POMP AND MAJESTY IN RELIGION

Cled E. Wallace

Cardinal Hayes, popular "Prince of Catholic Church," is dead. His body is merely a lump of clay, not unlike that of a dead hobo. Death is the great equalizer. The Grim Reaper is no respecter of persons. Millions pay idolatrous homage to the dead cardinal. Newspapers announce that "Majestic Pomp Marks Services for Prince of Catholic Church."

In a mighty pageant of sorrow and majesty the Roman Catholic Church gave its last service Friday to the dead Patrick Cardinal Hayes-the pontifical mass of requiem.

We naturally feel that restraint and subdued emotion which are a proper human reaction in the presence of the dead. But displays of "majestic pomp" over the body of a dead cardinal may well remind us of the distance the millions have wandered from the simplicity of the gospel. The pageantry of Catholicism is more pagan than Christian. It is the spirit of lawlessness which began in Paul's day, grown up to the full stature of maturity. It was a gradual development, a disregard of, and a withdrawal from a revealed divine order in organization, doctrine and worship. The distinctive features of Romanism are centuries younger than the New Testament and exist in defiance of that all-sufficient rule of faith and practice. Protestant parties in most instances have not gone into Rome's excesses, nor have they embraced idolatry to the extent that Rome has. They have, however, in their creeds, unscriptural organizations, names and doctrines, surrendered or compromised the only principle which can be an effective weapon against the "pomp and majesty" of Rome.

There was a time when believers in Christ "continued steadfastly in the apostles' teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers." (Acts 2: 42.) At that time they were neither Catholic nor Protestant in the sense in which those terms are used today. They were simply Christians, recognizing Christ as Lord and his will as law. This will was revealed by men who spake and wrote under the miraculous inspiration of the Holy Spirit. No pontifical honors were accorded the inspired mediums of the will of the Lord. When Cornelius, the Gentile centurion, fell down at the feet of Simon Peter, the apostle of the Lord immediately protested. "But Peter raised him up, saying, Stand up: I myself also am a man." (Acts 10: 26.) This is a closed rebuke to papal pretensions and may be considered a rebuke also to the little popes and dignitaries of Protestantism who love their titles and preen their feathers of authority.

The whole business of "majestic pomp" is contrary to the spirit of the gospel. It is a playing with baubles when there are fundamental verities being trampled upon and ignored. The disciples were reaching for such trinkets of pomp when they quarrelled over places of prospective power in the kingdom. The rebuke of the Lord was effective. His kingdom is not of this world. Nor is spiritual majesty akin to the unscriptural pageantry which characterizes Rome and her sectarian copycats. The Lord castigated those that made "broad their phylacteries" and enlarged "the borders of their garments" and loved "the chief seats in the synagogues, and the salutations in the market-places, and to be called of men, Rabbi." (Matt. 23: 5-7.)

But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your teacher, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father on the earth: for one is your Father, even he who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, even the Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted.

Romanism ignores all this and Protestantism also loves its titular baubles of official distinction. And evidence is not rare enough that some simple Christians are casting goo-goo eyes on titles of vanity.

Paul's fear has been realized. The departure from original principles that he feared became history. "For I am jealous over you with a godly jealousy: for I espoused you to one husband, that I might present you as a pure virgin to Christ. But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve in his craftiness, your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ. (2 Cor. 11 : 2, 3.)

If this original and divine simplicity is to be preserved in any case, certain fundamentals must chart our progress. Too much emphasis on numbers, the rise of institutionalism in religion, enthusiasm over accumulated money and centralization of power are the things which destroy the simplicity of the New Testament order.

We look in vain in the New Testament for anything in the way of religious organization larger than a local church and smaller than the entire body of Christ including all Christians. This leaves denominationalism without New Testament sanction. (Rom. 16: 16.) Churches of Christ should resist anything in the way of encroachment on their independence. They have a right to select their fields of activity, choose their workers, raise their money and spend it without outside dictation. And if they never get in the yearbook, that fact will not occasion much damage to the cause of truth.
THE SIN OF SECTARIANISM

The word "sect" very early and rapidly descended into unpopularity. So unwelcome is the word now that no body of people accept such a label to their party. It is regarded a stigma and its application is resented. It has the ban of public sentiment, and the very mildest view taken of the situation is that sectarianism is a grievous misfortune, and antagonistic to the spirit of Christianity.

Sects as we know them today are our inheritance from honest but misguided men in their imperfect struggle to shake off the shackles of Roman tyranny with all of its resultant corruptions. Under the papal yoke there was a compulsory absence of strife. The emancipation from this mandatory obedience had its twofold result. First, an exercise of freedom that headed into lawlessness; and, second, a rebound to human authority in the setting up of human creeds, human parties, or sects. Escaping from the tyranny of one resulted in the establishment of the other.

The Origin of Sects

As commonly used there is a vagueness attached to the word making it rather difficult to determine who and what is sectarian. Webster defines the word to mean "a part cut off; a body separated from others by special doctrine; a school, etc."

In Roman Catholic countries to dissent from the Roman Catholic Church is sectarian. Romanism there is orthodox. In Denmark, Sweden, and such countries dissent from Lutheranism is sectarian. In England, dissent from the Established Church is sectarian: hence, there the Roman Catholic Church itself is a sect. In the U. S. A. where we have not suffered the misfortune of an Established Church, dissent from established sects, called the circle of orthodoxy, is sectarian! All denominations, we are told, are "branches of the true church" and one who denies it, dissents from such views, is heterodox and sectarian!

But the true conception of a sect and a sectarian is dissent, not from Romanists and Protestants, who are themselves sectarian, but from the true New Testament church.

Among the Jews there were sects, parties, denominations. There was the large and respectable denomination, the Pharisees, to which Paul belonged—the largest church in existence then. There were others such as the Sadducees. These were churches among the Jews, even if they were not so called. They were sects. And when some of the Jews believed the gospel, and became Christians, the church was in the language of the Jews called the sect everywhere spoken against—they regarded it as a fragment cut off from the main body of Judaism, a heresy.

In the church, the church of Christ, there have always been sectarian tendencies which when they were not checked ended in sects. "For first of all, when ye come together in the church, I hear that there be divisions among you; and 1 partly believe it. For there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you." (1 Cor. 11: 18, 19.) When divisions exist, the heresies become known, which are behind the divisions, and that is necessary to place the blame where it belongs, making manifest the truth, approving those who hold to it, and condemning the teacher of heresy.

In the development of sects and parties in the church there is a gradation. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variances, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings. and such like of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (Gal. 5: 19-21.)

Observe the direction, from bad to worse, until the end is reached—and the end is heresy. Enmities, strife, jealousy, anger, hatred, seditions (the party spirit)—then heresy, the full-fledged sect. That is the way sects come. The present heresy in the church has come in exactly that way. Those who know can recognize the gradation. Out of jealously came strife; out of strife came anger; out of anger hatred; out of that came division, now the party spirit—and the emergence of the new sect. The crossbreed sect within the church, crossbred between Scofieldism and Russellism, with barely enough of the elements of the gospel left in its folds to distinguish it from those systems. It is certainly a decline, a complete letdown, from the pretended non-sectarian plea of those who now head this new party emanating from Louisville, Ky. Verily, the cap and the gown and all, are grandmother’s, but the teeth, and the ears, and other marks of visage belong to the wolf!

The Primitive Church

The primitive church was universal in character. There was no hierarchy. No ecclesiastical machinery. The local church, with elders whose jurisdiction and jurisdiction were local only and never extended beyond congregational lines, was the only organization. No man was called master, there was no lordship save that of the Lord Jesus Christ. The rule of elders was, and is, under Christ, that of expostulation or teaching and enforcing the will of Christ in the church of Christ. Submission to the elders as rulers was and yet is submission to the apostles’ teaching.

But advantage has been taken by teachers of error and their heresies on this very point. Because there is no ecclesiastical court in the church of Christ, and no creed save that of the apostles’ teaching—the New Testament itself—these errorists are wont to cry out that we are creed makers and ecclesiastics when their errors, are exposed and the line of truth is drawn against them. With equal consistency, however, could every sect or party, Adventist, Russellite, Rutherfordite, Norrisite, or What-not, charge of {m with a creedism or sectarianism if they withheld fellowship from such groups. So in order to avoid becoming a sect, according to themselves, they must fellowship every sect! The fact is, sects in the church are no more to be fellowshiped than sects out of the church. And heresies are sects.

Our creed is the New Testament. To the early church it was the apostles’ word. Myriads were made Christians before the New Testament was written. They believed what the apostles preached and taught, and that was their creed. When men came among these early Christians claiming to teach with the same authority that the apostles had, they “tried them which say they are apostles . . . and hast found them liars” and expelled such from their midst. Was it sectarian to thus bar these men and ban their teaching? If not, then to place the ban on such teachers in the church today, no matter what their prestige otherwise may be, nor what their pretensions of piety may appear to be, nor what their protestations of sweet innocence may assume to be, when their teaching is tried and found false, and they will not give it up, they should be expelled as heretics. Not to do so will wake the church a sect, rather than in
doing so, for to keep the church unsectarian its pure apostolic creed must be safeguarded and defended. That is the only scriptural attitude toward error. The hue and cry about division over an attitude toward error is a weak alibi for not defending the truth. It is mainly for effect. If such men as these had been in the church at Ephesus there likely would have been a division over the attitude toward error for they would have opposed the action of the Ephesus church in expelling the teachers of error from their midst.

The Sectarian Church

The primitive church was imperiled by many human developments. So Paul warned the elders at Miletus: "Also of your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Therefore watch ..." He did not say "to draw away" the people of the world—he said disciples, "to draw away disciples after them." And there is the hurt of the church today—the drawing away of disciples, many uninformed members after them, after these men—for indeed, their followers profess loyalty to the men themselves, even when they reluctantly admit that their teaching is wrong. This is the very thing, in principle, that Paul warned the elders of the church against.

