Paul was a solid wall of defense against the encroachment of Judaism in his day. He refused to circumcise Titus before sending him to Judaism would "bring us into bondage." He resisted Jewish demands "that the truth of the gospel might continue with you." (Gal. 2: 5, 6.) The die-hards in the church who put their "confidence in the flesh" and who sought to make a Jewish sect of the church, were called "dogs," "evil workers," "the concision." (Phil. 3 : 2.)

Paul's treatment of the issue turns a bright light on the peculiar form of Judaism in the church we are fighting today. The exaltation of Christ and the establishment of the church permanently cancelled any hope the Jew might entertain based on "the flesh." Paul in pointed and precise terms vetoes all fleshly claims. "For we are the circumcision, who worship by the Spirit of God, and glory in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh." (Phil. 3 : 3.) "We are" implies a "they were." Those who are preaching a future reign of Christ on earth and a restoration of fleshly Israel are under the delusion that the "they were" still "are." The issue resolves itself into the simple question: "who are?" "They are" shout the future kingdom advocates. "We are" says Paul. We hold with Paul. But we who? Members of the church, Christians. We have been baptized into Christ and are his. "And if ye are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise." (Gal. 3 : 29.) We have a new Israel, the church. The old is no more.

"We are the circumcision." Circumcision was the peculiar, fleshly mark of the Jew. It was vital. The uncircumcised was to be cut off from his people. So significant was this mark we find that the nation of Israel was not only known as "the house of Jacob" but also as "the circumcision." Brother Boll tells us in Word and Work that "the only 'spiritual Israel' there is, is that part of natural Israel that has been born again in Christ." It would be as reasonable to assert that the only spiritual circumcision there is, is that part of the fleshly circumcision that has been born again in Christ. Brother Boll is wrong, as usual, when he goes on a rampage on his hobby. Paul says that "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: 16.) A man must have a thick veil of Judaism over his heart who can't see that "the Israel of God" in this text is the new Israel, the holy nation of new creatures as Christ, "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 is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new." (2 Cor. 5: 16, 17.) These new creatures in Christ are now "the circumcision." "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.)

"Some seem to be terribly upset over "a spiritual and figurative fulfillment" of certain Old Testament promises. You would think that Paul and his methods were unknown to them. It is a pitiful quibble that recognizes the church as "the circumcision" and the only circumcision there is at that; and yet seeks to distinguish it from "the Israel of God." It is this new Israel which is now enjoying the "holy and sure blessings of David" under the reign of David's son and heir. (Acts 13: 34.) With Paul "the holy and sure blessings of David" were gospel blessings, and "the circumcision" was the church. This is all too "spiritual and figurative" for a materialist to understand. The whole trend of their philosophy sounds like an argument with Paul.

Paul admits that the fleshly marks that distinguished national Israel "were gain to him at one time. It was a fancied "gain," an illusion. He only thought these things were "gain" to him and he was mistaken if his view. This was before he became a Christian. It seems that some Gentile preachers today, who write and talk against sectarianism, fancy that being a Jew with less distinction than Paul enjoyed will be a decided gain to them, when the Lord returns. They are wrong about it. Paul enumerates these points of "gain" in the third chapter of Philippians and said that he had "yet more" occasion to glory in them and put his "confidence in the flesh" than any of them had. "Howbeit what things were gain to me, these have I counted loss for Christ." (Phil. 3 : 7.) He expressed his contempt for them in severe terms that ought to shame the theorists of future Jewish glory into silence. I "do count

(Continued on page five)
CONCERNING COLLEGES

In the current controversy among the brethren over the sphere of the school, the college and the church, certain colleges are themselves the aggressors. The controversy will be just as easily stopped as it was started-just let the schools abandon their departures, discontinue their objectionable practices, reform their worldliness, cease to infringe on the divine principle of the independence of the church from all human institutions, and quit imposing on congregations, and all will be well. In short, let the college stay in its place, and let the church alone.

For an example of the aggression mentioned, one of the leaders of the campaign to put the college in the budget of the churches closed an article with the statement that if it is not right to put the college in the budget, then he would join Daniel Sommer and be done with it. In other words, he will have it this way or no way! It is that "this way or no way!" spirit that has always driven the wedges, forcing issues upon the brethren, then blaming those in honest opposition to their schemes for resultant dissensions. It was so in the regressive movement that split the church. It has been so in the "Boll movement" which says "we will have our theories." It is now so in the present controversy with the colleges whose leader and mouthpiece says "we will have the budget or nothing." In that case the brethren should see to it that it will be nothing-from the churches. With this announced attitude the colleges can blame no one but themselves for the growing opposition to them, or for any division or alienation that may arise over the discussions.

We are charged with having attacked the colleges, with being anti-college, and withal of an attempt to destroy these institutions. But to the contrary this editor himself attended one in early life, has for several years had his children in them at intervals, and if when his younger children grow up there is yet one of the colleges true to the principles we believe he will likely continue his patronage.

Nobody engaged in the present controversy is fighting the college. Neither the Bible Banner nor its editor is. The Firm Foundation and its editor are not. We are simply opposed to the extremes to which the colleges in question have gone, to their worldliness, to their tendency toward ecclesiastical control, to their doctrinal weakness, and to their general departures. We are not alone in this. Some of the trustees of these institutions admit the things that have been charged, recognize the conditions as they exist and have expressed themselves as desiring to perform the needed reforms. If all those in the high places were of the same mind, and others upon whom they have apparently depended for leadership, were of the same disposition, the institutions could speedily win back the individual confidence and support of that great host of brethren who are now set against their practices.

Since it has been charged that the present writer is creating an issue and his convictions on this question are of recent origin, it will not be considered amiss, perhaps, to reproduce some editorials which appeared in the Gospel Advocate several years ago while the editor of the Bible Banner was then editor of the Gospel Advocate. That all may know that no change in positions has been made, and in refutation of such charges as are going around that "thou art mad" and "thou art beside thyself," and to show that the attitude held now toward the colleges is precisely the same as the attitude held then, the following editorials are resubmitted.

The Church and the School

The subjects of 1931 and education are very intimately related, if not inseparably connected. The interrogation of David, "What is man?" has become the question of the ages and the problem of the sages. But David did not leave it for the worldly-wise philosopher, by his own rationalization, to determine; for he answers: "Know ye that Jehovah, he is God: it is he that hath made us, and we are his." Man is not the creature of chance or evolution. Made in the image of God, he possesses reason, affection and conscience. Lifted above the creature of automatic instinct, he is more than a creature: he is a child of God. What, then should his education be? And here, alongside the question "What is man?" is presented another of but little less importance-What is education? The word signifies complete development. It does not consist merely in the art of learning to read and write or to cipher. It is not the acquisition of languages, living or dead. It involves the development of the whole being-body, mind, and soul.

This view of man and his education leads to the subject of the "Bible colleges"-their place and work in the field of education. If education consists of the training of the intellect, we need have no concern for the establishment and maintenance of such colleges. But it is the keenly felt need of heart training that has brought the "Bible college" into existence. Education has its degrees; and, grammatically speaking, physical culture is the positive degree, intellectual culture is the comparative degree and moral culture is the superlative degree. Hence the demand for schools that will give emphasis to the moral above every other line of human development. The Bible being the greatest textbook of morals in the universe, it is but a matter of simple reason that it should be prescribed in the course of study by a school seeking to reach the heart, as well as the mind. Because the Bible has thus been adopted by such schools, they have become "Bible colleges," while in fact, every other branch of learning found in all colleges of arts and sciences is also taught.

But the name "Bible college" has caused so much confusion in the minds of so many that it becomes necessary to discuss the relation of the school and the church. Let us compare the work of the church with the work of the school in seeking to obtain the correct answer to the questions involved. The Bible teaches that the work of the church is twofold. First, missionary, pertaining to the spread of the gospel-the salvation of souls. Hence, the church is called "the pillar and ground of the truth." Second, benevolent, pertaining to the care of the poor, orphan, or aged. This is referred to as "pure religion." The Bible further teaches that the church is all-sufficient to carry out this divine mission without the aid of human machinery. Any organization larger or smaller than the local congregation is an unscriptural organization through which to do the work of the church, and takes away from it the praise and glory. Therefore, we condemn the missionary society as an auxiliary to the church, a human machine seeking to do the work that God has commanded his church to do. We pronounce it, without further argument here, unscriptural.

What, then, is the "Bible college?" It is an auxiliary indeed, but not to the church. Let us observe in this connection the mission of the home and the duty of parents toward their children. Solomon said: "Train up a child in the way he should go." Paul said: "Bring them up in..."
the nurture and admonition of the Lord." This is the solemn obligation of the parent and the sacred mission of the home. But when the child reaches a certain school age, when it must pass from the home into the school, does the responsibility of the parent cease? Is it not still the serious duty of the parent to select the school where the influence of the home is continued? In this matter, then, the school simply takes the place of the home and the teacher assumes the responsibility of the parent. So the "Bible college," or the "Christian college," or whatever you may please to call it, is no more than auxiliary to the home. It supplements the work of the home. Some who have not made proper discrimination have wrought confusion by associating the "Bible college" with the work of the church. Others have, therefore, opposed it on the ground that it is a "church school," while others think it is wrong and sinful to teach the Bible in school. Such a conclusion should drive the Bible from our homes also and force the conclusion that it can be taught only in the meetinghouse on Sunday!

