THE PRAYER OF NEHEMIAH IN BABYLON

I beseech thee, O Jehovah, the God of heaven, the great and terrible God, that keepeth covenant and loving kindness with them that love him and keep his commandments: let thine ear now be attentive, and thine eyes open, that thou mayest hearken unto the prayer of thy servant, which I pray before thee at this time, day and night, for the children of Israel thy servants, while I confess the sins of the children of Israel, which we have sinned against thee. Yea, I and my father's house have sinned: we have dealt very corruptly against thee, and have not kept the commandments, nor the statutes, nor the ordinances, which thou commandedst thy servant Moses, saying, If ye trespass, I will scatter you abroad among the peoples: but if ye return unto me, and keep my commandments and do them, though your outcasts were in the uttermost part of the heavens, yet will I gather them from thence, and will bring them unto the place that I have chosen, to cause my name to dwell there. Now these are thy servants and thy people, whom thou hast redeemed by thy great power, and by thy strong hand. O Lord, I beseech thee, let now thine ear be attentive to the prayer of thy servant, and to the prayer of thy servants, who desiring to fear thy name; and prosper, I pray thee, thy servant this day, and grant him mercy in the sight of this man.

(Nehemiah 1:5-11)
T HE DIVINE origin of the Christian religion depends for its proof upon the evidence that Jesus of Nazareth is "the Christ the Son of the living God." This is the central thought of the entire Bible and upon its truthfulness, all else depends.

It has ever been the object of all infidels to discredit this statement and thereby rob Christ of His divinity and the Christian of his hope, which must forever rest upon, it. There have been written many books and many lectures forever to counterfeit the Christian of his hope, which must thereby rob Christ of His divinity and reduce Jesus to the level of mere man. All else depends.

Mr. H. G. Wells, the noted writer, in his book "Jesus, the Perfect Man," by which title he means "Jesus, the Great Philosopher," etc. Let me say to those who may read this article that I am not so much concerned about Jesus as a man, teacher or philosopher, but that I am tremendously concerned about Jesus, the Christ, the Son of the living God. Those who lived with Him and who heard Him talk and saw Him perform the miracles, wonders and signs which He did, unite in the brief that He was a super-man. The evidence of His friends is conclusive. His enemies are forced to join in saying, "Truly, He was the Christ, the Son of God." Some years ago, Mr. H. G. Wells, the noted writer, was asked to contribute an article for the American Magazine on six of the greatest men that had ever lived. This request came in recognition of His scholarship, integrity and ability; we measure men by the historian's standard. Though not a Christian himself and even skeptical regarding the Christ, Mr. Wells caused to be penned the following article:

"Jesus of Nazareth is easily the dominant figure in history. I am speaking of him, of course, as a man, for I conceive that the historian must reat him as a man, just as the painter must paint his as a man. We do not now as much about him as we would like to know. The accounts of his life and work as set down in the four Gospels are somewhat obscure and contradictory: but all four of them agree in giving us a picture of a very definite personality; they carry a conviction of reality. To assume that He never lived, that the accounts of his life are inventions, is more difficult and raises more problems in the path of the historian than to accept the essential elements of the Gospels as fact.

"Of course you and I live in countries where, to millions of men and women, Jesus is more than a man. But the historian must disregard that fact; he must adhere to the evidence which would pass unchallenged if his book were to he read in every nation under the sun. Now, it is interesting and significant—Isn't it—that a historian, setting forth in that spirit, without any theological bias whatever, should find that he simply cannot portray the progress of humanity honestly without giving a foremost place to a penniless teacher from Nazareth. The old Roman historians ignored Jesus entirely; they ignored the growth and spread of his teaching, regarding it as something apart from life, something, as it were, that happened only on Sundays. He left no impress on the historical records of his time. Yet, more than nineteen hundred years later, a historian like myself, who does not even call himself a Christian, finds the picture centering irresistibly around the life and character of this simple, lovable man.

"All sorts of dogma and tradition have been imposed upon his personality, of course; it is the fate of all great religious leaders to be misinterpreted by their followers. But from underneath this mass of the miraculous and incredible, the man himself keeps breaking through. We sense the magnetism that induced men who had seen him only once to leave their business and follow him. He filled them with love and courage. Weak and ailing people were heartened by his presence. He spoke with a knowledge and authority that baffled the wise and subtle. But other teachers have clone all this. These talents alone would not have given him the permanent place of power which he occupies; that place is by virtue of the new and simple and profound doctrine which he brought—the universal, loving Fatherhood of God and the coming of the Kingdom of Heaven.

"It is one of the most revolutionary doctrines that have ever stirred and changed human thought. His followers failed to grasp it: no age has even partially understood its tremendous challenge to the established institutions of mankind. But the world began to be a different world from the day that doctrine was preached; and every step toward wider understanding and tolerance and good will is step in the direction of universal brotherhood, which he proclaimed.

"So the historian, disregarding the theological significance of his life, writes the name of Jesus of Nazareth at the top of the list of the world's greatest characters. For the historian's test of greatness is not, 'What did he accumulate for himself?' or 'What did he build up, to tumble down at his death?' Not that at all but this: 'Was the world differer because he lived? Did he start me to thinking along fresh lines with vigor and vitality that persisted after him?' By this test Jesus stand first.'

Is it not rather strange that a man of the type of Mr. H. G. Wells would by all evidences available be forced to place Jesus, the penniless peasant of Nazareth at the head of the list of the world's great men? As rule, men do not reach their zenith early as thirty or thirty-five years. What the world considers its great men have lived to practically double the age of Jesus the Christ. Greatness is determined in general by an esteem, wealth, social or political prominence. Measure the Christ by either standard and you will find Him weighed and found wanting. He was born in a stable and cradled in a manger and at the end of the days for such, His mother offered a substitute for the sacrifice of the more wealthy. His father was a carpenter and for thirty years, He lived in practical obscurity. He came from a despised town, out of which the work thought no good thing could come. There is no record of His ever having a dollar. He made His home among the poor of this earth and the common people heard Him gladly. He was never galvanized into prominence by the social set nor did He attain political prestige at the hands of His friends.

With all these elements lacking, we are made to wonder how does Mr. Wells account for His superiority.

The only logical conclusion is that He was not merely man but was divine. Let not the world therefore rob Him of His divinity and reduce Him to a common level of other men.
BROTHER OVERBY’S CHALLENGE

WILL accept Brother Overby’s challenge in the March-April issue of Gospel Guardian, and will therefore send in one hundred subscriptions “within the next three months”.

And now, I want to issue a “challenge” to the associate editors and contributors of the Gospel Guardian to fall in the procession and help to make the magazine safe financially.

To date I have secured and sent in two hundred and eighty-five subscriptions. If all the members of the “Guardian Staff” had done that much for the magazine (and that isn’t much), there would be more than eight thousand names on the subscription list as a direct result of our work. The Gospel Guardian can only do good to the extent it is read, and we should feel it a joy to aid in securing readers.

If you have failed to assist in circulating the magazine, it is not too late to “redeem the time,” and the challenge is for you to join Brother Overby in sending in at least one hundred subscriptions. If all whose names appear on the “Staff” will do his part, thousands of new names will soon be added to the subscription list. There are many, many faithful preachers who are in sympathy with the cause the Gospel Guardian represents, who should be most happy to aid in this most worthy work.

As Brother Overby well said: “Merely making announcements will not do this—this is good, but it is not sufficient . . . Tell them you are taking” the subscriptions, and then see them personally. Yes, “it will work like a charm; try it.”

Let’s “pull together” and put ten thousand new names on the subscription list—it can be done!

Yours for a worthy cause,

E. G. Creacy.

LET US GO ON

A great many friends and readers of the Gospel Guardian who have been concerned about its welfare and its continuance will be interested in the following statement, which I introduce by the good word from my true and tried friend, E. G. Creacy.

The liberality of friends made it possible for The Gospel Guardian to exist. Through their loyalty it continues. There is nothing more to be appreciated than the fidelity of friends such as The Gospel Guardian has had. It is not due to any admiration that they have for its editor, nor to any personal following that he has been able to promote. He, in fact, is an unimportant and insignificant individual in person and personality, and of mere ordinary ability otherwise. The men who are proving loyal to the Gospel Guardian are among the best, ablest, devoutest, preachers of the gospel who are not swayed by personal leadership away from the principles of New Testament doctrine and practice. The same can be said of those brethren who have given to the Gospel Guardian the financial backing to supply thus far what has been lacking in paying its way. It is the Cause this magazine has espoused, for which it not only stands in sentiment, but for which it fights and will fight to the finish-departure from the Word of God in doctrine, worship and practice—that has enlisted the loyal support of these faithful men and women. The editor of the Guardian is grateful, profoundly so, and deeply moved by the voluntary “call to arms” sounded by Coleman Overby and responded to by Emmett Creacy. They are among the truest friends I have had. I shall humbly and untiringly endeavor to merit, at least partially, their loyalty, and that of others, by keeping the Gospel Guardian true to its name and its cause.

There will be another issue of the Guardian this mouth—the June number—it is already in the hands of the printers and will go into the mails the last week of June. The July number will then be brought out on publication date—the fifteenth of the month—and we hope to continue without further irregularity. It is hoped that this statement may allay any feelings of uncertainty and that friends of the Guardian may all become its agents and help to establish it by sending subscriptions to it. It would, indeed, help a great deal if a few hundred unpaid readers would remit the original dollar which was due on subscription pledge when the first issue was received.

Our cause is right, our work is earnest, and we believe it will go on.

A CORRECTION

There are two articles in the March-April number of the Gospel Guardian, written by O. C. Lambert, both of which are good articles, but one of which especially is worth rereading. These articles are found on pages 32 and 33 under the titles, “The Problem Of Organized Cooperation” and “The Catholic Bible.” These articles appeared under the name “C. A. Lambert” and the initial “O. C. W.” This was an error. We do not know how the names and initials got so misplaced, but it happened, as things will with editors, printers and proofreaders. We would like for those readers who preserve their magazines to refer to these articles and correct Brother Lambert’s name, and while doing that to re-read especially his article on “The Problem of Organized Cooperation.”
TITHING OR GIVING?