The existence of parties from Paul's day has been in multiplied form. He himself fought the effort to add circumcision to the terms of admission into the body of Christ. Later he fought to the finish the party spirit in the Corinthian church, even to administering a stinging rebuke to his own personal followers who would wear his name rather than Christ's. In this crisis Paul spoke with imperial sternness against human creeds and names and parties. Afterward, however, human leadership subverted divine authority in the development of the man of sin—the papacy. Apostasy was followed by efforts at reformation. Protestant sects became the order of the day. They are still sects—mere sects—lacking all essential features of the New Testament church. None of these sectarian denominations accepts the original, primitive creed—the word of the apostles. Some admits persons to baptism on the simple faith that their teaching is wrong. This is the very thing, in principle, that Paul warned the elders of the church against.

The New Emergence of Sects

When a certain contingent became dissatisfied with the work and worship of the church as prescribed in the New Testament, and corrupted the church with innovations, instrumental music, societies, auxiliaries, organizations as "adjuncts" to the church, their new and unscriptural practices became the ground of division. They loved their party more than they did the church, therefore they "went out from us, but they were not of us" and are in every sense of the word a sect. Their organic name is Christian Church. It is a sectarian institution.

When another contingent began to promote certain strange prophetic doctrines, the consequences of which de- throne our King, deny his present reign, postpone his kingdom by destroying its character, minimize the gospel and belittle the church (by making it a substitute and an accident in lieu of a kingdom that did not come), nullify the Great Commission, make God false to his promises, and assume that the scheme of redemption as foretold by the prophets is yet unfulfilled—when such a faction in the church makes these borrowed relics of Russellism and Scofieldism the rallying ground of a party and thus rides out of the fellowship of the church by acts of their own which make it impossible for the true church to longer fellowship their deeds and doctrines, that party thereby becomes a sect. Therefore the party headed by R. H. Boll in Louisville, Ky., for all the reasons named, and more, is a sect and forfeits the fellowship of the church by the very tenets they teach. To say that their teaching does not affect the practice of the church or obedience to the gospel is too thin. Their teaching vitiates the gospel to the very core, and their kingdom postponement theory makes the Lord's Supper impossible inasmuch as the Lord placed it in the kingdom "that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." But the basis of fellowship is not found merely in baptism and the Lord's Supper. Paul disfellowshiped some men in the New Testament church and "turned them over to Satan" because they taught the resurrection was past already. There is no evidence that the teaching of these men had any more effect on outward ordinances, such as baptism and the Lord's Supper, than is said by some today of the Russellite teaching of R. H. Boll and his party. But Paul said such teaching "overthrew the faith of some"; it made "shipwreck of the faith" itself (he charged the consequences of the doctrine against them); he said "their word will eat as doth a gangrene" (that is what this false doctrine will do in the church, and gangrene ought to be cut out); he said the teaching of such doctrine was "blasphemy," and so is the doctrine of these modern Hymenaeuses, Alexanders and Philetuses in the church today. Some of their friends and admirers, perhaps some who had been schoolmates of Philetus and Hymenaeus, doubtless protested that they were good men and should not be "ostracized," as their teaching did not affect the worship of the church, etc., etc.; but Paul said their teaching was as gangrene in the church, that it would proceed further into ungodliness, and he delivered them unto Satan to teach them not to blaspheme the word of God. It is a living New Testament example of whatour
attitude toward error and teachers of error should be. Contrast Paul's language and attitude with that of apologists among us today.

Majority Rule Defections

The spirit of faction will continue to breed sects if it is not checked. Already the church has suffered from the two major defections named in worship and teaching—the cleavage of the Christian Church and the blight of Bolism, alias Russelism. In the offing there are rumblings of disorder and division over matters of organization that can be speedily galvanized into another general faction if preachers do not preach the truth, and with consistency practice it, on matters of organization and church government. Elders of the church also must deal firmly with situations which in the past they have allowed to break loose and run riot. Political revolution and economic anarchy are contagious. Members of the church who belong to political industrial unions and clans imbibe the spirit of such organizations and through these members that spirit gets into the church. Democrats in politics have tried to “make the world safe for democracy,” and some seem to be trying to make the church a democratic party also. It is really surprising how many people there are in the church who think that the church should be run like the democratic party or a labor union. Thus we have in so many churches now the “majority rule” defection.

The history of these cases is nearly always connected with preacher trouble. A preacher comes to “take charge” of the church. When in a critical hour the elders insist on having charge, it becomes a case of preacher versus elder, often a young preacher versus old elders. For wisdom the old elders, who were there before the young preacher was born, would be the better choice by far. But the preacher calls meetings; the scheming begins; petitions are circulated to remove the elders and elect new ones, a sort of a “cabinet” for the preacher and the sequel is a divided church. In a sense the elders are to blame for going to sleep on their job and having such a preacher. But in it all, the preacher pleads that he is as innocent as holly's little lamb—he never did a thing except to follow the dear people and stayed to save the church! Splitting the church is a wonderful way to save it!! I dare say that most any preacher of average personality can visit among the members of the church for a time, build a party around himself, dissatisfy enough people with the very best elders, and muster strength enough to divide any congregation in the land, if elders give him time enough to do it. The mistake of the elders has been in not dealing as firmly with the land, if elders give him time enough to do it. The point in this connection is simply this: **When a majority rule faction in the church takes charge, ousts the elders, nominates and elects others at their will, whether that faction controls the building and property of the church or not, that faction becomes a sect.** Such a course in itself separates it from the New Testament church in organization and government. Thus we have in some places a majority rule sect calling themselves a church of Christ.

The Cure for the Condition

Is there no cure for these defections? Yes; a return to the New Testament order of things. The professional preacher complex is largely responsible for these disorders. It is gravely feared that the training young preachers are getting in some of the colleges is responsible for their professional ideas. A most reliable informant has said that the president of one of the colleges explained the value of a certain preacher on the board of trustees because of his ability to “locate” with the churches the student preachers who graduate from that college. The danger of that conception of things ought to be seen at a glance by a blind man at midnight. Yet these colleges where such tendencies exist resent any suggestion that they are headed toward ecclesiastical control in the churches. And it is quite a common thing to hear student preachers talk of “getting a church.” They do not see the wide harvest fields, stretching out over whole continents of unevangelized English-speaking people, and the ambition to preach the glorious gospel of Christ to these unsaved millions apparently never stirred within them. They want a church! But the boys are not to be too severely blamed. It is the system under which they are being trained. Witness the scrambling for churches! Every “vacancy!” is literally besieged with applications. Is it a New Testament picture? Verily nay. The New Testament mission of the gospel preacher is gospel preaching. Nine-tenths of the work expected of the student preachers in the colleges where such tendencies exist resent any suggestion that they are headed toward ecclesiastical control in the churches. And it is quite a common thing to hear student preachers talk of “getting a church.” They do not see the wide harvest fields, stretching out over whole continents of unevangelized English-speaking people, and the ambition to preach the glorious gospel of Christ to these unsaved millions apparently never stirred within them. They want a church! But the boys are not to be too severely blamed. It is the system under which they are being trained. Witness the scrambling for churches! Every “vacancy!” is literally besieged with applications. Is it a New Testament picture? Verily nay. The New Testament mission of the gospel preacher is gospel preaching. Nine-tenths of the work expected of the student preachers in the colleges where such tendencies exist resent any suggestion that they are headed toward ecclesiastical control in the churches. And it is quite a common thing to hear student preachers talk of “getting a church.” They do not see the wide harvest fields, stretching out over whole continents of unevangelized English-speaking people, and the ambition to preach the glorious gospel of Christ to these unsaved millions apparently never stirred within them. They want a church! But the boys are not to be too severely blamed. It is the system under which they are being trained. Witness the scrambling for churches! Every “vacancy!” is literally besieged with applications. Is it a New Testament picture? Verily nay. The New Testament mission of the gospel preacher is gospel preaching. Nine-tenths of the work expected of the student preachers in the colleges where such tendencies exist resent any suggestion that they are headed toward ecclesiastical control in the churches. And it is quite a common thing to hear student preachers talk of “getting a church.” They do not see the wide harvest fields, stretching out over whole continents of unevangelized English-speaking people, and the ambition to preach the glorious gospel of Christ to these unsaved millions apparently never stirred within them. They want a church! But the boys are not to be too severely blamed. It is the system under which they are being trained. Witness the scrambling for churches! Every “vacancy!” is literally besieged with applications. Is it a New Testament picture? Verily nay. The New Testament mission of the gospel preacher is gospel preaching. Nine-tenths of the work expected of the student preachers in the colleges where such tendencies exist resent any suggestion that they are headed toward ecclesiastical control in the churches. And it is quite a common thing to hear student preachers talk of “getting a church.” They do not see the wide harvest fields, stretching out over whole continents of unevangelized English-speaking people, and the ambition to preach the glorious gospel of Christ to these unsaved millions apparently never stirred within them. They want a church! But the boys are not to be too severely blamed. It is the system under which they are being trained. Witness the scrambling for churches! Every “vacancy!” is literally besieged with applications. Is it a New Testament picture? Verily nay. The New Testament mission of the gospel preacher is gospel preaching. Nine-tenths of the work expected of the student preachers in the colleges where such tendencies exist resent any suggestion that they are headed toward ecclesiastical control in the churches. And it is quite a common thing to hear student preachers talk of “getting a church.” They do not see the wide harvest fields, stretching out over whole continents of unevangelized English-speaking people, and the ambition to preach the glorious gospel of Christ to these unsaved millions apparently never stirred within them. They want a church! But the boys are not to be too severely blamed. It is the system under which they are being trained. Witness the scrambling for churches! Every “vacancy!” is literally besieged with applications. Is it a New Testament picture? Verily nay. The New Testament mission of the gospel preacher is gospel preaching. Nine-tenths of the work expected of the student preachers in the colleges where such tendencies exist resent any suggestion that they are headed toward ecclesiastical control in the churches. And it is quite a common thing to hear student preachers talk of “getting a church.” They do not see the wide harvest fields, stretching out over whole continents of unevangelized English-speaking people, and the ambition to preach the glorious gospel of Christ to these unsaved millions apparently never stirred within them. They want a church! But the boys are not to be too severely blamed. It is the system under which they are being trained. Witness the scrambling for churches! Every “vacancy!” is literally besieged with applications. Is it a New Testament picture? Verily nay.
And take the helmet of salvation. Every soundings have been deflected. A good policy of fairness in fighting the devil is on par -1 policy of fairness in fighting the devil is on par with the effort to be a good sport in a fight with a rattlesnake. The truth should be rigidly guarded, yea safeguarded, at all times, giving evil no advantages and error no quarters.

