaps every preacher whose answers to his questions were sought would have condemned his course, if they had known the facts.

When ever a preacher begins writing to all the “leading brethren” to ask them certain carefully worded questions, the brethren ought to know that he is about to divide a church somewhere, if he has not already done so, and they should ascertain the facts before lending the influence of their names to the preacher who becomes the leader of a faction in a congregation to promote his own personal ends.

All such preachers have the same alibi. They all cry “persecution!” They all claim that other preachers had the same trouble there. They all claim that the elders are liars. They all stay to save the church—but split it. They all say that outside preachers caused all the trouble-by teaching against majority rule. They all circulate letters among the brethren to “inform the brotherhood” of the “facts” concerning their trouble. When you receive such a letter from a preacher, whether signed by himself or others behind whom he hides, it is prima facie evidence that he is a party to a church trouble.

Open Letters

Dear Bro. Wallace: Enclosed find a letter from me and also a reply from Bro. Jno. T. Lewis. It is self-explanatory. Use your own judgment as to publishing it. I should not want injustice done to anyone.

The schools usually say that no one sees any wrong with the schools save those who have but little or no “schooling:” I do not claim to be a scholar but I suspect I have “attended school” as much as any of “our school” teachers. Besides attending the grammar school and high school I spent four years in two colleges (Winchester Normal College and David Lipscomb College), and parts of seven years in four universities, Evangelical Theological College, Southern Methodist University, Vanderbilt University and Clark University. I have two university degrees—M. A. and B. D., in addition to the college work. But I believe it would be wiser never to “attend school” a day, and learn to read at home and remain true to the New Testament than to have all the degrees that colleges and universities can give and lose the spirit of Christ. I do not object to schools, it is only the abuse or misuse that should be objected to. I am not sufficiently informed to know the exact situation in “our colleges”. I still believe that they are better than other schools in not teaching evolution, and in teaching that the Bible is the inspired word of God and, also, some other points.

They may be more interested in being “in line” with the “Southern Association of Schools” than the New Testament. Many believe that they are slow to teach some important truths.

I myself do not believe they are as quick-and ready and willing to teach all truth as they should be. But if I am wrong in this I should be very happy to learn it.

Do as you think wise with all this. Should you not think wise to publish the enclosed then please return it to me. I am not willing to harm a good alibi. They all cry “persecution” They should you not think wise to publish the enclosed then please return it to me. I am not willing to harm a good school, nor am I willing for the church to be harmed.

I depart for Meaford, Canada, on the first of Jan., but shall soon return to Texas.

I hope 1936 shall be the best year of your life up to now.

Kindly and fraternal,

G. A. Dunn.

Open Letter to John T. Lewis

In the “Gospel Guardian,” p. 8, November, 1935, you have an article, “An Open Letter to R. N. Gardner,” in which you use the words: “Thirty-six years ago you were a young man teaching in the Old Nashville Bible School, a school of sacred memory, whose spirit and policies died with its founders.”

My dear brother, for years I have loved you because I believed you loved Jesus and his church and his teachings. I consider you a “straight shooter,” but one was desires to be fair with one and all. By using the words, “sacred memory,” I conclude you still honor and love the school that then existed. So do I. But what do you mean by saying, “Its spirit and policies died with its founders”? Do you think the David Lipscomb College, the successor of the “Old Bible School,” has another spirit?

Recently I was at the fall opening of the David Lipscomb College, at which time Jno. T. Hinds made a speech in which he said the only reason for the existence of said school was the fact it laid emphasis on the Bible, or should do so, or words with such import. I then endorsed Bro. Hinds’ speech, and still do. Do you not agree with Bro. Hinds in such sentiments? Has the present school another spirit! Does it now lay emphasis on something other than the Bible? Are “our Bible Colleges” headed away from Christ and towards the world, desiring to be like the colleges around them, even as old Israel desired to be like the nations around them? If this is the situation, is it too soon to know it, and is it too soon to sound a warning?

Watchman, what of the night?

G. A. Dunn.

Reply

Dear Brother Dunn: Your “Open Letter to Jno. T. Lewis” is before me. By whose spirit and policies died with its founders?” I meant just what the phrase means; but I did not intend that it should be construed as a criticism of David Lipscomb College, or any other institution. I was just stating facts.

