There has been some undue excitement over "marking" certain brethren as dangerous teachers. For a man to assume an injured look and sadly protest that he is "a marked man" arouses the sympathy of the thoughtless and in some instances crowns him with a halo of martyrdom.

The truth is that all public men are marked. All Christians are branded. The fact that a man is marked carries no suggestion of shame or criticism. A man puts his own mark on himself and that marked carries no suggestion of shame or criticism. The fact that a man is branded. The fact that a man is marked by all who know me. My brethren have me marked as brilliant, mediocre, or plain dumb, according to their lights; hard, soft or tempered just right, according to their slant on such matters. One preacher wrote me requesting an explanation of my conduct in calling on Methodist and Baptist preachers to lead prayers in one of my meetings. As I did not recall doing anything of the kind, I suggested that he was a victim of mistaken identity; that possibly it was John O'Dowd, as he had circulated around in that section, too. I haven't heard whether or not he took the matter up with John. I often call on men to pray in meetings where I'm doing the preaching and try to stick to a well-defined principle. A man is not qualified to lead a public prayer in my meeting unless he is in thorough sympathy with the purposes of the meeting. And I also want some assurance that he is so related that the Lord will listen to him. Aliens are barred, and the principle also excludes courtesy as a determining rule. These are my principles whether I always adhere strictly to them or not. "For in many things, we all stumble." (Jas. 3:2) But please do not call on me to defend my stumbling or that of anybody else. It is out of my line.

Some of our pious protesters against the "sin" of marking brethren are equally guilty of doing the same thing. They recommend me about as heartily as I do them. They do not want me for meetings any oftener than I do them. One of the chiefs among them is said to have referred to two of my best friends, both of whom are able in the Scriptures, as "wild-asses." These men are marked, but I translate the mark in more complimentary terms. These protesters do not confine themselves to mere marking. They are even resorting to efforts at cancellation by means of anonymous libel.

The chief point in all this is that if a man will fear God and keep his commandments, he need not worry too much about his mark. "How be it the firm foundation of God standeth, having this seal, The Lord knoweth them that are his: and let him that nameth the name of the Lord depart from unrighteousness." (2 Tim. 2:19) As for what some mean by "fellow-shin" in this hectic controversy, if public men are marked for what they are, both good and otherwise, loyal brethren will take care of that in practical fashion.
WHAT IS THE CHURCH OF CHRIST?

Upon the threshold of this one momentous question there are numerous others which present universal problems to men who think on the subject of the church. Does the true church exist today? How may one find it? Of the many that do exist, is not one as good as another? Are there not legions of good people in them all? How can an honest man know which church he would join? In fact, why should be join one? The average man becomes lost in a maze of mystery and decides that no church is as good as any.

One Church Or No Church

It is an admitted fact that Jesus Christ founded an institution which he called the church. It is also true that there are in the world today many human institutions which are called churches, founded by men, existing by no higher authority than the word of men, governed by no higher authority than the creeds of men. Who is ready to say that these institutions are as good as the church that Jesus Christ built, and of which He is the Head? The fact that good people are in these human churches, better would they be called fraternities, is beside the point. There are good men in the Masonic Lodge, and good women in its feminine gender, the Eastern Star, but that does not make them divine institutions. If good people in all the churches makes one church as good as another, then good people out of all the churches makes no church as good as any. All such is shallow reasoning. In the light of the New Testament it is the church or no church.

What church should a man join? Why say what church? Rather, why not join all of them, that is, all to which we might have access. If, as claimed, there is good in all of them; some good in one not in the other; truth in all, but not all the truth in any; why limit a man to only a part of the truth and a fractional amount of the good when he could have as much of both as he desires? A church is the truth by uniting all of the churches. Men belong to more than one lodge, society or club; hold insurance policies in more than one bank-why not membership in more than one church, if it is purely a matter of "joining some church," one of which is as good as the other. It reveals the fact that nobody really believes that one church is as good as another and the statement turns out to be an effort to be broadminded and polite.

Men do not join the divine church. The Bible says that God adds to the church those who receive and obey His word when they do. "Then they that received the word were baptized and there were added unto them in that day about three thousand souls." (Acts 2:41) "And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." (Acts 2:47) Yet this dashing, smashing slogan of a "union meeting" was once seen: Join The Church Of Your Choice Aud Be Baptized As You Please! And that in the name of religion assuming that God has neither church nor choice, and that the Lord Jesus Christ and His Apostles never uttered a syllable on the how and the what of baptism.

Method Of Identification

The matter of finding the true church is as simple as any matter of identification, when the means by which to identify is at hand. Do you have an identification card in your billfold, purse or key folder? For what purpose? It describes your person, so that in case of accident or emergency you could be identified. When an automobile is lost or stolen the method of identification proceeds on the basis of registration, that is, the make, the model and the number. The New Testament contains the description of the New Testament church-the church of Christ; it is a registered institution. Its make, its model and its number, so to speak, are on divine record. Identify it by characteristics. You have the means at hand-the divine record and when you find a body of people today who embrace the principles set forth in the New Testament in teaching and practice-that will be the identification.

The New Testament plainly teaches that there is but one true church. Jesus Christ said, "My church." Paul said, "The church, which is his body." Again, "The body, the church." (Col. 1:18) Further, "There is one body." (Eph. 4:4) And finally, "But one body." (1 Cor. 12:20) If that is not talking of one church, and the same one, it is a peculiar way to talk of many.