Respecting congregational government it is simply reduced to this question: Shall we have law and order in the church or majority rule-and chaos?

Regarding the Christian Church innovators-the question is whether we shall yield to the grandstand, melodramatic play for pseudo-unity, or like Nehemiah refuse negotiations with religious Sanballats on the plains of Ono, while we rebuild the walls of Jerusalem.

Concerning the Boll sect-the danger lies chiefly in a sub-sentiment attitude toward teachers of error, and is a question of whether we shall listen to the voice of neutrality pacifists instead of militant leadership.

The time has come for the re-promulgation, with all the intensity of the gospel restorers, of all the principles of the New Testament church, to save the church itself from the throes of sectarianism.-F. E. W., Jr.

“HIS HEART TREMBLED FOR THE ARK OF GOD”

John T. Lewis

In the Christian Leader of July 19, 1938, that jovial, good-natured, optimistic, “yes mam” preacher, Brother H. H. Adamson of Detroit, Mich., turns into, not a weeping but a wailing prophet. Read his outcry:

It is said of old Brother Eli that “his heart trembled for the ark of God.” Regardless of the mistakes Eli might have made, that one statement is complimentary. Any one who believed in God or who had any interest in the ark of God would have trembled in heart under such strange and trying conditions. I wonder what Eli would do today under world conditions, and in particular, under church conditions. He possibly would have taken a tumble backward before this time. If these are not “the times that try men’s souls” I would not want to see such times. I am also wondering if the time will come when the church of Christ will have a “Vatican” in America. Where would we build it? Should it be placed in Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee, Kansas, California or somewhere on the “continent” of Texas? And then, ah, then, who would be the Big Papa? . . . Oh, yes, I came near forgetting one of the main things: What religious journal should mold the thinking, speaking and conduct of this host of little “me too” preachers? But why write in such a manner? Well, well—if we are not in the embryo stage of religious Vatican jurisprudence right now, our soundings have been deflected. A good brother whose name is a household word from Maine to California (living in the depths of the good old Southland) recently wrote me (and along the very lines of which I now speak), “I have encountered this spirit. If I can’t use you to accomplish my purpose, I will crucify you.’ That is a strong statement, but that makes us exactly what he is talking about—and I don’t mean maybe.” In the name of heaven’s God—what are all of us preachers going to do with that kind of a spirit? “Lord, is it I?” May God help us all to do some prayerful heart-searching before the sad, sinful cataclysm comes. Let us avant it.

Read the story of Eli and his sons in the first four chapters of First Samuel; it is an interesting bit of Old Testament history, “written for our learning, that through patience and through comfort of the scriptures we might have hope.” (Rom. 15: 4.) Studying the condition of God’s people in Eli’s day, and knowing the conditions in the church today, we must know that nature and human weakness have been the same in all ages. Unity meetings were not the remedy in Eli’s day, neither do they offer a panacea for the unfortunate conditions in the church today, You will find the only remedy, and the only hope of the church today, as in any other day, stated by Paul in Eph. 6: 13-20, “Wherefore take up the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and, having done all, to stand. Stand therefore, having girded your loins with truth, and having put on the breastplate of righteousness, and having shod your feet with the preparation of the gospel of peace: withal taking up the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the evil one. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God: with all prayer and supplication praying at all seasons in the Spirit, and watching thereunto in all perseverance and supplication for all the saints, and on my behalf, that utterance may be given unto me in opening my mouth, to make known with boldness the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in chains; that in it I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.”

Problems in Every Age

I wonder if Brother Adamson thinks Paul was “an ambassador in chains” for attending a “unity meeting” and shaking hands with Brethren Hymenaeus, Philutus, and Alexander, the coppersmith? Instead of having religious convictions, and almost threatening spiritual suicide, over the divided condition in the church today, Brother Adamson should get into the fight, asking the prayers of all the saints “that utterance may be given unto him in opening his mouth” to “speak boldly,” as he “ought to speak.” “Yes mam!” Every age has had its “isms” to trouble the church, and to try men’s souls. In the apostolic age it was “Judaism,” forty or fifty years ago it was the introduction of missionary societies and instrumental music into the work and worship of the church causing the trouble. Today it is “premillennialism.” Because of Paul’s fight against Judaism many were turned against him, but he did not throw up his hands in despair. Read Gal. 1: 6-12, and also Gal. 3: 1-3. Because of his fearless stand and fight against innovations in the church, David Lipscomb was once cartooned as an old woman in a Mother Hubbard dress and bonnet with a broom, trying to sweep back the tide of the ocean. Because of Foy E. Wallace’s debates with premillennial preachers, and his fight against premillennialism in the church today, to mention his name to many church members has about the same effect as waving a red shirt before a bull.

Eli’s Sons in the Church

Let us get back to “Brother Eli” and his sons. In 1 Sam. 2: 22-24, we read: “Now Eli was very old; and he heard all that his sons did unto all Israel, and how that his sons dealt falsely with the priests of the Lord.”

But let us get back to “Brother Eli” and his sons. In 1 Sam. 2: 22-24, we read: “Now Eli was very old; and he heard all that his sons did unto all Israel, and how that his sons dealt falsely with the priests of the Lord.”

The time has come for the re-promulgation, with all the intensity of the gospel restorers, of all the principles of the New Testament church, to save the church itself from the throes of sectarianism.-F. E. W., Jr.
interested in the women than they are about the purity of the church; but a “unity meeting” is not what they need, the church needs to believe and act according to 2 Thess. 3:6. I know such action would cause a great furor in the churches of Christ today, and some of the older members might “tumble backward”; because their sons and daughters will dance all night Saturday night, doing everything else that goes with dancing, and then their young sons will be put up to conduct the worship for the Lord’s people on Lord’s day. It is time somebody’s heart was “trembling for the ark of God.”

I agree with Brother Adamson that some of our editors and preachers became unduly alarmed about the “ark of God” during the late “unity meeting” held in Detroit, Mich. Their fears seemed to be not that the ark of God would be captured as in Eli’s day; but that it might be surrendered to the enemy. Personally, I did not lose any sleep over the matter, because I felt that the “unity meeting” would be like an inflated balloon, as soon as the gas was all out everything would be left “status quo.” And it was. In the Gospel Advocate of July 21, Brother Batsell Baxter tells of the success (?) of their “effort at unity” out in California. There is not a doubt in my mind that this whole “effort at unity” has been a farce, and a burlesque on the faith of some good brethren. When Brethren Adamson and Baxter have been thoroughly disillusioned about these late “unity meetings,” they will know that James DeForest Murch and “his people” would not give one string off of their fiddles for their fellowship.

**Diotrephes and Disgression**

Yes, Brother Adamson, that spirit: “If I can’t use you to accomplish my purpose, I will crucify you,” is “in the good old Southland,” all right; but why call on “heaven’s God” about that? Don’t you know there was a Diotrephes in the church in John’s day? Read 3 John 9, 10. As to whether “the church of Christ will have a ‘Vatican’ in America” or not will depend on its leaders. You know the New Testament church went into apostasy, developed the Roman hierarchy, and built the “Vatican” in Rome, Italy; but that was a good while after Paul, “the agitator,” and his influence died, and the church began to have “unity meetings,” conferences, and councils. It was in those councils that “Diotrephes,” or his spirit, “cast them out of the church,” took the Bible away from them, and set the “Big Papa” on the banks of the Tiber as the faith dispenser, and for a thousand years spiritual darkness brooded over the earth. But, “truth crushed to earth shall rise again,” and it rose through the “fires of Smithfield,” and the blood of martyrs. But alas! that part of the church that gave up the slogan, “Where the scriptures speak let us speak, and where the scriptures are silent let us be silent,” and turned away from the nineteenth century restoration movement, into disggregation, according to Brother Everett, is headed, not to a hierarchy, to something even worse-spiritual an-...
day, sent out men who stood for something, but since the management of that college passed from Campbell’s influence to others, the majority of preachers gone out from there have been what Moses E. Lard called “insulters of the authority of Christ, defiant and impious innovators on the simplicity and purity of the ancient worship.”

The first of January, 1900, Brother T. B. Larimore began a three months’ meeting with the South College Street congregation, in Nashville, Tenn. At that time J. A. Harding, another graduate of Bethany College, was president of the “Old Nashville Bible School” then on South Spruce Street. I was a student in the school at that time. One morning Brother Harding spoke about as follows: “Some one has suggested that Brother Larimore come over and lecture to our boys; but he will never come here to lecture to the boys, as long as I am president of the school, till he takes a stand on the music question. He calls on the digressive preachers to lead his prayers and I had just as soon call on the devil himself.” Brother Larimore never lectured or preached at the Bible school as long as J. A. Harding was president. Several years afterwards when Brother Larimore was in a meeting with the West End congregation, Birmingham, Ala., he said to me one day: “Brother Lewis, some of my brethren have gone farther from the truth than I ever thought they would go.” He was speaking of the digressive brethren, and I am sure he felt then that his noncombatant attitude had not been the best in staying the tide of digression in the churches.

