“But they cried out with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and rushed upon him with one accord; and they cast him out of the city, and stoned him: and the witnesses laid down their garments at the feet of a young man named Saul. And they stoned Stephen, calling upon the Lord, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit” (Acts 7:57-59).

This is our introduction to Saul of Tarsus, chief of sinners, who afterward became Paul, the apostle, chief of missionaries. Bitter war was raging between Judaism and Christianity and Saul sat high in the councils of Judaism. Judaism was materialism and its weapons were carnal. When argument did not suffice, it took up the sword. Christianity was a spiritual system whose adherents used words for weapons, fled before the sword or died praying for their enemies. He that was born after the flesh was persecuting him that was born after the Spirit. (Gal. 4:28-31). The struggle was to end in the casting out of the handmaid and her son, the overseas of Judaism and the triumph of the gospel, but not until Saul of Tarsus changed sides.

A Battle Royal

Two giants met when Stephen met Saul. Christianity and Judaism were respectively personified in these two. Stephen stood at bay before the council where he had been forcibly brought. He was assailed by perjured testimony and looked about into faces distorted by hate and scorn and the lust to kill. He asked no favors and offered no compromises. He accepted an opportunity to speak and his fiery words were a welcome address to martyrdom. “Ye stiffecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute? and they killed them that showed before of the coming of the Righteous One; of whom ye have now become betrayers and murderers: ye who received the law as it was ordained by angels, and kept it not” (Acts 7:51-53). The result was characteristic of Judaism. “And they stoned Stephen, calling upon the Lord, and saying, Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.” The manner in which Stephen met death was characteristic of the spirit of the gospel, as was also the bold manner in which he challenged it. Anyone who thinks that Stephen made a mistake in his methods, knows little or nothing of the spirit of the gospel. “And Saul was consenting unto his death.”

The Crusading Saul

Saul of Tarsus was a religious fanatic. In his eyes Christians were traitors to Judaism, vile ones at that, and had forfeited their right to life or liberty. He was the natural leader of a sinister movement to destroy the church. “But Saul laid waste the church, entering into every house, and dragging men and women committed them to prison” (Acts 8:3). “But Saul, yet breathing threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord.” (Acts 9:1). When they were put to death he gave his vote against them. He punished them in the synagogues and sought to make them blaspheme. He was exceedingly mad against them and persecuted them even unto foreign cities (Acts 26:9-11). In all this Saul had a religious motive. He was moved by a deep sense of right. He thought he “ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth.” He was “zealous for God” (Acts 22:3).

Saul could not kill Christianity. Nobody could. He was fighting against God. It would be natural to conclude that such a monster was unfit to live and his bloody career should be ended summarily by violence. Christians do not end careers that way. They were afraid of Saul and fled before his volcanic wrath but they scattered the gospel as they went and scores of churches sprang up to take the one which was the victim of Saul’s hand. Saul did not put out the flames but scattered it. It could not be quenched. God had kindled it.

Something was obviously wrong with Saul. It was not his boundless energy or his crusading spirit. It was not his zeal or his passion for conquest. These forces are right within them, selves. His faith was wrong, he was on the wrong side and consequently misusing his powers. It isn’t wrong to be an agitator, but the wrong thing can be agitated and wrong methods can be used. Saul was campaigning “ignorantly in unbelief” (1 Tim. 2:13) An enlightened faith on the wings of such tumultuous energy was destined to carry Saul where Stephen would undoubtedly have gone had he lived. Stephen was not a soft man nor was Saul. When the Lord called Saul by his grace, he did not destroy the spirit of the agitator, he directed it into new channels.

The Invincible Paul

Saul changed sides and became Paul, the apostle. He is still the irrepressible agitator. He continued to lay waste and make havoc wherever he went and he always went. His body might languish behind bars, but bars could not
"JEHOVAH-NISSI—THE LORD MY BANNER"

There is something in a name. Bible names always meant something. When Abrahahm was moved by divine fiat to offer Isaac upon the altar, God provided the sacrifice and Abraham called the place, Jehovah-jireh—"The Lord Will Provide." God does provide for all who like Abraham implicitly heed His voice.

When Gideon answered the call of God to go in His might to deliver Israel from the band of Midian, he built an altar at the scene of his call and named the place, Jehovah-shalom—"The Lord Send Peace." God did send peace. But it was peace through conflict, not compromise. We do not see Gideon calling a "unity meeting" with the Midianites; he did not ascend a knoll, lift up benedictory hands, stretch out spreading arms to Israel's foes, and say: "Let us have peace together." He drove the Midianites out by "the sword of the Lord and Gideon." There are some who seem to think that the Lord has dispensed with the sword, dismantled the armour, and resorted to diplomatic conferences with the powers that be.

When Amalek fought against Israel, Moses stood on the mount of battle with his hands uplifted, supported on either side by Aaron and Hur until the going down of the sun, and when Israel prevailed, he called the place, Jehovah-nissi—"The Lord My Banner." God was Israel's ensign, Israel's standard, that day. God is our Banner now. The inspired Warburton and certain others have given a banner to them that fear them; that, shall not be displayed because of truth (Ps. 60:4).

The prince of preachers said: "Lift ye up a banner upon the mountain, exalt the voice unto them" (Isa. 13:2). In the spirit of these sacred sentiments the present paper is promulgated as a banner of truth in a day of need—hence, The Bible Banner.

A Potential Text

A general softness is pervading the church. Firm faith and plain pi-caching, once universal and unanimous among those devoted to the ancient gospel, are now yielding to the persuasions of the plush-mouthed and velvet-tongued moderns among us who piously admonish us to "speak the truth in love," but who only seek refuge behind this divine behest for their own compromises while they themselves ignore the very manner in which the inspired author of this counsel, the fearless and peerless Paul, did speak the truth in love. He himself applied that principle. Observe him in action; witness his courage; behold him on defense (not the fence); accompany him on his itinerary; hear him preach and watch him "turn the world upside down" leaving behind him a religious upheaval that is comparable only to a typhoon of cyclonic destruction of everything false. Listen to his release of righteous fury against Elymas, the perverter, and his Stephen-like arraignment of the "enemies of the cross of Christ" follow him through persecution to prison; think on his resolute charge to Timothy then compare the pliant preaching so prevalent today, condemned by the capricious caning of such a potential text! Did not Paul give us an example of "speaking the truth in love?" May we in fact rather than mere fancy imitate the spirit of that apostle who enjoins all to love the truth and speak it.

The Spirit of Christ

Other stock expressions of apologists for the soft-pedal cadences of sweet preaching are that we should manifest the spirit of Christ, and do things in the Christian way. The word "manifest" means to make clear and plain what Christ thinks of the errors and sham of religion. This can be done by showing what He said and did regarding the teachers and institutions of error in his day. He said they were human plants and would be rooted up, and He called them all by name. A follower of Christ should always manifest the spirit of Christ; and a Christian should always do everything in the Christian way. There is no man whose soul senses a deeper desire for these Christlike traits than my own, unless he has a deeper soul. But how may we know the spirit of Christ save as He exemplifies it? Follow Him from Nazareth to Calvary and hear him release His spirit in reiterated exorciation of religious blind guides and their blind allies. To the divinity doctors and phylacteried Pharisees He had a bad spirit—the spirit of Beezlebub! If the very spirit of Christ in His own preaching was stigmatized as the spirit of the devil by pharisacal praters and pretenders who had their piety on parade, those who preach today as Christ and the apostles did, need not think to escape the same stigmatic criticisms. The Lord's way of preaching is on record. He said those religious leaders did things "for a pretence" and should receive "the greater damnation"; He said their proselytes (con. verts) were "twofold more the child of hell" than them, selves; He said, "Ye fools and blind ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel" (the Lord even had a sense of humor and resorted to the ludicrous in exposing their shams); He said, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell," and "upon you may fall all the righteouness of the scribes and Pharisees, because ye build upon the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar." Such was the preaching of Jesus. Do those who talk so much about "the spirit of Christ" preach that way on anything ever? Rather do they seem to think that "the spirit of Christ" and "speaking the truth in love" means to he so gentle and love everybody so dearly as to let them die and go to hell before we would nettles their feelings by telling them the truth!

There are religious Pharisees with us yet whose sins and shams demand castigation "in the spirit of Christ." Preachers today can choose between two courses: the course of the least resistance in preaching only that portion of the truth in a mild manner which meets no opposition, or like Jesus and Paul, preach the will of God in all of its condemnation, and save power, without thought of man's fear or favor. But the caution and popularity that accrue from compromise and neutrality are empty, indeed. "He makes no friends who never made a foe."
college together—that is college domination with vengeance. When the president of the college can sit in his office and dictate letters to young people in various churches which belong to "The Ex-Student's Association" and through them influence the policies of a congregation on certain issues, even to the point of who shall or shall not preach in certain places—that is college domination. When these young people in the church, whether preachers or not, feel that they are obligated to the institution that graduated them, and become virtually an auxiliary of that college in the church where they are—that is college domination. In other words, when it comes to pass that "Our Alma Mater which art in Abilene" can command the loyalty and devotion from an alumni equal to the homage due "Our Father which art in Heaven"—that is college domination plus. There are those who measure a man's loyalty to Jesus Christ by his loyalty to the college. This attitude is tested by the fact that he may criticize the church and bring no censure from college devotees, but if he criticizes the college, let him be anathema! These are some of the dangers in this form of institutionalism growing up among us, the gravity of which cannot be denied.