There are several uses of the word church in the New Testament, but in each use its unity is seen. First, the general church-all the saved in the aggregate. "And gave him to be the head over all things to the church which is his body." (Eph. 1:22) Second, the local church, all the saved within a certain locality, restricted by a geographical term of limitation. "The church of God at Corinth." (1 Cor. 1:2) "The church of Macedonia." (2 Cor. 8:2) And also "the seven churches of Asia." all the same church (John preached for all of them), of one faith and order. Third, the congregation, or assembly. "When the church be come together." (1 Cor. 14:26) In any New Testament sense the use of the word church when it refers to the institution of Christ includes all the saved, and no more, and no less. But a denomination cannot be the church in any Bible sense. In the general sense, the denomination is smaller than the church-for no denomination claims to have within its folds all of the saved on earth. In the local sense, the denomination is larger than the church-for a denomination is composed of all local bodies of one faith and order. The denomination is too large to be the church in the general sense, it is therefore not the church in any sense.

Procreation And Perpetuity

The church as set forth in the New Testament is simply this: God ordained that men should obey the gospel, thus become Christians and by this process be saved. In so doing they are added to the church, the saved in the aggregate. God then ordains that Christians should band themselves together for the purpose of work and worship-and wherever such a body of Christians is found, banded together in and under the scriptural requirements of the local church, without ecclesiastical head or creed, but who are in doctrine, worship and work what the New Testament requires-there you find a New Testament church.

Much has been heard in the past of the perpetuity of the church—its origin and succession. The effort to establish succession has been virtually abandoned by the Baptists. Their historians were in their way. Ancient history revealed a gap that could not be bridged. The Bible, not history, is the thing needed to establish the claims of the New Testament church. As long as the seed exists that produces the thing-why worry about succession? Then what of origin? God created the church as he created Adam, the first man. Next was procreation. Creation was the miracle: procreation, the law. The church, the new man, was created. (Eph. 2:14-16) On Pentecost it was formed; the Spirit was imparted to it. Today we have the seed, for "the seed is the word of God" (Lk. 8:11), which is the divine means of procreation. Thus when men hear, believe and obey the Word, the New Testament Church is reproduced, procreated. There is no need of unbroken succession, ecclesiastical church-making, creed-writing, synods, councils, conventions, manuals, disciplines, ar-
Organization And Government

The organization of the church is simple, not complex. The church is not a mere vague, spiritual thing, without visible existence or government. Of the whole church Jesus Christ is the Head, and the New Testament is the Law. As a kingdom, Christ is the King. Christians are citizens—a divine monarchy unlimited and absolute. From the King's decrees (the laws of the New Testament) there can be no appeal. His laws are subject to no change or revision, no modification, not even by his assumed Holiness, the Pope and his cardinals. But the Head of the church provided organization for his Church. There is first the body—the members; then there are the rulers over them, the elders, who are officers of God first rank, whose duties are described by several titles such as bishops, pastors, elders, presbyters, are nevertheless one official group. The New Testament order is a plurality of elders in every church, not a plurality of churches under one elder. The elders are what the word implies—men of age, experience, knowledge and wisdom, whose character and faith qualify them to rule the congregation. Such men were ordained by the apostles, and those to whom the apostles delegated such right, to be elders in the church. Their qualifications and duties were laid down in the divine record near the close of the era of inspiration, showing that it belonged to the permanent and not to the provisional order. They are under the divine command to enforce the teaching of the New Testament in the church of which they are the overseers. In so doing faithful elders are sometimes charged with "lording it over God's heritage"—a thing the New Testament, indeed, forbids elders to do. But an elder is not lording when he is enforcing the word of God, no matter how arbitrary his action may sometimes appear. A "lord" is one who sets up his own will and exercises an authority not derived from Christ. Elders who by the will of Christ hold the practices of the church to the New Testament are not lords. A church that establishes congregational rule (which is majority rule) against 'the rule of elders, is as in a state of anarchy and rebellion against God. It is on this vital point that much teaching is needed within the church. As old Israel borrowed their notion for a king from their heathen neighbors, the mistake that brought on all of their apostasies and miseries, so churches of Christ have borrowed notions about pastors and their parties, voting and petitioning, with all the evils of revolt from sectarian neighbors. The members of the church need to know what the church is—some elders preach that they need to learn their place in God's order.

We hear much of "congregational government," the authority for which you will find on the blank page in your New Testament. As old Israel borrowed their notion for a king from their heathen neighbors, the mistake that brought on all of their apostasies and miseries, so churches of Christ have borrowed notions about pastors and their parties, voting and petitioning, with all the evils of revolt from sectarian neighbors. The members of the church need to know what the church is—and some elders preach that they need to learn their place in God's order.

So obvious is the truth of these things that very few in the church will admit that they believe in majority rule. They will not own the practice even when it has been reported to. Some churches that have petitioned and voted elders out, nominated and elected others in, yet deny all the time that they believe in majority rule in matters of faith! To deny that what a church makes a practice of doing is a matter of faith is even worse than owning up to the unscriptural doctrine. The fact that provocations exist, or a false loyalty to a preacher, cannot justify the circulating of Petitions, house to house canvasses to ascertain how many can be mustered on this side or that side in matters pertaining to the church, which the elders should themselves settle. Even if wrong exists that needs correction—two wrongs do not make one right. We are forbidden in the Bible to do evil that good may come, which is the same as saying that good cannot come out of evil. A member of the church who signs his name to a petition circulated among the members, becomes by that act an anarchist. The preacher who permits a petition to be circulated on his behalf among the members of the church is a factionist.