During the ten years that J. A. Hardbug was president of the school, he would not have it incorporated; but when he left, Brethren Lipscomb, Dodd, and Timmons had it incorporated as a school, to give it legal status in handling property, etc. The absolute qualification of a teacher in the “Old Nashville Bible School” was his known loyalty to God’s word. It was this issue that was troubling the church in those days. That this statement may not raise a question mark in anybody’s mind, I will quote the following from “The Deposition of David Lipscomb” in the Newbern, Tenn., church trial.

Lawyer: “Upon that question, I want to ask you, Brother Lipscomb, if it is true that you and others had Brother Calhoun before you on one occasion several years ago, with the view of determining what his feelings were with reference to the society, and if you, in the effort, requested or wanted to
know if he would sign or agree to certain articles or principles, and upon his failure to do so, you ceased cooperation with him?"

David Lipscomb: "No, sir; not as you state it."

Lawyer: "Please state what you did do."

David Lipscomb: "Well, what we did grew out of his proposed teaching in the Bible School, not with any church. Brother Calhoun agreed with us fully, and he told me that he never had seen a sentence that I had penned in reference to societies of organs that he could not indorse. I think he wrote it; I think I have it written. We asked him to state that publicly or act on it. He refused to do so, and we objected to employing him as a teacher in the school because he was not willing to proclaim his convictions and what he believed. Therefore, the criterion of the qualifications of a teacher in the "Nashville Bible School" was his known position upon every living issue of the day, without any reference to his alphabetical soup. All the students of the otl school addressed David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding as Brother Lipscomb and Brother Harding.

David Lipscomb was hardly cold in death before the "Nashville Bible School" threw off its swaddling clothes and became a college quicker than a tadpole could shed its tail and become a frog. The college was named "David Lipscomb College," supposedly to honor one of the illustrious founders of the "Nashville Bible School," and then locked the doors against him by making it impossible for him to teach in the college if he were living. That is, they made ovetures for admittance into the "Southern Association of Colleges." They were admitted upon their promises to comply with the requirements of said association. So today, "David Lipscomb College" is appealing to saint and sinner alike for three hundred and fifty thousand dollars ($350,000.00) to pay the indebtedness and meet the endowment requirements of the "Southern Association of Colleges." The qualification of a teacher in the "Southern Association of Colleges" depends upon his alphabetical letters attached to his name. If David Lipscomb were living and in his prime, imagine, if you can, the "Southern Association of Colleges" telling the trustees of the college that bears his name, that they would have to give David a two or three years' leave of absence for him to attend some college in their association, and have some alphabetical letters follow his name before he could even teach in the college, to say nothing about being president of it. I am told that, the present "dean" of the college, a product of the college, not of the "Nashville Bible School," teaches the young men to address him as either Mr. or Professor, and not as Brother. This is stating facts without criticizing. You can draw your own conclusions. I feel sure, however, that the faculty and trustees of "David Lipscomb College" would tell you that when they were a school, they spoke as a school, they did as a school: but when they became a college they put off schoolish things.

Sow if you want to know my personal views. I do not mind telling you. Personally, I wish every one of "our" colleges was out of debt; but I would not give a dime toward an endowment fund for either one of them--where the carcass is, there the buzzards will gather. Every college the church has established, with baptismal vows to Sew Testament Christianity, and let no one think we are not subjected to the same abberations. The colleges are not in much danger as long as the teachers have to make some financial sacrifice to teach in them; but endow them, and meet all the requirements of the "Southern Association of Colleges," an educational incubus that recognizes no authority above its own assumed authority, and in fifty years to speak of the "policies and spirit of the Nashville Bible School" would be a joke. These are my predictions, and they are free.

(Signed) Jno. T. Lewis

Where The Heart Is:

A reader of the Guardian favors us with the following clipping from the Detroit Evening Times: "WITTY TO CONTINUE REVELATION SERIES." (The heading) "The Millennium, What Does The Bible Say About It?" will be the subject of Claud F. Witty at West Side Central Church of Christ, Grand River and Kirby avenues tomorrow at 11 A.M. Witty has been giving a series of sermons on the Book of Revelation and in this sermon he expects to connect the thousand years' reign of Christ, as described in Revelation, Chapter 20, with all of the other prophecies that refer to the same events.