**Lines of Cleavage**

Other signs of the doctrinal weakness settling down upon the churches are seen in such issues as that type of congregational anarchy existing in majority rule government in the church. This was lack of all the dividing wedges of division driven by the digressives fifty years ago. By majority rule they confiscated property that belonged to loyal brethren through the elders, who, without restrictions named in the deeds to property, were helpless in courts that considered the property rights were vested in the majority or held that a civil court had no jurisdiction. The majority rule issue has taken definite form and looms as an issue in the preacher's record on this question for the church will do well to check and double check the lines of cleavage exist in localities. Elders who are concerned for the church will do well to check and double check the preacher's record on this question before he is called to their service. Once a majority rule preacher has done his work, the elders have been disarmed and a rebellion is in full charge, led by an ambitious preacher. The sequel to all such cases is simply another church gone wrong.

**Preachers' Meetings and Lectureships**

A brand of convocation, conference, convention, or "what have you," that is becoming quite promiscuous, and which seldom, if ever, resulted in any good to the church, is "The Preacher's Meeting," more lately styled "Lectureships." They tend toward a sort of preacher union, or mass influence. All sorts of ideas are carried back into the congregations from these meetings, and frequently cause considerable trouble. If elders do not take new ideas of the preacher, they are met with this: It was discussed and sanctioned at the preacher's meeting! In one of these meetings recently membership in the Ministerial Alliance by the located preacher was defended on the ground that "Paul became all things to all men" and used "guile" and once took a vow! According to that Paul could have joined the Masonic Lodge or Methodist Church, had they existed in the time of the apostles or of those preachers in the conference of apostles and elders at Jerusalem (Acts 15) was used as an example of the church settling questions of dispute by majority decision—hence congregational government by majority vote! Just an old stock argument of the digressives which has been exploded as many times as authority for instrumental music in the worship has been refuted. Such meetings cannot advance the Cause generally, nor benefit the church locally. I have something nice to do than attend them.

There are many important issues before us. They are not imaginary; they are real. We have been taking too much for granted. The present generation has not enjoyed the thorough indoctrination accorded former generations under the giants of early restoration days. There must now be a general return to militant preaching, the old type of preaching—and the old type of journalism plans first principle preaching and teaching and writing that defends the truth against all errors and institutions of error by name, make, model, and number. It is the only thing that will salvage the church from the calamity of another wholesale digression. It may be too late to redeem a large element in nearly every church who have been saturated with weak teaching and are virtually out of sympathy with the original primitive plea. There will be a certain sloughing off as a result of this weak element—many can be retrieved, and the church can be saved for sound doctrine if elders and preachers will awake from their lethargy and arm themselves for battle. This has been the history of God's people and the church in all ages.

**An Independent Medium**

*THE BIBLE BANNER* is being launched on a sound financial basis and under safe business management. Its editor is not repeating a former mistake of entering the journalistic field alone and without resources and business backing sufficient to assure the success and permanence of the undertaking. While the editorial management will be in his own hands, the business management will be in the hands of others who are able and capable business men. We want all to know that the existence of the paper is definitely assured, and it is the aim of its promoters to make the paper a permanent medium for the propagation of the primitive gospel, and for an unreserved defense of the truth and the church on all issues.

In this connection let it also be stated and understood that *THE BIBLE BANNER* is not in competition with the *Firm Foundation*, Gospel Advocate, Christian Leader, Christian Worker, Apostolic Times, or any other gospel paper. With especial reference is this true of the *Firm Foundation*, which is a landmark for the Cause of Christ in Texas. Its editor, Brother G. H. P. Showalter, has my full endorsement and cooperation in his unwavering stand on all issues. I am persuaded that this feeling is mutual. Brother Showalter has been generous in his encouragement and commendation of me beyond my worth or merit. For this I feel both appreciative and responsive. We stand for the same things. Men who do stand for the same things should stand together. Any impression to the contrary entertained by anybody we should like to relieve. Any differences over any supposed issue, or attitude arising therefrom, or from any incident of the past, were composed. Personally, I am always willing and ready to correct any mistakes of my own in dealing with my brethren. If we differ on anything at all doctrinally or personally, I do not know what it is. I endorse wholeheartedly the positions to which Brother Showalter has committed the *Firm Foundation* on those issues involving the irregularities in certain institutions which he has sought to correct, and of the dangers of institutionalism. The policy and attitude of *THE BIBLE BANNER* toward the *Firm Foundation* will therefore be cooperative rather than competitive. Brother Showalter has himself had in mind the publication of a monthly periodical as an adjunct of the *Firm Foundation* devoted to special lines. He has in the past discussed such a project with me, and in the event he should yet consummate his plans to do so, my personal attitude will be unchanged, and we shall still cooperate as far as possible.

With a bid for the generous welcome and the liberal support of all who are jealous of the doctrinal purity of the church, and zealous for its promotion, and who believe in the defense of the truth against all encroachments of errors and isms and institutions, we pray for the guidance of God always in all things.

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.
The Disarmament Meeting at Detroit

That travesty on Unity recently staged at Detroit by some more or less prominent leaders of the Christian Church and some officious, self-appointed would-be pilots among us, has received the publicity its wily promoters have sought, with out which they could not have forwarded their subtle schemes. As a "union meeting" it appears to have been a great triumph, but as a unity meeting it was a fiasco—a complete flop.

Look at the personnel we'll be enough to convince anybody who has kept informed and grounded in the faith that it was a weak affair, with the divisive decided advantage in the advantage. Take a look at them: Claud F. Witty, J. N. Armstrong, E. L. Jorgenson, Don Carlos Jaws, and George S. Benson, of Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas. Men upon whom the Cause has depended for defense and to whom a faithful church has looked for leadership in many impending crises were conspicuous by their absence. Hardeman, Strygle, Whiteside, Boles, Nichol, Showalter: these men were not there. Others who were there, and were expected by some to make this the last unity meeting, evidently did not arise to meet the need, as future "unity meetings" are already being planned. Whether, compromising, side-stepping, love-making, were the order of the day. Direct discussion and debate of the actual issues were banned; in fact, it was declared that such was not the way to unity. It was a disarmament conference, once.

The Scriptural Attitude

There is precedent and example in the Word of God for the Scriptural attitude toward those who have spoiled the unity of the church by their innovations. For a precedent take a scene at Rom. 16:17: "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they are wizards, not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own deceitful spirits. Their words and fair speeches deceive the hearts. If it was right to mark them, they should be avoided, and it is wrong to fellow, ship them. The Detroit mutual admiration convention is a new slant on how to mark and avoid "them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine" we have learned.

An example of what our attitude toward such "unity" and "fellowship" meetings should be, is found in the ancient case of Nehemiah. At the first the Samaritans thought Nehemiah's effort to rebuild the wall of Jerusalem was too feeble to oppose. They ignored him. They scoffed. Tobiah, the Ammonite, said, "Eventhough which they build, if a fox go up, he shall evenbreake down their stone wall." So said and did the divisessatives at the start. Seeing, however, that Nehemiah's work was succeeding and the breaches began to he stopped, the Samaritans "conspired all of them together to come and to fight." Thus did the divisessatives in their later attempts to sustain their cause in debate. They launched a mighty fight. The great J. B. Briney labored hard to prove apostolic example for instrumental music in the church. O. E. Payne, with the endorsement of Briney and the Standard, battled for the music to the tune of "Psallo." But they could not take their own arguments seriously. Psallo did and did not prove it, as it could be either with or without: so they abandoned the flight. Now, like the strategy of Sanballat, they say, "Come, let us meet together." Nehemiah said, "They thought to do me mischief;" but Brother Armstrong calls them his "big-hearted Christian Church brethren" and stretches out his arms to them. Nehemiah sent hack the word, "I am doing a great work, so that I cannot come down: why should the work cease whilst I leave, and come down to you?" Of course, Nehemiah did not have such a farsighted leader like Claud F. Witty to advise him that he should go, that such a meeting was the veritable "promised land" and if they could only "walk the wire" with Sanballat in such a meeting, they could possess the land! The promised land of compromise! That also is a new wrinkle on the promised land.

The strategy of these divisive Samaritans and Sanballats today from first to last has been uniformly true to form. Strategy has ever been the weapon of division. But wire-walking is not the method of meeting wireworking. It was just such a thing—a great "unity meeting"—that brought the wily schemes of divisive leaders into the open about fifty years ago in Texas, when they ripped the church open by their meetings. They are up to no good thing now.

The fact that the Christian Standard heralds a great victory at Detroit is a fair indication that the meeting was a failure for the cause of truth. The editor of the Standard has celebrated their victory in several editorials, and his writers are holding a jubilee in the columns of that paper. Victory to division is defeat to the Cause of the New Testament.

The failure of the meeting for New Testament unity is seen in viewpoints of the articles in the Standard. They do not see themselves giving up their practices. They see opposition to their innovations crumbling and large "contingents" or "groups" of the "conservative brethren" coming over to them. By unity they mean uniting with them, and that is all they have ever meant. Take a look at some of their articles.

"Getting Beyond the Slogan"

Under this caption the Standard's editor discusses the restoration plea, "Where the Scriptures speak let us speak, and where the Scriptures are silent let us be silent." He says our differences are over the interpretation of this human slogan. He would thus detract from his practice to a slogan. But it is their practice, not a slogan, that has divided the church. The slogan as worded by Thomas Campbell, while he was yet a Presbyterian, was incidental; but the same principle worded by Simon Peter, called to he an apostle of Jesus Christ, is indirectly, "If any man speak let him speak as the oracles of God." What the editor brands as a human slogan is not a human principle. The real issue is—Is it true or false? Who is conforming to it, and who is not? Edwin R. Errect says it really means: Where the Bible speaks let us be silent; but where the Bible is silent we may speak—because we are not bound! Strange juggling it is, indeed, that makes even a human slogan "really mean" just the opposite of what it says. But here a divine precept speaks again: "That ye may learn not to go beyond the things that are arc written" (1 Cor. 4:15) Does that read like we may speak where the Word of God is silent? The only conclusion to be reached from the objections of the Standard and the "unity conference" to the restoration slogan is that they do not want to "speak where the Bible speaks and he silent where the Bible is silent." They break down and admit that they have been speaking where the Bible is silent, but inform us that they aim to keep it up.