A few years ago Brother J. G. Malphurs told me that Dr. Boyd, whose name was almost a household word in many churches in Middle Tennessee, an elder in the church at Donelson, Tenn., told him that instrumental music was not an issue in their congregation, nobody wanted it, so they never had any preaching on that subject. At that time, Brother Malphurs said, Dr. Boyd had a married daughter living in Clarksville, Tenn., worshipping with the digresses—the music crowd. You now have before you the two incompatible attitudes assumed by different brethren in the fight against digression. One attitude portrayed by Moses E. Lard and J. A. Harding, the other attitude by Brother T. B. Larimore and Dr. Boyd. You may draw your own conclusion as to which attitude did more to save the church, or a part of it, from digression and denominationalism.

Premillennialism—A Major Issue

Premillennialism and worldliness in the church are the two greatest living issues today, and I believe the Lord and Harding attitude—a fearless, uncompromising attitude toward these evils—is the only hope for the church. We will never get anywhere in the fight with “palsied knees” and “hands that hang down.” Let us consider first premillennialism. We have a unique character introduced in Gen. 14: 18. “And hlelchizedek king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was priest of God Most High.” This is the first time we ever read of one being both king and priest of “God Most High.” In Psalm 110: 4, we read: “Jehovah hath sworn, and will not repent: Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.” Again we read in Zech. 6: 12, 13, “And speak unto him, saying, Thus speaketh Jehovah of hosts, saying, Behold, the man whose name is the Branch: and he shall grow up out of his place; and he shall build the temple of Jehovah; and he shall bear the glory, and shall sit and rule upon his throne; and he shall be a priest upon his throne; and the counsel of peace shall be between them both.” This prophecy says some one else would be both king and priest upon his throne. Paul says: “So Christ also glorified not himself to be made a high priest, but he that spake unto him, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee: as he saith also in another place, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.” (Heb. 5 : 5, 6.) Here Paul quotes Psalm 110: 4, and applies it to the priesthood of Christ. If, therefore, Christ is a priest after the “order of Melchizedek” he must be both king and priest.

Jehovah and Christ are the only two spoken of in the Bible as being both king and priest. As king, Christ claims all authority “in heaven and on earth.” (Matt. 28: 18-20.) In Col. 1: 13, 14, we read, “Who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love; in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins.” Of course “the kingdom of the Son of his love” is the kingdom of Christ, and his subjects are in his kingdom now. Paul says he is also our great high priest. “Having then a great high priest! who hath passed through the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our confession.” (Heb. 4: 14.)

Zechariah said, “He shall build the temple of Jehovah.” Paul says: “Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, and such are ye.” (1 Cor. 3: 16, 17.)

A Premillennial Church Inevitable

Do premillennialists deny these facts? I will let Brother Robert H. Boll answer. In the “Boles-Boll Debate,” on page 201, we read, “My respondent uses strong language regarding the matter of Christ’s universal authority, which I showed is indeed his, ‘de jure’, though not as yet ‘de facto et actu’, as the lawyers say—that is, ‘by right’, but not yet ‘in actual fact and act.’” There you have it, brethren, in black and white. Christ is our king “by right,” but not yet “in actual fact and act,” he has all authority “by right,” but not yet “in actual fact and act,” he is our great high priest “by right,” but not yet “in actual fact and act.” We have been “delivered out of the power of darkness, and translated into the kingdom of the Son of his love” “by right,” but not yet “in actual fact and act.” We have our redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of our sins “by right,” but not yet “in actual fact and act.” We are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwells in us “by right,” but not yet “in actual fact and act.” When Brother Boll, or any other brother, thus teaches, he is an insulter of the authority of Christ, and a defiant and impious sower of discord among brethren. There is more bitterness and hatred today among brethren in Louisville, Ky., Nashville, Tenn., and Dallas, Texas, over this “de jure,” and “de facto et actu” tomfoolery than was ever caused over the music question.

I believe a premillennial church made up of the premillennialists from all the denominations is in the making, and inevitable. It is an ill omen for the church when there are so many brethren bitter against all who are fighting to save the church from this twentieth century cataclysm—a Christ-dethroning doctrine.
When Christians begin to hunger and thirst and pant and yearn for "unity," or for "Christian Union," they will do well to "use discretion." Unity is not achieved by "a federation of churches," nor by a compromise and tolerance in the matter of principle. Jesus prayed that his disciples should all be "one"; Paul instructed that they "all speak the same thing"; and that is not accomplished by compromise. But it seems that when some Christians become obsessed with the idea of "Christian Union," they may haywire and run with outstretched arms to embrace any one who looks like a prospect. Even some well-informed preachers and teachers are very "open-minded," and ready to clasp hands with any who will agree to walk a wire or ride a teeterboard. Some will even forget the scriptural system of being "purged from old sins" in order to federate with any who "claim" to be disciples of Christ.

That is "broad-mindedness"; much broader than was the prayer of Jesus. He said to the Father: "I pray not for them which believe not in me." (John 17: 12.) That was the extent of the prayer of the Savior, and no disciple of his is authorized to pray for any one other than that class, except to pray for all men, all rulers, "that all may see the salvation of God," and that they may live to have unlimited opportunities to obey the gospel.

Faith and Unity
The Lord thus prescribes a limit to the thought of unity. If it were possible for men to believe through some mysterious visitation of the Holy Ghost, as a great many religiousists teach, Jesus does not direct his disciples to make any overtures toward unity with them. John said he wrote his gospel to produce faith: "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through his name." (John 20: 31.) If any one can so manipulate the human mind that he can get faith in some other way, he is not a proper subject of the unity for which Jesus prayed. Such faith could not have the proper scriptural basis, hence, could not be pleasing to God. "So then faith cometh by hearing the word of God," is the God-given system of obtaining faith.

Christians cannot be pleasing to God when they enter into any semblance of unity with people who get their faith (or think they do) in any other way than by hearing the word of God. Jesus said he "that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me. People who do any "comeing" on any incentive other than "hearing and learning of the Father" do not "come to Christ," hence, they will be poor material for followers of Christ to regard as capable of unity. Their faith is all wrong, hence their obedience is wrong, and the only way they can attain to that unity for which Jesus prayed is to "repent, and believe." Yes, that is good Baptist doctrine, to put repentance before faith, but see if it will not work that way in such cases? People with that sort of faith cannot please God, because "it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe," and the gospel is the thing Jesus commanded to be preached.

When then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed?" If those preachers were instrumental in bringing about their faith, how could it be called "a miraculous faith," a direct gift of God, a miraculous work of the Spirit? "Whether it were I or they (Paul or other apostles), so we preach, and so ye believed." (1 Cor. 1: 11.) "Because our testimony among you was believed." (2 Thess. 1: 10.) Shall Christians who follow the teachings of the Lord enter into "union meetings" with people whose faith rests upon visions, dreams, impulses, messages of angels, instead of resting upon those things the apostles wrote? Should Christians even desire unity with such religiousists? Can they even recognize such misguided religions as being Christian? A good fraternal order, a lodge, which makes no pretense to being religious, would seem more acceptable than such unauthorized churches.

The Dividing Wedge
But if Christians are going to "unite" with some body on some thing, who will they approach with their appeal for unity? The Christian Church, to be sure. They "have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine," and must be regarded as brethren in error. Yes, they may be regarded as proper subjects of unity, for their faith is supposed to be based upon the words of the apostles, hence are included in Christ's prayer for unity. When they are approached on the subject of unity, there must of necessity be a foundation upon which to "unite." The movement for unity indicates within itself a "division" over something. If we all "obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine," there was unity that far. There was something later on that caused a separation, a parting of the way, that must be sought out and overcome. Somebody left "the strait and narrow way," or there would be no cause for a move toward "getting together"; we would still be together.

Any move toward unity that does not take cognizance of that which destroyed the unity is worthless. The wedge which caused the split must be removed before the rift can be overcome. A wedge may be driven into a tree and divide it; then it may be wrapped and bound up with the wedge still in there, but it cannot grow together again. So the tree surgeon has but 'one course to pursue, and that is to remove the cause of the rift. The cause of the rift between Christians was that some departed from "the faith," from that word which produces faith; they failed to "hold fast the form of sound words," and followed things "contrary to sound doctrine." They did not always speak "the things that become sound doctrine," and did not remain "sound in faith"—"sound in speech." They ceased to be of them that "tremble at his word."
The Spirit of Worldliness

That class of disciples erre'd from the faith by appropriating things that were not "of faith," because they had imbibed too much of the spirit of the world. What was it that made any Christian desire a mechanical instrument of music in Christian worship? The instrument made the music more attractive and pleasing. To whom was it more attractive and pleasing? They were supposed to "make melody in their hearts to the Lord." Did ever any one say he thought it sounded better to the Lord? Oh, no; it sounds better to the people; the young folks are attracted by it. If the young folks are attracted by instrumental music, they are not drawn by hearing and learning from the Father. Other things, missionary societies, endeavor societies, attractions of various kinds, are all acknowledged drawing cards to the world, and are not supposed to be more pleasing to God. The spirit which prompts all those things is not the Spirit of Christ. If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his; so if the advocates of such innovations are "none of his," what godly man or woman should desire a unity move in their direction?

Until the spirit of worldliness by which they are actuated can be replaced by the Spirit of Christ, who did always those things which pleased the Father, there can be no hope for unity-unless we long so fervently for unity that we will "move over to the middle of the teeterboard with them," which I fear, some old fogies will not do. "A preachers' conference for unity" that fails to make any attempt to "remove the wedge," or to even mention the cause of the rift, is about as useless and senseless as the convention of Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and infidels, and has accomplished about as much good. A gospel preacher who could attend such a conference as a speaker, and then commend it as being a GREAT meeting, surely is lacking in that "backbone" which Paul expected Timothy to manifest as a Christian soldier in 1 Tim. 6: 3-5.