These principles are fundamental. Let us draw the lines clearly. We have pointed out the central thought of the subject—namely, the school as an auxiliary of the home. This being true, it is not the business of the church to run it. The church is not in the school business. The only way the church can Scripturally do its work is through the elders of the local congregation. Appeals made to churches, therefore, in behalf of schools are wrong-fundamentally wrong-wrong in principle. Let the school stand where it belongs, apart from the church, as an aid to, and adjunct of, the home. Let parents and individuals realize their duty and feel their responsibility in the support and maintenance of them, thus making it possible for our children and our neighbors' children to have the training and influence they so much need and deserve.

The foregoing editorial did not create any stir, nobody accused the writer of being angry, but the articles were read apparently with considerable interest, judging from a volume of letters that were received at the time. Some of them were in approval, others in wholesome, not partisan, criticism.

A second editorial appeared shortly afterward in answer to some questions elicited from the first article. As further bearing on the purposes above stated it is also reproduced.

The Home and the School

The following from W. H. Thorp, of Middletown, Ky., touches some vital principles. It manifests sincerity and the questions indicate thought. We are glad to insert the criticisms with further remarks on the subject.

In an editorial in the Gospel Advocate of June 4, 1931, on the subject, "Man and Education," I find some statements and reasoning that seem to me not to be above criticism.

You say that the Bible teaches that the work of the church is two-fold—first, missionary; second, benevolent; would it not be more exact to say that it is threefold—missionary, benevolent, and educational? The work of the missionary is primarily the making of disciples, which requires only such teaching as makes known the terms of discipleship; but "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" is a service of the church which requires Christian instruction through the years.

Now, it seems to me that the Bible college is auxiliary to the church in this very work of Christian education, since the Bible is the central subject to which all others are subordinate and subsidiary. But, granted for argument's sake that the Christian college is an adjunct to the home instead of the church, is it not then ancillary to a divine institution? The church and the home are both divine institutions, and your plea is that such institutions need no auxiliaries, but are complete in themselves for the work for which they were organized.

If, then, it is permissible to have a Bible college as an adjunct to the church in the work of education and an orphans' home in the work of benevolence, why not a missionary society in the work of evangelization? It seems to me the same principle which allows the one will allow all.

The foregoing represents a common failure to make proper discrimination. Innovation in church work and worship has often found impetus in the erroneous idea that whatever is proper in the home is permissible in the church. On that fallacy some have sought to justify the use of instrumental music in the church. When Paul heard that the Corinthians had turned the Lord's Supper into a church dinner, he scathingly asked: "What? have ye not houses to eat and to drink in?" What would have been entirely proper in home life was not at all permissible in the church. The same principle will apply to the work of the church as well as its worship.

To grant that the home is a divine institution does not warrant the conclusion that everything related to the home may have the same relation to the church. The state is also a divine institution. (Rom. 13.) Shall every auxiliary of the state be made adjuncts of the church? Should the home and the church fill distinctly different spheres. One is the sphere of moral right and privilege; the other is the realm of Scriptural authority. In the home, anything right, right in itself, is permissible; in the church, only what the New Testament authorizes, a "Thus saith the Lord." Christ is not only head of the church, but he is head over all things to the church. (Eph. 1: 22, 23.)

Secular education is not the work of the church. But Christian men and women have the same right to conduct such schools as they have to engage in the mercantile business, farming, banking, publishing papers, or any other honorable business. They also have the right as individuals to teach the Bible in such schools as in any other sphere of individual life. Such schools should not derive their name from the Bible any more than from science, mathematics, philosophy, and other knowledge it imparts. In choosing the atmosphere in which to educate their children, it is not only the right of parents, but their duty, to choose schools in which the influence of the home will be continued. The teacher assumes the responsibility of the parents and the school supplements the work of the home. It furnishes no parallel for institutions and organizations which supplant the church.

Whatever the church, as such, is compelled to do can be done only through the church. And the only way to do anything through the church is to do it through the local church, which is the only organization known in the New Testament. The missionary society performs the functions of the church. It stands between the church and the work being done. Its organization supersedes and usurps the organization and work of the church. The missionary society, therefore, supplants—displaces—the local church.

But individuals have certain rights and privileges. Individuals may publish papers or establish schools. They do not have the right to bar the Bible and religion from such in order to have the right to operate them. But such endeavors thus conducted are private enterprises, and the individuals conducting them have no right to "adjudge" their own enterprises to the church.

If it were "permissible to have a Bible college as an adjunct to the church in the work of education and an orphans' home in the work of benevolence," we quite agree that it would also be "permissible" to have the "missionary society in the work of evangelization." But the question assumes the point to be proved. Nothing is "permissible" as an auxiliary of the church which is not Scriptural. And it is not Scriptural for the church to delegate its work, either missionary or benevolent to boards and organizations other than the church. Bible colleges and institutional orphans' homes cannot be made adjuncts of the church,
Scripturally. The only way the church could Scripturally run a school or a home would be for the local church to undertake such work through its local organization-elders and deacons-in which case it would be the work of that congregation.

Institutionalism has been a menace to congregational independence as taught in the New Testament. It has wrought havoc to the church in the past, and growing tendencies present hazards for the future. The truth of this has been seen by the more conservative element in the Christian (digressive) Church. They are trying to swing back. But they cannot "swing" without swinging all the way back, and the spirit of digression which led them away from the church is the same. But not until complete reformation can there be restoration.

We should study more carefully and fully the simplicity of the work and worship of the New Testament church and resolve to follow apostolic teaching and example.

Special attention is called to a particular statement in the foregoing, as follows: "Institutionalism has been a menace to congregational independence as taught in the New Testament. It has wrought havoc in the church in the past and growing tendencies present hazards for the future. The writer has never at any time, in capacity of editor of The Bible Banner, or any other capacity, said anything more direct on the subject than the above statement. It precipitated no fight then, brought no accusations, and the writer was not charged with attacking the colleges. Why should such be done now? There must be a reason.

In response to still further inquiries and requests a third article on the same subject appeared almost in successive issues of the paper, and it is also reinserted here as proof upon proof that the position maintained by The Bible Banner now is not a late creation of an issue by the editor. We ask 'of the reader this further indulgence.

A Distinction with a Scriptural Difference

The letter inserted below is from a man who is true to the word of God, who is interested in every good work, but concerned about a certain tendency in the church to drift from New Testament principles:

Have re-read your editorial in the Gospel Advocate of July 2, and received new encouragement in my feeble efforts as well as an increase of interest in the Advocate. Now may I ask you to give a little further with the subject under consideration, as there are a few points I am unable to clearly settle?' Since Bible colleges and institutional homes for orphans are not adjuncts of the church and the church holds funds in its treasury contributed as a part of its religious duty as a church, can the local congregation spend such funds to build up the educational and benevolent institutions? Is there a distinction with a Scriptural difference in contributing money to these institutions and contributing money to the support of an orphan? Can a church not pay the hospital bill of one of its members in an institution of which it dare not become a stockholder or contributor to its building program? Is it not also true that a worthy boy or girl may be educated in our "Bible colleges," and yet wrong to use treasury funds of the church to aid in buildings?

1. The Mission of the School. It has been previously set forth that the school is auxiliary to the home, not the church. It is not the duty of the church to teach sciences, mathematics, history, economics, athletics, etc. Individuals may establish such schools and by the same right teach the Bible along with other courses. Wise parents choose such schools that furnish such teaching that the religious influence of the home may not be counteracted, but continued. But such schools being on a par with other secular and individual enterprises, such as religious papers and publishing houses, it is not the mission of the church to maintain them. There is certainly a "distinction with a Scriptural difference" between the mission of the home and the mission of the church, though they may touch at certain points affecting right teaching and Christian living.

Institutionalism has been a menace to congregational independence as taught in the New Testament. It has wrought havoc to the church in the past, and growing tendencies present hazards for the future. The truth of this has been seen by the more conservative element in the Christian (digressive) Church. They are trying to swing back. But they cannot "swing" without swinging all the way back, and the spirit of digression which led them away from the church is the same. But not until complete reformation can there be restoration.

We should study more carefully and fully the simplicity of the work and worship of the New Testament church and resolve to follow apostolic teaching and example.

Special attention is called to a particular statement in the foregoing, as follows: "Institutionalism has been a menace to congregational independence as taught in the New Testament. It has wrought havoc in the church in the past and growing tendencies present hazards for the future. The writer has never at any time, in capacity of editor of The Bible Banner, or any other capacity, said anything more direct on the subject than the above statement. It precipitated no fight then, brought no accusations, and the writer was not charged with attacking the colleges. Why should such be done now? There must be a reason.

In response to still further inquiries and requests a third article on the same subject appeared almost in successive issues of the paper, and it is also reinserted here as proof upon proof that the position maintained by The Bible Banner now is not a late creation of an issue by the editor. We ask 'of the reader this further indulgence.

A Distinction with a Scriptural Difference

The letter inserted below is from a man who is true to the word of God, who is interested in every good work, but concerned about a certain tendency in the church to drift from New Testament principles:

Have re-read your editorial in the Gospel Advocate of July 2, and received new encouragement in my feeble efforts as well as an increase of interest in the Advocate. Now may I ask you to give a little further with the subject under consideration, as there are a few points I am unable to clearly settle?' Since Bible colleges and institutional homes for orphans are not adjuncts of the church and the church holds funds in its treasury contributed as a part of its religious duty as a church, can the local congregation spend such funds to build up the educational and benevolent institutions? Is there a distinction with a Scriptural difference in contributing money to these institutions and contributing money to the support of an orphan? Can a church not pay the hospital bill of one of its members in an institution of which it dare not become a stockholder or contributor to its building program? Is it not also true that a worthy boy or girl may be educated in our "Bible colleges," and yet wrong to use treasury funds of the church to aid in buildings?