The restatement of the slogan declares that where the Bible is silent we may speak. This is their defense of instrumental music now-down to date. It is their admission that the Bible is silent on the use of instrumental music in the church of Christ. A vital admission, indeed. What becomes of O. E. Payne's hook on "Psallo" which makes the music mandatory? Did the Hardeman-Boswell debate in Nashville kill that argument? A. D. Rogers and Homer Strong made their whole fight for the music in the Bentonville (Ark.) debate on
Psallo, and now the Unity Conference and the Christian Standard have kissed it goodbye! What about the apostolic example argument of the great Briney? If instrumental music comes under the "silence slogan," then there is no apostolic example for it, and Briney was wrong. His favorite argument is "gone with the wind." We knew all the time that it was all wind. What about the church-heaven argument by John W. Tyndall. If music comes under the "silence slogan" then it is not in the church-heaven, even if heaven is the church, as Tyndall contended. The admission is a complete surrender of every argument that has been offered and every effort that has been made to make instrumental music scriptural. It is a concession that every argument they have ever offered was wrong. Now, will the Standard's editor, Edwin R. Errett, stand by these admissions? Speak up, Brother Errett-what were you saying?

If editor Edwin Errett and the Standard stick to their statements there is only one issue now, namely: Does the silence of the New Testament authorize the use of instrumental music in the church? I hereby accept the negative of this proposition, and ask the editor of the Standard to defend his affirmation either in the Standard or on the polemic rostrum. This will clear the issue and would either expedite or ignite the unity movement.

"Authority of Christ in Areas of Silence"

Now comes W. R. Walker, in the Standard, saying: "I am persuaded that Christ has authority in 'areas of silence,' in every situation concerning which he has left no direct teaching, has bestowed upon me this authority to act for myself. Absolute loyalty to the authority of Christ requires that we respect that congregational liberty which He has granted in those areas where He has left no plain instructions." That was the keynote of the Unity Conference in Detroit. It is in complete harmony with Claud F. Witty's announced wire, walking policy which would allow each congregation in the "United Church" to determine for itself the use or non-use of instrumental music, without destroying fellowship between them all. Yet these "unity brethren" reseat any intimidation that-they would sell the church down the river!

If W. R. Walker has the authority from Christ to "act for myself" in "areas of silence," so does every man, Jew, Catholic and pagan. It looks more like acres of silence, when we begin to inspect the field. What a sweeping apology for innovation! What a religion, when such authority to "act for myself" is adopted by all! There are some passages of scripture that were evidently put on record to govern "areas of silence." One of them reads, "Whosoever transgresseth (goeth onward) and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God." Another one reads, "That ye may learn not to go beyond the things that are written." There are many such passages. They allow no human authority whatever. They permit no man to act for himself in any matter of worship and doctrine.

But the "authority of Christ in areas of silence" by the Standard is further concession that Christ "left no plain instructions" and "no direct teaching" for instrumental music in the church. So Psallo does not teach it. There is not a precept, not an example, not a word, in all the Word of God for its use, by their own admissions. They locate it in a vast "no man's land," which they call "areas of silence," where the Methodists get infant membership and sprinkling, and where the Catholics get holy water, incense and kissing the pope's feet! These are weighty admissions from the Standard and will have distinct hearing on the future discussions of these issues.

"Rapprochement At Detroit"

Under this somewhat dramatic title James DeForest Murch, Brother Witty's main side-kick, adds flavor to the union meeting salad dish. Some of the meanings of "rapprochement" are: reunion, concord, harmony, meeting half-way, etc. They evidently had "rapprochement at Detroit!" The Christian Standard relates that Brother H. H. Adamson, in a spectacular moment, placed the Bible on the desk and took his position four feet from the Bible on one side, at the same time asking James DeForest Murch to take a position four feet from it on the other side. Brother Adamson then said that he would not go to Murch and Murch would not come to him and proposed that they both move over to the Bible, and shake hands. So they met half-way. That was rapprochement at Detroit! The Christian Standard says that it was "very impressive." But to us it seems a mockery of unity, child's play, a travesty, on the teaching of the New Testament. By this "very impressive" performance, Brother Adamson admitted that he was as far from the Bible as was James D. Murch. What is Brother Adamson practicing that puts him four feet from the Bible, the same distance from it that Murch was? What does he propose to give up when he "moves over" to meet Murch half-way? If he says nothing-then the whole thing was a sham. But if he meant it-then it means compromise. Rapprochement! We expected better things of Brother Adamson.

For wavering, compromising, confessing with error and innovation, there has not been the equal since digestion swept so many brethren off their feet, when they went with the tide. As for the digressives, the attitude expressed in their articles is proof that they are still digressives. It may he summed up as follows:

1. Their sophistical interpretation of the restoration slogan.
2. Their loose references to the authority of Jesus Christ and the New Testament.
3. Their expressed sentiments in favor of the unity meetings assuming the form of delegate conventions, clothed with official rights.
4. Their plea for congregational liberty to use instrumental music in the church and other innovations.
5. Their same old nomenclature in the use of "conservative" and "progressive" terms, showing that they regard the non-use of the instrument as non-progressive.
6. In short, the fact that they have yielded no point intentionally, have no intention of doing so, and are only making monkeys out of a few of our brethren who think they are doing something spectacular, shows that the digressives are still digressives.

Instrumental music has never been the real issue. The real issue is the authority of the New Testament. The music question is only the horse they rode out on. If the music question should be eliminated, the actual issue would remain and manifest itself along other lines. Centering in whatever particular thing they regarded the most convenient.

FOY E. WALLACE, JR.
The church mentioned in the Bible is that great spiritual realm over which Christ reigns as head and in which the Holy Spirit dwells. That it was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ is not longer questioned by real scholars. Smith’s Bible Dictionary well declares, “That the day of Pentecost is the birthday of the Christian church.” Upon the day of its origin, about three thousand souls were built together. Soon after that, the number became five thousand men besides women and those who were able to understand.

Upon the death of Stephen, all the disciples were scattered abroad, save the apostles, and went everywhere preaching the Word. Their missionary efforts continued until the close of the first century, there were around six million members within the Roman Empire. Thus it might appear that very soon the Cause of Truth would cover the face of the earth, but before all of them there were evidences that became almost, if not altogether, universal. Paul saw the fall of sin revealed and the son of perdition busily engaged. He failed not to warn various ones of the fast that the time would come when they will not endure sound doctrine; that in the latter times many would depart from the faith; that grievous wolves would enter among them, and of themselves men would arise up to draw away disciples after them. The second century had scarcely dawned when departures were in evidence. New terms were coined and new phrases introduced to indicate the various positions to which men were appointed.

Development of Apostasy

There was, first of all, over the local church a priest. Then churches in a district organized and designated a bishop to preside over them. Following this, several districts of a province blended together and over these was appointed him whom they called archbishop. Another step was taken, and it was thought necessary to have someone to exercise authority over the entire province and, thus, came into existence the cardinals. But one other step was needed to blend the nations of the earth into one and, hence, in the year 606, Boniface III was designated Pope by the old emperor, Phocas, who himself was a murderer and an adulterer. This was the first. Thus in six centuries, the administrative department of what came to be known as the Catholic church was pretty thoroughly developed. Along with this, came strange doctrines peculiar to this growing ecclesiasticism. Holy water, penance, Latin mass, purgatory, kissing the Pope’s toe, the doctrine of substantiation, celibacy, indulgences, auricular confessions and sprinkling for baptism were finally adopted at the Council of Ravenna, Italy, in the year 1311.

During the dark ages, from about the fifth to the fifteenth century, this Roman hierarchy had almost absolute control over the affairs of men in both civil and religious matters. The world was practically in slavery and amenable to him who claimed to be the Vice-regent of God Almighty upon this earth. This whole system was based upon the false assumption that Peter was the first Pope and reigned in Rome for a period of about 25 years. No man can take the book of God and show that Peter ever saw Rome, much less there lived, reigned and died. The church of the Bible is built upon the firm foundation of the Word of God, and Peter is but the first in a line of apostles. He was first trained for a lawyer, but for the purpose of repairing St. Peter’s Cathedral in the city of Rome, he was permitted to take the book of God and show that Peter ever saw Rome, much less there lived, reigned and died.

The Reformation embraces the period called in history the Renaissance, or that transition from medieval to modern civilization. It means an awakening, a revival of learning, and a disposition to cut loose from former ties, to throw off the shackles of subjection and become more independent in thought and in deed. It means the effort to break away from the ecclesiasticism to which they had been in bondage for almost a thousand years and in all lines of thought enter upon new fields. England, France, Spain and Portugal were sending their ships to distant ports in search of that which lay beyond. A broader horizon was appearing and a greater conception, independence and responsibility were dawned upon the world. It was the period of great artists, Michael Angelo, Leonardo de Vinci, Raphael and others, who have never been surpassed even in our present century. It was the period of Shakespeare, Dante, Milton and a host of others. Along with these, men of great religious fervor were thinking as they had never thought before. Indeed, a new day was beginning to dawn and a new era was about to begin. The common people were beginning to put their heads together and they were forming strong resolutions, no longer to bow in submission to their sovereign, the Pope. Between the years 1520 and 1570, there was such a revolt that Germany, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, England, Scotland and Holland were wholly lost to the Papacy. In France, Spain, and Italy, there was open rebellion. People no longer hesitated to offer criticisms regarding the evil practices of a thousand years. Sentiment was ripe for men of ability to take the lead into new lines of thought and in contrary paths.