So there are many passages which refer to the millennium. Was Brother Witty really playing a good Samaritan act when he cast liinself in the role of peacemaker at Dallas, or were there closer relationships than his articles intimated? Which rules Brother Witty, his head or his heart? He said he was not a premillennialist. That was his head speaking, but his heart was with the premillennialist group, as was plainly indicated by what he did and said. Jesus said that where a man's heart was his treasures would be. Is faith one of those treasures which follow the heart?

It is to be feared that people too often believe what they want to believe. Balaam did have this advantage--he was not an Israelite. When an Israelite is placed in the position of wishing to pronounce curses upon Israel, it is high time for Israelites to view him with suspicion. When a brother says that he does not believe the theory of premillennialism, bu Shows clearly that his heart is with those who do believe it, T am in the words of Paul "afraid of" him.

Getting On The Band Wagon:

Some very fine articles are appearing in the papers now against R. H. Boll & Company by such men as J. M. McCaleb, Jesse I'. Sewell, et. al. We rejoice to see brethren take the side of truth; still, we wonder where these older brethren have been all these years. This is not a recent or late development. If the fight had been made twenty years ago, perhaps, Brother Boll himself might have been saved from his own partisanship and division averted. We hope the rest of the brethren will not wait until the victory is won and the shouting begins to climb on the band wagon. We are not members of "The Salvation Army," but of the Lord Army--we need fighters, not shouters!

The News Of The Month

Beginning with the next issue the Gospel Guardian will feature reports of the work done during the month by the various preachers and churches--provided the reports come in. Brethren are hereby invited to send a concise report of the month's work--"News-O-The-Month" style and help make this feature interesting and instructive.

Harley Emerson Woodward:

The many friends of Sister E. F. Woodward, including many who have never known her personally but to whom she is known as Dorcas by her good works, enter into her sorrow upon the tragic and untimely death of her only son, Harley Emerson Woodward. It came as a shock, and but for Sister Woodward's firm faith and lofty character, marked by ут la}Son she is known as Dorcas by her good works, enter into her sorrow upon the tragic and untimely death of her only son, Harley Emerson Woodward. It came as a shock, and but for Sister Woodward's firm faith and lofty character, marked by uncharacterized her, visible in marked degree to those of us who were present when the last rites were held. We sympathize with Sister Woodward, and rejoice with her too. Harley was
a fine man, faithful to the church, believed God's Word, and his charred Bible was found in the debris of the plane that crashed him to his death. This will ever be his mother's comfort, and his wife's, who is also a Christian. The services at Houston were simple; held in the Heights Church where Harley served as a deacon and in which he was reared. A scripture selection was read by Flavil Colley and talks were made by Oscar Smith and E. C. Coff man.

It is not the length of the life that necessarily counts. It is not the length of the story that makes it worth reading. The greatest stories ever written are the parables of Christ; and the greatest life that was ever lived was the life of the Son of God—just thirty three years. It is how we live, not how long we live, that counts in the great Reckoning Day, for "it is appointed unto man once to die, and after that the judgment."

ENTERTAINMENT

(Continued from Page 28) in our worship. Then, imagine what goes through their mind as in such service they beheld the congregation instructed to listen as a quartet performs, a chorus puts on a program, or someone singing a solo. Naturally, they wonder why, if that is supposed to be worship. Frankly, do you think that they would be impressed the next time that they heard one of our preachers condemning our neighbors for having entertainment features in their worship? Honestly, do you?

Not A Harmless Practice

In these "harmless" practices are we being compromised before the world, and are worldly people laughing up their sleeves at our antics? Would you want a preacher in a meeting who would preach against those things in our neighbors and then approve and encourage them in us? Would you want a song leader in a meeting who would perform these and other antics? Well, I would not and would personally oppose such in a meeting where I live. That is how inconsistent and dangerous this writer considers such practices. The trouble sometimes is, we don't always know just what brethren encourage such display features. Some people can be "conservative" in conservative sections of the country, and "liberal" in liberal sections with all varying shades, depending upon where they are.

The writer expects to make no friends for himself in this article, but does fervently hope that in a small way at least he will help some brethren to consider it their practice conforms to their preaching.

WHAT I SEE—

(Continued from Page 15) the Holy Spirit" when they were listening to the gospel. They are not "outside the range" of it when they are reading the gospel. In fact it is a fine way to come within "the range" of it. We are wondering if there is anybody who can write more misinformation to the page than a Baptist can when he is writing on doctrinal matters.