Elders And Deacons

But someone may inquire, What of the deacons? The answer is that the church needs faithful deacons; but let it be known that deacons are not elders. We develop strange ideas, and a language foreign to the Bible. We hear it said that the church is under the elders and deacons, another thing you may find in the third chapter of second Jude. Deacons have their work, but it is not one of authority or rule over the congregation. The common practice of having meetings in which the business of the church is settled by motions made and seconded and voted upon by elders and deacons with deacons outvoting elders is as foreign to the New Testament as a college of cardinals electing a pope. The deacons are assistants to the elders, and it is their duty under the direction of the elders to attend to the secular interests of the church. This is the limit of their official duties. The office confers no authority. This does not minimize the work of deacons—by means for it should be regarded an honor to be considered by the church as possessing the personal character that causes one to be sought for such active service in the church.

Preachers And Members

And what about preachers? Neither do they hold office. They are ministers of the word-evangelists. They are not pastors, but preachers. They should not be errand boys, nor doorbell pushers, calling on the sisters while their husbands are at work. When a preacher, whether located or not, becomes anything else than a preacher, a Christian preacher, he becomes something he ought not to be.

And what of the members? In humble submission to the divine arrangement of a New Testament congregation, members of the church should in meekness work out their salvation with fear and trembling, knowing that it is God who works in us to will and to do of his good Pleasure. The New Testament orders its elders to rule: deacons to serve; preachers to preach; members to work. So give us elders that will elder; deacons that will deacon; congregations that will congregate; and preachers that will preach! What could be more useless than nominal elders, deacons, and preachers, who do not function in their respective offices?

With a parting emphasis, this divine arrangement—the local church is the only organization known to the New Testament. All organizations larger or smaller than the local church, whether Sunday School, Missionary Society, Ladies Aid, Young People's Meetings, Inter-Church Committees and Boards, or What-Have-You, are not only unnecessary but unscriptural.
THE LOST IS FOUND

CLEO E. WALLACE

Brother F. L. Rowe, editor of the Christian Leader, has an article in his issue of December 6th on "Modern History In The Making." It has reference to the transformation of the Christian Leader. Inasmuch as this is to be the new paper which is confessedly a protest against the inefficiency and wicked ways of other leading journals among us, and proposes to satisfy an outraged brotherhood, Bro. Rowe's article is of peculiar interest. Some of the historical facts connected with the genesis of the movement are particularly arresting.

Early in this year many of our preachers received a questionnaire from Clinton Davidson, of Bernardsville, N. J., covering the activities of our church papers. The writer was a stranger to all.

I confess that I never heard of Bro. Davidson until I saw the "questionnaire." I looked it over and laid it aside with the feeling that it was written by somebody who was sore over the fact that a fight was being made on false doctrine and the growing spirit of compromise in doctrinal matters. The questions were framed to "lead the witness." The queerest had his mind made up and framed his questions with a view to getting widespread indorsement of his own sentiments. It was an appeal to the "dissatisfied" as Brother Lovel would say. It may be safely said that every compromiser and premillennialist among us reacted favorably to the leading of the questionnaire. If one was sent to John B. Cowden, he probably answered it. I saw the trick in it but had no idea that it was destined to make "modern history." A man who is a "stranger to all" seldom ever crashes a place in the public eye with such suddenness.

Bro. Rowe was skeptical. Before accepting an invitation to the stranger's home he "made all possible inquiry concerning Brother Davidson."

I learned that he had left Louisville nearly twenty years ago and been "lost" to us. But as I learned when I visited in his home that he had been in New York City where he had taken up life insurance and had applied himself to it night and day. He told me, that while other young men were having their evenings, holidays and vacations, he was constantly on the job so that in twenty years he was on top and in position to give his attention again to spiritual things.

It ought not to be out of place in view of such sensational developments, to ask a few questions and make a few comments. These are now matters of public interest. Since Brother Davidson has been found, after being "lost to us" for twenty years, and proposes to renew his "attention again to spiritual things" by rescuing the brotherhood from the sort of journalism the readers of the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation, while the known speculators and "neuters" among us purr with satisfaction over his questionnaires and surveys. The fact that he seems inclined to protect himself by copyright may arouse the suspicion that he has more confidence in the power of his money and the arm of the law than he does in the strength of his proposition.

Brother Rowe assures us that it is understood that the Firm Foundation, while the known speculators and "neuters" among us purr with satisfaction over his questionnaires and surveys. The fact that he seems inclined to protect himself by copyright may arouse the suspicion that he has more confidence in the power of his money and the arm of the law than he does in the strength of his proposition.

Brother Rowe assures us that it is understood that the traditional policy of the Leader will remain unchanged.

I would not consider any proposition that would not guarantee that the paper would be continued along the same lines that have characterized it from the beginning. I told him of my father's hard work in defense of Apostolic teaching and practice and that I would not be true to my trust if it's course or purpose were in the least changed. He repeatedly assured me that there would be no change whatever in its policy.