It should not be forgotten that being a Christian is a personal obligation, a duty which each one must work out for himself, and unity cannot be dosed out wholesale to entire congregations. Nor can a half dozen limber-necked preachers answer for the entire brotherhood; not even for one congregation.

The Bible has not one word to say about "a Baptist Church" nor "the Baptist Church." If you desire information about Baptist Churches you must get some book written by man. That is the reason Baptist debaters like to bring history into every discussion. They can read about Baptists in history but not in the Bible. They can read about Baptist Churches back until 1607. Beyond that they cannot go. However, that does not daunt them. Having found the record of Baptist churches in the past century, they infer that they have existed even until Bible times.

"The first regular Baptist Church of which we possess any account is dated from 1607 and was formed in London by a Mr. Smyth."—Benedict, page 304.

"It is here devoutly wished that the Baptist denomination, founded by our Anglo-Saxon fathers in tears and blood, may rise to wider fields of usefulness and progress and achievement."—Dr. George A. Lofton, Baptist.

Thus we see, by their own historians, that the Baptist Church was founded in 1607 by Anglo-Saxon men and not by the Lord Jesus Christ. The Baptist Church is a human organization, founded and controlled by men—then why be a Baptist?

Baptist Inconsistencies

The better educated preachers among Baptists know that they cannot trace a line of Baptist Churches back to Bible times. Only the ordinary or average Baptist preacher will thus try to do. The following lines show how real scholars among them speak about these matters:

"The attempt to show that any religious body has come down from the apostles an unchanged people is of itself an assumption of infallibility, and contradicts the facts of history."—Dr. Thomas Armitage, Baptist.

Again he asserts that Baptist teaching along this line contradicts "All reliable history."

Thus you can see that the average Baptist preacher is inconsistent. Note these inconsistencies:

1. To teach Baptist Church succession from Bible times is to be inconsistent with Baptist scholars. "All reliable history," and the Bible.

2. He will labor long and hard to prove links in his "chain of Baptist succession" and then will admit that his church is non-essential to salvation.

3. He will claim that no one can be a Baptist unless baptized by a Baptist preacher, strives to trace his line of baptized believers back to John the Baptist, yet he cannot prove that John was even baptized. Who baptized John the Baptist? Let some Baptist answer.

4. He teaches that baptism cannot be administered without the vote of a Baptist Church and yet has the nerve to claim that the Baptist Church is the church of the Bible. Question: Who voted on the eunuch, the jailer, etc.? The practice of Baptist churches is inconsistent with the teaching and practice of the Bible church. This confusion does not worry Mr. Baptist, however. That is the reason he is a Baptist. When people get confused they generally become Baptist.

5. It is, they say, "a cardinal doctrine of a Baptist that no person need be a Baptist to be saved!" Then again I ask, Why be a Baptist?

6. Christ authorized believer's baptism. (Matt. 28: 19, 20; Mark 16: 15, 16.) Yet you cannot be baptized, even though Christ did authorize it, until some Baptist Church authorizes it. Remember also, dear reader, there was no such thing as a Baptist Church until 1607. Thus you see that Baptist baptism is purely of human origin founded upon the doctrine and command of man. Yet some preachers in the church of Christ will receive Baptists into fellowship on Baptist baptism. There is a big difference between Bible-baptism and Baptist baptism. Bible baptism is authorized by Jesus Christ and Baptist baptism is authorized by a Baptist Church. Baptist baptism rests on a personal experience and Bible baptism rests on the word of God. Baptist baptism is predicated on the authority of God and rests on the judgment of a Baptist Church. Bible baptism is based on the great commission. Baptist baptism puts one into the Baptist Church and Bible baptism puts one into Christ. (Gal. 3: 26, 27.)
CASTING DOWN IMAGINATIONS


HUGO MCCORD

"For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ."

Some religions are spread by the sword, notably Mohammed's. New laurles in their mannhish heaven are promised to every son of Islam who converts an infidel (Christian). And to them it is no reproach to slay the infidels. But the weapons of a Chris- tian's warfare are not carnal. Yet it is reported Charlemagne, in his loyalty to Christianity, commanded soldiers to pursue the fleeing barbarian Teutons and to force them to a creek or river and baptize them. We know such would not make them Christians; the weapons of our warfare are not carnal.

Strangely, there are those among us who defend a Christian's participation in murderous war. They would not think of using rifles to make Christians, but they would to "make the world safe for democracy." But cer- tainly no justification from the testa- ment of peace can ever be found. It forbids me to defend myself; may I defend a political government? It forbids me to defend the Lord (in the case of Peter); may I defend any hu- man? If I am restrained from fight- ing for myself, for my family, for the unblemished church of my Lord, for what holy purpose may I ever use car- nal warfare?

For me to refuse to use a Spring- field rifle is one thing; for me to re- fuse to be a fighter for the Lord is another thing. Every Christian must be a soldier, and that means battle, not dress parade. There are those among us who believe in being soft, noncontroversial, nonfighting; some preachers consider themselves compli- mented when they hear: "He's not a fighter." But the old Book still tells us to fight the good fight and to put on the whole armor of God. A preacher who is not a fighter can never pull down strongholds.

We all love positive preaching. I like to preach on love, on kindness, on the beauties of heaven. To speak of the errors of the denominations is to me repulsive. But both kinds of preaching are certainly required. I must tear down as well as build up. I must preach negatively and positive- ly. Christianity is a positive message, but it uproots many an error. 2 Cor. 10: 5 has both negative and positive advice.

CASTING DOWN IMAGINATIONS

Many are the imaginations in religion today as always. One such is Speaking in Tongues

Sincere people think they can speak in tongues. Sometimes they forget that Paul ordered them to do their speaking just one at a time; always they forget that Paul ordered them to have an interpreter, else keep silent in the church. And they have not learned that tongues were only for the first age of the church along with other miracles. Paul taught even then that tongues "shall cease." Hence, if 1 Cor. 13: 8 is at all to be believed, tongues have ceased, and all who claim otherwise are just beset with an imag- ination. They are earnest in their belief, but if the Bible is true, it is just an imagination. Accordingly it is the duty of every Christian to cast down such delusive teaching.

Christian Scientists

Another imagination afflicting good people is the teaching that Mary Baker Patterson Eddy was inspired of God; that she was told of the Lord how to write Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures. Though the Bible was finished in the first century, the Lord waited till the nineteenth century to give to the world the key to the Book. On the contrary, the apostles were guided into all truth (John 16: 13), which was so plain that a wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err there- in, which was so plain that an apostle says one is acting foolishly if he does not understand it (Eph. 5 : 17). The sad truth is, then, that the followers of Mrs. Eddy are afflicted with an imagination.

The Mormons

The Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints is the result of a similar imagination to that of Mrs. Eddy's. Joseph Smith believed that in Fayette County, New York, in 1830, an angel gave him some golden plates containing a new revelation from the Almighty. Both the Mormons and the Scientists condemn each other; and if the Bible is true both churches are just the product of fruitful imagina- tions; the apostles 2,000 years ago were guided into all truth, hence there was no new truth to be made known in 1830 or in 1869.

CASTING DOWN HIGH THINGS

Many are the "high things" that exalt themselves against the knowledge of the Lord. Every faithful soldier of Jesus will therefore fight.

Organic Evolution

Evolution's devotees are those who claim to have a monopoly on modern knowledge; truly evolution is exalted as a high thing. If it is in harmony with the laws of the Lord, it is mar- velous; if it is against the knowledge of God, it is abominable! But evolu- tion demands a violation of Gen. 1 : 24. Evolution cannot be true if Gen. 1: 24 is true. After his kind is the law believed in by every Christian. Evolu- tion, therefore, is by God's minister to be avoided as one of the "opposi- tions of science, falsely so-called."

Modernism

There are preachers in all cities, graduating from theological seminaries every year, who do not believe in the virgin birth of Jesus; they do not be- lieve he turned water into wine; they do not even believe he was bodily raised from the dead. Yet those men still claim to be Christians, and speak before audiences as pastors of Chris- tian flocks. The apostle Paul be- lieved in the miracles of Jesus; passionately he held to the resurrection of the Lord; and he said that if any- body, man or angel, preached any other gospel than his, "let him be ac- cursed." Modernism, therefore, is one of the high things that exalts itself against the knowledge of God; like evolution it claims to be the very acme of education. Modernist preachers and evolution professors very gra- ciously sympathize with old-fashioned Bible believers. They feel that if the old-fashioned people had their advantages in modern education they would see the "truth" also. But old-fash- (Continued on page eleven)
THE DEVIL’S INFLUENCE IN BIBLE SCHOOL WORK
Among Churches Avowing Apostolic Order the Devil Enters the Bible School Through Teachers Who Are Cardsharps, Dance Artists, Divorcees, and Exponents of Worldliness in General

C. A. Norred

I can remember the time when I heard leaders in the religious work in the denominations make the remark that the devil slipped into the church through the choir. I easily understood that they meant to say that the practice of permitting the choir to fill from the ranks of the giddy and worldly had a hurtful influence on the religious tone of the congregation. I cannot shake off the conviction that among the churches avowing the apostolic order of things the devil is slipping in through the Bible school.

As goes the Bible school so goes the church! Without pausing to argue I first remark that the oncoming membership of the church depends greatly upon the Bible school for its instruction. The instruction received in the Bible school will shape the ideals of the persons in question. This means that the character of the Bible school will be reflected in the membership of the church.