We would be far from saying anything to encourage or excuse penurious giving on the part of Christians. There is more said on the subject of giving in the New Testament than of faith, repentance, or baptism. Thirteen of the twenty-nine parables of Christ are financial parables and "turn on a financial pivot." Whole chapters in the Epistles to the churches are devoted to the subject of giving. But it is a noteworthy fact that the apostles did not try to emphasize the duty of giving by preaching on tithing.

The method of reasoning employed to make tithing a part of the Christian system is similar to the effort of the Methodists to prove infant membership based on the covenant of circumcision, and likewise parallel with the attempt of the "diggrenses" to bring over the music of David and the Jews into the worship of the New Testament.

The chief argument seems to be based on Paul's statement that Christ is priest after the order of Melchizedek, to whom Abraham paid tithes. The drift of the argument is: Christ is priest after the order of Melchizedek; Abraham paid tithes to Melchizedek; therefore, Christians should pay tithes to Christ. The reasoning is fallacious and the conclusion is not of logical sequence. Christ is priest after the order of Melchizedek only in the particular cited by the writer of Hebrews—that is, "without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God: abideth a priest continually." The meaning plainly is that, like Melchizedek, Christ did not come of priestly lineage, having neither predecessor nor successor in priesthood—none before him and none after him—but "abideth a priest continually." The reference to tithing in this passage was only to emphasize the greatness of Melchizedek, "to whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all." So great was Melchizedek, the King of Salem, that even so eminent a personage as Abraham paid him tithes.

The careful reader can see that Christ is priest after the orclr of Melchizedek because he is priest forever. "As he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek." (Heb. 5:6.) An argument on tithing based on this passage is too far-fetched to even be interesting.

Another instance of poor exegesis is that Paul commands us to "walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham," and we are told that one of the "steps" of Abraham's faith was tithing! May we not ask what the other "steps" were? Tithing is not all Abraham did. What about the offering of Isaac on the altar, sacrifices, and circumcision? Shall we walk in these steps also? The plain truth is that Paul did not command us to walk in Abraham's steps. But to walk in the steps of Abraham's faith. To walk in Abraham's steps would require the doing of all that Abraham did: but to walk in the steps of Abraham's faith is simply to be guided and actuated by that same lofty principle of unhesitating faith in doing all that God commands us. "By faith Abraham . . . obeyed." Abrahamic faith is faith that obeys. Some brethren would have us think that it is tithing!

Still it is urged that tithing was practiced many centuries before the law of Moses was given; hence, not merely a part of the old law. But the same is true of offerings, sacrifices, and circumcision. We are hardly prepared for such a loose line of argument from brethren who know and preach the proper division of the word of God on all other questions.

In the second Corinthian letter Paul devotes two consecutive chapters to the subject of giving. He talks in terms of "abounding in the grace of giving"; "readiness to will"; "a willing mind"; "it is acceptable according as a man hath," and "as God hath prospered"—all these and more, yet not a word of tithing. Thus the principles of Christian giving as set forth by Paul are summed up in the charge: "As a man purposeth in his own heart, so let him give." Paul might have simply commanded the Corinthians to tithe and disposed of the question in one word. Instead, he uses two entire chapters teaching Christians how to give.

Tithing belongs to the letter and legalism of the old system and not to the spirit and freedom of the new. The new is better, and it is not tithe or tax, but voluntary, liberal, cheerful giving; and God will judge the giver.

THE REPUDIATION OF MARK 16:15-16

CLED E. WALLACE

All the constitutions and statutes of all governments of all time are not to be compared with the Great Commission. It is indeed the Magna Charta of salvation. As recorded by Mark, Jesus said: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned." (Mark 16:15-16) This was the inspiration for the evangelization of the whole world in a generation.

It is not strange that this text has called forth the forces of truth and error to battle. There is nothing difficult about the text. Its terms are clear. Jesus beyond reasonable doubt makes both belief and baptism conditions of salvation; while unbelief alone is made a sufficient reason for condemnation. This much is clear on the face of the text. Some modern partisans have developed a rabid aversion to baptism as a condition of remission of sins and have made some reckless and ingenious efforts to break or change the force of the language that Jesus used. These efforts have not proved satisfactory to even all who were in sympathy with them. Some have gone to the extreme of repudiating the language altogether and contending that Jesus did not use the language at all. But criticism, scholarly and otherwise, has failed to shake the historical accuracy of the text. Jesus said it. The "assured results" of scholar criticism support the text.

This language of Jesus does not square with the faith alone doctors. The order of Jesus is (1) belief (2) baptism (3) salvation. Sectarian doctors would have it (1) belief (2) salvation (3) baptism. They would feel infinite relief if they could make Jesus say, "He that believeth and is saved shall be baptized." Their theory demands a change in the order of the terms that Jesus used, and, also a change in the tenses of the verbs that Jesus used. This amounts to a rank perversion of the language of Jesus that cannot be tolerated for an instant by those who have any respect for the word of the Lord. Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." This makes both belief and baptism conditions of salvation. The text stands.

A plain text does not always stop a partisan. If it blocks his path, he resorts to artful dodges and detours around it. He does not surrender to the obvious fact that Jesus made belief and baptism conditions of salvation in the text. The text also makes disbelief sufficient ground for condemnation. This offers the sole opportunity for evasion.
“He that disbelieveth shall be condemned.” Jesus did not say “He that disbelieveth and is not baptized shall be condemned.” Ergo, baptism is not a condition of salvation. Shades of logic! It might be excused in the dear old lady who thought it a touching story, that one about little Moses among the bull nettles, or in the brother who thought that Sodom and Gomorrah were man and wife. But for a man who knows that the epistles are not the wives of the apostles it is simply pitiful. Yet it is seriously urged by some men with seminary training, evidently for the consumption of the ignorant. They do not of course explain how a disbeliever could be baptized even if he wanted to, or how he might even be induced to want to.

Suppose, for purposes of examination, we concede that Jesus should have said: “He that disbelieveth and is not baptized shall be condemned?” What follows? Well, more follows than the average dupe who apes the observation ever dreamed of. It would follow that the man who believed and refused to be baptized could not be condemned. But that is not the half of it. It would also follow that the man who disbelieved but should be baptized, as though such a thing could he, could not be condemned, either, under the conditions of such a test. The most striking thing, however, that follows is that the sectarian critics, in trying to make a fool of Jesus, have succeeded admirably in making fools of themselves. The language of Jesus stands. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned.” Nothing can be done to it that will make it any plainer, and we cannot allow it to be eclipsed by sophistry.

---

**SOME MORE POETIC LICENSE**

W. CURTIS PORTER

Since brethren who are able to appreciate poetry take advantage of "poetic license" to sing songs that are not Scriptural it might be well to consider the following from Catholic literature. Regarding their devotion to the Virgin Mary I find this paragraph from one of their writers:

“The main idea being clear, we can deal more in detail with the Church’s doctrine concerning Our Lady. It may be summed up briefly under three heads: First, Mary is mother of the God-Man Jesus Christ, and is a most eminent saint, dear to God and man. Secondly, she takes an interest in the faithful on earth, redeemed, like herself, by the blood of her Son, and prays for them in heaven. Thirdly, it is legitimate and becoming to honor her, and to ask for her prayers. On the other hand, the Church repudiates all idea that Mary is more than a creature, or that her intercession stands on the same level or in any way means the same thing as the intercession of her Divine Son. Any language used by foreign devotional writers which seems to English ears to suggest otherwise, would be condemned by the Church if intended to hear such an objectionable sense; but such expressions ought rather to be taken in a rhapsodical and poetic sense, and not to be regarded as serious doctrinal prose. As a matter of taste, it might be better to restrict in some way the use of words, for it is in this case as in the abuse of superlatives: if we exhaust our highest language over Mary, we shall have no higher language left to apply to Our Lord. But matters of taste are not matters of dogma.” (What The Catholic Church Is, page 30.)

Of course, this writer thinks that as a matter of taste it would be better to use the highest language with respect to Christ, but if some other’s taste should lead him to ascribe the highest praise to the mother of Jesus, he shall not be hindered, for after all “matters of taste are not matters of dogma.” And in their prayers to Mary if some writers use language that seems to English ears to exalt her to the same level in her work of intercession with her Son, it is not to be taken as "serious doctrinal prose" but should be thought of “in a rhapsodical and poetic sense.” That sounds almost like some of our brethren contending for unscriptural songs through poetic license. And since it has been claimed that poetic license gives us the right to sing songs that are not quite Scriptural perhaps this right given by poetic license will lead us to sing:

“Hail, heavenly Queen! Hail, foamy ocean star!
0 be our guide, diffuse thy beams afar;
Hail, Mother of God! above all virgins blest,
Hail, happy gate of heav’n’s eternal rest.”

And since it is only a matter of taste anyway we might continue with:

“I’ll sing a hymn to Mary,
The mother of my God
The Virgin of all Virgins,
Of David’s royal blood.
Oh, teach me, holy Mary
A loving song to frame,
When wicked men blaspheme thee,
To love and bless thy name.”

And if that does not sufficiently cover the field granted by "poetic license"; then in a “rhapsodical and poetic sense" we might exclaim in song:

“Daily, daily sing to Mary,
Sing, my soul her praises due;
All her feasts, her actions worship,
With the heart’s devotion true.
Lost in wond’ring contemplation,
Be her majesty confessed;
Call her Mother, call her Virgin,
Happy Mother, Virgin blest.”

And I wonder just how far we may be allowed to wander from the truth till our "poetic license" would be revoked.