When The Church Began

The Baptist and Reflector carries an article by Pastor H. F. Wright on "When the Church Began." The editor explains that "A local pastor of another denomination in Edwin attacked Baptist doctrines. Bro. H. F. Wright was moved to reply in a local paper and another brother urged Bro. Wright to send the article to the Baptist and Reflector."

Pastor Wright thinks the church began in the days of John, the Baptist. He says: "Just why Christ sent John the Baptist to begin (found) His New Testament Church, I cannot tell . . . What is certain, we can see the church in action from the ministry of John."

J. N. Hall and other Baptists were wont to affirm that the church was established in the days of John the Baptist. Later debaters among the Baptists evidently considered this position untenable, as they fixed times and places, some, one, and some, another, subsequent to John's ministry, for the establishment of the church. Some of the best Baptist scholars agree with the Sew Testament, and Smith's Bible Dictionary, that Pentecost was the birthday of the church. We are tempted to wonder just what Baptist doctrine is on the question! Baptists themselves do not agree just when the church began. I am of the opinion, subject to correction, that the editor of the Baptist and Reflector will not give his one hundred percent endorsement to Pastor Wright's article.

"What is certain," if the church was established in the days of John, it was established before Christ was a priest, before the New Testament became effective, the law of Moses was still in force, and the members of the church were unbelievers in the resurrection. The great commission had already been given. And we wonder why Paul commanded certain disciples in Ephesus to be baptized "in to the name of the Lord Jesus," who had received nothing but John's baptism. (Acts 19) Jesus was not made Lord and Christ until he ascended to the Father. (Acts 2:36) If Pastor Wright, or the editor of the Baptist and Reflector, or both of them together, will try to fit these facts into "Baptist doctrines", I will suggest some other Bible facts for them to chew on. I could give them now, but then dead old Brother Eph Rogers used to say that when he fed a mule ten ears of corn, he didn't give him any more until he ate that up.

THE PREACHER

(Continued from Page 34) ing and does render every assistance possible. But that assistance is only such as by Christian in the church can and should give.

(2) The gospel preacher is not a priest. At least, no more than any other Christian is a priest. The preacher has no special "pull" with God. His prayers are no more effective than the prayers of any other consecrated Christian. He can, and does, pray for the sick. But his prayers in their behalf are no more efficacious than the prayers of any other Christian. He can, and does, call on the sick. But he calls as a brother in Christ, and not as God's special agent. And it is no more the preacher's duty to call on the sick than it is the duty of every Christian in the church. Does the members of the church think they hire the preacher to do their calling on the sick for them? Are they trying to practice that command of Christ by proxy? It would seem so sometimes.

On the other hand the gospel preacher is a proclaimer of the gospel. He is employed by the church to "preach the word" both "in season and out of season," "publicly and from house to house," when he tries to do more than that he is very likely to try something for which he has neither scriptural precedent or command. In the very nature of the case most of the preacher's calls will and should be in the homes of non-Christians. It is conceivable, and even probable that a gospel preacher might preach for a church ten years and never see the inside of the homes of a large percent of the members of the church. Why should he? When there is so much teaching of the untaught to be clone why should he spend his valuable time in useless calling in the homes of those who have been Christians as long as he has, and probably know as much about their duty to the Lord as he does?

We believe there is a growing tendency among the churches of Christ to make "pastors" out of their preachers. And unless there is much and vigorous teaching done along this line there is bound to be trouble.
IT IS not pleasant to raise a voice of warning, I will not say criticism, against an institution, the memory of which is almost as sacred to you as life itself. That is now my unpleasant task, a task I would gladly let pass, if I did not believe in doing so I would be a traitor to the very principles I learned from its illustrious founders —David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding. A spirit, or principle that would spike, or challenge every glaring departure from God’s word in its incipiency.

My school days in the Nashville Bible School began on September 28, 1898, and ended May 24, 1906. Those were the happiest and most profitable years of my life. What ever good I may accomplish, as a gospel preacher, must be attributed to the providence of God that led me to, and kept me in, the Nashville Bible School for eight years. During those eight years I swept floors, built fires, distributed mail, and rang the bell. I said in my farewell address that during those eight years the faculty had never asked, or made a request of me that I considered unreasonable, and that I did not gladly comply with. During the first five years I was there, the school was on South Spruce Street, during the last three years it was at its present location. During the first three years I had a daily Bible lesson under J. A. Harding —his memory work, and I averaged a daily Bible lesson under David Lipscomb for eight years. This is said only that the reader may know that I learned the spirit and principles of the founders of the Nashville Bible School from the founders themselves, and those principles were woven into the very warp and woof of my being.