But the devil is coming to have a great deal to do in shaping the character of the Bible school. And, what is more, he is going about this work in a very sensible and skillful manner by shaping things so that the general run of teachers will be of mediocre efficiency in teaching the divine word and agreeable to the increase of worldliness. As a matter of fact the teacher makes or breaks the Bible school. The teacher should therefore be chosen carefully by one who is prepared to make wise selections in that particular. But this is exactly what is not happening. Under the ordinary setup the superintendent is virtually compelled to assign favorite places, without regard for fitness, to members of the prominent families of the congregation. Then next there is often a group of persons loosely attached to the work but of such situation that some of the prominent members would like to hold them. These are drawn on for other teachers. Should there be any places hard to fill they are generally filled by those first thought of or from those who first volunteer. All persons experienced in Bible school work know that the course just described exists more or less in every congregation. All know furthermore that such a course brings forward the wrong element as teachers; particularly is it given to filling the Bible schools with teachers who represent the cardsharps, dance artists, divorcees, free lovers, and exponents of worldliness in general in the congregations. And it is from this element that the oncoming membership is made to take its point of view and shape its religious outlook! Here is where the devil is getting in his influence in the work of the Bible school. And I cheerfully concede him that he has chosen a fruitful field and an effective method of operation. His wisdom is amply evidenced in the spiritual indifference that is setting down like a spiritual malaria over the church of God.

So what? As for myself, although I have been intensely interested in Bible school work, have directed some of the best Bible schools among us, and conducted training schools over a somewhat extended area, I am constantly feeling in my soul an almost overpowering impulse to chuck the whole thing and decline to give another moment’s thought to such work. And what is more, I think I have good reason for holding the conviction that some really capable gospel preachers who had all the potentials for excellent work in this field have yielded to the same impulse. But I cannot dismiss from my mind the conviction that such a course is parallel with that of declining to preach because many preach error or have a hard time if they persist in preaching the truth. I simply cannot see that we can whip the devil by surrendering to him. It will be well, in the first place, for us to keep straight the truth as to who is responsible in this matter. The elders of the congregations in which the evil described exists must answer to God for the condition. The elders of the congregations in which the evil described exists must answer to God for the condition. And until these men are in earnest about changing the situation anyone who endeavors to alter conditions will necessarily work at a disadvantage.

But what can the elders do about it? They can put the teaching in the hands of worthy Christians who will really endeavor to teach the truth of God. First ascertain if the prospective teacher is capable of teaching in a successful manner. But under no circumstance use even the most capable teacher if there is any well-founded doubt as to Christian character. If a person is not worthy of emulation in the things of Christian character that person would be a menace in the teaching force of any Bible school. The fact is that the leaders of a congregation should be as careful in regard to the teachers who teach the Word in the Bible school as they are as to the man who proclaims the gospel in the pulpit.

As it is the devil is getting a big slice of the dividends of the Bible school. But he has no right to such. The Bible school should be used to the glory of God and the salvation of souls. The elders in the congregations can exercise much influence in bringing about correct conditions in this particular.

Casting Down Imagination
(Continued from page ten)

Ioned Bible believers will still cast down all these high things that are self-exalted against God’s laws.

In Captivity
Not only is every Christian to be a virile fighter of error, but Paul’s idea was that he must control his thoughts. His thinking must be put in captivity, in a cage, bound down, and made to serve the Christ. Certainly that is one reason why Christians not only should but must be particular about their books, magazines, movies, radio. It seems the first aid in developing advertising managers is this: appeal to the sexual. Everything is advertised by a picture of a girl nearly naked—in a bathing suit. Calendars are made the same way. Cannot a girl be beautiful and attractive in a neat and pretty dress? Of course, but the advertisers must appeal to the sexual too, they think. Billboards suggest evil things, and are the enemy of bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ. And if there is no other reason that will make a Christian stay away from most movies, if not all of them, it is to help him bring his thoughts into captivity.
The Tingley-Wallace Debate

John T. Lewis

This debate was held in Birmingham, Ala., September 20 to 30, 1938. There were twelve sessions, ten mornings and two afternoon sessions. The afternoon sessions were held in Tingley's tabernacle, the night sessions in the open. There is a half block vacant between 18th and 19th Streets on Seventh Avenue, North. In the middle of this lot a large stand about four feet high was built for the speakers and the moderators. In front of this stand, seats were provided for several thousand people, and large crowds attended every service. About seventy-five gospel preachers from different states attended. The presence of all was appreciated, but none more than Brother Foy E. Wallace, Sr., the father of Foy E. Wallace, Jr., the debater.

“Popcorn” Myers of Montgomery, Ala., furnished a loud-speaker, and moderators. In front of this stand, was built for the speakers and the operation. This added much to the debate, and Brother Myers deserved and received the thanks of all for that service. Brother R. L. Whiteside, of Denton, Texas, moderated for Brother Wallace. Brother Whiteside is editor of Query Department of the Gospel Advocate, and also writes the Annual put out by the Advocate. His presence and counsel were a help and an inspiration to Brother Wallace. A. M. Reifsnyder moderated for Mr. Tingley. Mr. Whit Windham, a Presbyterian, and a prominent attorney of the city, was chairman moderator. Those who had charge could not have selected a better chairman. He was absolutely fair and impartial to both sides. The members of the church of Christ who attended this debate will always think kindly of Mr. Windham and appreciate his services, which were rendered gratis.

The four following propositions were discussed. Affirmative speaker to have five minutes additional rebuttal.

PROPOSITION I

The Bible teaches that at the second coming of Christ, the Jews as a nation (national Israel) will be restored to Palestine, and receive the kingdom of Old Testament prophecy, and with Christ as King rule over the whole world. Affirmative, Glen V. Tingley; negative, Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

PROPOSITION II

The Bible teaches that after the second coming of Christ there will be an age or dispensation (known as the millennium), during which period Christ will occupy the literal throne of David in Jerusalem (Palestine) and reign on the earth one thousand years. Affirmative, Glen V. Tingley; negative, Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

PROPOSITION III

The Bible teaches that baptism in water to all alien sinners is a condition of pardon from past sins. Affirmative, Glen V. Tingley; negative, Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

PROPOSITION IV

The Bible teaches that all alien sinners must receive the Holy Spirit baptism to become a child of God. Affirmative, Glen V. Tingley; negative, Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

The three sessions of two hours and five minutes were given to each proposition. I shall not attempt to give the arguments pro and con; because sometimes there were no pros and at other times there were no cons. However, I will give a brief resume of the course pursued by the debaters. On the first proposition Mr. Tingley correlated all the prophecies, made before and during the Babylonian Captivity, concerning the return of the Jews to their land, and applied them to a yet future restoration of Israel, and asked Brother Wallace to answer (?) the scriptures he had used, and urged the people to read the Book. The prophecies he used had just about as much bearing on his proposition as 2 Pet. 2: 16 would have and that was absolutely none. Brother Wallace showed that the only return the Jews could have had in mind was their return from captivity. His arguments, made from the prophecies, which he had on charts, were invincible on this point, and I do not think anyone knew that better than Glen V. Tingley.

On the second proposition, Mr. Tingley correlated many of the prophecies concerning the first advent of Christ, and the establishment of his kingdom, with the promises of his second coming, juggled them all together, applied them to his propositions - that is, to a thousand years' literal reign of Christ on the literal throne of David in Jerusalem. He then urged the people to read the Book. To Tingley, his followers, and even to some church members, this nonsense means the second coming of Christ. Brother Wallace showed the utter folly, fallacy, and danger of such juggling of the scriptures; that God fulfilled his promise and oath to David when he raised Christ from the dead, and set him on David's throne, and that Peter so disclosed in Acts 2: 20-35. He showed this rule and reign of Christ was to last till all his enemies were put under his feet, the last enemy would be death, then Christ would deliver the kingdom up to his Father. (1 Cor. 15: 20-28.) Therefore this is the only everlasting kingdom that ever was or ever will be the spiritual kingdom of Christ is always spoken of as an everlasting kingdom.

Mr. Tingley answered (?) all of Brother Wallace's arguments on the third proposition-water baptism-by appealing to religious prejudice, shouting that Brother Wallace was sending all the good Methodists, and Presbyterians, who had not been baptized, to hell; also his brother-in-law, who was recently mangled in a wreck out in California, and had not been baptized. Of course these arguments (?) were nothing new to all who ever heard sectarian preachers preach or debate on baptism. When you add the question, "What about the thief?" you have their battleground before you. Brother Wallace very properly showed, and I think with telling effect, that the teaching of Tingley and his bibh and kin was what kept good people from being baptized.

On the fourth proposition, Brother Wallace not only showed the teaching of the Bible on the baptism of the Holy Spirit, its purpose, effects, and results; but he also fed Mr. Tingley out of his own spoon, by showing that he was sending all to hell who were not baptized with the Holy Spirit, and making God responsible for his damnable teaching.

IN-C U L L INGS - C O M M E NTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

BY THE EDITOR
In the above, I have not tried to give the arguments, but have pointed out the course pursued by the two speakers. You may supply the arguments and answers without overtaxing your mind, and especially the results of the debate.

I hope I may say without prejudicing anyone in his conclusions of the debate that Foy E. Wallace, Jr., has the keenest, most alert, and logical mind I ever heard in action.

This debate was conducted on a high plane, only twice did anything happen to suggest to the most scrupulous mind that the discussion might degenerate into personalities. In a religious discussion, the church of Christ has absolutely everything to lose, and positively nothing to gain in personalities; the opposition has everything to gain and nothing to lose, therefore you may expect them to court personalities; but a gospel preacher cannot afford to stoop to such tactics in a debate. Everyone who attended this debate knows now that a religious discussion can be conducted on a high plane, with personalities left out, and I rejoice in that fact, because I knew it could be done. "Going after the man" instead of his proposition is the curse and plague of modern debates, and has brought religious discussions into disrepute.