Now that sounds reassuring, and if true, who knows but that I may be writing "Sword Swipes" for the new paper yet. There is a slight (?) discrepancy that needs to be ironed out yet. It just simply does not jibe with that questionnaire and copyrighted survey. The Leader has repeatedly through the years carried articles that have proved it to be no better than the Gospel Advocate or the Firm Foundation. Its writers have time and again furnished articles that Brother Davidson's "survey" shows
the brotherhood to be “dissatisfied” over, and the new paper is pledged to the proposition that they will get no more of it. It looks like Brother Davidson has made contradictory pledges, one to Brother Rowe, another to the “dissatisfied” brotherhood. We shall watch with some interest to see if he is skillful enough at “walking the wire” to fulfill both of them. The new paper has promised a lot to live up to. We shall watch its progress with interest. It will be the wonder of the century if the newly-found promoter from New Jersey accomplishes the miracle in journalism he has promised. He has started out to give us a New Deal.

POSTPONED OR CANCELLED?

The kingdom we now have, the church, is consistent with the prophecies regarding the sufferings of Christ. The future-kingdom theory is not. The time for the kingdom prophecies to be fulfilled was “fulfilled” when Jesus came the first time. So said Jesus and so say the future-kingdom advocates. Two lines of prophecy, one pointing to the death of Jesus and the other to the establishment of the kingdom, by common consent belong to the period of the first advent of the Lord. Had the kind of kingdom the Jews expected and Brother Boll and his followers predict for the future, been set up when the time was “fulfilled,” Jesus would not have died. We are told that the fulfillment of one line of prophecy, the suffering and death of Jesus, occasioned the postponement of the kingdom. Had the kingdom of prophecy been set up when the time was “fulfilled,” the prophecies regarding the death of Jesus would not have been postponed, they would have been cancelled. The two lines of prophecy regarding Christ and the Kingdom are contradictory, according to the theories of premillennialists. The whole Boll theory is subverhibe both of prophecy and the gospel. Christ died and the kingdom was set up when the time was fulfilled.” —Cled E. Wallace

THE INDIAN EVANGELIST

In another department of this magazine will be found a most interesting, instructive and appealing article from the pen of James E. White, Indian evangelist. The reader will be impressed with several things in the perusal of this article. First, the unusual ability of the writer, as a native Indian, to express himself in writing to us. He is master of both his language and ours. Second, his evident sincerity of purpose and devotion both to his people and the church of Christ. Third, his willingness to sacrifice to preach the glorious gospel to his own flesh and blood. Those of us who know Brother White personally have no hesitancy in commending him and his work to the brethren everywhere. The fact that he was tutored under L. L. Brigance and N. B. Hardeman, and now has their full endorsement, is recommendation enough. He is not a novice—broad a man of sufficient years to have developed the wisdom of maturity. He knows what he is doing and how to do it. He deserves the support of the brethren, and we hope he will receive it.

At the present time Brother White is traveling in interest of his Indian work. He has seldom resorted to this. In fact, in the several years of his work this is the second time he has ever gone among the brethren to solicit their assistance. He is not a missionary moocher, nor a circulating beggar. His present trip is fully justified on the grounds which he so very forcefully sets forth in his plea. It is his actual desire to stay among the Indians without having to canvass and campaign—he is an evangelist to the Indians, and cares nothing about visiting among the brethren just to be travelling. We sincerely hope the brethren will make short work of supplying the needs of his work so that he may return at once to the Indian reservations with assurance of permanent support.

The immediate needs which Brother White is presenting are: First, funds with which to purchase a tent in which to hold his meetings. He states that $200.00 will be needed for this, but more than this amount should be provided in order that seats and equipment might be included, and the more money raised the better the tent and equipment. Second, enough regular contributions to his work to provide a reasonable support for his family over and above the routine expenses connected with all such work. Everything these days must have “carrying charges added” — and this is true of preachers who do anything. And, finally, (though this has not been asked for) as the work progresses the brethren should keep in mind to provide a neat chapel building in the reservation where Brother White will be located in order that the Indian church, which now numbers fourteen members, may have a place of their own in which to worship. This would not cost a great deal and would give a permanence and prestige to his work that would overcome some of the handicaps and disadvantages mentioned in Brother White’s article.

If a respectable number of individuals and churches can be attracted to this worthy cause it will be a simple matter to meet all the demands with dispatch and send this Indian evangelist back to his people with a happy heart to tell them of Christ and his church. Those who wish to deal with Brother White directly may address him Box 7, Oneida, Wisconsin, or while he is on his present trip any mail addressed to him in care of The Bible Banner will be forwarded to him. This is a job that should be well done.

THE GOSPEL PROCLAIMER

The Firm Foundation announces a new monthly 16-page magazine beginning January first 1939 which will bear the above title. The name of the magazine indicates its purpose, and the publisher of it, Brother G. H. P. Showalter, is sufficient guarantee of its soundness. The Firm Foundation gives the following items of information concerning the forthcoming monthly:

1. The “Gospel Proclaimer”, will be devoted to the first principles and articles essentially connected with the church. It will be, therefore, a newspaper of the church. News will be continued through the Firm Foundation, as in the past.

2. The subscription price of the “Gospel Proclaimer” is $2.00 per year. In clubs of ten or more, the price is $1.00 each per year. But until December 25, this club rate will be 50 cents each.

3. Those sending us a club of ten or more subscribers will receive one year’s subscription free as compensation for their services.