I will now tell you something about the principles and struggles in those early years of the founders of the Nashville Bible School. The Digestives held a convention in the Vine Street Christian Church, in Nashville, in those days. J. B. Briney, of the Christian Standard, was the chief speaker. In commending the abortive missionary efforts of their society in Tennessee, he said: “When we shall have had a few more high class funerals in Nashville, we can hope to accomplish more.” Those “high class funerals” of course had reference to the passing of such men as David Lipscomb, E. G. Sewell and J. C. McQuiddy whose hands were then guiding the destinies of both the Nashville Bible School, and the Gospel Advocate —deadly foes to all departures from God’s truth. In those days, David Lipscomb was cartooned as an old woman in a Mother Hubbard dress, and bonnet, with a broom trying to sweep back the tide of the sea.

On the first of January, 1900, that amiable, lovable and non-combative preacher, T. B. Larimore began a three months’ meeting at South College Street, about one mile from the Nashville Bible School. Bro. Larimore’s sweet spiritedness caused him to have the few digressive preachers who were living in Nashville then to sit on the rostrum, and lead prayers in his meeting. Some body suggested that Bro. Larimore come over and deliver some lectures to the students of the Nashville Bible School. But J. A. Harding, then president of the school, said: “No, if T. B. Larimore ever lectures to this school while I am president, he will take a stand on digression. He had those digressive preachers leading prayers in his meeting, and I had just as soon call on the devil himself.” Bro. Larimore never lectured to the school while J. A. Harding was president; but M. C. Kurfees was there at different times delivering lectures on what he called, “Living Issues” —Instrumental Music in Worship, Missionary Societies, and denominationalism in general —everything that he knew the young preachers would have to meet when they went out into the world. So far I have been stating the spirit and principles of the founders of the Nashville Bible School as I knew them.

Therefore as a student who drank of the fountain of blessings which flowed from the Nashville Bible School, and one who loves and cherishes the memory of its founders, I am one hundred per cent for every school, or college, that is controlled by the same spirit and principles that founded the Nashville Bible School. But I believe when any college departs from those principles it will ultimately become a menace, and an enemy to New Testament Christianity.

David Lipscomb College should not be judged today by the principles and spirit of the founders of the Nashville Bible School; but by the principles and course its present directors are pursuing. It is their present course that I raise a voice of warning against. I shall not take up a lot of unnecessary space telling you how much I love the present directors—that might sound good to some readers; but it is not germane to the issue. I believe that in the present “David Lipscomb College Campaign,” the president of the college, and the board of directors, have bridged the chasm that separated it from the claims of all denominational and worldly colleges, and have thrown overboard every principle for which the founders of the Nashville Bible School stood.

In the first place, by no stretch of the imagination could any one conceive of David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding hiring a high-powered sectarian company to raise money for the college. “The Williams Company’s” sole business is to wrest money, at a handsome premium for themselves, out of cities and communities, for institutions that pretend to have claims upon the people. At the same time the company had the $350,000 campaign on for David Lipscomb College, it had on a $500,000 campaign for the Furman University at Greenville, South Carolina, and then followed these campaigns with a $500,000 campaign for the University of Richmond, Va. What is the difference in the three campaigns? Has David Lipscomb College come to be just another college? I have heard David Lipscomb say more than once, “If the Nashville Bible School ever got to be just another school there would be no excuse for its existence.” Has that time come? The following letter, to which I have received no reply, is self explanatory.