---

**COLEMAN OVERBY’S “BIBLE WOMEN”**

A new book deserves a place only when it deals with themes effectively and instructively that have not been thoroughly and fully covered in the same way. This is true of a very fine treatise on “Bible Women” by Coleman Overby. It has one hundred eleven pages, with an introductory chapter on Bible Dispensations, followed up by twenty-six lessons on Old Testament Women and twenty-five chapters on New Testament Women—fifty-twoIdxs in all. It contains a discussion of eighty-two Old Testament women and fifty-six New Testament Women. The lessons are arranged for class study, and it is actually true to its sub-title—“A Book For Bible Study.” There are groups of Christian women all over the country who feel the constant need of class material, guides to their Bible and study classes, and this booklet will serve that keenly felt need.

Anything that Coleman Overby offers to the public is worth ordering. He is a student of God’s word, he is true to its teaching, and knows how to teach it.

The book sells for thirty cents (30c) per copy, cloth binding or fifty cents (50c) board binding, and should be ordered from Coleman Overby, 208 North G St., Muskogee, Okla., or from the Firm Foundation Publishing House, Austin, Texas.
ASSOCIATE EDITORIALS

BIBLE COLLEGES AS I SEE THEM

If Alexander Campbell, the Greatest Intellectual Prodigy of the Nineteenth Century, Were Living Today He Could Teach in Any of Our Christian Colleges.

JOHN T. LEWIS

In the March-April issue of the Gospel Guardian, I had an article calling attention to the dangerous precedent the president and directors of David Lipscomb College were setting by hiring a high-powered money raising organization to wrest money from sinners, sectarians, business organizations, and saints alike for the college, and by featuring the digressives in the leading role on the program.

I have often said when denominations put on drives in cities to raise money for their churches or schools, it was about like putting a gun under the nose of business men and telling them to "put up." Because such campaigns suggest or offer but two implications to business men—either come-across with their money or be boycotted. Thus religion has been brought into disrepute, the churches stigmatized, and cursed as begging institutions by men who have been embittered by such tactics. I have thus thundered away against denominational practices for more than a third of a century, and I certainly do not believe the evil is mitigated any because the church of Christ has begun to ape the denominations in these matters. I said the late "David Lipscomb College Campaign" was a dangerous precedent both to the church, and to Bible colleges. What would be more natural for the young preachers who are now students in David Lipscomb College, inoculated with the spirit of the campaign, when they leave college, urged by the fires of youth, and with ambitions to make their mark in the world to put on just such campaigns to raise money to build meeting houses and to otherwise carry on the Lord's work? It was that spirit that organized the "American Christian Missionary Society," in October 1819, at Cincinnati, Ohio, and sold life membership to saint and sinner alike for as much "per." They wanted to do something, and they did-create a faction, caused a division, and built a party in the church of Christ which has out-deno- 

In the present educational system it is not knowledge or an education that counts, but "degrees". There are men and women living today who had been principals of High Schools, and colleges for more than a quarter of a century, whose educational qualifications, or ability to teach were never questioned, they held their certificates by the merit, or examination system; but when the "Southern Association of Colleges" assumed absolute control of our educational system today. Under our present educational system it is not knowledge or an education that counts, but "degrees". There are men and women living today who have not a "degree" from one of the colleges and Universities of our country. Some one may say: But if Alexander Campbell, the greatest intellectual prodigy of the nineteenth century, were living today he could not teach in any of our Bible Colleges, because he did not have any alphabetical letters following his name. One may say: But if Alexander Campbell were living today the Colleges and Universities of our country would give him "honorary degrees," that might be true; but if every College and University in the United States had given him "honorary degrees" it would not have added one grain of sense, common or otherwise, to his almost super-intellectual powers and inexhaustible store house of knowledge. Our educational system of today is filling the religious, educational, and political fields with intellectual peanuts, who have had enough "hours" under Drs. X., Y. and Z., to give them "degrees," and thereby granting to them all the rights, privileges, and emoluments of the "Southern Association of Colleges," whose

Shall History Repeat Itself?

I believe the only hope for our Bible colleges is for them to sever their present relationship with the "Southern Association of Colleges," and all other educational incubuses that recognize no authority, either of God or man, save their own assumed authority. Any organization that arrogates to itself supreme authority, recognizing neither State lines, or "States’ Rights," is a menace to democracy and should have no place in a free country. If something is not done to strip these educational association of some of their assumed authority, and tomfoolery in the fields of education, they will ultimately bankrupt every State in the Union. No State legislature can meet without their lobbyists being present to lobby for more money, thus they are continually piling financial burdens upon the backs of an already tax burdened people. I am neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet, but I believe if these educational associations do not come to themselves, and change some of their unreasonable requirements and methods, they are destined to fall under the weight of their own folly. I do not believe that money-large endowment funds—and athletics should be made the criterion of intellectuality, yet those things are almost absolute monarchs of our educational system today. Under our present educational system it is not knowledge or an education that counts, but "degrees". There are men and women living today who had been principals of High Schools, and colleges for more than a quarter of a century, whose educational qualifications, or ability to teach were never questioned, they held their certificates by the merit, or examination system; but when the "Southern Association of Colleges" assumed absolute control of our educational system these old experienced and tried teachers were thrown out because they did not have "degrees" from some college in their association, and young inexperienced teachers with "degrees" were put in their places. All of which was nothing but a mockery of common sense. And this is not a criticism of young people with college degrees; but of an iniquitous educational system that would make "credit-hunters" and "degree worshippers" out of young people. When our young people go away to college these days they do not go seeking knowledge; but rather "credits" and "degrees," because if they have these things they can teach in any college whether they have anything else or not, so far as the Southern Association of Colleges is concerned. Any system that puts a premium on the alphabetical letters that have been tacked on to your name rather than an approved ability is an iniquitous system. Why should a teacher be discriminated against, and barred from our educational institutions, if he is qualified to teach, and can prove his qualifications by standing any reasonable examination that he might be—and all should be—required to take, just because he has not a "degree" from one of the "Southern Association of Colleges?"

If William Anderson, who spent his life in the school room, succeeded J. A. Harding as president of the Nashville Bible School, and held that position till his death, were living today he could not even teach in David Lipscomb College. In act if Alexander Campbell, the greatest intellectual prodigy of the nineteenth century, were living today he could not teach in any of our Bible Colleges, because he did not have any alphabetical letters following his name. Some one may say: But if Alexander Campbell were living today the Colleges and Universities of our country would give him "honorary degrees," that might be true; but if every College and University in the United States had given him "honorary degrees" it would not have added one grain of sense, common or otherwise, to his almost super-intellectual powers and inexhaustible store house of knowledge. Our educational system of today is filling the religious, educational, and political fields with intellectual peanuts, who have had enough "hours" under Drs. X., Y. and Z., to give them "degrees," and thereby granting to them all the rights, privileges, and emoluments of the "Southern Association of Colleges," whose
rights and privileges are granted not on merit, but on "degrees."

Brethren, I believe any alliance with educational associations that would bar such men as Alexander Campbell, David Lipscomb, and William Anderson from the faculties of our Bible Colleges, while it would let in, and protect the rankest infidels, is an unholy alliance. That is exactly what the "Southern Association of Colleges," and the "American Association of University Professors" would do. If you believe this is a radical, extreme, and untrue statement, read the following "United Press" dispatch of, December 31, 1935.

"College Ruled as 'ineligible' "
Association of Professors Proposes Penalty on Pittsburgh By United Press
St. Louis, Dec. 31.-Recommendation that the University of Pittsburgh be placed on the ineligible list of the American Association of University Professors was made to that organization today by its committee on academic freedom and tenure.

The action was based on the dismissal of four professors on grounds of alleged "irreligious teachings."

Coupled with the committee's recommendation, already approved by the governing council of the A.A.U.P. was a stinging rebuke to the action of 22 states which require teachers' oaths of loyalty to the Constitution.

"Loyalty is something one lives, not something one professes, in spite of views to the contrary held by misguided patriots and owners of low-class newspapers," the report asserted.

"The tyranny of public opinion in a democracy may become as dangerous as the absolutism of the despot."

The report demanded to know why teachers should be singled out, "asserting "the educator cannot be denied the rights of citizenship which others enjoy under the First Amendment of the Federal Constitution."

The Pope of Rome, and his College of Cardinals have never assumed more dictatorial or tyrannical powers, than these educational associations have assumed over our colleges. I do not believe it would be any more deadening to our religious freedom, and to New Testament Christianity for our Bible Colleges to be controlled by the "Roman Catholic Hierarchy" than for them to be controlled, and dictated to, by these educational associations in whose councils and deliberations the New Testament has no place.

Again it would bankrupt every member of the church in the United States to make it possible for our Bible Colleges to meet all the monetary requirements-endowments, buildings, equipments, teachers, professors' salaries, etc.--of these educational associations. All of which would not add one iota to the teacher's ability to teach, or to his spirituality. Read the following from "The Tennessee Educational Bulletin" for 1935.

Training of Faculty

"Each member of the faculty offering courses in teacher preparing curricula shall be the possessor of an earned Master's degree in education, or in an appropriate subject matter field, or the equivalent of such degree. All full professors shall have had two years of study in their respective fields of teaching in a fully organized and recognized graduate school. The training of a department head shall be three full years of coordinated graduate work in an institution of recognized standing, culminating in a Ph. D. degree, in the field in which he is to teach, or should represent a corresponding professional or technical training.

Salaries

"It is recommended that no teacher's salary be less than $1800 for nine months; that no full professor's salary be less than $2400 for nine months; and that no department head's salary be less than $3000 for nine months."

Financial Support

"Each junior teachers college shall have an annual appropriation or income sufficient to maintain the standards herein established. Such annual appropriation or income should in no case be less than $35,000. If not tax supported, a junior teachers college shall possess a productive endowment of at least $500,000."

Let the directors and presidents of our Bible Colleges say what they are going to do about these things--"We" have a right to know.

These are things that cannot be settled by the wave of the hand, or by ignoring them, they must be settled by prayer and action.

---

The Neo-Wollice Discussion and the Voice of the Pioneers on Instrumental Music and Societies (Lewis) can be ordered through The Gospel Guardian.