We have the “Gospel Proclaimer” will begin with a bang. The magazine has a worthy mission being devoted to “first principles and articles essentially connected with the church.” The poor lost world needs all such that can be placed within reach, and we cannot have too many publications. The relations between the “Gospel Proclaimer” and the “Bible Banner” will be entirely friendly and fraternal as, indeed, exists between the publishers personally. We congratulate Brother Showalter on this forward step and extend our strongest best wishes.
WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT? or TWO ANTIPODAL POSITIONS

JOHN T. LEWIS

DEALING WITH DANIEL

All quotations from Brother Boll in this article will be from his book, "The Kingdom of God," unless otherwise mentioned. On page 13, he asked this question: "Has Daniel 2:44 been fulfilled?" He then says: "This will at once be answered affirmatively by many. It is widely claimed that this prophecy found its fulfillment in the establishment of the church on the Pentecost after Christ's resurrection." After giving the reasons assigned for this position, he says on page 14, "But the prophecy fairly taken represents not a gradual process, but a catastrophic event—a great, general smashup of the world-kingdoms by supernatural agency. The stone's effect upon the image is due to violent impact, not to 'peaceful penetration.' The stone falls for judgment and destruction upon the world-power—not for the conversion and salvation of individuals. The image is suddenly broken up—pulverized by an act of God. ... The stone is not represented as growing at all until the image has been reduced to chaff and winds have swept away its fragments into the nowhere."

Again you have the two positions stated by Brother Boll, and his view of the first position is stated on page 15. He says: "As for my part—if I could get no light on the point I would prefer to leave the question unsolved, and to me unsolvable, rather than to try to satisfy myself and others with a cheap and false explanation, which can only do dishonor to God's word. But there is a divine explanation, clear and satisfying." Therefore all who believe and teach that Daniel 2:44 was fulfilled on Pentecost, in the establishment of the church, only give to the prophecy "a cheap and false explanation, which can only do dishonor to God's word," and that, too, in the face of a "divine explanation, clear and satisfying." "Clear and satisfying" to whom? Why, to Brother Boll and his friends, of course. Yet they are willing to fellowship these perverts and insulters of God's word.

The Explanation Examined

Let us look at Brother Boll's "divine explanation, clear and satisfying." On page 16, after telling what the image
and the beast represents, he says: "The next power and dominion to hold sway over the earth, according to Daniel, is the kingdom of God. And that kingdom of God and its coming is not represented as a development here below, but as an irruption from above, 'without hands,' that is to say, not of man's device nor of human agency. The kingdom enters in by a judicial and destructive act from on high, by which the whole image is reduced to fragments like the chaff of the summer's threshing floor which are carried away by the winds and no place is found for them. Then the little stone which wrought this destruction takes possession and becomes a great mountain, filling the whole earth." After telling us just how the kingdom will enter, how it destroys "the image and the beast" and then what the "little stone" will do, he says: "The inspired interpretation of all this is summed up in these words," then he quotes Daniel 2:44. That is, Brother Boll says, Daniel 2:44 is, "a divine explanation, clear and satisfying" of all he says about a future earthly kingdom.

That may not be new to Brother Boll and his friends; but I venture to say it would be something "new under the heavens" to Solomon if he were living.

The Roman empire, the fourth world kingdom represented by Nebuchadnezzar's image, vanished more than fifteen hundred years ago. Brother Boll seeing this difficulty refers to Rev. 17:8, on page 19, and says: "This is not dark symbolism but divine interpretation, which needs no more interpreting. The Roman world-power then, though now it does not exist, is to return. When it returns, the Roman power will be in the form of a ten-kingdom confederacy under one dominant head; which fact is indicated by the toes of the image; more fully set forth in the ten horns of the fourth beast (Dan. 7); and clearly revealed to John in Revelation. . . . It is this league and combine represented as the ten-horned beast, and particularly its head, that will receive its judgment and utter doom at the hands of the returning Son of God (Rev. 19:11-21)."

Thus Brother Boll declares that the Roman empire of the Caesars, though long since gone the way of the other constituent part of Nebuchadnezzar's image, will return with world supremacy before Daniel 2:44 is fulfilled, and it is imminent too. He also says that Rev. 19:11-21 tells of the "judgment and utter doom, at the hands of the returning Son of God" of this future Roman world empire.

Some Difficulties In The Way

I want to point out some difficulties, as I see them. In Rev. 19:17, 18, John says: "And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the birds that fly in mid heaven, Come and be gathered together unto the great supper of God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty man, and the flesh of horses and of them that sit thereon, and the flesh of man, both free and bond, and small and great." But according to Brother Boll's "divine explanation, clear and satisfying," at the second coming of Christ the returned Roman world empire and its confederation will be suddenly broken up—pulverized by an act of God, reduced to chaff and its fragments swept by the winds into the nowhere." Now if Rev. 19:17, 18 tells of this "act of God," necessarily, by the same "act of God," the fragments of this pulverized empire will have to be brought back from the nowhere, instantaneously revitalized, and turned into the flesh of kings, captains, mighty men, horses and their riders for the birds to feast upon. If these prophecies are thus to be literally fulfilled at the second coming of Christ, and Brother Boll says they will be, I am wondering over what or whom Jesus Christ and his saints will reign during the thousand years they are to be in Jerusalem (?). Will it be over the fragments of the pulverized Roman empire, or will it be over the revitalized flesh of man and horses while the birds are feasting upon it?