Ensley, Ala.
Jan. 27, 1936

Mr. E. H. Ijams
President of David Lipscomb College
Nashville, Tennessee

Dear Bro. Ijams:

I received your letter requesting me to send you the names of sixteen of the leading, and most active
brethren from the congregation where I labor. Now I believe congregations or brethren should be fully advised as to any plans they are asked to join in, and since such information did not accompany the request, I did not send the names. It would appear from the literature I have received, and from the editorial in the Gospel Advocate, Jan. 16, 1936, that you, as president of David Lipscomb College, have put on a campaign to raise money for the college. Whether intentional or otherwise, this would seem to be misleading, since it is not you directing the campaign; but George W. Williams, president of “The Williams Company” - a high powered worldly, or sectarian money raising organization. Why should not congregations that are called upon to take part in this campaign be informed as to this fact? I believe that David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding, the founders of the Nashville Bible School, would turn over in their graves if they could know that you had hired this worldly or sectarian organization to put on a campaign in your name, or in the name of David Lipscomb College, to wrest money from the church and world alike, for the college. I also believe you are setting a dangerous precedent both for the college and the church. Being therefore constitutionally, conscientiously, and unalterably opposed to calling upon the world for money to carry on the Lord’s work, to say nothing about hiring a worldly or sectarian organization to do the calling, I find myself unable to join you in this campaign, either in prayers, sympathy, or efforts. Hoping that you can understand and appreciate my position in this matter, I am

Yours for the “old paths,”
Fraternally,
John T. Lewis.

Bro. Ijams may have felt that my letter deserved only silent contempt; but if he thinks that will silence my protest against the methods of his present efforts, he is dreaming.

The Reason for My Warning, or Protest Against the “David Lipscomb College Campaign”

I believe the president of David Lipscomb College, the directors of the college, and all the churches in Nashville, that have backed the present “David Lipscomb College Campaign,” have thrown over board that distinctive plea which has made them what they are today. And henceforth they have no plea to offer the people of Nashville, and Davidson County, that is not common to all denominational schools, and churches. Unless (a thing that is possible; but not probable) they all repudiate the method of the present campaign, and declare that such shall never again happen. This I hope they may do. It would mean more to David Lipscomb College, and to the churches in Nashville, than anything else.

The following is from “The Babbler,” the college paper, of Feb. 20, 1936.

“The drive in Nashville got under way last Friday with the public indorsement of Governor McAlister and Mayor Howse. Workers at their first report Monday noon turned in $117,649. The next report will be made tomorrow noon at a luncheon at the Noel Hotel.

“The nashville newspapers have been carrying daily accounts of the progress of the drive, and have also carried editorials urging general public support. The Nashville Banner called attention to the fact that in the 45 years of the school’s existence it has not heretofore made a general appeal for financial aid. Gifts from major foundations which have been the largest supporters of the larger private colleges in the South may follow, it was pointed out, when the friends of Lipscomb free it of debt and provide the minimum required endowment.”

Since when did it become necessary to have “Governor McAlister and Mayor Howse,” two elders, or outstanding members of Vine Street Christian Church, start off a campaign for David Lipscomb College? “The Nashville Banner, judging from the above clipping, knew, if the directors of the College and Brother Ijams did not know, that the present drive was something “new under the sun” for David Lipscomb College. The picture of Mayor Hilary E. Howse handing his “own check and others from his official family” to S. H. Hall was in “The Babbler” (the College paper).

Hilary E. Howse and I were born in the same “neck of the woods,” near the old Burnt Knob, in Rutherford County, Tennessee. We were reared under about the same environments, and both drank, or tasted the dregs of poverty in our boyhood days. I have watched with interest his rise in the political and business world. I have also appreciated the outstanding service, he, as Mayor and as a citizen, has rendered Nashville and its poorer citizens. But I have absolutely nothing to do with the system of worship he has chosen, and I certainly would not ask him for a “check” to forward the system I follow. I hope I am saying these things “in the right spirit.”

“The Nashville Banner” carried a picture of Governor Hill McAlister handing his “own check and others from his official family” to S. H. Hall and Lacy Elrod. Brother Elrod is one of the elders of “Central Church” in Nashville. Brother S. H. Hall is the minister of the Russell Street church, an alumnus of the Nashville Bible School, and a director of the David Lipscomb College. I suppose these pictures were put out by the “Williams Company” as decoys to lead the Digressives, the business men, and the Churches of Nashville, and Davidson County, into the campaign. It at least shows that they understand psychology, if they don’t know anything about New Testament Christianity. The following letters were published in “The Nashville Banner” Feb. 16, 1936.

Dear Doctor Ijams:

It is with the sincerest of wishes for the success of your efforts to raise the foundation fund for David Lipscomb College that I tender my contribution to so worthy a cause, including several checks from members of my official family.

Would that my duties were lighter, that I might take a more active part in the campaign.