The Lutheran Reformation

Chief among these was a young man named Martin Luther. Though born and reared in poverty, he had within him a desire to secure an education and to make his impress upon the world. He was first trained for a lawyer, but after a serious illness diverted his energies to religious endeavors. He had never known any religion except that of the Catholics, but as he advanced in years and observed the practices of his church, it could no longer be indorsed and, in the year 1513, when there was announced a great sale of indulgences for the purpose of repairing St. Peter’s Cathedral in the city of Rome, he openly rebelled and declared the practice rotten, corrupt and unworthy of decent men. He then wrote out ninety-five objections to the Catholic church and with a courage that must be admired, demanded a discussion of their merits. This brought forth the bitter denunciation in what is called a Papal bull. Luther defied the Pope by burning his decree before the gate of Wittenburg. The result of this act on Luther’s part was his excommunication from the Catholic church in 1521, and it came to pass that this date marked the beginning of modern denominationalism upon this earth. The Catholics and some Protestants have had many an
hard saying against Luther and have
published him to the world as a “trick-
ster and a cheat,” whose titanic pride,
untainted temper and lack of per-
sonal dignity, utterly unfitted him to re-
form the church and the age.

It is declared that Luther possessed a
violent, despotic and uncontrollable na-
ture. Professor Scibbery, a Protestant of
Berlin, said: “Luther strode through his
century like a demon, crushing under
his feet what a thousand years had ven-
crated.” Old Bishop Bewick declared
him to be “foul-mouthed and scurril-
ous.” But let it be said in all candor
that since Christ stood before Pilate,
since Peter stood before the Jewish Sanhedrin, and since Paul stood before
Agrippa, the grandest moral spectacle
this old world has ever seen was Martin
Luther, standing before the Diet of
Worms (Vorms). Because of his abil-
ity to expose the corruption of the old
church, Luther was a real leader of
men.

Coming from Luther is that denomina-
tion which bears his name and which
was founded in the year 1521. The
Augsburg confession of faith, the ritual
of the Lutheran church, was drafted
and adopted in the year 1530. In his
opposition to the Catholic church, which
lays quite a bit of stress upon works,
Luther broke wholly away and
conceived the idea that men were “jus-
tified before God” by faith alone.
This doctrine taught in the Word of
God, and having failed completely,
rather than give up his theory, when
he came to the passage in Romans 3:28,
which reads, “Therefore we conclude
that a man is justified by faith without
the deeds of the law,” he took unto
himself the liberty of adding the word
“alone,” and made the passage read as
follows: “We hold that a man is justi-
fied without works of the law by faith
alone.” The makers of creeds from that
day to this have followed Luther’s ad-
dition and thus, the doctrine of justi-
cation by “faith only.” This expression
is found in the Bible but one time—in
James 2:24. It is declared that “a man
is justified by works and not by faith
only.” Strange as it may seem, that
which the Bible declares, men deny;
that which the Bible does not mention,
men will affirm. The greatest thing that
Luther ever did was to give to the
world an open Bible and thus loose it
from the pulpit to which it had been
chained. He had a great part in clear-
ning away the rubbish, in denouncing
the false, and in preparing for the
dawning of golden light, the rays of
which have come to many of us.

Though a denomination was formed,
Luther urged them not to wear his
name, “I pray you to leave my name
alone, and call not yourselves Luther,
but Christians. Who is Luther?

My doctrine is not mine. I have not
been crucified for any one. St. Paul
would not that any should call them-
selves to Paul, nor Peter, but of Christ.
How, then, does it befit me a miserable
bag of dust and ashes, to give my name
to the children of Christ? Cease, my
dear friends, to cling to these party
names and distinctions: away with them
all; and let us call ourselves only Chris-
tians after Him from whom our doc-
trine comes.” (Stork’s Life of Luther,
p. 289). A failure to heed his admoni-
tion has ever been a chief cause of di-
vision among professed Christians.

Along with Martin Luther, came
John Calvin, another great reformer,
who sought to impress his sentiments
upon the people of France and Switzer-
land. He was a strong believer in the
sovereignty of Jehovah and emphasized
a divine power more than any other
inspired man. Calvin became
the founder of the Presbyterian church
in the year 1535. He emphasized five-spe-
cial points, viz.: 1. predestination; 2. a
limited atonement; 3. total depravity;
4. effectual calling; and 5. perseverance
of the saints.

Back of John Calvin, there is not a
hint nor a trace of such an institution
as the Presbyterian church to be found
either in the Bible or out of the Bible.
In tracing its history, one can go back
to the day of Calvin and then it is “he
plus ultra.” The spirit of Calvinism
spread over a large part of the European
world and assumed different names in
different countries. On the continent of
Europe, Calvinism was called “The
Church of the Reformed Faith;” in
France, “Huguenots;” in Scotland, the
same body was called “Presbyterians;” in
England, “Puritans;” in Holland, “The
Dutch Reformed Church.” When
therefore either of these terms is used,
the same body in origin, doctrine and
practice is meant.

The State Church

The Episcopal church is another ef-
fort of Reformation. It was begun by
Henry VIII, King of England, and un-
der circumstances quite unique. The
history of this body is known to every
school boy in all the land, and as cer-
tainly as Columbus discovered America.
Henry VIII was the founder and start-
er of the Anglican or Episcopal church.
The facts stated briefly are as follows:
When Luther made his attack against
the Pope, Henry VIII very bravely
came to the defense and was styled by
the Pope himself, “the Defender of the
Faith.” Later on, he had a lot of trou-
ble with his marriage relations. He first
married Catherine of Aragon, Spain,
his brother Arthur’s wife. He lived
with her for eighteen years and became
the father of six girls, all of whom had
died except Mary. Under the canon-
flag that Catherine could not become
the mother of a boy baby who might
inherit the throne, he told her that he
believed their marriage illegal and that
they were living in sin. For this act he
was married by a special order of
Pope Julius II and he fancied that Pope
Clement VII would readily issue him a
decree by which their marriage
would be annulled. The real facts were
that he had fallen in love with Anne Boleyn,
a maid of nineteen summers. When the
Pope refused to grant a divorce, old
Henry had Thomas Cranmer appointed
archbishop of Canterbury and then
made him write out a bill of divorc-
ment. When this was done, the Pope
declared his excommunication on the
charge of adultery. He then went to
Parliament and had a bill passed to the
effect that he, himself, was made the
only head on earth of the church in
England. Another law followed, which
meant the separation of the Anglican
church from the Papacy in any form.
Another enactment was that any man
was to be declared guilty of treason,
who denied the rights of Henry VIII
as head of the church. Thus, the Epis-
copal church was conceived in sin and
brought forth in iniquity. It is purely
a state church and is governed by poli-
tics. It is a creation of the Parliament
and boundaries to dot an “i” or cross
an “a” without the consent of this gov-
ernment on the bank of the Thames.
The British Parliament is made up of
members of the church of England,
Catholics, Jews, and, possibly, Moham-
medans. Before any act affecting the
prayerbook of the Episcopal church can
pass, not only the Jew, but likewise the
Mohammedan has a vote upon it, and
it is possible that either of these un-
believers in Christ might cast the de-
termining vote determining the doctrine
and policy of the Anglican church.
Aside from the fact that the Catholic
believes the Pope exercises supreme
power, there is scarcely a particle of
difference between the High Episcopal
church and the Catholic.

Numerous Protestant Bodies

Due most largely to the teaching on
the subject and action of baptism, there
were those who broke away from the
opinions thus far expressed and recog-
nized that only adults were subjects
and that immersion was the only act. Hence,
the rise of the Baptist church in the
country of Holland in the year 1608.
It was organized in England in 1611
and in America in 1639. That these of
people has tried to establish a line of
descension from the present back to the
days of John the Baptist. Some have
imagined they could make the chain
rattle all the way, but the best informed
have long since discarded this ridiculous
claim. Baptist doctrine is made Up of
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Calvinistic theology, plus congregational government. This church teaches not a single doctrine of deistic necessity. As a religious organism, they are unknown to God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit. This is equally true of those who have gone before. Their origin, doctrine and practice is conspicuously absent from the book of God and all efforts of reformation on their part can but result in failure. In Spurgeon Memorial Library, Volume I, page 68, the great Baptist preacher said, "I look forward with pleasure to the day when there will not be a Baptist living. I hope they will soon be gone. I hope the Baptist name will soon perish; but let Christ's name live forever."

A little more than one hundred years later, another organization sprang up, which had its center around John Wesley. He was a deacon in the Episcopal church and observed the coldness, the formality and the emptiness in the service of his church. He sought to bring about a reformation and, together with three other young men, viz; Charles Wesley, Robert Kirkham and William Morgan, began to meet and meditate upon questions as they were. It was not his intention to start a new organization, but such, however, was the result. Methodism is a by-product of Episcopalianism. Its discipline with twenty-five articles is taken directly from the Episcopal prayerbook, which has thirty-nine articles of faith. Methodism grew and developed into one of the leading human organizations of the age. Its teaching and practice are known under the title of Methodism. The outcome of the fact that the sun forever shines on some building erected by them. Though great has been their influence and remarkable has been their growth, it must be admitted by all men of candor that, as an institution, this likewise is a stranger to the book of God. The Holy Spirit made no revelation of anything akin to a human institution. It must be conceded that these are weighed in the balances and found wanting.

From the second century on for sixteen hundred years, the church of the New Testament seems to have been lost amid the theories and speculations of men and it was finally buried under the rubbish of Catholicism and human denominations. History fails to record a definite account of the doings of that church established on Pentecost in the year 33. But for the fact that the word of God is the seed of the kingdom, the world would have continued to march in the darkness of despair with no hope of the original church being duplicated on this earth. Luther, Calvin and Henry VIII sought to reform Catholicism. But as the latter Senator Carmack said concerning the saloons of our land, "If refuses to be reformed and must ultimately be destroyed." It was the earnest desire of John Wesley to form the Episcopal church of which he lived and died a member. He, too, met with failure in this attempt.