1. The Mission of the School. It has been previously set forth that the school is auxiliary to the home, not the church. It is not the duty of the church to teach sciences, mathematics, history, economics, athletics, etc. Individuals may establish such schools and by the same right teach the Bible along with other courses. Wise parents choose such schools that furnish such teaching that the religious influence of the home may not be counteracted, but continued. But such schools being on a par with other secular and individual enterprises, such as religious papers and publishing houses, it is not the mission of the church to maintain them. There is certainly a "distinction with a Scriptural difference" between the mission of the home and the mission of the church, though they may touch at certain points affecting right teaching and Christian living.

Since to establish and maintain such schools is not the mission of the church (such schools not belonging to the church, and therefore not "church schools"), the church should not be called upon to support them nor church funds diverted to maintain them any more than religious publishing houses and numerous other things an individual may have a perfect right to do.

Another letter, from my long-time friend and colaborer in the gospel, Austin Taylor, of Texas, makes the proper distinction:

It is plain enough to see that the church is to support the truth—the teaching of the gospel of Christ. But if the church is to support the teaching of athletics, mathematics, geography, etc., I would certainly like to know it. I am sure schools do not always make enough money to satisfy those who are running them; neither do newspapers receive enough money to satisfy the publishers. I have worked for months on songbooks that did not pay me anything. Should I call on the church to contribute monthly to me while I am in such work? I believe the work of the church is one thing and the Christian's life in dealing with individual affairs is another thing. There are many good things people may do as Christians that the church is not instructed to engage in.

If the foregoing statement does not represent sound reasoning, I am ready to limit confusion on the point.

2. The Mission of the Church. It has also been previously set forth that the mission of the church is twofold—missionary and benevolent. Any organization that supplants the church, takes over its functions, and as an organization does what the church is commanded to do, is in violation of a plain New Testament principle. Such organizations cannot be defended on the ground of system or method. The missionary society is not a method. It is an institution with its own working units and organization, and uses methods, or system. It usurps the functions of the church, taking the oversight of the work and the management of the funds out of the hands of the elders and deacons of the church and placing them in an entirely different organization. The missionary society, therefore, supplants the church in that phase of the work the church is commanded to do.

But the church as such is also commanded to do benevolent work. It is, therefore, on a par with missionary work, and for the same reason the church cannot Scripturally transfer the work of benevolence to any agency or institution that takes the work out of the hands of the elders and deacons of the church—the local church. Such organizations would supplant the church in benevolent work exactly as the society does in mission work.

This does not mean that a church cannot provide homes for the orphans and aged. The Charlotte Avenue Church, in Nashville, has several cottages built on their own property and is providing for several fatherless families, keeping each home intact, and it is all being done by the church through the divine arrangement of elders and deacons. Other churches can do the same. And if the burden of one church is too heavy, other churches can relieve the burden of that church (Acts 11:29, 30); for anything that one church has a right to do, another church has the right to help it do, provided that in so doing the elders of one church do not become agents for all the churches in certain undertakings that extend beyond the limits of the local church.

3. Helping Those in Need. The command to "do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." (Gal. 6:10), makes it the duty of the church to help those in need. If a family is in need, the church may surely pay the grocery bill, without going into the grocery business. If a poor man's rent is due and his family must have shelter, for the church to pay his rent would not put the church in the tenement business. Like-
wise, if a poor person is sick, the church may surely pay the doctor or the hospital. On the same principle the church may help some worthy young person go to school without going into the school business.

In each instance the church is in direct contact with the individual and the thing being done. It is the church helping the one in need—the very thing commanded. Nothing comes between the church and the thing done.

Individuals may become interested in certain worthy enterprises, such as publishing religious papers and running schools, and if they have the wherewith to engage in such, or can legitimately get it, well and good, but they have no right to start anything and make it the charge of the church.

May Christians learn the divine mission of the church and realize the error of devising human agencies to supplant the church in fulfilling that mission. “Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages.” (Eph. 3:21.)

These articles written in 1931, brought apparently no rise from the heads of the same colleges that are taking such great exceptions to the same criticisms now. Indeed, so sensitive now to criticisms have they become that two college presidents wrote demanding letters to me because of certain things they had heard were said in some public addresses. A correspondence followed. In order to counteract so much misrepresentation, and that others might see for themselves what was said, it was necessary to mimeograph the correspondence for general circulation. And now because the letters from these college presidents were answered with proof documentary of statements challenged, the presidents retreat and their partisan followers begin to cry persecution and charge that we have attacked the colleges. But ours was the defensive; theirs the offensive. These colleges are themselves the aggressors in the controversy. Their aggression must be repulsed, for if their present extremes are tolerated further more serious extremes will surely follow, as was so ably pointed out by the veteran W. W. Otey in the Firm Foundation of recent date, in an article all lovers of truth should read and appreciate.

Who are the enemies of the college, and who are its friends? Some of us believe that we who oppose their errors and seek to correct their evils are the real friends of the schools. We are not their enemies. The real enemies of the college are those who so loudly profess to be the friends of it. By their very efforts to affiliate church and school the thing done. It is the

THE BIBLE BANNER OFFICE TO OKLAHOMA CITY

At the time **The Bible Banner** was launched several places were under consideration for its permanent location and office. After due deliberation we have selected Oklahoma City as the home of **The Banner**. There are no papers published by our brethren in the State of Oklahoma, and Oklahoma City as an ideal central midwest location of such a thing. The editor and his family have many personal friends there, and enjoy the best of social and spiritual advantages among them.

Details in the organization of the company, completion of the staff, and opening of permanent quarters will be effected with dispatch and **The Bible Banner** will go forward. We ask all readers to make note of this change and address all correspondence to **The Bible Banner** Company, Post Office Box 1804, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
This “open letter to our editors” was published in the Christian Leader of June 21. Brother F. L. Rowe penned the following note to the letter:

The above letter from James DeForest Murch cannot be waved aside. Brother Murch states some truths that we are all only too familiar with. His letter suggests that we had better have a house cleaning first. His letter recalls a statement by J. D. Tant, about ten years ago, that we have about twenty groups among our “loyal brethren.” Brother Murch’s keen observation has revealed much of this confusion to him, and seeing and knowing of this confusion he would naturally feel impelled to write as he has.

Copies of this letter were sent to the editors of our church papers, some of whom will doubtless have something to say in early issues—E. L. R.

I have read “this open letter” two or three times, and I am unable to detect anything in it that would suggest a “keen observation.” The whole thing is a fabrication of sophistry of the thinnest variety. As to Brother Tant’s statement, he said a few years ago that ninety per cent of those who were baptized by the “located” preachers in Texas did not know the plan of salvation. That would only show that some of the “located” preachers in Texas do not know the plan of salvation, or they have quit preaching the gospel. I doubt that this deplorable condition is confined to Texas; but a unity meeting in Detroit is not the remedy. Such preachers ought to attend some Bible teacher’s classes, and read The Bible Banner.

In the late unity conference held in Detroit, Michigan, “the two great groups” were represented by Brother H. H. Adamson and James DeForest Murch as being four feet apart, each being two feet from the Bible, and therefore two feet from God. If Brother Adamson had been living in Lewisburg, Tennessee, where he used to live, I would have guessed he was two feet South of the Lord and Brother Murch two feet North! But since they both live in the North my observation is not “keen” enough to detect just what directions they were from the Lord. It seems to me however that after Brother Adamson and Brother Murch met halfway, and grasped hands on the Bible, Brother Murch’s “open letter” was unnecessary, unless he wanted to show the absurdities between Broth Ch Adamson and the Lord, while his two feet was paved with the silence of the Bible. Every Christian should want to know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth in religious matters. The Bible Banner is set in defense of this principle. No gospel preacher or writer can afford to handle the truth deceitfully, this principle is a part of my very being. With those thoughts before us we will notice Brother Murch’s “open letter,” and veiled questions.

AN OPEN LETTER TO OUR EDITORS

By James DeForest Murch

Cincinnati, Ohio
June 10, 1938

Editor Christian Leader,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Dear Sir:

I am writing you, and all the other editors of the periodicals published for the “Churches of Christ,” sincerely seeking information.

You may, or may not, know that I am deeply interested in the reunion of the two great groups which profess to be representative of the Restoration movement. I work and worship with that group which has been labeled “progressive” or “digressive.” I have attended all of the recent conferences looking toward eventual unity and have tried as best I could to discover the underlying point at which we who have so much in common, part company. I have listened to your men state their views. I have made it my business to read your periodicals and books. I have made inquiries and observations from actual contact with your churches in several states and I must confess I am more puzzled than ever about this point at which separation begins. I have many questions on my mind.