Brother Elliott Hill of the Parkview congregation and Brother Floyd Horton of the Woodlawn congregation worked up this debate. Mr. Tingley said they lassod him and got him into it. The Parkview and Woodlawn congregations bore the financial burden. For this, I feel that the churches of the Birmingham district and throughout the country owe them a debt of gratitude, because the plans were fine, and the execution was complete. We thank Brother Wallace for his part.

**The Whole Truth**

The gospel is the whole truth preached by Christ and his inspired men. How did they preach? O what a question, whose answer should bend our souls to hear! The Master of men fully taught the word of his Father, then named and exposed the errors held by his auditors, putting those errors in sharp and bold contrast with the truth. So also did all his Spirit-filled men. He and they preached the whole truth, for which they were gashed upon and slain by the men they had rebuked and exposed. It was the height of their offense. Had they left this off, and "just preached the gospel and let everybody else alone," they would not have suffered the shame and agony heaped upon them. Yet dare we feel they erred, or were moved by an ill spirit?

And today whoever preaches the gospel imitates, in both word and example, that inspired pattern, and faithfulness to this word involves the faithfulness in persecution necessarily. But why, pray, are we not persecuted today? Humph! Because Old Nick cares not a rap for much of our puny, sweetened-moonshine brand of preaching; that's why! He and his preachers don't care what we preach or do, just so we leave them uncondemned. Ah, but to fail to condemn error, to leave off contrasting it with the truth, is verily to set at naught the divine way! And whoever so preaches, whatever his aim or alibi, does not preach the whole truth, but instead makes haste to deliver us to apostasy. My brethren, here is where we so sadly fail today. Preachers have we aplenty who will preach the truth and nothing but the truth, yet will not preach the whole truth. Here's where they are betraying us.

**Is This Compromise**

M. S. Rucker usually writes a full page or more about the social "doings" of the Ninth and Lime Streets Church of Christ of Long Beach, Calif., in the *People's Bible Advocate*. In the issue of July 15, 1938, he says: "Lake Xrrowhead: 6,000 feet above sea level, among the pines and ferns, overlooking the great Mojave desert; deep blue water from forty feet deep. ... We spent the Fourth of July here. There is a small community church here. Their services at 10:00 A.M. were three Sunday school classes which were well conducted. The adult class was taught by a lady and two younger classes went outside the house, got down on the ground and were taught by two young ladies who did their work well. I was asked to take the adult class, but observing a gentleman entering the room, whom I suspected to be a preacher, I declined. After classes were dismissed, the ladies, who seemed to be the pillars of this little church, announced that there would be no service at night unless someone would volunteer to conduct one. No one volunteered and meeting was dismissed. After dismissal the leaders insisted we have some kind of service. I suggested to the man whom I took to be a preacher, if he would preach, I would be glad to conduct the song service. He accepted my challenge. The ladies made announcement as none had left the grounds. and at 7:15 these faithful ladies were back to the meetinghouse and with the zeal of the bellman who rang out liberty with the old Liberty Bell in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, July 4, 1776, they aroused the people of this camp with the old church bell in this little church building. The people came to the church, the preacher did his part well, as for the song service, I'll leave it to you to guess. The women mentioned opened the church doors, built the fire in the stove (even though it was the Fourth of July), ordered the electric company to turn on the electricity for night service, arranged the seats, distributed the books, taught the classes and dismissed the meeting."

This sounds as if somebody has taken the Detroit Unity Meeting to heart, and decided to unite with every Tom, Dick and Harry that comes along, no matter what shade or brand of religion they may have. Although the Fourth of July came on Monday this year, it is evident that the above meeting took place on the Lord's Day, because they had Sunday school. Have members of the church of Christ the right to "forsake the assembling of the saints so as to enjoy a vacation and go into a union service with a group like the one mentioned above? I wonder if the ladies officiated at the Lord's Supper also? Or did the brother break bread that day? Did that preacher preach the gospel? Did he preach anything that is peculiar to true Christianity? This report surely sounds like the language of denominationalism to me. The report was carried in the *People's Bible Advocate* apparently uncensored and unreviewed by the editor, so I suppose that he approved of such actions.

--- Felix W. Tarbet.

**"Truth Wins in Birmingham"**

Floyd H. Horton, Birmingham, Alabama, October 3: "The debate between Foy E. Wallace, Jr., and Glenn V. Tingley closed last Friday night. The truth never won such a victory in Birmingham as it did in this debate. Brother Wallace was at his best, and he did not leave a peg for Mr. Tingley to lean on in any of the subjects discussed. More than seventy-five gospel preachers attended the debate from several states. We had splendid order, both on the part of the speakers and the audience. The church here is greatly strengthened, and many sinners saw the difference between truth and error during the debate. If you want to see a sectarian preacher get the life whipped out of him in a debate, I would advise you to call Foy E. Wallace, Jr. Rl. Keeble begins a four weeks' mission meeting among the colored people here in Woodlawn tonight, sponsored by the Woodlawn Church." -*Gospel Advocate.*
There are four species of poisonous snakes in the United States. The copperhead and rattlesnake are rated as very bad actors. The copperhead is the sneakiest and most dangerous in his mode of attack. In daytime, he remains concealed in bushes, leaves, or brush heaps. He crawls out at night, strikes quickly without warning and with little provocation and glides into concealment.

A copperhead has appeared among us. He lies concealed in the bushes of anonymity. Using the “List of Preachers of Churches of Christ,” he has circulated the brethren with a vicious, personal attack on a prominent man among us and failed to sign his name. The document is anonymous. Anybody who will do a thing like that against anybody is a sneak and a coward and deserving of the contempt of decent people. A man who will attack a character anonymously will lie, and usually does. A rattlesnake is a gentleman compared with him. The former announces his identity immediately before or after striking. A cause that demands copperhead methods in its defense must be in a desperate way.

We fight and sometime we fight hard. We fight fair. We will never attack a man or a cause without signing our names to it.

The best evidence we have indicates that the copperhead in question crawled out of some den of darkness in Chicago. His fang prints bear a Chicago postmark. Possibly someone of the pious brigade in Louisville knows where he stays coiled up in the daytime. If he is ever discovered and exposed, the good sense and fairness of the brethren can be depended on to behead him so effectively that his tail will not continue to wiggle till the sun goes down. —Cled E. Wallace.

Concerning the Unity Movement

In a recent issue of the Apostolic Review, Brother Witty gives a brief history of the unity movement since May 4. He explains some of its aims and purposes. I am thankful for his explanation. It is true that some may have opposed this movement because of a lack of knowledge about it, and some may have opposed it because of jealousy, and some may be honest and sincere in their opposition.

It is not my intention to question the motives of those who favor or oppose this unity movement. Surely the restoration of unity between brethren so long estranged is a thing to be most desired. I do propose to examine some statements made by Brother Witty in his article of July 19, on the subject. I wish it understood that I am willing to consider Brother Witty and his co-laborers sincere, and do not desire to cast reflection on anyone.

• All of my life, until four years ago, I was a member of the Christian Church. I have been Sunday school superintendent, sponsor for the Christian Endeavor Society, president of the various ladies’ organizations, and was appointed a deaconess. In fact, I have held all of the unscriptural offices it is possible to hold in the Christian Church. During that time I learned a lot about the viewpoint of those people. I have attended their conferences and conventions and have heard them discuss many and various subjects that they consider most important. I therefore feel qualified to speak on this subject. I have little faith in the outcome of this unity movement; yet it would not be impossible to achieve the desired end. That depends on how much both parties concerned really want it. At a glance it might seem that in some points some of us are already close together as Brother Witty says. He gives an example of two churches in a community. He says, “Their Sunday schools are about the same.” The Sunday schools of the Christian Church are organized from top to bottom, even among those who call themselves conservatives. They are so completely organized that they sustain no relationship whatever to the church, but are, in fact, competitive organizations. These Sunday schools are made up of groups of smaller organizations of departments and classes, each having its own officers. The same is true of the Christian Endeavor Society, and the ladies’ organizations of any congregation anywhere calling itself the church of Christ has anything like these it had better get rid of them. I am not opposed to using the class system of teaching, but I am opposed to calling that Sunday school, even without the organization that the Christian Church has perfected.

He says the church of Christ sends its missionary offerings to an independent missionary in some foreign land, and the Christian Church does the same. The group in the Christian Church that does not support the U. C. M. C. claims to support independent missionaries directly, but they really do not. They have an organization in Cincinnati, Ohio, called “The Christian Restoration Association.” This organization acts as agent for the “independent missionaries.” It publishes a magazine called The Restoration Herald. The missionaries may advertise their work through this paper by paying an exorbitant price for one page. Some of them complained about the price, and when I left them the new president of the C. R. A. was trying to work out a new scheme to take care of that expense. In 1935 the association was selling life memberships in the association at one hundred dollars each. I think before complete unity could be established with these folk something would have to be done about the C. R. A. Will they disband it, or shall we adopt it? I do not believe Brother Witty has intended to misrepresent these things. He has only been misinformed about them.

He supposes a Christian Church in a community whose members have not bothered to find out if they are doing right or wrong in using instrumental music; and a congregation of the church of Christ whose members have not been interested enough to find out why they do not use it. If they should try to unite that would be a dangerous combination. Dangerous to those who are not using the instruments of music. Those who use instrumental music (although they do not know if they should or not) do know that they like to use it, and would make loud objections if asked to give it up; and those who have not been interested enough to learn why they do not use it would be easily persuaded to accept it. That might be unity but not scriptural unity.

Mrs. R. H. Kyker (Fla.).