I trust that all Christian citizens may find in the history of the college, as I have, forceful reasons for contributing.

Very sincerely yours,
(Signed) Hilary E. Howse
Governor

Mayor Howse’s letter follows:

Dear Doctor Ijams:

This is to let you know that I am in whole-hearted sympathy with the drive you have on to eliminate the debt of David Lipscomb College and re-establish the endowment, also construct other buildings that the institution so much needs.

The forty-four years history that this institution has made in educating the young people of the state and especially in this section makes it worthy of the support of every good citizen that we have, and I want you to know that you have our whole-hearted sympathy in obtaining the goal for which you are striving.

Most respectfully,
(Signed) Hilary E. Howse
Mayor.
It would seem to be just a little confusing from these published reports as just who did receive these checks; but that could be explained on the ground that after Brother Ijams had received the checks, “The Williams Company” scented some hot campaign fodder in the transaction, so they just had Brother Ijams turn the checks over to brethren Hall and Elrod, and had them carry the checks back to the Governor and Mayor, and had the boys to pose for a picture while receiving the checks. If this does not explain the matter satisfactory, you will have to call on Brother Hall, and Brother Elrod for an explanation.

I have heard David Lipscomb say many times: “When you once open the flood gates there is no way stopping digression, or departures from God’s word.” The following clipping from “The Nashville Banner” shows the truthfulness of his statement.

“Assured by outside interests seeking to award several millions of dollars to American colleges that Lipscomb would be in a position to make request for sufficient funds to carry out the expansion plan if Nashville and the territory served by the college would secure its present financial stability by raising $350,000. Dr. Ijams said the Foundation program, inspired by such encouragement, had gone so far that architectural drawings for the developments have been completed.

“Following a tour of inspection by prominent Nashville businessmen, headed by Judge John R. Aust, the architects plans for the expansion program, which will require outside financing of at least four times the amount of $350,000 now being sought by public subscription, were made public. They include completion of the present campus “Circle” with another dormitory and library building and a new administration building and athletic field, with the main building layout facing Belmont Avenue instead of Granny White road.

“This entire program, which will bring more than a thousand additional students to the college, has been inspired by conferences with several wealthy men and others outside of Nashville representing many millions of dollars available to “American colleges,” the announcement said, “But none of it will be given to institutions that are not supported financially by the cities and contingent territories they serve.

“As soon as this Foundation Fund campaign is completed and sufficient pledges have been received to assure receipt by the college of $350,000, these additional funds will be applied for.”

Brethren there is no stopping to our drifting when we cut loose from our mooring. "Following a tour of inspection by prominent Nashville businessmen, headed by Judge John R. Aust” etc. Who is Judge John J. Ijams? He is a leading digressive in Vine Street Christian church, where J. B. Briney talked about “high class funerals in Nashville” Instead of Briney’s statements being diabolical, as many thought in the early days of the Nashville Bible School, they were rather prophetic, and are now being fulfilled. If we were to judge from these published reports we would have to conclude that the Vine Street Christian church conceived, brought forth, and fathered the Nashville Bible School.

I wonder if “Dr. Ijams” does not know that “outside interest” never awards several millions of dollars to American Colleges without a draw string around the “award”? Vanderbilt University was used to be controlled by Methodist Bishops, but they kept seeking, and receiving several millions of dollars “awards” from “outside interest” until it dawned on them that they had lost control of the university. The “awards” were so glittering that the Bishops did not notice the strings till it was too late. They went into the courts and tried to regain control, but the courts ruled against them, they had sold their birthright for a “mess of potage.” Is that to be the fate of David Lipscomb College?

Brethren if your present course is indicative of the principles that shall guide David Lipscomb College in the future, will you not, in the name of reason and in common justice to the memory of David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding, quit talking about the principles upon which they founded the Nashville Bible School? Finally, your present course will make David Lipscomb College just another Bethany, or Lexington College, a hindrance, if not a curse to New Testament simplicity and principles.

KURFEES SERMON NOTES

What could be a more welcome announcement to the many gospel preachers throughout the country than the statement released by B. C. Goodpasture that a volume of M. C. Kurfees sermon notes in multigraph is ready for delivery. These notes are gleaned from several thousand outlines, drafted in Kurfees own handwriting, covering important sermons preached during his forty-five years ministry with the Haldeman Avenue Church, Louisville, Kentucky. It was a laborious task to translate these notes to type, but one in which the doing of it is ample reward for those who had part in it.