Brother Murch says, “I am sincerely seeking information.” There is nothing that gives me more pleasure than to help “sincere seekers” find the truth, so I gladly furnished Brother Murch the “information” he is seeking. He speaks of the two great groups. Jesus Christ says: “And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd.” (John 10: 16.) You see Brother Murch, you have one “group” too many, therefore one must be wrong. What we want to do, is not to unite the “two great groups”; but to dissolve the one that is wrong, and cannot be right. The dissolution would be painless and spontaneous—without even a “unity meeting” if the “group” that is wrong will substitute faith for opinions in the work and worship of the church. Paul says: “For we walk by faith, not by sight” (2 Cor. 5: 7). Brother Murch says: “I work and worship with that group which has been labeled progressive or digressive.” Progress means, “to move forward; grow; gain; advance; improve.” Peter says: “But grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ” (2 Pet. 3: 18). Therefore every Christian is either progressive, or he is spiritually dead or dying. So that label will not do for your “group” Brother Murch. Digress means, “to turn aside; go out of the way; deviate; wander.” I suppose that a man even with Brother Murch’s bedevolved vision would know that the “group” he worships with has turned aside from the “old paths,” and therefore the only label for them would be “digressives.” Again Brother Murch says: “I must confess I am more puzzled than ever about this point at which separation begins.” I am puzzled that a man with any information of the “Restoration movement” would be looking for the “point at which separation begins.” If Brother Murch will go back to 1849 when “The American Christian Missionary Society” was organized in Cincinnati, Ohio, and to 1859 when Dr. L. L. Pinkerton put a melodeon in the church at Midway, Kentucky, he will find where, and when the seed of separation was sown, and he will be near the time when separation began—not “begins.” And again he says:

I. FAITH

Before I begin asking for the information I desire, may I say this: I believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God and my personal Saviour. I have repented of my sin, confessed Christ before men, been immersed, re-
ceived the gift of the Holy Spirit and am
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are camouflaged and deceptive. A few years ago I was sitting in the park at McMinnville, Tennessee, one Saturday afternoon. Two Mormon preachers came along, and one preached on the conversion of Lydia and her household, he preached it just as any gospel preacher would have preached it. When he finished, he said: “I have quoted the King James Version, and this shows we believe the Bible.” I said: “Sir, do you believe the Bible is our last and final Revelation?” He said: “No, we believe there are, and will be other Revelations.” I said: “That is all I wanted you to tell these people.”

Brother Murch says: “I believe in the Bible as the Inspired revelation of God.” Now Brother Murch, do you believe that the plan of salvation, and the divine system of worship, have been revealed in the New Testament? And that human opinions must not enter the realm of either? If so, you are a Christian and I would gladly fellowship you. There is no place in the plan of salvation, or in that system of worship that owes its origin to divine authority, for either “opinion” or “liberty.”

II. PRACTICE

Now, I would follow another line of investigation. Again I state my position: I try to continue steadfastly in the apostles doctrine, in the fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers. I am evangelistic and try to win souls to Christ, preaching and persuading men by the everlasting Gospel. I try to be a Christian steward in all things, including the earthly goods which God has given me. I do not neglect the assembly on the first day of the week, where, among other things, I sing with the Spirit and understanding and make melody in my heart. I look upon the brethren in God’s Word as our occupation offers an otherwise strive to do those things which are well-pleasing to my Lord.

Second question: Am I a Christian in my practice, in so far as the above would indicate? If so, would you be willing to fellowship me as such? If not, what lack I yet?

Paul says: “I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also” . “Singing with grace in your hearts unto God.” “Singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord.” Brother Murch says: “Among other things, I sing with the Spirit and understanding, and make melody in your heart unto the Lord.”

Fifth question: Is it unscriptural for churches to have Bible classes and Sunday schools?

One of the qualifications of elders is apt to teach,” therefore teaching the Bible is the mission and business of the church. But the modern Sunday school with its superintendent, assistant, secretary, and treasurer, is a degenerate of denominationalism without precept, example, or necessary in-
ence in the word of God, and therefore must rest on the “silence of the Bible” as do all other inventions and devices of men.

Sixth question: Is it unscriptural to use quarters in the teaching set vice of the church?

The good or harm that may come from the use of quarters depends on the use made of them. If the teacher reads the question from the quarterly without knowing what it is all about, and some one reads the answer from the quarterly without getting what it means, they had just as well be fishing. If you have competent Bible teachers the quarters are useless; but if the teachers are without experience in Bible training the quarters may be used to great advantage.

Seventh question: Is it unscriptural for a local church to elect elders and deacons, rather than have them appointed by evangelists?

There is no record of a church appointing elders without an evangelist. “And when they had appointed for them elders in every church,” etc. (Acts 14: 23.) Paul told Timothy and Titus to appoint elders. But this does not mean that preachers can go into congregations that they have had nothing to do in establishing, and appoint elders without the wish, or request, of the congregation, neither does it license a preacher to put out old elders and appoint new ones. Brother Murch is not the only one that needs information along this line.

Eighth question: Are orphan’s homes unscriptural? Is it unscriptural for churches as such to support orphan’s homes?

James says: “Pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world” (James 1: 27). This shows it is the duty of the church to care for the widows and orphans in its midst. But the church with which I labor has neither the right nor reason to start something it knows cannot finance and then call upon all the churches to help, and anathematize every church that does not support its project. Church autonomy means that the church sees after its own affairs without being told by outsiders what to do. Recently I visited the “Boles’ Orphan Home,” near Quitlan, Texas, where Brother J. B. Nelson and his good wife are in charge, and I do not believe two better people could be found for the work. Sister E. F. Woodrow of Houston, Texas, an individual Christian, blessed with this world’s goods, had built a nice brick administration building. She had also built a nice nursery or building for the preschool age, in memory of her little granddaughter. I ate dinner in this home with the little fellows, and in all my life I have never been in a private
home where the children were more orderly, and showed better table manners than the little fellows. I wish every father and mother in the country could visit the home and see that it can be done—that children can be taught to behave at the table. But I am sure if it had not been for Sister Woodword’s liberality and interest in the home there would be a different story to tell and possibly the church brought into disrepute in the community, because the home could not have met its financial obligations.

Ninth question: Are Bible colleges unscriptural? Is it unscriptural for churches to support such colleges?

Educating our children is an individual responsibility and not the churches’ business. But since our state colleges and universities are honeycombed with infidelity and modernism, there is nothing more important for Christians to do than to build schools where their children can be educated free from the baneful influence of modern educational bunk. But there should be no schools dominating the churches.

Tenth question: Is it unscriptural to have “located” ministers receiving a “stated salary”?

As to how long a preacher should stay with a congregation, and what salary he should receive, are matters of opinion, and should be decided by the elders and the preacher.

Eleventh question: Is it unscriptural to use choirs, quartets, or organized groups to lead the congregation in singing or to render “special music” apart from the congregation in worship?

There is neither precept or example for such performances in New Testament worship. It is only a morbid desire to be like the denominations around us that suggests such things.

Twelfth question: Is it unscriptural to serve meals in the church building?

That depends on what they are served for.

Thirteenth question: Is it unscriptural to use an instrument to amplify the voice of the preacher or song leader in worship?

If you have a large crowd it would be no more unscriptural to use an “instrument to amplify the preacher’s voice” so he could be heard than it would be for him to be bawling to the top of his voice so he could be heard. You have nothing here Brother Rлуч.

Fourteenth question: Is it unscriptural for churches to send money to foreign missionaries through some third party or agent and for missionaries to obtain support through same?

No. It could hardly be done any other way. If the church selects a preacher, sends him to some new field to preach, and mails his check direct to him, the post office would be the “third party.” But that would not be a missionary society, taking the money of the churches, selecting the preachers and sending them where they want them to go, without even consulting the churches.

Fifteenth question: Is it unscriptural to believe that Christ will come before the millennium? Should such belief, or the so-called “millennial” or postmillennial view, be made a test of fellowship?

This premillennial foolishness has honeycombed, and caused trouble in all the denominational churches, and it is splitting the churches of Christ into bitter factions. Paul says: “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that cause the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them” (Rom. 16: 17).

Sixteenth question: Is it unscriptural to recognize the names of the “weak brother” (in the matters mentioned in section II) so as to preserve the unity and peace of the local church?

Paul says: “But him that is weak in faith receive ye, yet not for decision of scruples” (Rom. 14: 1). That is exactly how far we go in recognizing the scruples of a weak brother. Let him keep his scruples and opinions to himself and not try to force them upon the church.

Eighteenth question: What relationship does “unscriptural practice” have toward recognition or non-recognition in these lists? Who is responsible for eliminating the names of the unworthy? By what authority do they act?

The worthy are, or should be responsible for eliminating the names of the unworthy. Their authority is Rom. 16: 17. As to the United States Government’s Religious Census, the government is responsible for its own acts. I suppose the government learned the difference between the churches of Christ and the denominational churches, just as I learned the difference between the Methodist and Baptist “groups” by reading the religious papers and books, I hope Brother Mуч will be kind enough to give this “information” to the readers of the Christian Standard. They need it.

Spiritual Bogies

0. C. Lambert

Though we may sometimes fail to become alarmed when we should, we also see “bogies” when they exist only in imagination. The Catholic Church is afraid the members might spill some of the fruit of the vine, they say, so they take it away from them. The Lord had no such fears.

The Baptists say: “It is most likely that in the Apostolic age when there was but ‘one Lord, one faith, and one baptism, and no differing denominations existed, the baptism of a convert by that very act constituted him a member of the church, and at once endowed him with all the rights and privileges of full membership. In that sense, ‘baptism was the door into the church. Now, it is different; and while the churches are desirous of receiving members, they are wary and cautious that they do not receive unworthy persons.” The churches therefore have candidates come before them, make their statement, give their ‘experience,’ and then their reception is decided by a vote of the members.” (Hiscox’s Manual, p. 22.) If the Lord had seen the danger that Baptists thought they saw he could have fixed it like the Baptists, but he did not.