All denominations claim to be but branches of the church. In speaking to His disciples, Christ said, "I am the vine and ye are the branches. If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered." I am not interested in any branch church. I am looking for the main trunk—the true vine. It is clearly taught in the book of God that the institution approved by Him was founded by Christ in the year 33 in the city of Jerusalem. This must be conceded by all who respect the word of God. The Catholic church was not established by any particular person nor at any definite place nor at any specific time. It was a growth and development, which covered a period of something like a thousand years. Lutheranism was founded by Martin Luther in the country of Germany in 1535. Surely, no one would be so careless as to suggest that this is what Christ had in mind when he said, "Upon this rock I will build my church." The Presbyterian organization was founded by John Calvin in the country of Switzerland in the year 1535. The Episcopal church was brought into existence by Henry VIII in the country of England, 1535. The Baptist church was organized by John Smythe in the country of Holland in 1608. The Methodist church was founded by John Wesley in the country of England in 1729. No honest man can claim that any of these organizations was the one mentioned by Christ when he declared, "Upon this rock I will build my church."

**Back to the Bible**

It seemed evident to a great number of candid men that the efforts of reformation had resulted in failure. The years passed and a divided condition in the religious realm presented a fruitful field of infidelity. By the beginning of the 19th century, the banner of skepticism and of atheism were unfurled with a boldness that challenged the attention of earnest, honest men. The churches were lifeless; a pagan world was in darkness and there was but little effort to send the gospel light. Some of the causes of this period of unrest were, first, a divided church; the prayer of the Saviour in John 17 was wholly ignored. He said, "There shall be one fold, one shepherd." Paul pleaded that all might speak the same thing and that there be no divisions among you. He had declared that "division was carnal." Men saw that these divisions were weakening the forces of God and dissipating their energies. Another cause back of an earnest effort to restore the ancient order of things was that these various denominations were not only jealous of each other, but in many cases they were actually devouring one another. Instead of being allies, they were enemies. Another contributory cause to more earnest efforts was a belied theology and a misconception of the book of God. There was a failure to recognize the different dispensations taught in the Bible and even God's book was considered a dead letter.

In conviction and conversion, it was thought that the Holy Ghost must move in some mysterious way His wonders to perform. Material sights, sounds, visions, sensations, dreams and experiences were assurances of pardon rather than the word of God. The time has never been when there was a more arrogant clergy than those who had a part in the denominations of that day. That they were ignorant is pretty generally conceded and it must be said that they were the chief cause of a divided condition that prevailed. They lorded it over God's heritage and assumed the right of legislation for those in the pew. Disciplines, creeds and confessions of faith were much more influential than in later years. These human booklets served as the criterion by which all religion was to be measured. The clergy had to subscribe to every declaration of the ritual. Creeds destroyed the unity that should have prevailed and caused infidelity to grow the more rapidly. Sincere men became aroused and the 19th century opened with a challenge to find a better order of religious affairs. Good men saw there was something radically wrong. Moved by a single impulse and a desire to discover the remedy, serious investigations were begun. In the old world the Haldane brothers had seen the sinfulness of division and had sought to return to apostolic Christianity.

Thomas Campbell, while in Scotland and a member of the Presbyterian church, put forth an earnest effort to bring about a union of the four different bodies of Presbyterians, all of whom held to the Westminster confession. In America, there was a spirit of unrest among some of these denominations. They began to see the evil of division among themselves. It was first felt among the Methodists, about the time of the Declaration of Independence. As yet no discipline had been adopted. Troubles over the government of the church arose. Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury led in a plea for a prelacy, or an episcopalian government. James O'Kelly favored the congregational form of government with the New Testament as the only book of discipline. The Episcopal party were so strong that O'Kelly and his followers felt justified in withdrawing.
The secession took place on Christmas day, 1793, at Manikintown, North Carolina. Far away in Connecticut, Dr. Abner Jones, a Baptist preacher, of Hartland, determined to break away from human names and creeds and to return to the simple life of New Testament Christianity. In the state of Kentucky, Barton W. Stone, a young Presbyterian preacher, also denounced Presbyterians and fixed his eyes upon a path that was to lead back to primitive Christianity. Thus the forces in different parts of the world, sick, tired and disgusted at the religious efforts put forth, recognized that the hope of the world lay not in reformation, but in a complete return and restoration of the ancient order of things. Naturally, this aroused the enmity of all those who had subscribed to human creeds and were characterized by human names. No such interest has ever prevailed as that which was characteristic of the first part of the 19th century. Certain principles were announced by different ones and the acceptance of these meant the ultimate unity of those who were determined to break away from human institutions. The motto of Barton W. Stone was: "The Bible and the Bible alone as our only rule of faith and practice." Thomas Campbell said, "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are silent." A 'Thus saith the Lord,' either in express terms or by approved precedent for every article of faith and item of religious practice. They declared that all men could accept the Bible and that alone as their rule of faith and practice; that all could wear the name Christian with no sacrifice of faith whatsoever, and furthermore, that all could endorse immersion for baptism without his. In Rome it flowed out to infect the whole praetorian guard and inflame into boldness the timid hearts of disciples throughout the city (Phil. 1:12, 13). His weapons were no longer carnal but spiritual and proved to be far more powerful. At the end of a few years he could say triumphantly that all creation under heaven had heard the gospel (Col. 1:23). Immediately after his conversion he walked boldly into the synagogue and preached Christ to his enemies with the same boldness Stephen had used when he was dragged before the council.

Much of the history of the early church is epitomized in the life of Paul. Its struggles and triumphs are seen in him. The marks of Jesus branded on his body are symbols of its struggles while the trophies are symbols of its triumph. A believer in Christ and His resurrection, he lent unswerving fidelity to the fundamentals of the faith. The two outstanding enemies of the gospel in Paul's day were paganism and Judaism and he met both, in the church and out, with unconcealed hostility. No one ever doubted what side Paul was on. As is always the case with such intense agitators, he made loyal friends and bitter enemies. His friends were willing to share his prison life and follow him even to death. His enemies were capable of binding themselves with an oath to neither eat nor drink until they had killed him. Slander was one of their mildest weapons. The pagan governor, Felix, was terrified as Paul preached to him of righteousness, self-control and the judgment to come (Acts 24:23). His successor, Festus, classified him as a fanatic, and accused him of madness, in the midst of one of his most eloquent appeals for the truth of the gospel (Acts 26:24). The spokesman of Judaism called him "a pestilent fellow, and a mover of insurrections among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes" (Acts 24:5). In Thessalonica, the Jews said: "These that have turned the world upside down have come hither also." Their wrath was directed mainly at Paul. They did not act without provocation. Believing as they did, they were logical in their attitude. Paul cut deep with the sword of the Spirit and drew blood with every thrust. Indeed, he did turn the world upside down! Wherever he went, he found things downside up and he proceeded to turn them. What a man! On a casual visit through Athens, his spirit was moved within him as he beheld the city full of idols. He could not keep quiet. He preached in the synagogues and disputed in the marketplace. He got called "this babbling" for his pains and was dubbed "a setter forth of strange gods," but the mockery drew from him a masterpiece of eloquence against idolatry. Wherever he went, he shattered alike the citadels of idolatry and the foundations of Judaism. This moving, exploding ambassador for Christ is the wonder of the centuries.

The Intolerant Agitator

The converts to Christianity who composed the early church were formerly Jews or pagans. The influence then of both Judaism and paganism were to be reckoned with in the church itself. Paul sternly declared that Christians were washed of the uncleanness of paganism and a continuance of their iniquities would bar them from heaven. He had little patience with Judaizers who would bind the yoke of Jewish bondage on the church. "Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the law: ye are fallen away from grace" (Gal. 5:4). He was ever the perennial, intolerant agitator for gospel principles. He made one scornful remark that even modern friends of Paul have sought to soften, because in their eyes it borders on an obscene jest. Surely, no sweet-spirited, soft-talking compromiser of the gospel would have made it. "I would that they that unconditionally would have gone beyond circumcision" (Gal. 5:12). He wished that those who preached circumcision would preach mutilation, the cutting off of the member that was circumcised. It would always serve the cause of truth if the protagonists of error would go to such absurd lengths as to discredit themselves before all. But Satan is a wily antagonist. "For even Satan fashions himself into an angel of light. It is no great thing therefore if his ministers also fashion themselves as ministers of righteousness." Paul's hardest task was to strip the sheep's clothing from the wolf so he could be seen in his naked character.

If godly nble men today find it in their hearts to become agitators for the truth of the gospel and find themselves averse with zeal to combat false doctrine, impure worship and worldliness in the church, they can find a worthy exemplar in Paul, the fiercest of agitators. When fundamentals were at stake, he was not a wire-walker.
As the stone thrown into the lake will cause waves to reach even the farthest shore, so any idea, attitude, or experience on the part of any of us will to some degree affect all of us. No one is immune to the thoughts and beliefs of his associates. He will undoubtedly feel their influence even if he does not yield to their sway. We have seen with what incredible rapidity political doctrines spread from one nation to another. Two decades ago there were a score of kings reigning in Europe who are now either dead or in exile. The unrest and dissatisfaction of all the world after the World War proved fertile soil for the growth of political propaganda. Breaking out at first only as a tiny flame the gospel of revolt swept like a holocaust across the face of the earth. In one country after another the red flag of revolution was unfurled to the breeze; dynasties which had lasted for a thousand years were put to the sword; bloodshed and violence were the order of the day. No nation was absolutely immune to the epidemic. In some countries in America, other and more recently extruded ideals counteracted to influence; but every nation on earth was affected.

Effects on the Church of Christ

Inasmuch as the church is composed of human beings who think and feel and act like other human beings, and since we are not immune to the subtle influence of world reactions and world attitudes, it was inevitable that sooner or later the backlash of these two modern religious trends be discernible within the body of Christ. Indeed, the ideal of church unity has ever been a cardinal belief with Christian people. But this unity, earnestly desired by Christ and enjoined by His apostles, is different both in kind and in degree from that which the religious world is now seeking. And it is only within the last few years that there has been found within the church any desire at all for the sort of union the denominational world is seeking—a union which ignores Paul's injunction that "all speak the same thing, and be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment," but tries rather to achieve a religious synthesis by refusing to talk of the things that divide.