On page 20 Brother Boll writes what he calls "the conclusion." He says: "We have seen then, that in the fair meaning of the prophecies of Daniel, the kingdom of God, in that phase of it which is viewed by Daniel, has not yet come." Peter says the prophets did not know, and could not find out, the when, nor the how of the fulfillment of their prophecies (1 Peter 1: 9-20). But Brother Boll says Daniel had a fair view of the fulfillment of that phase of his prophecies which "has not yet come." He says the stone spoken of in Daniel 2:44 refers to the church. On page 14, he says: The stone and the image do not coexist peacefully at all: when the one comes the other goes. Nor is it true that the stone by its growing gradually displaces the image. The stone is not represented as growing at all until the image has been reduced to chaff and the winds have swept away its fragments into the nowhere. As to the question of the stone's growth—the church of Christ has had much fluctuation, but not anything like steady growth. It is doubtful whether now after 2000 years, there are any more real Christians in the world—I say not in proportion to the population, but in actual figures—than there were at the close of the apostolic era.

Minimizing The Church

According to Brother Boll the church of Christ has not grown any since the apostolic age, and it cannot grow till the Roman empire returns as a world power, then the church or little stone (Charles T. Russell called it "the little flock") comes, "as an irruption from above—a judicial and destructive act from on High," by which the world powers are reduced to chaff and swept into the nowhere. Then the little stone which wrought this destruction takes possession and becomes a great mountain, filling the whole earth." That is, after the return and destruction of the yet to be Roman world empire the church will have such a phenomenal growth it will become a great mountain and fill the whole earth; and this will all be literal too. Because Brother Boll says: "If, after all he has so solemnly promised and sworn to his people, Israel, God does not fulfill his word to them, but instead turns all into a spiritual and figurative fulfillment to a new spiritual contingent called 'The Church,' then we cannot know that any promise of God can be relied on, nor can we know what he means when he says anything." (March issue of Word and Work). Therefore according to Brother Boll's theory all the money, time, and efforts that have been spent since the apostolic age, or shall ever be spent, in preaching the gospel before the return and destruction of the Roman world empire, have been, and will be wasted. Because the church or stone has not grown any since the apostolic era, nor cannot grow till the destruction of this yet to be world empire. To me this is the very essence of foolery.

Two Theories Antipodal

But let us look further into this tomfoolery. On page 84, we read: "What will be the conditions of salvation during the millennium? There can never be any salvation for anyone, anywhere anytime, except by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and obedience to the gospel. Whatever changes that the new era may bring, there can never be any altering of this fundamental and essential truth." Of course, the apostolic age was the beginning of a new era, and if the little stone has grown none since that age, as a result of preaching the gospel, if some fellow starts to preaching it during the millennium, won't that throw the whole machinery into reverse and stop the growth of the stone or church?

Thus far Brother Boll has run the "two theories" antipodal, and that
is as it should be, so everybody can see the difference. But on page 20, he writes that he calls "notes on Daniel 2:44," as though he had said nothing about that verse before. In this note, he scrambles the "two theories," confuses the issue, and colors his position. In the "Boles-Boll" debate, on page 140, he refers to this note as setting forth his position on the kingdom question. One is left to wonder, if this note of less than fourteen lines states his position on the kingdom, why the book? Yet his friends refer to this "note" as showing there is no issue between us. The note follows: "The statement that Daniel 2:44 has not been fulfilled, does not deny that the stone which smites the image upon its feet already exists. Necessarily the cutting out of the stone 'without hands', must precede its descent upon the image. If it be contended that the words in Dan. 2:44, in the days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom; has reference to the first preparation of the stone, in the establishment of the church on Penteocost, we have no objection to offer. It is in harmony with the conception that Christ descending at the head of His saints (Rev. 19:11-21) destroys the last world-power, and takes possession of the earth. This is the stone, which has been forming throughout the present age and which in due time comes down to smite the image and assume the control of the earth. But it is the latter point the establishment of the Kingdom of God in the earth open manifestation and supreme power-which the catastrophe Dan. 2:44 has especially in view."

A Cheap And False Explanation

Now let Brother Boll tell us how that little stone "has been forming throughout the present age," since the preaching of the gospel has had no effect upon it, and how could it "be forming" without growing? If the establishment of the church on Penteocost was the first preparation of the stone, why did God quit "cutting out" the stone at the close of the apostolic age? Brother Boll says the stone has not grown any since then, and cannot grow till the destruction of a returned world empire. Yet he says in his "note" : "Necessarily the cutting out of the stone 'without hands,' must precede its descent upon the image." This is "clear and satisfactory." Eh? There is nothing said in Rev. 19:11-21 that speaks of "Christ descending from heaven at the head of his saints." If I could get no light on Rev. 19:11-21 I would leave the prophecy "unsolved, and to me unsolvable, rather than to try to satisfy myself and others with a cheap and false explanation, which can only do dishonor to God's word."

In our next, we will look further into "The Kingdom of God."