Sometime we are told that if we speak of the church as “Church of Christ,” or “Church of God,” we make a denomination of it. If the Lord had entertained any such fears we could not read of the “churches of Christ” and “church of God” in the New Testament.

But we are told that we are liable to include less than all of God’s children if we use those terms. But the Lord himself had no such fears.

The church in the aggregate sense includes all of God’s family, but in the local sense includes all who worship together. A child of God living in a city is not a member of a local congregation unless he “congregates.” To speak of the church of Christ at a certain street address includes all who worship at that place, and no more. A Christian might be a member of a certain congregation for years and then join the Baptists, or some other denomination. He does not cease at that moment to be a child of God, though he sinned in so doing and remains in sin so long as he remains a member of a denomination. He is an erring child of God like the fellow who gets drunk. He then is a member of the church of God in the aggregate sense and also a member of the Baptist Church. Though he is a member, still, of the church of God in the aggregate sense, he is no longer a member of the local congregation.
The same is true of the child of God who refuses any longer to assemble for worship. He is an erring member of the church in the aggregate sense but is no longer a member of the local congregation. A letter of commendation from one congregation to another is not "membership." One is a member of the congregation with which he congregates.

It is said that the expressions "churches of Christ" and "church of God" are not names. This is indeed a strange position. It is well known that the Greek word ekklesia, translated usually by the word church, was in common use for hundreds of years before the church of the Lord was established or the New Testament written. So the word church, does not properly designate the divine institution. But it is asked: Does not the New Testament speak sometimes simply of the church? Yes, but that is an elliptical expression. When it is used those to whom it was spoken knew that it was not a mob, a civil court, or the Jewish church.

To be allowed only to use an expression which might mean any one of many things reminds me of the man whose name was Robert Fountain Garrett. He had two boys and they were both named Robert Fountain Garrett. The wife avoided confusion by calling the old man Robert Fount, and one of the boys Robbie Fount, and the other one Bobbie Fount. So, after all, they had different names.

What is a name? "A word or term embodying any knowledge, notion, or conception so as to fix and make it subject to record and recall for future or common use in the process or interchange of thought." (New Standard Dictionary.) The expressions above mentioned do this: therefore, they are names of the church. Whatever a thing is called, that is its name. I once saw a brand of cosmetics—the no-name brand. No-name was its name! But the Lord does not have a no-name church.

The Church of Christ? Because Christ built it (Matt. 16:18); bought it (Acts 20:28; Eph. 5:25); is head of it (Eph. 5:23); married to it (Rom. 7:4; John 3:29); it is his body (Eph. 1:22, 23); called it "my church" (Matt. 16:18); and, congregations were called churches of Christ (Rom. 16:16).

Why Is It Called Church of God? Because "all things that the Father hath are mine." (John 16:15.)

The Bible teaches justification by faith. It does not teach we are saved by faith only. "Ye see that by works a man is justified and not by faith only." There is a vast difference between justification by faith and justification by faith only. The degree of faith that saves is the obedient faith. (Rom. 1:16:26). It takes perfect faith to save and faith is perfected in obedience. (Rom. 5:1). It is a plain contradiction of the word of God to say that a man can be saved by faith only. Obedience is taught all through the New Testament. The following scriptures will illustrate this point:

1. One must obey to enter the kingdom. (Matt. 7:21).
2. The only way to be the servant of Christ is to obey Him. (Rom. 6:16).
3. The foundation of a Christian life will not meet God's approval unless obedience is included in it. (Matt. 7:24-27).
4. Christ is the author of eternal salvation only to those who obey Him. (Heb. 5:9).

Whatever justification by faith might mean it is certain that it includes obedience. "Being therefore justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom.5:1). When faith justifies the believer has peace. However, Paul had faith several days before he had peace. If faith only saves, Paul would have had peace the moment he believed. Since he did not have peace the moment he believed it is proof conclusive that he was not at that moment justified. Faith was engendered in the heart of Paul while he was on the road to Damascus. (Acts 9). When the Lord appeared to Paul (Saul) on the Damascus highway he believed but did not have peace until three days later. Peace came into his life when, in obedience to the will of God, he arose and was baptized. (Acts 22:16). Jesus says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Therefore, when Paul was baptized he was saved.

It is contended by sectarian preachers that Paul was saved on the Damascus road the moment he believed. Paul was not saved on the way to Damascus as may be seen from the following:

1. If Paul were saved on the Damascus highway, he did not know it.

After Paul had believed he cried out. "What shall I do, Lord?" Is it not strange, in view of denominational teaching that the Lord did not say, "Do nothing, Saul, you are a believer now, therefore you are saved." Sectarian preachers say, "When you are saved you will know it." Their strongest argument is, "I am saved because I know it." If he were saved the moment he believed he did not know it. According to the teaching of the sects Paul could not have been saved on the Damascus road or he would have known it.

2. If Saul were saved at the point of faith the Lord did not know it.

The Lord says to Paul, a penitent believer, "Arise, enter into the city and it shall be told thee what thou must do." The very fact that the Lord did not recognize Paul as a saved man the moment he believed is proof beyond a doubt that he was not saved. If Saul were a saved man surely the Lord would have known it. And if the Lord knew Paul was saved why did He tell him to go to the city where it would be told him what to do?

3. If Saul were saved on the Damascus highway the Lord told a falsehood.

Jesus said, "Arise, and go into Damasc us and there it shall be told thee all things which are appointed for thee to do" (Acts 22:10). The Lord was very specific as to where Saul was to be told what he must do. "Arise and go," says He, "into Damascus" and "there," not here, but "there," in Damascus, it shall be told thee what to do. It was there, fore in Damascus where Paul learned what to do to be saved and did it.

4. If Saul were saved on the Damascus highway Ananias did not know it.

When Ananias came to Saul, he said: "And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name" (Acts 22:16). Paul was yet in his sins if Ananias told the truth. Ananias did tell the truth, Baptist preachers to the contrary notwithstanding.

5. If Saul were saved on the Damascus highway he was the most miserable saved man I ever read about.

Saul was led by the hand to Damascus, "and he was three days without sight, neither did he eat nor drink" (Acts 9:9). Note the change in Paul after he obeys the will of the Lord. While yet in his sins, even though a penitent believer, he did not have peace. After he arose and was baptized to wash away his sins he took food and was strengthened. (Acts 9:18; 22:16). Paul had peace after he obeyed in baptism. Therefore, justification by faith includes baptism. When Paul believed and was baptized he had peace was justified.

Since Saul, the Lord and Ananias did not know that Saul was saved on the Damascus highway, pray tell me how sectarian preachers found it out.
The Churches of Christ in Oklahoma City

It is refreshing to find a thriving western city where the church is flourishing. As a metropolis, Oklahoma City is comparatively young; so is the church. The writer remembers when the church was established in Oklahoma City. It has had a steady growth through the years, and best of all along strictly sound lines, adhering always to New Testament principles.

The Tenth and Francis Streets Church is the original and still the largest congregation. The elders of this congregation have had an exceptional measure of grace and wisdom and knowledge of the New Testament, and they have been fortunate and blessed in their selection of gospel preachers both as evangelists to conduct their meetings and as preachers to live and labor with them, for no divisions have come among them, and no heresies have been taught. Thus loyal to the New Testament in teaching, work and worship, the Tenth and Francis Streets Church has grown from a few dozen members to a thousand.

The Capitol Hill Church had its beginning in 1923. It was the writer's privilege to do the preaching in the meeting that resulted in the establishment of this congregation. It was the evangelistic spirit of the Tenth and Francis Streets Church that made it possible. Starting with some thirty or forty members, the Capitol Hill Church has grown into a congregation of near a half-thousand and is doing a commendable work, indeed, in a busy, industrial section of Oklahoma City. It was the Capitol Hill Church that promoted and supported, with the aid of others, the Webber-Wallace Debate in the Coliseum last December, where as high as 6,000 people assembled to hear Bible issues debated. We believe such discussions will always be fruitful, one of the immediate benefits of which is to call the attention of a great public to the existence and presence and diligence of the New Testament church at their very doors.

The most recently established congregation is the Culberson Heights Church. The Tenth and Francis Streets Church backed the establishment of this congregation also, and some of her most able members, including a long-time elder, went to this new congregation. It is a fine example of how churches can be established without divisions and factions. Already the Culberson Heights Church has begun its good works. They engaged R. N. Hogan for a month's meeting among the colored people—one hundred and one were baptized and a colored church of about one hundred and twenty-five members was established. Now they are purchasing property, and making arrangements to support a colored preacher full time to make the work permanent. Compare this with that type of so-called missionary work that sends thousands upon thousands of dollars into a “foreign field” where with forty years of “missionary work” self-supporting churches have not been established!

While the Hogan meeting was in progress C. E. McCaughey, preacher for Tenth and Francis, also conducted a meeting on the lawn of the church premises, and more than sixty were baptized in that meeting. This is another good example. Instead of all the white brethren crowding the negroes out, the separate meetings were being held. Brother Rue Porter was holding forth at Capitol Hill at the same time—and a general gospel bombardment was being waged in Oklahoma City, the results of which were definite and decisive.

The elders of the Tenth and Francis Church are A. W. Lee, L. E. Diamond, L. J. Estes, and Brother Blackwell. Brethren Lee, Diamond, and Blackwell have been elders through all of the progress of the church, Brother Estes having only recently been added (wisely so) to the eldership. Brother C. E. McCaughey is their evangelist.