No man is better fitted for the task of selecting and publishing these notes, and of getting them into the hands of the preachers, than B. C. Goodpasture. He is a lover of books, especially old books written by great preachers of the past. Brother Goodpasture possesses about every book ever written by one of our brethren and expects to make that collection complete. He is able to furnish preachers most any old or out of print book they may desire to obtain.

It is well that the preachers all get on his mailing list.

The Kurfees notes sell at fifty cents a copy, a neatly bound booklet. If the first volume meets with proper response a second volume will be published. Every preacher, or anybody else needing outline suggestions should order one from B. C. Goodpasture, 1192 Clifton Road, N.E., Atlanta, Ga.

PROPHECIES

(Continued from Page 38)

God broke the covenant, after Israel had broken it, and all the things he had prepared for them "passed away from them." There remains nothing for them as a nation but hissing and curses. Their renewal as a nation is a pipe dream. The only hope for the Jew is to be "gathered one by one" into Christ's kingdom, the Church, Isa. 27:12. "I will take you, one of a city, and two of a family, and will bring you to Zion."(Jer. 3:14) "Zion" is "the church of the firstborn."(Heb. 12:22-23) God had not failed in his part of the covenant (JOSH. 23:14), but broke it forever because of Israel's delinquency. All the prophecies "taken literally" become entangling to the Premillennialists, and they do not take them all that way.

THE NEW SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

Six Months, One Dollar; Twelve Months, Two Dollars.
The Interior of the Auditorium of the McAlester, Oklahoma, Church of Christ

The December Gospel Guardian carried the following report of the first meeting that was held in this recently acquired property:

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

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

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

The McAlester church has made arrangements with Brethren Wallace and Doran to continue the work in this unusually accessible building one-half of each month as long as it may be deemed expedient. The program of work will be varied, covering the development of the church as well as the evangelistic phase, but preaching and singing the gospel will be the dominant note in the work.
THAT GOSPEL GUARDIAN SUBSCRIPTION LETTER

The letter below was mailed to more than one thousand names on the Gospel Guardian list that appeared unpaid on our files. Many have responded, but not all; in fact, not half. We regret that there were some errors, and some who had sent their dollar received this letter. A one-cent card from you to the Gospel Guardian will correct the listing—your word is sufficient. We have no other way of correcting errors than to be notified. If you received a letter through error, please send us a card advising us; otherwise, please send us a dollar and let your magazine continue. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Oklahoma City, Okla.
March 5, 1936

Dear Guardian Friend:

Our revised record shows that there are more than one thousand names on the subscription list of the Gospel Guardian of those who subscribed for the magazine who have not sent their dollar—just an oversight or daily negligence so common to us all.

One dollar is a small item to each subscriber but to the Gospel Guardian it is necessary to the continuance of the magazine. Won't you send your dollar now and help us to keep the Guardian going?

Mistakes will occur no matter how careful we may be; so if your subscription has been paid, just notify us and the correction will be made on our list. Or, if you have mailed your dollar within the past few days, just disregard this letter. But if you have not paid your subscription, please attach one dollar to the form below and mail it. The Gospel Guardian needs the dollar now.

Thanking you, I am,

Faithfully,

[Signature]

Editor

The Gospel Guardian,
Box 1078,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

Attached herewith is one dollar in payment of my subscription to the Gospel Guardian.

Name __________________________
Address _________________________
________________________________
The NEAL-WALLACE DISCUSSION
on the
MILLENNIUM
held at
WINCHESTER, KY.  CHATTANOOGA, TENN.
January 2-6, 1933  June 6-9, 1933

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

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

A 350-Page Book
Price $2.00

— Cloth-bound —

P. 0. BOX 1078 THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

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
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.

ORDER FROM
THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN
P. 0. Box 1078
Oklahoma City, Okla.
CHRISTIAN HYMNS

“For Every Purpose in Worship”

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

The Book

Appearance--Beautiful

Binding-Durable

Material--The Best

Arrangement-Excellent

The Songs

Scriptural

Spiritual

Inspirational

Singable

Applicable

| 60c per Copy (prepaid) |
| $50 per 100 (not prepaid) |

GOSPEL ADVOCATE COMPANY

Nashville, Tennessee