There is a terrible and bitter irony in the fact that Christ was done to death by the identical sin which he had made the chief target of his earthly ministry. Time and again in his preaching he had condemned and denounced the people who refused to shoulder their responsibilities. In the story of the Good Samaritan, he did not denounce the robbers who beat and wounded the victim: anybody would condemn them. He saved his wrath for the respectable priest and Levite, and for the attitude of the heard of the matter. In the story of the Last Judgment, he spent no time in arraignment of those who attacked the poor, exploited the prisoners, took advantage of the sick; any just man would censure their conduct. Christ reserved his disapproval for the "good" people who sidestepped their responsibility. In the parable of the talents, it was not the embezzlement of funds, the misuse, or dishonest appropriation of another's property that Christ condemned; it was the attitude of the man who was quite honest along most lines, but who refused to acknowledge his responsibility.

Adopting Pilate's Attitude

It is in view of such teachings as these that we say there is a tragic irony in the fact that Christ was crucified by a man who was guilty of the identical sin. "When Pilate saw that he prevailed nothing, but rather that a tumult was arising, he took water, and washed his hands before the multitude, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this righteous man; see ye to it." In his general attitude Pilate was not a bad sort. He was attracted to Jesus; he despised the bigotry and narrowness of the Jewish leaders. And, doubtless, he would gladly have been relieved of his role in the trial. But Pilate made one awful mistake. It is a mistake which thousands of people make every day: it appears innocent and harmless, but is positively deadly in its consequences. Unbidden and unwanted a great responsibility walked up to Pilate and looked him squarely in the face. ... and Pilate washed his hands of it.

Pilate did not make this fatal blunder in one moment or in one day. It was the culmination of a life-long attitude. Many times before he had avoided an unpleasant duty or evaded a disagreeable task by 'passing the buck.' From the picture Josephus gives of him we can see the lineaments of his character in vivid and unmistakable outline. On more than one occasion in his administration in Judea he had refused to shoulder responsibilities which were thrust upon him: he had often made the same mistake he made now-but never before with such tragic sequellae.

If we will but look into our own lives and into the lives of others, we will discover that Pilate was guilty of one of the commonest and most ordinary of all human weaknesses—that of sidestepping responsibility. And nowhere is this attitude more apparent than in the matter of religion. Here, if anywhere, can be traced the course and consequences of such an attitude. Here, if anywhere, can be seen the disastrous results of a widespread evasion of responsibility; and here, more quickly than anywhere else, can be seen the healthy response and marvelous growth coming from a general acknowledgement and shouldering of responsibility.

The Disintegration Of A Religious Movement

Today, in a manner almost without precedent, there is a responsibility placed on those who have espoused the cause of New Testament Christianity. For this generation is witnessing one of the most ordinary and common, yet awesome, of all religious phenomena—the decay and disintegration of a vast religious movement. From time immemorial this has been the invariable story of human religions: they wax, wane, and decay. We believe the signs are unmistakable that Protestantism, as it has been historically known, is irrevocably doomed. It is but a question of time until the whole Protestant movement will have so been degenerated as to lose its former semblance the thing it started out to be.

And that brings Christian people face to face with their responsibility. Here are millions of souls who are finding themselves without any religious stability; they are adrift and at sea. The old foundations of their lives have been broken up: increasingly they will either abandon all religion or will seek a more solid foundation on which to erect their spiritual houses. Such a situation will challenge the earnest Christian to search deep into his own heart, and to ask himself the question. What is my duty and responsibility in this hour?
The Christian’s Unavoidable Responsibility

First of all, the Christian has a positive and unavoidable responsibility toward the gospel of Christ: to “guard it,” and preserve it from corruption. It was Paul who warned young Timothy to “guard that which is committed unto thee.” Again, he exhorted the Corinthians to “hold fast the word which I preached unto you,” and urged Titus to “speak the things which befit the sound doctrine.” He pronounced the curse of heaven upon creature, man or angel, who would pervert, corrupt, or in any particular alter the gospel of Christ. We can readily see the reason for these solemn and awe-inspiring statements. Man can be saved only by the gospel of Christ (Rom. 1:16; I Cor. 15:2, Heb. 5:9, II Thess. 1:9); hence, any tampering with the gospel is a tampering with the eternal destiny of precious souls. This most priceless of earth’s treasures must be jealously guarded to be kept free from corruption or perversion.

In view of the Christian’s responsibility to guard, protect, defend, and champion this gospel, how sad it is to see so many walking in the steps of Pilate. They say, “We have preachers and debaters to do that—see ye to it.” And, even worse, some of those who are recognized by many as leaders seem inclined to take the easy way out. When controversial issues arise in the church, issues which may threaten the very life of the church, how often we see preachers who don’t even inform themselves on the points in dispute! They calmly sit back, as though nothing concerned them, and, in effect, say to those who are bearing the brunt of the battle, “See ye to it.”

Preserving The Purity Of The Gospel

Pilate might wash his hands, but washing could not remove the stain of innocent blood from them. And no amount of work, piety, love, or prayer, can cover the guilt of him who habitually sidesteps his responsibility toward the gospel of Christ. Friendships may have to be sacrificed; jobs may have to be surrendered; even homes may have to be broken up. But at any cost, and at all costs, the purity of the gospel must be preserved.

Again, the Christian has a responsibility in turning the erring from their way. It is not an easy task. It calls for real and earnest consecration. A man must often face censure and indignation at the hands of those he is trying to help. His motives will be impugned; his own mistakes will be magnified; and in countless ways he will be embarrassed and perhaps often humiliated. But does that remove his responsibility toward the erring? Does that relieve him of all necessity of trying to win them to Christ? After all, did not Christ suffer at the hands of those he was trying to convert from error? And did he not warn his disciples that they were not above their master?