The elders of the Culberson Heights Church are Frank Winters (formerly an elder of Tenth and Francis) and George Patterson. Brother Barton having moved away shortly after the formation of the congregation, Cleo E. Wallace and K. C. Moser have done their preaching thus far. John Bannister begins work with them September 1.

The elders of the Capitol Hill Church are Brethren Ward and Bost, and Jesse F. Wiseman is their preacher. It was Brother Wiseman who first locked horns with Doctor Webber and who with much patience and determination succeeded in securing all arrangements for the Coliseum debate. May his tribe increase.

The writer's travels have been far and wide but nowhere has he found the church quite so satisfactorily progressing as in Oklahoma City. It is a delight to be among them.

The Campaign for a Paper Combination

A circular is being mailed over the brotherhood in behalf of modern journalism. The effort seems to be to enlist all the preachers in a campaign against plain writing and preaching. Some editor is being sought who is a graduated specialist in journalism and who has been educated and trained to write without calling names. It registers definite opposition to personalities, even to the point of getting very personal itself. There are more personalities implied in the circular than have ever been employed by most writers it criticizes-personal reflections that insinuate without calling names, the most ignoble of all personalities. The following comments from Hugo McCord, one of our most brilliant young men who is fast developing into a vigorous and accomplished writer, expresses the sentiments of this editor better than he can express it himself. It is worthy of careful reading.

Religious Journalism

"All of us are interested in anything that makes our writing more effective. Such an interest is being manifested in the questionnaire that is being sent to the preachers, apparently all of the preachers among churches of Christ, especially those who are not regular writers for the religious papers. It emphasizes the technique of writing, desires to help us get attention. I would that I had the privilege of a graduate course in journalism. Yet it seems there are some hurtful things insinuated by this questionnaire.

"It says that in the brotherhood there are so many thousand trained and experienced preachers, but only a few dozen such writers. Hence,
many times the competition in the preaching field that we have in the writing field. If the figures are true, even then, when preaching and writing become competitive something is wrong. In the athletic and business world there is competition, but in Christianity there can be none. Brother H. Leo Boles once told the story of an old preacher who, instead of being jealous and filled with the competitive spirit, said: 'I wish that every preacher in the world could preach better than I.' In the track meet one wants to outdo his opponent; in Christ those running with him are not his opponents, and he wants them to do even better than he if at all possible. To me, therefore, it is a mistake to say that one of my opportunities, if I learn to be an effective writer, is that I shall be in an exclusive field, where the competition is less warm. That is a jealous, a purely selfish attitude that does not become a Christian. And that same ugly and competitive attitude is shown again when it is asked if preachers have been afraid that the influence of certain papers would be exalted against them, unfairly, and injure their prospects as local preachers and evangelists. Consecrated gospel preachers never have been and never will be worried about their calls to churches to locate or to hold meetings. They, instead, live pure lives and do all the good they can, and resort not to low tricks of politics or of newspaper propaganda to get jobs. God's servant is not interested in a job; the ministry to him is not a profession; he is going to live right and save souls regardless of any calls to churches for located work or to hold meetings. This questionnaire leaves the impression that it is appealing to job seekers and salary hunters.

"Our papers are condemned with an inference that they unfairly criticize preachers. No gospel preacher is afraid of criticism. If the criticism is just, he will profit by it; if it is unjust, he is not worried, for his Lord knows all things. 'But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment: yea, I judge not mine own self; but he that judgeth me is the Lord.' (1 Cor. 4: 3, 4.) Preachers that are afraid of criticism and cry persecution make me sick. If a man lives right and preaches the whole counsel of God he won't be crying that a paper keeps him from getting a fat job. Whoever put the author of this questionnaire up to this needs some criticism. Whoever that bold man was, in the background, who has spurred the critic to send out such a questionnaire, is one of Our preachers who does not call names. He is tactful. He does not believe in impersonating. He believes the old saying, 'Preach the gospel and let other folks alone!' But someone, hiding in the background, he goads another to criticize another preacher, and the result is directed insinuations! Such is called tact and diplomacy; anybody that knows calls it cowardice. The questionnaire (Charlie McCarthy) asks if you like those articles that criticize another writer by name rather than condemning his false teaching, he not only does wrong, he is contemptible. But the New Testament model is to criticize by name and by condemning the teaching."-H.W. McCrop.

The combination that has been suggested to coordinate certain colleges and the proposed paper into one financial organization would, of course, set out at once to control schools, churches, and preachers, and it would be hard to imagine anything more menacing to the New Testament Church.

Under the Juniper Tree

It seems that one of the doctors among us has something like Elijah of old; he hied himself "a day's journey into the wilderness" and "sat down under a juniper-tree." Elijah asked the Lord to kill him, seeing as how he was the only one left and they were after him. As I see it, our brother under the juniper tree has far less provocation than Elijah but seems to be no less lonely and gloomy. It is generally known that he is addicted to such "spells" but this one seems to be abnormally aggravated. He speaks in the Gospel Advocate of July 28 after this fashion. He proposes to tell us "in cruel words of truth" exactly what is the matter with us.

Our big men are dead. We have men of little souls and little attainments now in big places and reckoned as BIG PREACHERS. Little souls could never be anything but ARBITRARY DICTATORS. Hence, they are saying: "You must not only approve my style, my method, my manner, BUT YOU MUST DOGGERELIZE my ungodly behavior and imitate my coarseness, or you will be promptly, circularized—an encyclical will be issued against you— and you will be excommunicated.

This is our trouble, and there is no mistake about it. This is the doctor's diagnosis of the case but I can't tell just whether he thinks the patient will die or get well. He thinks we ought not to "even let this wickedness continue" but I have the impression that he doesn't know exactly what "we" are going to do about it. I'm mildly interested in "we" of course, but being neither a doctor nor a "big man" it looks more to me in this case like the doctor has a case of indigestion. At the moment "we" look better to me than he does, even though he does seem to be cocksure of himself. But then this particular doctor always is.

"Our big men," whatever that means, may all be dead, but according to my grasp of the situation we still have a few medium-sized ones who will refuse to be decayed away from live issues that affect the church, to enter into a childish discussion of who is greatest in the kingdom. And they are plenty big to attend to the particular brand of false teachers who seek to corrupt the gospel with Judaism and materialism.

Speaking of "coarseness," the doctor's diagnosis isn't exactly perfumed with culture and gentle manners. He is irritated enough to remind One Of The woman in the doggerel:

0. woman! She's the saddest of the saddest.
When she's sad, her sadness is so great
And the gladdest of the gladdest,
When she's glad,
But her sadness and her gladness,
And no patchin' for her madness.
When she's marl.

-C. E. W.

Real Unity

Sprinkled among the items of news in the weekly reports are stories of reunion. Congregations which have been torn and dismembered are being reunited. Factions are being brought together, confessing their sins, and the cause attains oneness. It is devoutly hoped that these are not mere whitewashings, but spiritual reuni"dons, that is the real unity. It is the only unity talked about and commanded in the Scriptures-the unity of God's people. The New Testament says not one word about the kind of unity that is being discussed in meetings in Detroit, Cincinnati, and Indianapolis; it has much to say about the kind of unity in which so many congregations are lacking. Those who are already united upon the truth should get along with one another. If they are not planted upon the truth there should be no unity. Having the truth, they should "keep" the unity of the Spirit.

Not many outsiders know anything about, or care anything about, what takes place at the unity meetings. But thousands of them are watching the congregations function. Nothing closes the door of opportunity more securely than for the congregation to divide. When it does, it plays right into Satan's hands. It is high time we began talking unity where unity can be found, and where it is so much needed.
Use a Little Seasoning

The editor has made it clear that he is not running in competition with such weeklies as the Gospel Advocate, Firm Foundation, and Christian Worker. These are good papers and doubtless fill the calorie requirements of bread, meat and vegetables, salads, and even desserts. You'll want some salt and pepper to go with it. Read The Bible Banner. And you'll get some variety servings of other things, too, with the possible exception of desserts. It is our opinion that most of the brethren have had more sweetening than is good for them. Some of them already have "sugar diabetes." If you don't like salt and pepper, better lay off The Banner.—C. E. W.

A Cappella Concert Canceled!

The editor has the following from his friend, L. N. Moody, Vernon, Texas: "The A Cappella Chorus planned to sing here. It was in the paper that the 'A Cappella Chorus' would give a concert at the church of Christ. We called the paper, and they said the report came from the college. We sent them a wire not to come—1 mean by we—there. Did it?"

Knowing the elders of the Vernon Church as we do, Bro. Moody, did not have to explain who cancelled the "concert." If elders of all the churches in Texas would manifest the same independence the Vernon Church did in this case, there would be no college control of the churches. But if the college continues to "concert" the churches, succeeds with the campaign to "put the college in the budget" of the churches, and to issue "certificates" to churches that cooperate with the college, and dominate all the preachers who come from the college and others that may fear their influence—then we shall have college control. We need more elders in the churches who have the courage to cancel the college, keep hands off the church and the school in its place. It has a place, but its place is not "in the budget of the church," nor does it have any right to hold "concerts" in the churches. The action of the elders at Vernon is commendable. Give us more elders.

The History of Conventions

Conventions have given birth to innovations and all forms of digression. These meetings now being held, which no man or men in the church have a right to call, or hold, if even to attend, can only aid the sinister work of the same men who have by their devious machinations led many away from the simplicity that is in Christ. They have ever been artful and deceptive. They still are. Some are living today who attended the "unity meeting" of long ago at Austin, Texas, and witnessed the division of the church that resulted. History repeats itself. Can we learn only by experience? Why not learn some things by observation?