These are the only books The Gospel Guardian handles or supplies. We shall be glad to furnish them to our readers at $2.00 each or $3.00 for the two in one order.

---

THE PARABLE OF THE IRON BEDSTEAD

A Wooer of the Sects Criticizes Gospel Stalwarts

HUGO MCCORD

IN Word and Work (May) H. L. Olmstead takes an under-the-table kick at Wallace, Hinds, Srygley, and other stalwarts. These men have insisted strongly on speaking and teaching just what the Bible says, no more or less, and have criticized men who featured interpretations (prophetic or otherwise). Having no other way to back-fire, Olmstead says "you're another" by accusing them of "subjective interpretations of scripture." (I'm sure they feel flattered that they are capable of such doings, and so would be loathe to deny; but I'll do it for them.) And Bro. Olmstead doesn't excuse or defend himself for bridleless speculations; even if Srygley, et al, are guilty, "Therefore thou art inexcusable, Olmstead, for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest least the same things."

And he wasn't man enough to personate, but felt rather respectable fighting behind a mask (it's not respectable to fight; it's not right to strive, that is, not openly; it's perfectly all right under-handedly, impersonately).

Bro. Olmstead accused these men of making those "subjective interpretations" tests of fellowship. Over and over they've denied such, but to no avail. These men have no interpretations that they'd dare bind on anybody.

Bro. Olmstead condemns, in the same article, "the setting up of a human denomination." Good! Does he do that in Gallatin? Does he condemn sister denominations when in union meetings with them? Does he condemn a sectarian preacher and his faction and division when he calls on said preacher to lead in prayer? It doesn't appear that Olmstead is so nauseated at denominations, but at his brethren, Wallace, Srygley, Hinds, Nelson, etc. Why would a man fellowship a denomination but co n d emn his own brethren ? Could his featuring a theory be so altogether lovely to him that it means more than brothers dwelling "together in unity"?

When a wooer of the sects accuses Wallace, Srygley, etc., of abandoning "the true ground of the Restoration Plea" something tickles me under the fifth rib.
SWORD SWIPES


CLED E. WALLACE

SOME time ago in Word and Work, Bro. Boll stated the editorial policy of his paper. In the May issue of Truthseeker, Brother Armstrong gives first page prominence to a part of Bro. Boll’s article because “the editorial policy of Truthseeker is so well stated in the excerpt.” So the Word and Work and The Truthseeker have the same policy “so well stated” by Brother Boll himself. It looks like we have two peas in the same pod. We gather from Brother Armstrong’s remarks that his and Brother Boll’s paper are the only papers there are which have a policy which guarantees “that the whole truth can” be taught. These papers are “open forums” for the use of the “advocates” of “a great cause.” At the moment I do not recall seeing any strong articles in either paper condemning the Judaistic heresies which have disturbed the church. Possibly when the brethren find out that these papers are open forums some pointed articles along that line may be sent in. But it is to be feared that they may be turned down on the ground that they do not “advocate a great cause.” The hobby of Word and Work is preaching premillenialism. The hobby of Truthseeker is to defend Word and Work against the efforts of some able brethren to teach that paper the word of the Lord more perfectly. It seems to me that a merger would be logical. Truthseeker and Word and Work should combine into one paper. It could be made larger or come out oftener. A name could easily be found which would be suitable It might be called The Premillenial Advocate, The Sweet-spirited Harbinger or The Gospel Compromiser. As long as Brother Armstrong scratches himself everytime somebody stings Brother Boll they ought to be more closely associated.

Corn-Cobs and Sawdust

Brother Ernest Beam is writing a lot in Brother Armstrong’s paper, the Truthseeker, about “Tests of Loyalty.” Brother Beam is not sure whether he is alarmed, worried or plainly outraged over the efforts of some of us to teach the truth on the kingdom question and warn the brethren against the current premillenial perversions of the gospel. We remind Brother Beam of the cowboy who fed his herd a pile of corn-cobs. He would let the cow smell an ear of corn and when she opened her mouth to take it, he would ram a cob down her throat. By insinuation, because he is too nice to say so, Brother Beam charges the Gospel Guardian with feeding cobs to the cattle. Under the circumstances I think I am within my rights in saying that the stuff Brother Beam is writing in defense of false teachers reminds me of the Irishman who fed his laying hens on sawdust. During the process one hen laid and hatched out thirteen eggs. Twelve of the chickens had wooden legs and the thirteenth was a woodpecker. Corn-cobs are at least as good for cattle as sawdust is for chickens. I expect some people to cite this sawdust story as evidence that I do not have the Spirit of Christ who think that Brother Beam’s corncob yarn shows that the Holy Ghost dwells in him. Premillenialists and their sympathizers are not noted for consistency. At least nobody could prove it on them by the way they write.

Brother Beam pleads “for goodness, for gentleness, for meekness” and immediately charges that we believe “the Spirit is the word and the word is all the Spirit there is.” This is plain misrepresentation. He charges that we “fight the mistakes of good men but know nothing of really making the heart a place of abode for the Spirit of God.” We are not Christ’s, are not teachable and “are blind and deaf.” Some of the brethren are likely to wonder how such a tame sheep can bite that way.

Baptist Poultry

According to what I read in the papers, the leaders of organized work among the Baptists are giving grace a rest, and are hard at work trying to bind the Jewish system of tithing on the Baptist church. Some of the sisters are excited over the matter. One sister says: “My husband lets me have all the chickens and the increase for myself, and I’m just going to give one-tenth of all of them to the Lord.” Another is deeply moved by this example of self-sacrifice and ecstatically exclaims “Don’t you know her flock of chickens must be happy, that they may all be Baptists?” These Baptist lens should not rely on faith only or the impossibility of apostasy but should faithfully lay one egg per day each, or it may be decided that they have fallen from grace, or never had it, and will wind up in the family pot. Women are funny that way.

Another dear sister, according to the paper, was tithing her flock to pay her pastor and had $20 saved up in the bank. Her husband, the brute, decided that was too much to pay the preacher and so he sneaked out half of it, leaving only ten. He quickly got his rebuke from the hens. They simply quit laying. The husband, conscience stricken, confessed his thievery, or misappropriation of funds, embezzlement or whatever it was, and the hens immediately began laying again. You are sure to get caught if you try to fool a hen when she has decided that a tenth of her output should go to a Baptist preacher. If I had a flock of hens that partial to a Baptist preacher, I would just give him the hens. This choice bit of information about how to make hens happy and productive came from the Baptist Standard and The Baptist and Reflector.

Baptism and Works

As long as men, and some preachers are the worst offenders, run against the plain teaching of the New Testament, it is our duty to oppose them. L. W. Carlin has a long article in the Baptist and Reflector on “Salvation By Grace” and prays “that God may use it to refute the Christ dishonoring, soul destroying doctrine of salvation by works.” Some of the language he uses reveals the fact that he is highly inflamed by prejudice and thereby disqualified to examine certain texts of scripture. He says among other things:

All the works of men such as baptism, church-membership, right-living and all other bodily acts for (in order to) salvation are excluded.

All who are ever saved, are saved before, and without baptism.

The gospel which saves is not a gospel of works but a gospel of grace: and those who add baptism, church-membership, and other works of men for salvation, do not preach the gospel and therefore they have no saviour, no salvation, and are under the curse of God.

A man who thinks that baptism and church-membership are incompatible with grace knows too little about both grace and works to break loose in the paper. He should be receiving instruction instead of trying to give it. Paul says that Christ is the author of eternal
salvation to all who obey him. (Heb. 5:9) He also says that both Jews and Gentiles are reconciled to God in the one body, the church. (Eph. 2:16)

When convicted sinners asked Peter what to do to be saved he told them to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ. (Acts 2:38) Baptism is not a work of human righteousness. It bears the names of Father, Son and Holy Spirit and belongs to the “obedience of faith.” “Ye are all sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. (Gal. 3:27)

He also says that both Jews and Gentiles are reconciled to God in the salvation to all who obey him. (Heb. 2:39)

When Moses was trying to do a dozen men’s jobs his meddlesome father-in-law butt ed in and dictated to his boy-in-law how to run things (Ex. 18). No, that wasn’t it. In an interested way, Jethro sympathetically said to Moses: “I will give thee counsel...” Moses didn’t interrupt and assert his rights, but listened well, and was thankful.

Ecclesiasticism Blinds Paul

Pope James and his college of Jerusalem elders bound Paul to an out-worn Judaistic law (Acts 21:17-26). Paul bowed to the earth before their religious authority and obeyed them. Again, that wasn’t it. Paul’s brethren were requesting, not commanding. Paul didn’t waive his religious freedom, but followed their advice because he thought it best. And what was their counsel? To revert to a dead law in order to appease ignorant and intolerant Christians. But Brother Boll won’t hold his theory privately though wise and tolerant Christians have begged him so.

Hymenaeus an Unbound, Creedless Christian

Just as Brother Boll has, so Hymenaeus had a right to his theory; he had liberty in Christ to speak as he pleased. Though Paul and others remonstrated, kindly besought him, he vigorously taught that the resurrection was past already. The more brethren went to see him about it, the more he considered himself mistreated, bossed; then he felt that “were I to submit to these brethren I’d become creed-bound and forfeit my liberty in Christ. I once bowed to idols and learned I should bow to God only; shall I now bow to mere men? God forbid!” Then Hymenaeus wrote an article for his magazine as follows:

“I can tell you in a few words what my faith is... I believe in Jesus Christ as Lord and Son of God, ... I believe in the gospel, ... And as to all matters of Christian work and worship, I believe and practice as you do.

I have never demanded of any that they must believe as I do in any manner 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,’ [or ‘Pre-resurrectionist,’] nor have I in any wise drawn a line on my brethren for any of the differences current among them...” (Apologetics to R. H. Boll’s letter of October 30, 1935 to J. M. McCaleb.)