In the church, as in the denominational world, this sentiment is traceable directly to a weakening of doctrinal convictions. There has grown up a generation of people who are members of the church of Christ for precisely the same reason that their friends and acquaintances are members of the Baptist and Methodist churches—because their parents before them were members. They are Christians because they were born into a Christian family rather than into a Methodist or Lutheran family. There is another large, and ever-increasing group who have "joined" (literally) the church under the emotional appeal of an evangelist without having first been taught. These two groups constitute the most serious threat today to the purity of the church and her loyalty to the teaching of Christ. Because they have no deep-rooted convictions, and because they are without doctrinal stamina, they have the typical sectarian and denominational attitude toward the church and her work. It is these groups who decry "hard preaching," who would not only permit, but encourage, the local minister to affiliate with the pastors' alliance, who are so sweet-spirited that they cannot hear to hear error exposed in the pulpit.

The Way Out

That we are facing a crisis in the present life of New Testament Christianity should be evident to all thinking people.

Although our position is precarious it is by no means discouraging. For the evidence is accumulating that the churches are awakening to the situation. And once awakened the way to salvation from the present crisis is clearly indicated. It lies along two distinct paths, the first of which is endocentric. Every member in the church must be taught the "rudiments of the first principles of the oracles of God." The Book of Acts must again be brought into the curriculum of church teaching. The line, and the reason for it, between Christianity and denominationalism must be clearly and decisively drawn.

But if our first line of attack against the present danger is endocentric, our second and equally important line must be evangelization. Church history shows that in periods of intense and fervent evangelism there has always been a corresponding growth in the moral and doctrinal purity of the church. It is only when the church ceases to work that she exposes herself to the insidious influence of false teaching. The religion of Jesus Christ is a thrilling challenge—not a soothing opiate. The church must never lose sight of the fact that she is a fighting army. She has neither time nor inclination for truce or parley. Satan has no compromise which she can accept; and she has nothing to offer him but the cutting blades of a two-edged sword.

The church must be militant and relentless in her opposition to error and sin, tireless and unyielding in her efforts to "make disciples of all the nations." Endocentricity, evangelization—herein, and herein only, lies our salvation.

FANNING YATER TANT

A CRISIS IN CHRISTIANITY

Unless the Wave of Doctrinal Inertia and Relaxation Is Checked We Are in Danger of Degenerating Rapidly Into "Just Another Denomination."
John T. Lewis

Before his conversion Paul was exceedingly mad with all who dared believe that “the promise made of God unto the fathers” meant anything but an earthly kingdom.

But after he was converted and called to be an apostle, he changed his mind about “the hope” from an earthly Jewish kingdom to a spiritual kingdom.

Paul before Agrippa said: “And now I stand here to be judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which promise our twelve tribes, earnestly serving God day and night, hope to attain. And concerning this hope I am accused by the Jews, O, king! Why is it judged incredible with you that God doth raise the dead? I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth” (Acts 26:6-9).

Paul Before and After Conversion

What was “the promise made of God unto our fathers” that became the bedrock of the hope of Israel? Paul first thought it would be a revitalization of that legalistic, judaic kingdom, peculiarly and exclusively of spiritual Israel. Hear him: “I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth” (Acts 26:6-9).

“Brother Boll, again: “If you are a Christian, you have been ‘cut out’ of the fleshly kingdom of Israel, with its Jewish ordinances and worship, in Jerusalem. But after he was converted and called to be an apostle he changed his mind about ‘the hope’ from an earthly Jewish kingdom to a spiritual kingdom. For this change of ideas and convictions on that subject he was persecuted by the Jews as few men ever suffered.”

In 2 Cor. 5:16, 17, Paul says: “Wherefore we henceforth know no man after the flesh; even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more. Wherefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away, behold, they are become new.” The word “henceforth” means from now on; but Brother Robert H. Boll, an old friend and schoolmate of mine, takes issue with Paul, he says we will know Christ again after the flesh, and that “the old things” Paul says have passed away are to be made new again, and he does it in such a sweet spirit of humility that thousands of good brethren think nobody but a renegade would call in question his teaching.

“The Spiritual Contingent”

Brother Boll, in the March issue of his paper-work und Work-spatting back at Paul, says: “If, after all he has promised and sworn to this people, Israel, God does not fulfill his word to them, but instead turns all into a spiritual and figurative fulfillment to a new spiritual contingent called ‘the church,’ then we cannot know that any promise of God can he relied on, nor can we know what He means when He says anything.” Now if I knew how to say it in a spirit and manner that would not offend Brother Boll’s admirers, I would say his trouble about God’s promises to Israel is precisely the trouble Paul had with them before his conversion—he could not swallow that “new spiritual contingent called the church,” which he so indefatigably defended after his conversion, and call to the apostleship, and for which he also died.

We will let Paul explain to Brother Boll just how God’s promise “made to our fathers” can be spiritualized and “relied on,” too. “But it is not as though the word of God hath come to nought. For they are not all Israel, that are of Israel: neither, because they are Abraham’s seed, are they all children; but in Isaac shall thy seed be called. That is, it is not the children of the flesh that are the children of God: but the children of the promise are reckoned for a seed” (Rom. 9:6, 8). Now let Paul tell us “who the children of the promise” are. In Galatians 3:26-29, he says: “For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on H r i s t and if ye are Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, heirs according to the promise.” So you see it is the “spiritualized” and not the “circumscribed” that are “heirs according to the promise.” It seems to me to be almost blasphemous to speak lightly of “a spiritual and figurative fulfillment” of the promise, since that is the only sense in which Gentiles can become “Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” Therefore all Gentiles who are not willing to be spiritualized are outside that “spiritual contingent called the church.” They are therefore separate from Christ, alienated from the covenants of the promise, having no hope and without God in the world. (Eph. 2:12).

The Israel of God

“For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as shall walk by this rule, peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God” (Gal. 6:15, 6). Here Paul says this new creature, or creation is the “Israel of God” and circumcision or fleshly Israel is nothing. Again Paul says: “In whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ: having been buried with him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead” (Col. 2:11, 12). Here Paul did some more spiritualizing; he says the “Israel of God” or “spiritual Israel” were spiritually circumcised in the cutting off of their sins in baptism. From the giving of the covenant of circumcision to Abraham till the beginning of the spiritual reign of Christ, the “promised seed,” everyone that was not literally and fleshly circumcised was “cut off from his people,” since the beginning of the spiritual reign of Christ every responsible being that is not spiritually circumcised will be “cut off from his people.” God has never authorized but two circumcisions, one literal, the other spiritual; the literal belonged to fleshly Israel, the spiritual belonged to spiritual Israel. After reading so much of Paul’s spiritualizing, we will hear Brother Boll again: “If after all He has so solemnly promised and sworn to this people, Israel, God does not fulfill His word to them, but instead turns all into a new spiritual contingent called ‘the church,’ then we cannot know that promises of God can be relied on.” The word “contingent” means likely or liable, but not certain, to occur. A nice way, indeed, to speak of “the kingdom of the Son of His love,” into which people have been “translated” for more than nineteen hundred years. “Believe it or not.”
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THE UNITY OF CHRISTIANS

One Cannot Be a Christian and at the Same Time Be a Party to or Member of an Organization Which Teaches False Doctrine and Engages in Unscriptural Practices. Christian Unity Exists, and All the Hue and Cry about Unity is but a Plea for Something to Take Place That Was Accomplished by the Gospel and Has Existed Through the Past Centuries.

C. R. NICHOL

A century ago there was much said about “Christian Union.” The thought was in the mind of those who insisted on “Christian Union” that there were many Christians in all of the religious bodies, regardless of the name and practice of the denomination. It was insisted, ed, rightly so, that sectarian names were unscriptural, that such names promoted and perpetuated division; that denominational names should be rejected, creeds made by men destroyed, and professed followers of Christ should subscribe to the Bible only as the rule for faith and practice in their religious activities.

To me it appears that the plea for what was at that time called “Christian Union” was faulty, and that the same mistake is being made by many today; for with me is the conviction that it is thought that there is a division among Christians, and that because of the division among Christians the effort to unite is timely.

Who Is a Christian? May we well to clarify matters, least we be deceived. Of a failure to understand such a failure to understand the notion is precipitated.

What is a Christian? The United States is referred to as a “Christian Nation.” Though one of our citizens may not believe in Christ, yet if he visits in a heathen land he is called a Christian, solely because he lives in a country where Christianity is recognized as true. When people talk about “Christian Union” they do not intend that such a man be united with those who believe in Christ and follow his lead in their lives. There are men who have carefully weighed and compared the teachings of Christ with the systems of religious originating with and taught by mere men; and in their judgment they have decided Christianity is right, hence they reject all other forms of religion. Such men may be called Christians in judgment. When “Christian Union” is contemplated, surely such men are not appealed to, for they are not in their lives even professed followers of Christ.

What is meant by the term “Christian”? I use the word “Christian” to describe a person who is saved, is a member of the church of Christ, and in addition thereto is faithfully following the teaching of the New Testament.

There are some who have become the church of Christ, but have lapsed; men who seldom attend the services of the church, and whose lives are now openly wicked. I do not think of, nor do I refer to such men as Christians, for instead of being followers of Christ, they follow the wicked one. “Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves to obey, his servants ye are whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness?” (Rom. 6: 16). Surely no one who has even a faint conception of the scriptures makes reference to such people as Christians; hence they are not thought of when they advocate “Christian Union.”