More Manifestoes

The brotherhood has lately been treated to another series of manifestoes. A few years ago several of these authoritative pronouncements were delivered to the "brotherhood at large" and circulated in special free editions of Word and Work (R. H. Boll's magazine) among all the preachers. The present manifestoes issue from the same office, having the same seal. The burden of their author, R. H. Boll, is to prove that Christ is not King "in act and fact," that the church which He built is only a "new spiritual contingent" (accident) and was not in the original divine plan, but has been offered as a substitute for the Kingdom which was deferred when fleshly Israel rejected the Christ, and that when the Zionist movement succeeds, and Mussolini and Hitler have reenacted the role of the old Caesars, Christ will then come again to establish the Kingdom which was dated by the inspired prophets to begin "in the days of those kings" about two thousand years ago. Yet there are some who have the temerity to refer to these theories as "harmless guesses." The word "guesses" is too mild for such a set of teachings. They are rank perversions of God's word, uprooting, undermining and total, destructive of the gospel system. It is refreshing to see of late the many vigorous articles from able brethren exposing the pernicious nature of such teachings and the obdurate character of those men who persist in teaching it overprotests and pleadings of twenty-five years. Among those who have contributed some unusually able and timely articles in the Gospel Advocate are F. B. Strygley, W. E. Brightwell, H. Leo Boles, C. B. Dowthitt, C. R. Nichol, and Hugo McCord. Even some neutrals who said that the discussion of these issues would only "widen the breach" have ventured to say that without being against it they would like for it to be understood they are not for it! Let the good work go on.

From the Christian Church

Every week the news columns of the gospel press carry reports of "so many from the Christian Church." It is definitely a trend. Thoughtful brethren are rebelling against the oppressions of the U. C. M. S. in the Christian Church. It is to be hoped that those who come to us are thoroughly converted on innovations; but it is fairly sure that it is the loss of congregational independence that causes them to wake up and think. Once awake to the dangers of denominationalism, it is not difficult for them to find the way back to the Old Paths.

The publicity being given to a certain so-called unity movement is not calculated to stimulate the thinking of these brethren who are looking our way. It may discourage them. They may figure that if we can all get together in conferences, there may not be so much difference between us after all. Our preaching should make the difference manifest. Our practice should make the difference real.

The predicament of the Christian Church itself should warn us, and deter us in going any further in that direction. There is apt to be politics and selfish interests to be served.

The Field Is the Church

Dear Brother Wallace:

I have just today for the first time seen The Bible Banner. It is exactly, from end to end, the sort of paper that all the papers ought to be. I thank God and take courage when I see you touch on things that are positively shipwrecking the plea for Bible Christianity, but that are very popular and have the support of many of the supposedly popular preachers. I am not worried about what field it occupies. I wish it could be read all over the whole field, in every home in the land, especially by every member of the church. The Bible Banner expresses my sentiments better than I can express them myself.

We are now printing the August issue of the Apostolic Times, and it is too late to say anything about it as the type is all set, but if I can I want to get in a free display ad. We have 9,100 for August and I hope it does a little good. If I had money I would donate to any paper like that.

Wishing you unbounded success and that the Lord may use you to work a much needed reformation, I am,

Yours in Christ,

James A. Allen.
From a Former Christian Church Preacher

Note-During my recent meeting in Columbus, Indiana, Robert Sharp and his wife publicly renounced the unscriptural practices of the “Christian Church,” and definitely took their stand with the brethren to contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints. Brother Sharp spent four years in the digressive school in Cincinnati, Ohio, and had been preaching for the digressives several years. I have reason to believe that Brother Sharp is truly converted to apostolic teaching and practice. He is a young man of ability, very sincere, and is a promising preacher of the ancient gospel. He is not the kind that will follow the course of the least resistance in preaching, but will follow the examples given by the apostles. He is a “straight shooter,” and I believe he will be true and faithful. The following article by Brother Sharp is a “Statement of His Convictions.”—E. G. Creacy.

Some well-meaning and loyal people at heart are entertaining in their minds some false doctrines, which I entertained for a decade. First, that the church of Christ is an “offshoot” or digression from the “Christian Church.” Second, that the Bible is silent there is freedom of action in religious service. Third, that the Christian Church can be reformed. That the church of Christ is not an “offshoot” or digression from the Christian Church, but rather the “Christian Church” is a digression from the church of Christ, all well-informed people on the history of the restoration movement know. The most modern of the Christian Church preachers admit that the introduction of instrumental music in the worship caused the split. Alexander Campbell was opposed to instrumental music in religious service as was also the other pioneers. The introduction of it in Christian worship involves a principle of Divine teaching, the violation of which principle gave birth to the Christian Church. Consequently, the Christian Church is a digression or an apostasy.

The pioneers of the restoration movement adopted the slogan, “Where the Scriptures speak, we speak; and where the Scriptures are silent, we are silent.” The church of Christ adheres to this and contends that it is the true principle of religious service, but the Christian Church teaches and practices another principle— that as long as an act of worship is not prohibited by the Scriptures, even though such an act may not be authorized, it is not wrong. What do the Scriptures say?

“Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.” “Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.” “That we may learn not to go beyond the things which are written.” “That no one of you be puffed up for the one against the other.” For who maketh thee to differ? “In vain do ye worship me, if ye do not do the will of God.” “Ye have received the word of Wisdom.”

The Bible is silent there is freedom of action in religious service. We cannot believe in the all-sufficiency of the Scriptures and add to or subtract from the worship which God has revealed.

Can the Christian Church be reformed? That the Christian Church needs reforming, every sincere Christian Church preacher will admit. But these preachers are making the same mistake Luther and the other Protestant reformers made. Luther tried to reform a church which was wrong at the roots—an apostate church—and as a result of the reformers’ labors, various denominations were built around their particular ideas. But the Catholic Church and the denominations continue. One error was added to another. It is just as impossible to reform the Christian Church as it was to reform the Catholic Church, because it is wrong at the roots.

Russellism alias Bollism

Dear Brother Wallace:

In THE BIBLE BANNER (August) you made a statement on page three that I have thought for a long time should be emphasized more. This is the statement:

“But we agree with him on that point—that he should never have been so distinguished by the label of ‘Bollism’ on his theories, for they do not belong to him.”

I believe your statement is true and that Roll’s speculations should always be called “Russellism,” and never “Bollism.” He does not “wince” half as much when his theories are called “Bollism” as he does when they are called “Russellism.” If you or C. R. Nicholsome one of equal calibre will write along piece for THE BANNER showing the similitude of Boll’s and Russell’s theories, then make it a part of the policy of THE BANNER to always refer to Boll’s theories as “Russellism.” I feel sure that such would make one toward informing the brethren correctly concerning the identity of Boll’s foolishness. The brethren know generally that “Russellism” is not a “harmless theory,” and they should be taught that Boll holds more in common with Russell and Rutherford than with Christ and the apostles.

When it becomes well fixed in the minds of the people that Boll’s theories are Russellism, and that Boll is just as much of a Russellite as he would be if he joined them, then the people will place him right where he belongs. I do not know of anything that Boll teaches that he could not continue to teach, if he joined the Russellites. He says he does not believe in a second chance; but he does. He believes that men (especially the Jews) will have a chance to repent after the second coming of Christ; he believes their conversion is one of the “fruits of the Lord’s coming.” If that is not a “second chance,” neither is Russell’s theory. The parable of the Ten Virgins teaches emphatically that there will not be a “second chance” after the Lord’s coming, as any passage teaches there will not be a “second chance” after death. Yes, his theories are “Russellism.”

Your article on Jorgenson’s songbook touches another sore spot. You are striking at the source of their support, when you write about that songbook. Please keep that point before your readers. You are doing a good work. Just keep it up.

Fraternally,

Cecil B. Douthitt.

An Interesting Report

From the following in Christian Leader of July 19, 1938, it appears that Brother Jorgenson was sent from Detroit to California as messenger to give “a report of the Unity Meeting held at Detroit and the Mass Meeting held at Kansas City.” “The congregation was stirred by his sincere message” on “God’s Love.” Brethren Taylor and Ruble of Louisville, Ky., should have been there.

Hollywood, Cal.

On Lord’s day, June 19, Bro. E. H. Ijatts, president of David Lipscomb College was our guest speaker. The service was well attended and his discourse was enjoyed by all. On Lord’s day, June 26 there were three services with many visitors present. After the morning service, dinner was served to all who were present. In the afternoon at 2:30 Bro. E. L. Jorgenson, of Louisville, conducted a great song rally. Bro. J. N. Armstrong, of Starved, Ark., delivered a brief but soul-inspiring message. Bro. Jorgenson was the guest speaker at the evening service, speaking on “God’s Love.” The congregation was stirred by his sincere message. He also gave...
College Certificates for the Churches

It has come to pass. Now, one college is issuing beautifully decorated, embossed, certificates to churches that "cooperate with the college." A few years ago, when the college wrote letters to churches asking that a certain Sunday be set aside as College Day in the churches, C. R. Nichol asked: "How long will it be before placards will be seen in the churches saying, 'I his church is cooperating with the college.'" Not long, Brother Nichol, it is already here, better than placards -embossed certificates, to be framed for hanging on the wall. It is the twin sister to "the college in the budget." The church budgets the college, and the college certifies the church! A blind man at midnight ought to see where such as that is headed. When Brother Nichol's prediction was made, some waived it aside, as just a passing remark-but already it has come true. Some who are not farsighted enough to see tendencies, and where departures will eventually head, could well afford to listen to men who have witnessed digression in all of its forms and save the church from the disaster of history repeating itself. But some people learn only by experience.