After Paul and others criticized Hymenaeus for his theory he could have used every one of Brother Boll’s statements above in his own defense! When Paul accused him of being factional, and after he had delivered him to Satan, Hymenaeus could have used the following words from Brother Boll in his own defense:

“Your accusation... 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 it up or else be ostracized—does that make me factional? Such is the situation as I understand it.” (Same letter.)
MORE INFORMATION ABOUT DENOMINATIONS

E. G. CREACY

In former articles a brief expose was given of the Baptist and Methodist denominations. There are many such denominations extant. The origin and tenets of some of these human systems command our attention in this article. Be it remembered that the church of the New Testament is not a denomination, and our purpose in these efforts is to exhibit the difference between the church and the denominations.

Lutheranism

The Lutheran denomination is the oldest Protestant denomination in the world. It dates from the eve of All Saints Day, October 31, 1517, when Martin Luther tacked his famous ninety-five theses on the door of the old Castle Church in Wittenberg, and defied the Pope of Rome to meet the objections filed. Mr. Luther, who was a monk, did not mean to withdraw from the Catholic Church, but in his protest against the corruption of the Church of Rome, including the sale of indulgences as carried on so extensively, struck a great blow at the papacy and led to the reformation and the origin of the Lutheran denomination.

The Lutheran movement became the “established Church” of Norway, Sweden and Denmark. Germany became largely Lutheran. Immigration to the “new world” planted Lutheranism in America. The Lutherans in this country are divided into a number of “factions.” The denomination has many “earmarks” of the Roman Catholic Church. The fact that it is the oldest Protestant denomination, and is sixteen hundred years younger than the church, is sufficient proof that it is not the institution of Christ. Denominational “churches” are of human origin; separate and distinct from the New Testament church. Denominationalism and Christianity are not synonymous.

Presbyterianism

Presbyterianism is next in the catalogue of human defections. John Calvin gave up the Catholic Church and became the founder of the doctrinal system known as “Calvinism,” which in a very large measure is associated with Presbyterianism today, although, there are a number of denominations, including the Baptists, not Presbyterian in government that “hold” to Calvinistic tenets.

Strictly speaking, Mr. Calvin did not found a distinct denomination, but what he preached and practiced became the principles which underlie the Presbyterian denomination. Under the leadership of John Knox, Presbyterians became very powerful in Scotland. The first book of discipline was written in 1560, and about 1592 Parliament made Presbyterianism the “established Church” of Scotland. Francis Makemie, planted Presbyterianism in America, organizing the first Church in Maryland in 1684. He was called the “Father of American Presbyterianism.” Throughout the history of the denomination there have been about seventeen distinct bodies formed.

Episcopalianism

The Episcopal Church was originated by Henry VIII after his contention with the Roman Catholic Church, because the Pope refused to annul his marriage to Catherine of Aragon, that he might be free to marry Anne Boleyn, with whom he had become infatuated. Through the shrewd schemes of Henry, the English Parliament severed the connection of the Church of England and the Church of Rome, and made him the head of the English Church.

The “Book of Prayer” was the result of one Thomas Cranmer, who wrote the Book of Homilies and the Forty-Two Articles, which was reduced to Thirty-Nine Articles, and finally incorporated in the Common Book of Prayer. The Episcopal Church of today is based upon the Nicene Creed and the Thirty-Nine Articles.

Episcopalianism was established in this country by English Colonists, under the jurisdiction of one of the Bishops of London, and this ecclesiastical connection was broken during the Revolutionary War, and the Church of England became the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. The denomination is a very close relative of the Roman Catholic Church.

Seventh-Day Adventists

Adventism had its origin in Massachusetts about one hundred years ago, under the leadership of one Wm. Miller. He preached that the “coming of Christ was at hand”; publishing a booklet entitled “Evidences from Scripture and History of the Second Coming of Christ about the year 1813, and His Personal Reign of One Thousand Years.” When his “prophecy” failed, he declared that he had erred in his “calculation” and moved the “time” up another year! This likewise failing, he set the time for the following year. The third failure divided his deluded followers, and out of the fragments Seventh-Day Adventism was constructed. Mr. and Mrs. White became the leaders of the cult. Premillennialism and Sabbath keeping constitute the heart of the denomination. Premillennialism within the ranks of a few “churches of Christ” today, is a borrowed relic from this fanatical cult.

Mormonism

The Mormon denomination had its genesis in 1830 at Fayette, N. Y., by Joseph Smith, Jr., who was known as “PeeP-Stone Joe.” Simply following in the tracks of his father as a roaming water witch, he claimed he had a vision in which the angel “Morona” appeared to him and revealed the hiding place of certain plates of gold on which was inscribed the “full and complete Gospel.” With the aid of some close friends, Smith translated this writing into the Book of Mormon. It hardly seems possible that people would believe such foolishness, but quite a following centered around “PeeP-Stone Joe,” and with him came to Ohio, and later removed to Missouri. Finally, Smith and about fifteen hundred of his adherents went to Illinois. It was in the State of Illinois that the doctrine of polygamy was introduced. Much internal trouble arose and public feeling ran high against the Mormons. Smith and his brother were lodged in jail, and finally shot to death by a mob. After Smith’s death, the Mormons split into several factions, but the main body, under the leadership of Brigham Young, immigrated to Utah, and settled at Salt Lake City. Another group formed the “Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints” in opposition to Brigham Young, and today has its headquarters at Independence, Missouri. The Salt Lake City group is by far the largest
body of Mormons today. From first to last, Mormonism has divided into six (distinct parties.

Russellism

Russellism is a mixture of many isms. This conglomeration of religious heresies under the name “Millennial Dawn,” and later, under the title of “Studies in the Scriptures.” While his writings were both un-Scriptural and anti-Scriptural, lie cited much Scripture, which made his teachings doubly deceptive. No man has ever established a better reputation than he at perverting the word of God—he was an artist in that kind of work. He greatly enriched himself from the sale of his books.

Court records of Pennsylvania disclose a dark picture of the man. His character and conduct, according to revealed facts, was nothing of which to boast. Upon this kind of foundation, a monstrous system of religious deception has been constructed. Russellism represents the most radical claims of premillennialism known today, and how long it will take Premillennialists of other schools, including some of "our brethren, to reach this stage is not known.

Since Russell’s decease, Judge Ruth-eford has espoused the cause of Rusellism, and the movement is at present sailing under the appellation of “Jehovah’s Witnesses.”

Conclusion

The above facts automatically prove that “denominational churches” are not Christian institutions. They are "plants" the Father has not planted (Matt. 15 :13). Men ought to rejoice that they can be Christians, members of the body of Christ, which is the church of Christ (Eph. 1 :22, 23; Col. 1 :18, etc.). Our next will give attention to the development of ecclesiasticism, or the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

THE REALM OF OPINION

Assertions that One May Hold to Certain Theories As Private Opinion in a Separate Realm from Faith Are Ambiguous and Reflect on the Unity of the Truth.

R. O. KENLEY

O N Sunday, April 12, 1936, Brother George A. Klingman preached for the Central Congregation in the City of Houston.

At the evening service, his subject was “Unity,” using as his scriptural lesson Ephesians 4:1-16. He gave a wonderful lesson on endeavoring to keep "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," and likewise emphasized the importance of the one body, one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all. He also stated that if Christians entertained opinions which would be disturbing factors and tend to disrupt the UNITY so earnestly urged by Paul in his letter to the Ephesians, that all such opinions should be kept as personal, and belonged to be kept in a separate realm or circle, so as not to be disturbing factors. By implication, he suggested that such state of thinking was not only possible, but permissible in a Christian.

I have read such similar statements from several brethren, some of whom claim to be bitterly opposed to "Bollism," and to the premillennial theory, as advocated by R. Boll. But, have I never been able to understand how such ambiguities and contradictions could exist in the mind of the same person and at the same time. How a person could believe the things as stated by Paul, as necessary prerequisites and parts of the UNITY OF THE FAITH, and at the same time hold a private opinion, in a separate realm and circle to the effect:

(a) That Jesus came to earth to establish a Kingdom, but on account of the opposition of the Jews, he changed his mind and established the church instead.

(b) That the church is not the Kingdom, but is only a vestibule or phase of the Kingdom.

(c) That Jesus is not now ruling on his throne, as an absolute monarch.

(d) That when He comes again He will establish His Kingdom as He originally purposed.

(e) That the Kingdom He will establish at His second coming will be an earthly Kingdom, and He will rule over it for 1000 years.

I do not believe that such faith in Jesus Christ and His Church, as is necessary for the salvation of a human being, will permit such personal opinions as above mentioned, though they are kept in a separate realm and circle.

I am not favorably impressed with the statement coming from any Bible student that such condition of mind is possible. I do not believe in emphasizing possible exceptions to general rules, as people are prone to make of the exception the rule, and pervert the general rule into an exception. Jesus only made one exception as a reason for divorce and re-marriage of the in- in the proper context.

As an illustration of abuse of this rule, I once had a friend come to my office and discuss a difference he had had with a business associate, and after I had advised him of his legal rights, he jokingly remarked, “If I would do the right thing, I would get me a six shooter and two good witnesses, and go to his place of business and kill him in self defense.”

About ten or twelve years ago, I heard Brother Jesse P. Sewell, before an audience composed of the Board of Trustees, several preachers and the student body of Abilene Christian College, in a speech of commendation of the Christian character of Brother George A. Klingman, make the statement that “the faith of Brother George A. Klingman is so strong that he can worship God either with or without mechanical musical instruments.” At the time I regretted the statement, and did not believe a word of it, but like the “feathers in the wind,” such careless statements keep moving.

These brethren with super minds and super faith, like the three Hebrew children, may survive the flames of the fiery furnace, but what about such single track and simple minded Christians as J. D. Tant and myself?
Quite often you can catch a man without money; once in a great while you can catch him without any tobacco; but you can never catch him without an excuse. No matter what a man’s practice is he always has an alibi. Try to correct him of his error and he starts asking, “Where is the harm in it?” Already he has anticipated you and thrown up a wall of fortification.

I wish to notice some of the evils of card playing. I cannot point out all of them any more than I can point out all the evils of drunkenness. You may close your eyes to them but they are there whether you open your eyes to them or not.