Are False Teachers and Dividers of the Church Christians? There are some who have by reason of having been born again, were saved,—became citizens of the kingdom of God, members of the church of Christ; and then departed from the faith and are now teaching false doctrine, doctrine which is divisive. When people talk about “Christian Union,” or “Christian Unity,” is it thought that they mean to include in the term “Christian” men who by their false teaching divide churches? In my view the man who drove the nails through the hands and feet of the Lord was a sinner; but men who by false teaching, or any other means, drive a wedge into the church, the spiritual body of Christ, are far greater sinners than those who “nailed Him to the cross.” These false teachers who divide congregations are men whom Christians avoid, for the Holy Spirit says: “Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them” —“turn away from them” (Rom. 16: 17). Surely no right-thinking man regards such men as Christians. If they do, and mean by “Christian Unity” that they should join forces with such men, how can it be done without refusing to obey the command of the Lord to “turn away from them”? If such false teachers are Christians, it must follow that some Christians sow discord among brethren, and sowers of discord among brethren are hated by Jehovah. (Prov. 6: 19). In my view a Christian is a follower of Christ. One cannot follow Christ and at the same time he, religiously, a party to or member of an organization which features and teaches false doctrine—fighting the truth, and engaging in unscriptural practices.

It is possible for a child of God to wander off in sin, to embrace false doctrine, and engage in unscriptural practice; but such men, in my thinking, are not Christians who engage in such things. In my conception there is no such thing as a “Christian who divides churches” —contrary to the doctrine taught by Christ. That no one misunderstands me: I do not believe the men who introduced institutional music into the worship of the church of Christ, thereby dividing the spiritual body of Christ, “contrary to the doctrine” of the Lord, were Christians.

Some years ago one A. S. Bradley became a member of the church of Christ, and for several years preached the gospel acceptably to brethren, and I think to the Lord, in sections of Arkansas and Texas. He was “united” with the Lord, and with all who abide in Christ. But the time came when he was deceived by false teachers, and became an active advocate of the doctrine that Christ has not been seated on David’s throne; but that at His second coming He would be crowned King; His throne would be established in Jerusalem, Palestine, and for a thousand years His government would administrate from that place. He embraced much of the doctrine taught by the Christadelphians, and R. H. Boll. Mr. Bradley on entering a community where he was not known, sought the fellowship of members of the church of Christ, and if opportunity presented itself would preach the very things he knew they believed; but at the same tune he would in a private way teach his false doctrine; and on the first occasion when he thought he would begin a favorable hearing by some of the members, would publicly preach his divisive doctrine. He divided many congregations. All the while he would insist that one did not have to believe the things taught by him which divided congregations—that his divisive doctrine was not essential to being a Christian; yet he persisted in teaching such things, sowing discord. Is there a man ready to say that A. S. Bradley was...
a Christian when engaged in such teaching, and dividing churches? Was he the character contemplated when people insist on “Christian Unity”? He was regarded by many as a very pious man, deeply religious, and sweet-spirited. He was very agreeable until contradicted, and then he was as bitter as gall.

Christian Unity Exists Now

In my way of thinking “Christian Unity” exists now, and has existed every moment since the first Christians were made. All this hue and cry about “Christian Unity” is not one whit short of a plea for something to take place that has existed through the past centuries!

Jesus said: “I will build my church” (Matt. 16:18). He did build His church, and it is his body (Col. 1:23). There is “one body” and “but one body,” one church (Eph. 4:4, 1 Cor. 12:20, Eph. 1:22, 2:3); hence when one becomes a member of His body, he is a member of His church. Entrance into the body of Christ is consummated by baptism (1 Cor. 12:13, Gal. 3:27, Rom. 6:3); but those who are in Christ are united with Christ—the body was buried together with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life. For if we have become united with him in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection (Rom. 6:4, 5). All who enter Christ are “united” with him, hence, “united” with each other—and that is “Christian Unity!” That “unity” exists, of course, till broken by sin. Sin separates one from the Lord (Isa. 58:2). All who “abide in him” are united. “Christian Union” exists among all who are Christians.

Baptists insist there are many Chris-tians in all the churches throughout the land—that though a man refused to be immersed, though he teaches that infants are proper subjects for baptism, as Methodist and some others do, such people may be Christians while teaching and practicing such doctrine. I can understand how Baptists can insist that there should be brought about “Christian Union” for they believe many thousands of Christians have never been obedient to the peculiar doctrine of Baptists; they believe and teach one can be a Christian who refuses to do what the Lord commands; but how can a man who knows the truth—that all Christians are “united” with Christ, hence, “united” with each other—be continually crying that “Christian Unity” be brought about?

Obedience to false doctrine has never made a Christian. Men who give the weight of their influence to teaching and practicing things unauthorized by the

**CONCERNING UNITY CONFERENCES**

**Hugo McCord**

Detroit brethren are mistaken to say we are not doing all we can for unity because we don’t join the Murch Witty movement. We just don’t mean to compromise, for that is the only direction we can go if we have the truth now. Any movement from truth is bound to be either compromise or treason; truth doesn’t vibrate or see-saw on a board.

If a conference with the Christian Church would do any good, of course, every peace lover would participate. But the Christian Church does not intend to change its practices. Do I hear some one say, “You are judging them without a trial”? No, brethren, they have judged themselves. They do not consider us; they consider us non-progressive, non-missionary, old-fashioned; unless we are willing to become as progressive (?) and modern as they, they are not interested in a unity movement! A harsh statement? Ask those staunch men who have come out from the Christian Church. Ask them if the Christian Church is turning back to the Testament or modern to modern Christianity. We are no closer the Christian Church today than we are the Baptist Church.

**The Martinsburg Unity Conference**

I have just been in a unity conference at Martinsburg, W. Va. The pastor of the Christian Church, learning some of his members had invited me to dinner, dropped in after dinner and immediately wanted to know if I had read Payne’s hook on instrumental music. He had become interested in unity when some of his members were at stake. I complimented him on his knowledge of Payne’s hook, and invited him to a public dis-cussion. That he refused, but asked me to come to his study next day. Then for three full hours we talked. I begged him not to let anything divide our fellowship: “Brother Worden, we can have unity in Martinsburg if you want it; we at the church of Christ practice nothing that will divide; we follow the New Testament, as you admit. If you will do the same, we can be united. If you are really concerned about the restoration plea, an appeal for unity, you can have it; we beg you to let us come and he one with you; don’t put barriers in our way.” But it sadly turns out that he is closer to any denomination than to simple churches of Christ.

**Restoration Principles Abandoned**

I asked him if he dared preach a pure gospel sermon to the Ministerial Alliance, of which he was president:

Lord, sowing the seed of discord among brethren, dividing congregations, are not Christians! Christian Unity exists.

“Wouldn’t they reject you if you did?”

“There is a time and place for all things—they know where I stand.” But Brother Worden, when you go to a meeting of your alliance, don’t you thereby agree to gag yourself for the time being? Then you are not true to your conscience and act that way.

Brother Worden, how can you go into a union meeting with the United Brethren and Methodist Churches (the Catholic, Lutheran, Baptist, and Pentecostal Churches refused) here in Martinsburg?

“They preach some good things, and I wouldn’t have the spirit of Christ if I refused.”

How can you call a Methodist preacher, “Brother”? “Did not Ananias call Saul ‘brother’ before he was baptized?”

In the Lord or in the flesh? “Well, I don’t say; I just say, ‘brother’.” But the Methodist preacher thinks you are calling him “brother” in the Lord, and you let him think that? “I’m not responsible for what he thinks; I do just what Ananias did.”

Brother Worden, is one a Christian before he is born of the water and the Spirit?” “Well, there is life during the time before the birth of a child: you admit that don’t you?” (Was them ever was a better Baptist answer?)

I asked him about his Thursday night communion service. His Biblical reply: “It makes a very beautiful service.”

Then why not go to the Catholic, if beautify the thing?

I asked him about my observance of Holy Week, Pentecost, and read Galatians 4:10, 11. There was no reply.

When he admitted he could worship without the instrument, I begged him to remove that harrier from between us.

“Then we would be further from the other denominations in town.”

**More Denominational Than Christian**

He was very interested in the Detroit unity conference, and said he had prayed for it; he repeated the statement: “Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; where the Bible is silent, we are not bound.” I then quoted II John 9-11.

“Where is that found?” I pointed out that if we are not bound, we may use incense, the rosary, etc. “You are judging; I don’t want to use the rosary; but what is wrong with incense?”

Brethren, we should try to win back our brethren, and everybody I know of never has stopped trying to win them back. I tried hard to change Brother Worden; we bowed and prayed together, but, the sad truth is: he is now more of a restoration seeker than is a Methodist preacher. We are hopelessly divided; he loves the denominations more than he loves us.
What's New in the News?

The Bible Banner is primarily a religious magazine for the discussion of special issues. It is not its function to chronicle the news. But it reserves the right to comment from time to time upon the trends of the news.

In the field of secular journalism, current events constitute the textbook for practically all special writers. The work of these magazines is to comment, directly or indirectly, upon the news of the day. The connection is not so close in religious matters. Inspiration described the hounds of the field of truth nineteen centuries ago. The New Testament is our inspiration. But to present the gospel effectively, it is essential to know men as well as truth; for the truth must be applied to men. Church news supplies the surest indication of the direction of religious thought. The trends of the news show where special work is needed.

The Paper-College Combination

Some of our brethren are longing for "brotherhood owned" papers. How can the brotherhood own anything, when there is no legal entity? But we have religious institutions with ambiguous ownership. It would take a Philadelphia lawyer to locate the legal ownership. This move would be very dangerous. And if these "church" papers should become denominational organs—and they would not be far from it at their beginning—and they should devote themselves to promoting the interests of "our institutions," which they probably would, we would be on our way! Our hearts are full of sectarianism now. Our speech betrays us. The news reports show it. A tie-up between ambiguously owned papers and institutions would spell a definite denominational set-up. We are not drifting, as Brother Tant says. He may have been right when he first started warning us, but he needs to revise his slogan. We are hurrying ourselves headlong into the thick of sectarianism! With the fight before us already on institutionalism, the pending combination between certain colleges and a "brotherhood paper," and if controlled by the combination, portends no good thing for the church.