It Does Look Like a Premillennial Move

Brother Homer E. Moore, publisher and editor of the Christian Worker, Wichita, Kansas, in a personal letter to the editor of THE BANNER, says: "I received a letter from Murch of the Christian Standard-Claude F. Witty's partner. He said he was writing to all the editors. He has a long list of questions-only one that really meets the issue. I don't know what his object is, but from the tenor of his letter, I suspect he would like to get a different answer from each one. . . . I understand that Witty said at Kansas City, that they did not expect to get a certain element in the Christian Church, nor some in the church of Christ, but an element out of both bodies. It looks to me like a premillennial move. I see that Murch wants all the discussion and college cooperation with the college. It does look like a premillennial move."
We Are Softening

HUGO MCCORD

I was impressed by W. E. Brightwell’s series on, “The Crisis We Are Facing,” in the Gospel Advocate some time ago. Certainly, in “getting recognition” and in “removing prejudice” many of us have paid dearly. The truth as it is in Christ Jesus has been too much diluted. I should like to give some particular examples of Brother Brightwell’s diagnosis.

But first, is it right to be particular? Is it right to call names? All who are halfway informed know that our Lord and his apostles were very particular, were “personators.” They’d have been cowards to see sins and rebuke not, to mollify sectarian errors. Paul was not an enemy but a friend because he told the truth to the ones that needed it. To omit names from some discussions, says E. G. Creacy, is to “play Yankee Doodle without the dodger.”

John T. Lewis has written some about a tendency to desert Lord’s day service for a singing session. At Carbon Hill, Alabama, during one of our meetings some of the members left town on Lord’s day for such a singing. Of course, they were too loyal to miss the Lord’s worship — that is, if the Lord would agree to go along and be present when the convention decided to take time out for a ritualistic observance of the Supper. When they came back to the meeting naturally I tried to blister such practices. Now those same folks say my preaching was too hard; I don’t know that they are capable of judging.

Also, during a Portland, Tennessee, meeting, the pioneer, straight-from-the-shoulder preaching of Lipscomb, Sewell, Srygley, etc., was completely blackmailed. On Sunday night, the Methodist Church dismissed its service and attended our service in a body with its pastor. Our song leader, said to me before church: “Call on him (the Methodist preacher) to lead the prayer; we don’t draw the line.” I thanked the Methodists for the courtesies of dismissing their service in favor of ours; then explained that because they practiced things in religion that unnecessarily divided Christians that we could not fellowship them; hence could not ask their preacher to lead in prayer. After service, the Methodist preacher shook hands marmly and said he enjoyed the service. Rut some of the brethren went to that preacher and apologized for what I had said. Over town the next day the report from some of our own members was that the young preacher went off half-cocked and had ruined the meeting and hurt the church. I confess I was wrong in bringing up the matter publicly: I suppose I should have just proceeded with the service and have ignored the visitors. But I was amazed that the Portland church should so compromise the truth, and say that “we” didn’t draw the line. I was happy to find later that many of the brethren did not approve of calling on sectarianists.

I he song leader at Greenfield, Tennessee, was calling on someone to lead the prayer every night. One of the pillars of the church told the song leader that the Presbyterian preacher was present, and to call on him. The song leader was dubious but proceeded. There I was, in a loyal church, shocked to hear them call on a Presbyterian preacher. During the next song I didn’t worship; I debated what to do. “If I say nothing, I’ll be a partaker of the sin; I’d better condemn it publicly, right now.” So I pointed out the heinousness of what had been done. Before I had talked three minutes a half dozen people left. To myself, “They’re Presbyterians.” Next day I found that all of them were members of the church, and I found, too, that some of our members had apologized to the Presbyterian preacher. I’m not writing this to advertise my loyalty and courage. Neither is this article designed to be a confession. But the point is, from these examples, many others that other preachers can name, the church is softening! We want to get along with sect neighbors regardless of the cost. As Bro. Brightwell puts it, “The liberals among us are almost as easy whit as liberal as the most progressive among them (the digresses) were a century ago.”

Straight Paths and Crooked Ways

G. K. WALLACE

John the Baptist came to make the Lord’s paths straight. How could he make them straight? Who made them crooked? God’s paths were straight when they were given to Israel.

The Children of Israel modified the paths of God to suit their own notion. They added one tradition after another. The commandments of God were made of none effect by their traditions. (Matt. 15:6.) In almost every case their tradition consisted of an addition to the commandment of God. In thus adding to God’s ways they so crooked them that God would no longer fellowship these apostate Jews. Jehovah sent John to straighten the paths.

He sent a circular letter to all priests and announced in all synagogues that he hoped to unite all factions among the jews, the Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, and requested that they gather at Jerusalem and make a great “fellowship meeting.” Of course, God would not recognize these sects and said they were hypocrites but John would — he was big and broad.

The meeting resulted in a general good fellowship between them all — all who dared to go and those who refused to go were accused of not having any interest in unity. Let’s start a new paragraph.

It is evident that John did not use the above-mentioned method to straighten the paths of God. He came in the “spirit and power of Elijah” to turn the hearts of the fathers and the disobedient “to walk in the wisdom of the just.” His call was a call to repentance.

The Pharisees who came to his baptism were called hypocrites. These Pharisees felt that they should be fellowshipped by John the Baptist. “We have Abraham as our father,” they said in their hearts, and we should be in full fellowship. John told them that was no advantage to them. “Ye off-spring of vipers,” said John, “repent” and prove that you have repented, by bringing forth “fruit worthy of repentance.”

Since Jehovah will not fellowship apostate children until they repent why should we? If the members of the Christian Church desire fellowship with the church of Christ let them repent and bring forth fruit worthy of repentance.

Jesus said, “Every plant which my heavenly Father planted not, shall be rooted up.” (Matt. 15:13.) The Christian Church sheds tears over the restoration movement and the divided condition of God’s people yet, like Ephraim, they will not repent. It is their practice over which there is division, as their leaders thus admit.

They also admit that the things they have introduced are unauthorized by the Word of God. C. C. Crawford, of St. Louis, Missouri, said to me under date of March 15, 1935: (1) “I do not use them (the Psalms) as an authority for instrumental music in the worship.”

(2) “How can one use the Old Testament, you ask, to substantiate the use of mechanical instruments of music in Christian worship. The answer is the same as T gave to question (1) above.”

(3) “Upon what grounds may they be used? I reply by saying that I consider their use justified solely on the Law of expediency which covers all matters of custom.”
If they are so anxious for unity can they not give up a custom for peace in Zion? Let mechanical music, women preachers, women elders, majority rule in the church, societies, and such like be given up and then we may be ready to enter a fellowship meeting.

It is strange that some brethren will fellowship those whom God will not fellowship—those who practice a corrupted religion. Like John the Baptist, they should straighten the paths made crooked by the additions of the Christian Church. These paths can be made straight only by repentance on the part of the people who teach and practice unauthorized things. “Repent ye therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out.”

“Stand ye in the ways, and see and ask for the old paths, where is the good way, and walk therein.”

The Jerusalem Conference

HUGO McCORD

A man scared of a policeman thinks he sees one on every corner. He can’t see anything but policemen: he dreams of them; they haunt him. So Brother R. H. Boll thinks he sees Israel’s restoration pictured gloriously in multitudinous scriptures; he reads all scriptures in the light of his theory; his theory haunts him; he sees it clearly in Acts 15! And had the nerve to print his findings! In his earlier days, before his theory got him down, surely he’d have been ashamed to say, much less print, that he meant anything like that. James was not lacking in good sense—only R. H. B., his interpreter, has lost his “thread.” But what then was the cause and purpose of James’ speech? Not “Israel’s” hope but Gentile circumcision (Acts 15:5).

Boll: (1) Gentiles called; (2) Tabernacle rebuilt.

James: (1) Tabernacle rebuilt; (2) Gentiles called.

Brother Boll admits the immediate cause of controversy was over circumcision, but, says he, the cause under that was the Jews were worrying about their national promises. Just pure speculation, unbecoming a “Thus saith the Lord” preacher. It’s the old story of making the Bible fit man’s theory, instead of making man’s theory fit the Bible.

Afterthoughts

In Brother Boll’s attempt to exalt an earthly millennial kingdom he degrades the church as a miscarriage of God’s plans; that because the Jews rejected Christ, the Father postponed his promised kingdom and set up the church as a substitute (utility man) during the interlude.

Christ evidently was planning H’s church (Matt. 16:18) as His kingdom (vs. 19) and gave no intimation that it was to be a makeshift, or any hasty get-up to serve till human beings allowed God to execute His plans.

The Holy Spirit evidently thought the whole of Christ’s life was “by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God” (Acts 2:23; Isa. 53, etc.). If Christ’s blood was shed by the determinate counsel of God, then the institution for which that blood was shed (Acts 20:28) could not have been an afterthought.

At a faculty religious forum this writer and Professor V. W. Kelley of the University of Illinois heard a modernist (infidel) hailed as “Professor of the English Bible” at Depauw University, say that the Great Commission was an afterthought; that Jesus never spoke it; that some of His disciples after His death put those words in His mouth and started a religion, Christianity. Which, Brother Boll or the Professor, is a worse wrister of scripture? One says the church was an afterthought; the other says the Commission was an afterthought.