1. A deck of cards is the gambler’s ensign. The game was worked out for the gambler—not for the innocent amusement of a church group. It is a very clever game. One may spend an entire life-time studying it without mastering all its tricks. It is the gambler’s only universal game. No matter where you go the card game plays an important role with the gambler.

The most noted gambling house in the world is the great Casino at Monte Carlo. I visited it some years ago and was lost in wonder at its beauty and grandeur. There are rooms, tables and games galore. People of every nationality and language go there. Even there the game of cards has its place. If you go to the most distant ports of the world you will find the card game in vogue by the gambler. It is his badge wherever you go.

2. It is a fascinating game. When people once start playing they never know when to quit. It is not unusual for them to play all night. Interest in everything else is absorbed by it.

Sleep, hunger and business are forgotten in the interest of the game. When church members take to the game they are nearly always lost to everything else. If you go to the most distant parts of the world you will find the card game put one in the head, the toe of the shoe, the movement of a finger or any of a hundred different ways. Beside communicating with one’s partner there are likewise hundreds of other ways. During my services with the American Expeditionary Force in Europe I saw men cheat at cards in ways that were unthinkable. Cards are oftentimes stolen, or dealt from the bottom of the deck. The ordinary deck of cards is marked on the backs. I have never been able to see the marks; nor is the average man able to do so. But I knew a man intimately who could read the backs as readily as the faces. Oftentimes in poker games he would get the other players to ante all they had, and when all was in the pot he would tell them just what they held. Good players sometimes mark cards with their finger nails; or they may even slip an extra card into the game. There are so many ways of cheating, and the temptations are so great that few can entirely resist.

4. The card game has been the cause of more fusses, disputes and serious troubles than any other game. The newspapers carried a report a year or two ago of a man slapping his wife at a card party for playing the wrong card. She was so humiliated by it that when she got home she shot and killed him. There is no place where there is more wrangling and hard feelings (unless it be in a church choir) than in a card party. Because of so much cheating and misunderstanding in card games many people who were once friends have become bitter enemies. With the professional gamblers it is not unusual for knives and pistols to be flashed and many times used—when contending in a dispute. Many have lost their lives because they held “five aces” or because of some other unfair advantage taken.

5. The card game spouts one in the wrong company. You do not find the most devout squandering their time in such a way. On the other hand you find the most desperate and questionable characters of earth playing cards. It is their game. However, some church circles have tried to take it away from them. The card game, belonging to the crowd that it does, tends to drag one down rather than to lift him up. No one was ever made better, brighter or more useful by playing cards. It does not enlighten the mind, ennoble the spirit or strengthen the character of anyone. Instead of it being a recreation game it usually becomes a tug of war.

6. The card game destroys one’s influence for good. Suppose a preacher should go about with a deck of cards sticking in his pocket for everyone to see. Would he not be an object of ridicule? Would he be regarded as a consecrated servant of the Lord? Let us refer again to the game played by the deacon and the steward. Not long after the particular incident referred to above both the denominations represented by these church officers held revivals. The professional players went a few times to the meetings. But the deacon and the steward never took an occasion to talk to them about their soul’s welfare. I asked one of the sharks if the deacon or the steward should come to him what effect would it have upon him. He laughed, and remarked, “Not a bit.” In fact, he knew that neither would approach him.

The fact remains that the card game has been productive of untold harm and in no instance has it ever been productive of any good. The example set by the mothers, playing cards for prizes, has started many a boy on the road to gambling and all the evils consequent thereon. The card game is a corrupt tree and so are its fruits. It never bears any other kind. Like the dance, some of the fruits may be destroyed before they are fully matured, but the legitimate fruits are gambling, disputes, broils and a general let-down in the standards of morality.

People sometimes say, “There is no harm in card playing if you don’t make harm out of it.” This is like saying, “There is no harm in war if nobody gets killed.” Wars just don’t turn out that way. Neither does the card game. It is all right if nobody is hurt; so is going over the Niagara Falls in a ten foot skiff. But who wants to try it?
Twentieth Century Demoniacs

According to this Definition of Demon Possession the Modern Seizures Are of a Peculiarly Virulent Type, More Potent than Were Those of the First Century.

YATER TANT

Demoniacs today? The very suggestion of such brings amused smiles and patronizing looks to the faces of those who profess themselves to be Bible scholars. The whole subject of demon possession is dismissed with a shrug of the shoulders and a tolerant pity for those deluded souls who believe in it. But that this generation is witnessing something remarkably akin to the demon possession of the first century, and in some aspects much more terrible, we are firmly convinced. Those who deny it betray either their ignorance of the Bible, or of certain present day phenomena, or of both. The modern epidemic is of a peculiarly virulent type, yielding to no known treatment—more distressingly powerful even than the demons encountered by Christ; for those spirits were subject to his word, whereas these modern influences are seemingly impervious to anything he has said or might say.

The subject of demonology has ever intrigued the interest of Bible students; we can know little of it, however, other than what the Bible reveals. When the whole thing is boiled down to its essence it amounts to about this: demon possession meant that some evil power or influence entered into the man and took possession of his life, controlling his actions and words (whether it controlled his thoughts or not the Bible does not say). The demoniacs were variously afflicted, not all of them being affected to the same degree nor in the same manner. But the manifestations and symptoms of the malady were such that it was easily recognized by the people of that day. Possibly no one man had all the symptoms, but the possession of only one or two of them was enough to reveal his affliction unmistakably.

We give here a list of some of the more common indications of demon possession:

1. Blindness—The premillennial brethren show every indication of being totally blind. Unanswerable arguments are held up before them one after another, and they never bat an eye; plain statements of scripture utterly demolish their theories (e.g. see Bro. John T. Hinds tract, “Christ On David’s Throne”), but so completely are they controlled that they actually cannot see the force of these arguments and scriptures. Never lived there a demented demoniac more thoroughly blind than they.

2. Deafness—Surely there is no mistaking the voice of the brotherhood in regard to supporting Bro. Don Carlos Janes’ Personal Program for the Propagation of Premillennial Propaganda. Through the religious press, from the pulpits, and through personal letters he has been told in thunderous accents what the church thinks of his Singular System. But the indications are that he is profoundly deaf to it all. The mails still continue to be flooded with his pleas for money.

3. Dumbness—Surely no editor who was articulately would let pass without comment the things that have been urged against the Boll movement. So direct have been the arguments and so convincing in every detail that Bro. Boll must certainly feel their force. Bro. McCaleb’s letter calls for an answer. The January issue of this magazine would not go unchallenged by any editor who had a vestige of self-respect. And the fact that nothing but a vast and empty silence has greeted these things lends considerable confirmation to our rapidly growing suspicion that “an evil spirit hath taken him.”

4. Exceedingly fierceness—Who does not remember the challenge that Bro. Chas. M. Neal broadcast to the whole brotherhood? and the letter to Bro. Max Ogden that accompanied it? And who of those attending the Ft. Worth debate has forgotten the “exceeding fierceness” with which Dr. Norris threatened to have a hundred men do bodily violence to anyone who betrayed any symptom of disagreeing with his diatribe?

5. Dwelling in tombs and mountains—This is one of the most direct and revealing symptoms of all. For many years now Bro. Boll and his associates have been wandering around in the Jewish burying ground engaged in the ghoulish task of trying to dig up the decayed carcasses of Judaism and Roman Empire. They have lost them selves in the mountain of Daniel 2:44, 45, and in seeking to get down from it have ended up in the Jewish cemetery.

6. Crying out night and day—When have our ears ever been free from the cry of “persecution”? When all arguments have failed and all defenses crumpled, when there is left to them not a vestige of scripture or logic for their theory, these brethren have filled the earth, night and day, with their cries of “persecution.”

Perhaps a few first-class exorcists might be of some help!
Dear Editor:

The greatest need today is preachers who will speak for God. They may speak "to" churches - the "taught" are command ed to support the teachers. But they must speak only "for" God, or our end can be predicted from the beginning-clenbonationalism and merited oblivion.

The truth of God is worth it. It demands it. Nothing short of it will please God and save souls. Let us review some of the simple demands which the truth makes. Let each preacher examine himself candidly by them. Let each Christian measure the preacher whom he is helping to support by them. Can all the preachers go all the way in this simple examination? It is needed, for all are not preaching alike today. There is real danger of two schools of preaching developing among us, and there is only one God-approved method, in so far as the proper attitude toward, and handling of, the truth is concerned.

Consider the Attitude

There can be no compromise in the attitude toward the truth. It must be placed high above every other consideration. The preacher must speak his convictions. He must not swallow them under any provocation. Then his sentiments must be where his convictions are. If his convictions are on one side of a question, to make his voice effective, he must have his interest, his emotions, his benedictions, his indignations, his prejudices if any, his disgusts, all his heat and energy on that side.

He must be one hundred per cent -heart, soul, and spirit-will, emotions, and intellect-on the side of truth on every question. There cannot be any subjects which are taboo, no neutral zones, no doctrinal vacations. He cannot afford to say that he has not studied the subject, and yet pretend to speak for God. No subject has been preached too much. Many have been preached too little. There is no subject so simple, nor so well understood, that it does not need to be preached. The people soon forget.

Why the Apologies?

Have all the preachers passed the attitude test? If so, why do we hear so many saying, "I do not believe the doctrine, but I think the other side has said too much"? It was a genuine disappointment a few Sundays ago to hear the voice of E. W. McMillan coming over the air from Nashville, Tenn., with a note of apology. He was speaking on the second coming of Christ, and in substance said: "Now, you all wonder which side I am on. I am not on either side. One side teaches things which I cannot endorse; and the other side has talked too much."