Broadcasting Fanaticism

Early on the first day of the week a long time ago a group of devout women discovered the empty tomb which mutely but eloquently bore witness to the greatest and most significant of all miracles, the resurrection of the Lord. The day stands as a memorial of the fact. Christians meet in solemn assembly and celebrate in acts of worship the Lord has appointed. It is a burlesque on the day and what it stands for. Early on that day in any large city, the turn of the dial tunes us in on wild orgies of fanaticism, in the name of the Lord, which are heathenish in their emotional excesses. Raucous-voiced preachers urge shrieking women and ignorant wild-eyed men to voice their feelings as evidence of pardon and divine acceptance. It is the ripened fruit of the direct operation theory in religion. There is not an ounce of intelligence or knowledge of Bible
teaching in it. It is a gushing forth of religious fervor both untutored and in many cases unteachable, a distinct exhibition of religious insanity. It is called Holy Ghost religion but the Holy Spirit who guided the apostles into all the truth and revealed Christianity, has as little to do with it as he does an Indian snake dance, or the incantations of an African medicine man. They are often heard to exclaim hysterically that they would not exchange the feelings that surge through their hearts for "a whole stack of Bibles, praise the Lord." Extract about half the noise from one of them and sober him up a bit and you have a typical case of Baptist conversion.—Cled E. Wallace.

**Potential Pastors**

In the Catholic Church the priest is "the" pastor and Protestant churches call the preacher "the" pastor. This is only one of many things in which Protestantism is following Catholicism. While preachers among us would almost universally disclaim the title, they often act the part and the members frequently refer to him as "our pastor." There is certainly a drift in that direction that should be met before it becomes too formidable.

The word *pastor*, which in the New Testament meant one of the plurality of overseers of each local congregation, has acquired an ecclesiastical meaning—the ruler or boss of the church. We never read of *the* pastor of a church in the Bible because every church had more than one. The Lord never intended to have a one man rule in the church. In the denominations the pastor has more authority than all the congregation and it is well understood if you want to take up some matter with a church see the pastor. As Israel wanted to be like the nations around them, we find many churches among us that want a pastor. The elders who are the divinely appointed pastors usually have but two functions—hire a preacher (pastor) and then be his rubber stamps. Not only do the members speak of the pastor as the preacher but preachers are sometimes heard to refer to "my elders" or talk of going to such-and-such a place and "take charge of the church"!

An evangelist is one who carries the gospel but as such has no "official" status. He is just a Christian and should be under the elders, or bishops, or any science of the church of which he is a member. As any Christian, he has a right to suggest but not to command.

Good brethren sometimes realize in a vague way that there is something wrong but err in their diagnosis. They conclude that if a preacher lives and labors in one locality for several years that makes him a pastor in the denominational sense, if so then Paul was an unscriptural, denominational pastor for he stayed a long time at Ephesus and also Corinth. Again, brethren are perfectly willing to employ a man to preach once a month but not every Sunday! It is not how long you preach at a place nor how frequently you preach that makes you an unscriptural pastor, but what you do while there. When any preacher begins to dictate to the elders he becomes a potential pastor and his services should be discontinued immediately! We should have no one man rule in the church of the Lord. Most church troubles could be avoided if the elders would "fire" the preacher the minute he tries to be the boss.—O. C. Lambert.

**Never Heard of It**

A man asked what church I was a member of. My answer of course, was that I was a member of "the church of Christ." He looked surprised and spoke as though he had never heard of it. He seemed to be well acquainted with the leading sectarian bodies. A man of supposedly wide information and running for Congress had occasion to read some religious statistics over the radio. He came to "Church of Christ" and remarked that he did not know what it was unless it was "a Holy Roller" outfit of some sort. There were a dozen or more simple churches of Christ within thirty miles of where he was speaking. The chief point in this is that men who pride themselves on their knowledge know all about sectarian churches none of which are ever mentioned in the New Testament; yet they never heard about the only church that is found in the New Testament. The heathen are not all in China. We possibly send men to Congress who do not know but what Sergius Paulus was the prophet the ravens fed. It isn't enough to tell a man you are a Christian and a member of the church of God. We are in process of having as many churches as America as there were gods in Athens. There is only one in the New Testament, and a large part of our religious population are hell-bent on belonging to anything except it. And they won't let a man be a Christian only if they can help it. They will pin something else on him—just anything else if he will allow it. A man has to be pretty cantankerous these days to be a Christian and not be herded into some sectarian goat pen.—Cled E. Wallace.
At the present time there are issues, emanating principally from Louisville, Ky., featured by Brother Boll and others, that are arraying schools against schools, papers against papers, preachers against preachers, churches against churches; and, generally, are disturbing the brotherhood far and wide. These things are considered by those who promulgate them, things that are not essential to salvation. Brother Boll in his discussion with Brother H. Leo Boles said that these things that are now disturbing us are not essential to our salvation. That being so, they fall under the head of things indifferent. These lead one to the study of a lesson found in the eighth chapter of First Corinthians where the apostle Paul discusses the question of eating meat, which he considered a matter of indifference so far as it within itself is concerned. Paul said that the meat was nothing. For when one understood, while eating the meat, though it was offered to an idol, that he was eating it as he would eat any other meat, he thereby committed no sin. But there were those who had not this knowledge. They, therefore, when they ate the meat that had been offered to an idol, ate it as a thing offered unto an idol, and in doing so became a worshiper of the idol and thereby sinned. Paul taught that the man who had the knowledge might eat this meat provided that while eating the meat he did not lead his weaker brothers, who were without this information, to eat this meat in the wrong way. That is, as meat offered to an idol. If the brother who knew what was proper led his weaker brother to eat the meat offered to an idol, he thereby brought about the destruction of his brother. This, Paul says, is a sin. When people do that which is indifferent, which is not wrong within itself, but leads other people into sin, they sin. Jesus said, of those who sin and die in sin, “Whither I go, ye cannot come.” When brethren teach things that are indifferent within themselves, but which do harm by arraying brother against brother, and split congregations and cause disturbances, they, thereby, sin; and in the name of the God of heaven according to the teaching of the Bible they are enjoined to leave undone the teachings of those non-essentials forever.

There is the second class among us who are contending that those of the first class are teaching things that are non-essential things, as they claim, should not teach such things if they cause trouble. All would agree that if these things are taught in the Bible, and are essential, they must be taught; even if one man teaches them and stands alone in the world with everybody against him. But if they be non-essential, but they are disturbing the church, and are arraying preachers against preachers, then they are things that must be left off or else we sin.

There is a third class who say to the second class, which second class objects to the Boll theory being taught to the disturbance of the church, you should not object to the teaching of such things. This third class says the second class is wrong in objecting to Brother Boll’s teaching these things. They say that they have no right to tell him not to teach these things, though he admits them to be non-essential. Yet by teaching these things the brotherhood is torn asunder. Among the second class who object to the teaching of these doctrines are those who will not admit that these things are non-essential, but that the Bible plainly teaches upon them. They claim that Brother Boll of Louisville teaches heresy pure and simple. All agree that certain prophecies of the Old Testament, Daniel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Joel, Ezekiel and others taught that the kingdom would be established in the days of the Roman Empire. If these prophecies of the Old Testament are false, then the prophets who gave them were wrong. But behind these prophets is the Holy Spirit, for these prophets did not give the prophecies of their own will, but the Holy Spirit, guided them in delivering them. And behind the Holy Spirit is the Almighty God. The Holy Spirit did not come into this world to give prophecies of his own accord, but was sent by God himself. If, therefore, these teachings found in the Old Testament are wrong, then not only the prophecies are wrong, but the prophets who gave them are wrong, and the Holy Spirit who influenced them is wrong; and the God of Heaven who sent the Holy Spirit to lead the prophets into giving the prophecies is wrong himself. Not only so, but coming to the New Testament, John the Baptist taught that the kingdom should be established in the days of the Roman Empire. That it was even near at hand at the time he taught, Jesus Christ taught the same thing. The twelve apostles taught the same thing. The seventy evangelists taught the same thing. But behind John and Jesus, the twelve apostles and the seventy evangelists, in this teaching, is the Holy Spirit; for the Holy Spirit guided them in their teaching. And behind the Holy Spirit is the God of heaven; for the Spirit did not come of his own accord, but was sent by God himself. Thus, if all this teaching by John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, the twelve apostles and the seventy evangelists is wrong, inasmuch as they were guided by the Holy Spirit sent by the Almighty God, then God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit who led these men into this teaching are all wrong. Hence, those who reject them do reject the prophecies and the prophets backed by the Holy Spirit, who was backed by the Almighty God of the Old Testament, plus John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, the twelve apostles, and the seventy evangelists led by the Holy Spirit backed by the Almighty God as contained in the New Testament. These are all wrong and must be rejected if the kingdom did not come as all these taught. This, therefore, repudiates all teachings in the Old Testament and the New Testament on this subject; and in doing so, God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit are all three rejected and repudiated. This must lead to infidelity, for if all these teachings guided by the Holy Spirit and taught by the Lord Jesus Christ backed by the God of heaven are wrong, then we have a Bible that is wrong and cannot be depended upon. This will lead to infidelity, wreak faith in God and the Bible. Again, if all these teachings in both the Old and New Testament are wrong as to the beginning of the kingdom, and the kingdom did not begin as they taught, but was postponed and the church, something else, was given in its stead, and all taught falsely upon this, how can we know that anything they taught can be taken as the truth? As an instance, when the Bible teaches that Jesus is coming again, how can we know it is right about it? If they were wrong in the teaching concerning the kingdom the first time, may they not be wrong about this teaching also? When they teach there will be a resurrection of the dead, may they not be wrong about this, inasmuch as they were wrong concerning the teaching of the kingdom? Therefore, we cannot be certain that Christ will ever come again, or that there will be a resurrection of any of us. Nor can we be certain that anything that pertains to the future as taught in the Bible is true.

This wrecks faith in God and the Bible, and it cannot be considered as a matter of indifference, but must be rejected as a heresy, and a heresy that can lead to nothing but trouble, division, and infidelity. G. A. Dunn.