A Premillennial Background

Have you observed the background of the unity conference at Detroit? See the company. They are either Boll partisans, representatives, sympathizers, neutrals or non-committals. If you do not think so, then ask yourself where, when, and how, did any of the men connected with the unity movement ever take a stand on the Premillennial, or Boll question? Look them over, and think. There you will find the common ground among those of the Christian Church and those of the churches of Christ who are associated with the movement. James DeForest Murch is a Premillennialist; so are the other digressives. Claud F. Witty is a known sympathizer with the Premillennialists among us. It has been our observation that people of many different religious connections are finding common ground in Premillennialism. This is also true of the Christian Church preachers and those of the churches of Christ who are fraternizing now—they have common ground—a real basis for a merger. Witty, Jones, Jorgenson, Armstrong, and others were in the forefront at the unity meeting, and I cannot recall a single man now who took active part who has ever taken a forthright stand on this issue.

Stressing the Spiritual

A "Christian College" the slogan of which is "Stressing Spiritual Development," has recently "developed" a movie star in their dramatic arts department. Much publicity was given to the young hero in the daily press. The same daily paper carried repeated announcements of a hotel banquet where there was dancing and card playing, and took especial pains to emphasize that a teacher of this "Christian College" and one of the students were in attendance and furnished the musical feature. Other announcements of the spiritual development in progress at this institution of Christianity continue to cite the $8,000 stadium where the "Christian Wildcats" will perform in modern gladiatorial glory. On the heels of spending $8,000 for the stadium, a campaign was launched among the churches to raise money to pay the college debts, on the ground that it was giving a "Christian Education" and stressing the spiritual!...
Incidentally, too, one of the “heavy, weights” of the college was announced as a contestant for the Golden Gloves, an honor (?) held by Joe Louis, the Brown Bomber, at the present time. The hreseten are being asked for money to promote such things under the flag of Christian education, and the churchmen are being asked to put the college in the budget. It was even said that “the church that does not put the college in its budget, does not have the right preacher.” Yet there is a great resentment when some solicitous hreseten speak of college domination and control of the churches and the preachers. It is time for the hreseten to wake up.

Missions and the Unity Meeting

Dr. George S. Benson’s speech at the Detroit Conference seems to have turned into an appeal for “missions.” He emphasized missions as the immediate task of the church. The Standard says: “The address was especially pleasing to the ‘progressives’ as all of the speeches made at Detroit seemed to be. Missions! If a man is a gospel preacher in the United States, but announces for Japan, buys his ticket and changes his address, he automatically becomes a missionary! Thereafter he is no more called a preacher, but a missionary. Why? Have you thought about the difference, and the origin of the “mission” and the “missionary”? Think on it a while. Then think of a man putting himself up as a leader among us who would deliver a missionary appeal at a unity meeting with the digressives instead of debating an issue. And the ‘progressives’ were pleased, the Standard said. Doctor Benson must not have antagonized their societies and innovations. Harding College’s reputation for softness hasn’t been helped any by such as this.

Brother Armstrong’s Arms

Over at Scarcy, Arkansas, Brother J. N. Armstrong has stretched out his arms to his “big-hearted hreseten of the Christian Church.” He tells how good these Christian Church hreseten have been to him, and rectifies just how “big-hearted” they are. A dracones with great enthusiasm the Unity Conference at Detroit. That might (?) do in Arkansas, but not in Texas, where the “big-hearted” Christian Church “hreseten” have stolen every church house in the state that did not have the Restrictive Clause in the deed. Better ask men like Joe H. Blue how big-hearted they have been in Arkansas before you take Brother Armstrong’s outstretched arms too seriously. Between the premillenialists and the digressives Brother Armstrong is a nust master anarlist.

It Went Unchallenged

Brother Thos. H. Burton writes: “I attended the g-cat ‘National Unity Meeting’ in Detroit. I only heard two speeches, one by a digressive and the other by Brother George Benson. From my point of view it was certainly a flop so far as the church is concerned, and a victory so far as the digressives are concerned. Brother Benson paid the other speaker a compliment on his speech as an appeal for unity, but I could not see such in it, but rather an appeal for tolerence. I really felt for the weak members in the audience. The digressive speaker closed his talk with this illustration: A Catholic priest met a Quaker. After passing a few remarks, they began talking of God and religion. When the time came to part, the priest laid his hand on the Quaker’s head, and pronounced the Papal benediction, after which the Quaker laid his hand on the priest’s head and pronounced upon him the Quaker benediction. He continued by saying that these two men would meet in heaven and there enjoy God’s blessings, as eternity rolls on. Brother Benson said many good things, but never answered this illustration. I was told that the digressive preacher of Tuesday night made the statement that where God has not spoken we have liberty to do as we please. This I understand also went unchallenged.”

That is inside information on a great unity meeting! Be it said to Brother Burton’s credit that he was holding a gospel meeting near Detroit at the time, and was not particepscriminus in the affair. Of course, the hreseten said “some good things” as I suppose the Christian Church preachers did, as also do the Methodist Bishops when they hold a conference. But it is one thing to say “good things” and quite another to defend the truth without compromize in a crisis.

Why He Was Not There?

The Christian Standard quotes Claud F. Witty’s indorsment of its editorial. “One of the finest things written about this meeting is by Brother Edwin R. Errrett, editor of the Christian Standard, which appeared in April 23 issue. Brother Errrett is in a meeting in East Liver, pool, Ohio, or he would have been with us.” How about the editorial of May 1? Brother Witty? Errrett’s interpretation of the “slogan” is: Where the Bible speaks we are silent, but where the Bible is silent, we may speak, because we are not bound. This is what your “Brother Edwin R. Errrett, editor of the Christian Standard” was preaching at East Liver pool, which you take pleasure in announcing. Great unity! Wonderful fellowship!

The Doctors That Are Among Us

From the Abilene Daily Reporter the following is clipped: “Dr. George A. Klingman Fills College Church’s Pulpit Today” (headline) Then, “For the first time in a number of years, Dr. George A. Klingman will fill an Abilene pulpit. He will be heard both morning and this evening at the College Church of Christ meeting at A. C. C. Since leaving A. C. C. Dr. Klingman has been minister of congregations in Detroit, Toronto, Louisville, Ky., and other centers. One of the most universally loved persons who has ever served in Abilene College, Dr. Klingman has long been recognized as one of the most brilliant theologians and protestants. His undergraduate work was done in old Transylvania University. He is the son-in-law of the late Isaiah B. Grubbs, one of the leaders whose work overlapped or immediately followed that of Alexander Campbell.”

The references in the above newspaper write-up furnish proof that this was not a reporter’s article, but rather an “inside job.” A newspaperman would not know anything about “old Transylvania” and “I. B. Grubbs, one of the leaders whose work overlapped that of Alexander Campbell.” Either the College or the College Church, is responsible for this write-up. So we have a “great theologian” and “protestant” among us, as well as some “doctors” of the LL.D. variety! The Doctors might have said that one of thecalled “Dr. Klingman served signally for the Elders of the Transylvania C. C. ” was an outright Boly Church (the Jorgenson congregation in Louisve) and while minister of that church he also served in the digressive seminary at Cincinnati. It may be further said that Doctor Klingman is directly responsible for weakening the love of scores of young men who attended Abilene Christian College in past years—yet he is again put before city, school and church, as heing fully indorsed. These hreseten should not wonder about being doubted for soundness and censured for softness. What shall we do with the Doctors (?) that are among us?

A Deep Impression

The Christian Standard says: “A deep impression was made by a telegram from Sherman, Texas. It was signed by Homer Strong, minister of the First Christian Church, and A. R. Holton, minister of the Central Church of Christ. They expressed themselves as being greatly interested in the Detroit meeting, said they were praying for God’s guidance in its deliberations, and indicated their own willingness to further the cause of unity.” At this rate there may soon be unity at Sherman—but with what and with whom?
“The New Number Two”

The publisher of “Great Songs of the Church—Number Two” sent the editor of this paper a complimentary copy of his new edition. It is understood that a comment of some kind is expected from those who receive complimentary books. First, there is no reason to excuse for publishing a songbook from sectarian sources, without editing the error out of the songs, and calling the book “Great Songs of the Church.” Great songs of what church? As well compile a book of sectarian sermons and call it “Great Sermons of the Church!”

When the book under reference was published it was advertised as a permanent book, and recommended for life. But now “The New Number Two” is on the market. Why? The old book had many premillennial songs in it. Some of these have been left out of Number Two—purely for propaganda—but there are the original objections to the Number Two. It is yet affiliated with the factional party in the church headed by R. H. Boll, and is their great chest financial asset. Why should churches of Christ turn their wherewith to promote these heresies?

This writer is not a poet, nor the son of a poet, nor kin to a poet, but—

If you would the church be pure,
Use songbooks that we know are sure;
Yield not to all the fickle lure,
The Boll promoters do adjure.

The truth in song is very solemn,
Be not arrayed in Boll’s book column;
For that is what the crew will do
To those who buy their Number Two.

Published by men who are untrue,
The Number Two just will not do;
For gospel songs let’s join in action
Against this truth destroying faction.

Sure after due deliberation,
No loyal church will make donation
Or join this group in such relation
To aid in gospel desecration.

For loyalty’s sake, and truth’s devotion,
Contribute not to heresy’s promotion
Of the Boll and Jorgenson foolish notion
Condensed to music’s soothing lotion.

To the church of Christ we should be true,
To the gospel truth bid no adieu;
Nor faithful preaching should we undo,
Buying the book called Number Two.

For further information on the affiliations which make the Jorgenson songbook unsuitable to churches of Christ, read the article in the next issue of this paper.