True, he made it plain that he was not a premillennialist. He said that he expressed himself on that subject before accepting the position he now holds with Central Church at Nashville. Even if, as a matter of judgment, he thought too much had been said against premillennialism, why should he give any comfort to premillenialists by saying so? Could the knowledge that the majority of the elders of Central Church are known to be sympathetic to the premillennial group have had anything to do with it? Who is it that has talked too much, and what did they say that should not have been said? Has he talked enough on the question? Would it not have been fair to be a little more specific? Why give comfort to the side whose teachings he cannot endorse? And why reflect upon the side where his convictions are? Is it either wise or complimentary to be neutral on one of the major religious issues of the day?

Making the Application

It is not enough for the attitude to be right, the preaching must be right. To be right it must be both positive and negative. The truth must be established, and error must be torn down. It takes far more tearing down than building up, because men are constantly running to extremes, going off at tangents, taking detours. They have to be called back to the highway of truth. Their error must be pointed out and explained-the application must be made-before men will see the need of returning.

It takes more sermons now to effect a conversion than in apostolic days. It must be because hearts are filled with false doctrines. There is no conflict between love and demolishing error. It was the "apostle of love" who said to "try the spirits." Paul was constantly hammering on Judaism. Jesus tore down that he might build up. If by the "spirit of Christ" we mean the spirit Christ manifested, then it certainly involves the refutation of error. We cannot be loyal to Christ without being loyal to his doctrines.

What Preach About

The fact that there is no known disturbance in the church over a question is no sure sign that preaching is not needed on that subject. Preaching is preventive as well as curative. It is far better to indoctrinate against false doctrines before it gets a foothold in the congregation. And with the radio and so much literature being circulated false doctrines spreads rapidly. Elders have made many serious blunders in telling preachers that there was no need to preach on certain subjects. Hundreds of members who have never said a word to indicate that they had any leanings toward mechanical music, have upon moving to a new community joined themselves to the music crowd. The churches must be indoctrinated as was the Jerusalem church, so that when they are scattered abroad, either by persecution or the normal calls of life, they will preach and practice the truth in all things.

Against Whose Doctrine

There is general agreement that the errors of denominationalism must be refuted, but we must not "quarrel" with our brethren. When Jude said to contend earnestly for the faith, he continued: "For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ." Could not those who "crept
in” do more damage than any who were on the outside?

Who was it the Ephesian church tried and found to be “liars”? They were on the inside. Christ commended them for trying their own brethren and convicting them of imposture. He also wrote to Pergamos: “So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitanes, which thing I hate.”

The Lord hated some of the doctrines that were taught on the inside, and expected his people to hate and expose them. He commended the Ephesians for hating the “deeds” of the Nicolaitanes. The deeds were the fruit of the doctrines. Most of the trouble was “inside” in apostolic days. Paul fought the Jews both in and out of the church, but the brunt of his opposition was no doubt Jews who were nominally on the inside.

Preachers must not compromise the truth in their own hearts-in their attitude. They must not compromise in method, failing to make the application against false doctrine. They must not compromise in the choice of subjects. It is foolish and vicious to “whale away” on points not disputed and neglect the very things about which the hearers are disturbed. The emphasis must be placed where it is needed, in so far as that can be ascertained; and the whole truth must be preached as a preventive against spiritual disease.

Borrowing Respectability

There are some churches which have been dominated by premillennial influence, but which have many members who are sick of the doctrine and complaining that they cannot hear the old fashioned gospel. Some of these are reluctantly calling preachers who are not premillennialists for meetings. They then boast of the fact that Brother So-and-So held a meeting for us. Apparently they seek to capitalize upon the matter to borrow doctrinal respectability in the eyes of those who do not believe their doctrines.

Can a loyal preacher afford to hold such a meeting, making converts to such a church, without preaching the truth on premillennialism? It is not enough to preach that the church was established on Pentecost. They do not deny that fact. It is not enough for him to let them know, however firmly and bravely, how he stands on the millennial theories. They know that before they call him, and care nothing for any of these things, so long as he does not make the preaching so strong that it threatens their hold upon the church.

Brother McMillan let the Central Church know before he accepted the place he holds, and again in his recent sermon what his views are; but they do not care for that, especially when he says he is on neither side, and that those who oppose premillennialism have talked too much! They profess neutrality.

The church that has had only premillennial preaching is behind with preaching against speculation on these subjects. These subjects cannot possibly be neglected under those circumstances. S. H. Hall had such an opportunity at Gallatin, Tenn. last year and “muffed” it.

No the preacher cannot compromise the truth for friendship nor fellowship. Paul rebuked Peter when he needed it. The preacher who cannot rebuke his brethren when they are wrong is following the wrong calling. He should be employed in a department store operated by one of the Hebrew race. However, he would not be allowed to insult either customers or prospects. It is the height of foolishness to tolerate error in the church to hold the membership intact, and then take a chance on driving our “good sectarian friends” away by exposing their errors! And those who compromise with the brethren will soon learn to compromise with their religious neighbors also.

Are some of our preachers coming around to the sectarian viewpoint of preaching no doctrinal sermons? They are headed that way, when they compromise with error in the church.

Causes of Compromise

If we look for the causes of this “Sweet-spiritedness” among some of our preachers and churches, the most likely one is a desire to build a great church. There could be no other excuse for exempting error within the fellowship. The ambition to do great things has obscured many. If we want to make a place in the sun for the “church of Christ,” of course, we will not want to make anybody mad.

One could make a plausible case against the “pastor system.” Preachers have toned down the message, avoiding controversial subjects to keep peace and insure their stability, no doubt; but churches supporting preachers is not the cause of this. It has merely brought out some of the weakness that already existed.

Premillennialism could be set down as the prime cause with a degree of plausibility. Sweet-spiritedness has been the trademark of the movement, in so far as the little contingent within our own ranks is concerned. And the controversy with them has furnished the occasion for bringing out the weakness in the attitude of many toward error, particularly error in the church.

But, indirectly, the Gospel Guardian has been instrumental in bringing out this weakness as much as anything. Mr. Editor, and I want to thank and congratulate you for helping to bring this dangerous weakness among us to a head. I knew the Guardian would be a great force for good before it started. But I must confess that there is far greater need for its services than I had realized. The opposition it has aroused has revealed to me that the situation was much more serious than I had dreamed.

You may rest assured that the congestion, the poison, was at work in the body, or you could not have revealed it. You did not create it. If those you have “smoked out” were so weak that they could be stamped into such a ridiculous attitude toward the truth of God by what you have done, then that weakness was a condition that we needed to know and correct. And now that you have revealed the danger, it must be courageously met. And the Guardian must help supply and apply the remedy.

At first I thought the Guardian would be a great help. Now, it is well nigh indispensable. Your friends must talk subscriptions for the Guardian. And if it were practical, I had rather help in a campaign to raise thousands of dollars to endorse the Guardian than to raise similar thousands for a national broadcast, or for any of “our” institutions. It is a strange thing to me that money can only be raised in large amounts to erect “buildings,” or to put on a big show of some kind. I think the “biggest” thing that could possibly be done in the brotherhood at the present time would be to offset the spirit of compromise that is so well entrenched with some of our “leading,” or “misleading,” preachers and churches. The future of the so-called Restoration Movement, without a doubt, hinges more upon the proper culmination of the fight which the Guardian has started than upon any movement for which money has been raised in recent years.

Yours in the fight on Compromise, A. D. Bunker

(Synopsis of sermon delivered in Holdeman Avenue Church, Louisville, Ky., by M. C. Kurfees, following the Boles-Boll Discussion, in 1927)

1. This was certainly a most fearful arraignment of Jehovah’s prophets. And it was Jehovah’s own arraignment of them. Moreover, in view of its very plain import, it challenges the serious consideration of all Christians today.

2. But what did such an arraignment mean? It meant that some of Jehovah’s prophets had so far departed from Jehovah’s words that they were teaching their own opinions and palming them off as a “Thus saith the Lord,” when the Lord “had not spoken.” Hence, Jehovah made this reply to them: “The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully.” (Jer. 23:28)

3. Now, the identically same situation is upon us today, the recent “Boles-Boll Debate” in the Gospel Advocate over human opinions being a vivid illustration of the fact; and hence, I have been requested to point out instances of mere human opinion in that discussion. Brother R. H. Boll began publicly teaching certain speculative opinions about twelve or fourteen years ago, and the Gospel Advocate opened its columns nearly a year ago to him and Brother H. Leo Boles that they might discuss therein the issues involved, and hence our theme for the occasion is worded as follows: "Man Saying 'Thus Saith the Lord' When the Lord Hath Not Spoken," and to this theme, attention is now invited.

But, first of all, I will state the fact that, as a reason or excuse for his magnifying and pressing the subject of the Second Coming of Christ, he says:

"I have made the statement and I am not unwilling to make it again—that the professing Church has virtually lost its hope of the Second Coming." (“The Second Coming,” by R. H. Boll—page 10.)

That statement is contradicted and proven to be a positive misrepresentation by every Church throughout the world that meets on the first day of the week and eats the Lord’s Supper, saying by this act that they "proclaim the Lord’s death till he come." (Cor. 11:26.)

If he is sincere in his statement, then why not give the Church credit for being sincere in theirs?

THE CLAIM WHICH R. H. BOLL MAKES FOR HIMSELF

1. Here it is in his own words: "First and last and always I desire to say that I stand for nothing else and nothing more or less than what God says." (Gospel Advocate, Nov. 3, ‘27, page 1037.)

2. That is the very position which we should all occupy; and if he had really occupied it in all his religious teaching, there would never have been the strife, trouble and division which have quite generally followed in its wake. It is the position which I myself am striving with all my might to maintain: but he not only did not occupy that position, but went far and radically away from it. Hence, it is now proposed to cite:

II. INSTANCES IN WHICH HE DOES NOT MAKE GOOD HIS CLAIM

That the investigation may be more systematic and intelligible, it is proposed to cite:

1. Instances of claiming to say what the Bible says, but saying something else.

2. Instances of contradicting the Bible.

3. Instances of Scriptures ignored.

4. A single fact which completely overthrows the speculative theory about the Lord’s Second Coming.

Following this order, let us now note:

I. INSTANCES OF CLAIMING TO SAY WHAT THE BIBLE SAYS, BUT SAYING SOMETHING ELSE

1. He says the Jews will be converted as a nation and then “as a righteous nation” be “nationally restored” to Palestine and “never again fall away or be removed from their land.” (Gospel Advocate, May 19, ‘27, page 461.) I have two remarks to make on that:

(a) Not one word in the Bible says any such thing.

(b) He and his sympathizers called on me at my room in a very short time to think with them that the coming of Christ was then right at hand and would likely occur in a very short time. My reply and quotation of Matt. 24:36—"But of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, neither the..."
Son, but the Father only."

(c) Third Fact: He says "a thing is imminent when, so far as we know, it may occur at any time. The coming of Christ is imminent because it is certain." Such a perversion! There is not a solitary fact in the dictionary to support that statement. As a matter of fact, six thousand years ago It was "certain" that Christ would come the first time, but he did not come till after four thousand years.

The word "imminent" not only has no such meaning today, but that is not the view of Christ's coming taught by the speculations of the last few years; for, if it had been, there would have been no trouble or strife, nor even any differences over the teaching, for everybody knows the coming of Christ "may occur at any time." "Imminent" is from the Latin im for in, and minere to project — the word literally meaning a thing that projects in, and hence Webster defines it: "Threatening to occur immediately; impending." and the Standard Dictionary defines it: "Threatening to happen at once, as some calamity: dangerous and close at hand: impending: as, imminent peril." But he passed over that definition which the Standard Dictionary places first as its own definition of the word today, and gave its "archaic" or "antiquated" definition instead! To me, it was painful to see that.

4. He says: "Israel is back in their land just before the Lord's glorious coming, the temple rebuilt, its services.

2. Cor. 6:16—"And what agreement hath a temple of God with idols? for we are a temple of the living God; even as God said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people.

I. Pet. 2:5—"Ye also, as living stones, are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ."

Hcb. 9:1-10—"Now even the first covenant had ordinances of divine service, and its sanctuary, a sanctuary of this world. For there was a tabernacle prepared, the first, wherein were the candlestick, and the table, and the showbread; which is called the Holy place. And after the second veil, the tabernacle which is called the Holy of Holies: having a golden altar of incense, and the ark of the covenant overlaid round about with gold where-in was a golden pot holding the manna, and Aaron's rod that budded, and the tables of the covenant; and above it cherubim of glory overshadowing the mercy-seat; of which things we cannot now speak severally. Now these things having been thus prepared, the priests go in continually into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the services; but into the second the high priest alone, once in the year not without blood, which he offereth for himself, and for the errors of the people; the Holy Spirit thus signifying, that the way into the holy place hath not yet been made manifest, while the first tabernacle is yet standing; which is a figure for the time present; according to which are offered both gifts and sacrifices that cannot, as touching the conscience, make the worshipper perfect, being only (with meats and drinks and divers washings) carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation."

5. He says: "When he comes in power and great glory and destroys his adversaries, and Satan is bound and imprisoned, and the Kingdom of the world shall have become the Kingdom of the Lord and of his Christ, his saints also shall sit upon thrones and reign with him a thousand years, and beyond that forever and ever." (Gospel Advocate, July 21, '27, page 676.)

As Christ's "adversaries" are destroyed at that time, over whom will he and his saints reign—over themselves?

II. INSTANCES OF CONTRADICTING THE BIBLE

1. "Death is never set forth as the goal of the Christian's hope, nor is the Christian ever asked to prepare for death." (Gospel Advocate, Oct. 20, '27, page 989.)

But see Rev. 2:10—"Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life."

2. He denies that Christ now has universal authority and power, and says: "As it would be put in legal language, the throne was his 'de jure et potential' at first; and became his 'de jure et actu' afterwards—that is, it is his by right and authority at first, and in fact and act afterwards." (Gospel Advocate, Sept. 8, '27, page 845.)

That Christ has such authority and power now, see the following Scriptures:

Matt. 28:18—"All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth."

Acts 2:36—"Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified."

1 Cor. 15:20--26—"But now hath Christ been raised from the dead, the first fruits of them that are asleep. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive. But each in his own order: Christ the first fruits; then they that are Christ's, at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father; when he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death."

Eph. 1:19-23—"And what the exceeding greatness of his power toward who believe, according to that working of the strength of his might which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and he put all things in subjection under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all."

1 Tim. 6:15—"Which in its own times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords."

1 Pet. 3:21-22—"Which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ; who is on the right hand of God, having gone into heaven; angels and authorities and powers being made subject unto him."

3. The Church, he contends, is only "betrothed" to Christ now, but not yet "married" to him. See the following reply:

Rom. 7:2-4—"For the woman that hath a husband is bound by law to the husband while she liveth; but if the husband die, she is discharged from the law of the husband. So then if, while the husband liveth, she be joined to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if the husband die, she is free from the law, so that she is no adulteress, though she joined to another man. Wherefore, my brethren, we also were made dead to the law through the body of Christ; that ye should be joined to another, even to him who was raised from the dead, that we might bring forth fruit unto God."

Jas. 4:4—"Ye adulteresses. know
ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? Whosoever therefore would be a friend of, the world maketh himself an enemy of God.” *

* See foot-note in R. V.- “who break your marriage vow to God.”

III. INSTANCES OF SCRIPTURES IGNORED

Matt. 24:36—"But of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels of heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only.”

Note what it distinctly and specifically declares.

Mark 13:32—“But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.”

Almost identically the same language of Matt. 24:36.

IV. A SINGLE FACT WHICH COMPLETELY OVERTHROWS THE SPECULATIVE THEORY ABOUT THE LORD’S SECOND COMING

Every solitary Scripture passage which has been used by brethren to prove that Christ’s coming is near at hand was in existence nineteen hundred years ago and said then exactly what it says now. Yet we see that, notwithstanding what these Scriptures said then, nineteen hundred years have since come, and Christ has not yet come; and how can men know, notwithstanding what these Scriptures say now, that there may not be another nineteen hundred years before He comes?

This shows the utter vanity and misleading nature of all such teaching. This pointedly emphasizes Matt. 24:36-44. “But of that day and hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father only... Therefore be ye also ready: for in an hour that ye think not the Son of man cometh.”

And Acts 1:7—“And he said unto them, It is not for you to know time or seasons, which the Father hath set within his own authority.”

The Latest Appeal:

A member of a well-known church in the brotherhood, who has only recently come from a denomination, remarked about the high-salaried preacher of the aforesaid church: “He is a wonderful preacher; why, you could hear him for months and never know what church he is a member of. We just cannot afford to make people mad.” That preacher must have “seeks appeal”!

Confess Your Faults—All But The Preacher!

Other preachers have an appeal that brings scores of church members “through” at a single service. Sometimes when great numbers “reconcile” themselves, there is no room for all to come down front, and they are merely asked to rise to their feet. That is just as sensible as shaking hands with the preacher—neither is needed. But the preacher should climb up on the stand to let the people know he is “standing” on the proposition. Or, if he is conscientious, he might, after foolishly stirring up a great number of the best members of the church to recklessly make public apology for sin, more appropriately crawl under a bench!

Name It And Take It:

F. B. Srygley recently said that there was as much reason to pledge on any other Christian duty as on giving. Never mind, Brother Srygley, nothing has been overlooked. Many of these so-called restorations are nothing but blanket admissions of neglect and a public pledge to live better. It is good psychology. It provides rousement for the meeting and boosts the preacher’s reputation for getting results. The money pledge comes under an entirely different head— that is good business!

How Much Can a Christian Keep?

Leslie G. Thomas, Query Editor of the Firm Foundation, gave me a scare. He says that the first “tenth” belongs to the Lord. We do not give that—we pay or deliver it. Giving starts and ends in the nine-tenths. He gets around the embarrassing silence of the New Testament by explaining that tithing is a principle, not a command. That is what alarmed me. To think that for nearly two thousand years most Christians have been ignoring an eternal principle, simply because the Holy Spirit did not bother to base a command on it. But Brother Thomas saved the day. He explains that the tithe under every dispensation has gone to the priesthood. That seems to be a principle too. That fixes everything. You see Christians are a kingdom of priests. All of God’s children are priests and all of God’s children must pay a tithe to the priesthood, so all of God’s children have just been delivering the tithe to the priest closest to them, to the priest in which they had most confidence, to themselves!

But Brother Thomas probably thought it should go to the preachers. I am afraid his error on the priesthood is worse than his error on tithing. It is fundamental that every Christian is a priest in his own behalf. Each priest has a temple to keep and sacrifices to offer. There is nobody between him and his God, except his: High Priest, Jesus Christ.

But Brother Thomas not only taught me something about tithing and Christian priesthood, but he gave me a new thought on stewardship. I had thought that all we had belonged to the Lord, in actual ownership, and that all that we used for personal purposes must be used to the glory of the Lord, and that we devoted a part to the Lord to be used in a special way for the advancement of his cause. I thought this was strictly voluntary. But according to Brother Thomas the first tenth is the Lord’s.

And then he taught me something on authority. I thought we were governed by principles expressed through some commandment. I did not know that eternal principles were to be captured when discovered running loose. There is only, one example of tithing being paid prior to the law. It was a tithe of the spoils of war. Abraham had engaged in the war. Melchisedec was greater than Abraham, and he received the spoils of war. Does that not indicate a principle favorable to war as much as one favorable to tithing? And Melchisedec brought out wine and served Abraham. Does that denote a principle concerning the drinking of wine? It seems to be up to Brother Thomas to explain which are principles and which are not, if the Holy Spirit neglected to do so; and the Holy Spirit did neglect to do so, if tithing is a principle.

And I had also thought that the greater portion of the tithe supported the functions of government. I thought I could bring as good argument that only one per cent went to religious purposes as any man could that ten per cent was so used. The tithe included taxes. If taxes be considered now, the average Christian far exceeds the average Jew, for the average American pays in direct and indirect taxes approximately thirty-three per cent— more than three tithes—for taxes alone!
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