A Common But Mistaken Attitude

How common is the attitude (and how mistaken!) that a profound and perfect silence is the treatment both error and erring should receive at our hands. But did Christ do that? Did he not rather risk the loss of friendships and popularity by teaching against error, by telling people to their very faces that they were in error, and were headed straight for the “judgment of hell”? It would have been much easier for him, and is much easier for us, to pass lightly over the matter, mouthing words about “love” and “charity” and “tolerance.” But that attitude does not turn people from error; it confirms them in error. And the Christian who sees his responsibility in this matter must let no ties of friendship or kinship or of any other deter him from it. He must not wash his hands of his duty toward the erring.

For two millenniums it has been the creed of Christendom that Christ was “crucified under Pontius Pilate.” All Pilate’s protestations of innocence, all his symbolic washing of hands and disavowal of responsibility will not remove the judgment of the ages—and of God. Pilate found no fault in Christ; but all Christendom has found fault in Pilate. He stands condemned. And for what? Merely because he took the easy way out, refusing to shoulder his responsibility.

The Desperate Need Of The Church

How desperately today the church needs men of a different stamp, men who will not flinch under the withering fires of ridicule, contempt, satalue opposition, or personal abuse; men who will see and assume their responsibility toward the gospel and toward the sinner. The time is ripe for a tremendous assault on the strongholds of denominationalism. Only those who are blind can fail to see it. Now, more than for generations, people are seeking a way out of their spiritual morasses. They have tried the ways of men, and found them wanting. In disillusionment, and often cynicism, they are abandoning all religion, or else are joining the numerous seemingly harmless Oxford Groups, Legion of God, etc. etc. Thousands of them are ripe for a reception of the truth.

0. Church of God, awakened from the slumber. Put on the whole armor of God, and go forth to battle for the Lord. This is a fight for truth and for the souls of men. Responsibility in capital letters has walked up and knocked at your door. Beware, beware, of Pilate’s mistake.

PAGE BROTHER WITTY

G. K. WALLACE

“More than 400 delegates from nineteen states, representing more than 2,700 churches with excess of 400,000 members, will be in attendance at the annual Midwest Regional Meeting of the Congregational and Christian Church, Wichita, Kansas, Monday, October 24.”

Page Brother Witty. Surely he is in the crowd. If not why not? “Our great statesman” as the Christian Standard calls him is surely interested in this great unity movement. The Christian Church and the Congregational Church were “united” some years ago. The marriage was consummated with great joy among leaders of the Christian Church. Pray tell me, why Brother Witty and other preachers are courting the other fellows’ bride? The Christian Church has been married to the Congregationalists Church. Why should certain brethren woo her when she is already joined in marriage?

Polygamy or Divorce

Does Brother Witty expect churches of Christ to be united with the Christian Church before she severs the marriage ties with the Congregational Church? If not, then, he will have a polygamous condition. What shall it be—divorce or polygamy? Tell vs. Brother Witty. You cannot expect us to become united with the Christian Church until this marriage with the Christian Church is broken. Then, whose wife will she be in the judgment, for they all had her?

A Strange Child

The effort to unite the church of Christ and the Christian Church is being carried out without an effort to correct this union with the Congregationalists. What will be the fruit of this triangle? A combination of the church of Christ, Christian Church and the Congregationalists? What a monstrousity—whose son is he?
No Gospel Preacher is Worthy of the Name Who, Knowing What Needs to be Said, Permits Himself to be Gagged. The Church Must in Righteous Wrath Destroy 'Error or Error Will Destroy Us. Silence is Not Always Golden; It May Be Criminal.

A. B. KEENAN

"The Lord is in his holy temple; let all the earth keep silence before him." (Heb. 2:20)

Like many another, the above text may have its beauty and force dissipated through a wrong application. Certainly, it was never meant to apply to the field of religious investigation and fact-finding. None denies that there is a silence obtaining today among people who profess themselves to be inspired and directed by the teachings of Jesus. Searching of the Scriptures languishes, religious discussion is frowned upon. Error is whole-skinned and waxes strong amid his worshippers.

The Eclipse Of Free Discussion

Unfettered speech constituted a defense of the truth in the first century. The Apostles argued, pleaded, exHORTED, rebuked and commanded; as a result the Cause became firmly implanted in the world. The word of reconciliation entrusted to them was in turn committed to faithful men, who taught others also. When Paul spoke of those whose mouths must be stopped, we can be sure that his method of closing some blasphemous mouths was not the refusal to talk with their owners, but rather the defeat of them in open controversy, demonstrating that they were not able to withstand the spirit and wisdom by which he spoke. Such was the strength of all who adorned the doctrine of God our Saviour... and in open, fearless discussion were the churches made fast in the liberty wherewith Christ had made them free.

The eclipse of free discussion of the apostolic writings in time meant the emergency of the Papacy. To some Christians controversy was "unseemly," devoid of the "spirit of Christ," "disturbing" generally. People refused to make a scene any longer over growing corruptions in doctrine and practice. Those who continued to do so found themselves members of an ever decreasing minority whose unpopularity increased in inverse ratio. Ultimately all dissent was stifled by main force; "heretics" were ferreted out and their lives made forfeit.

With few exceptions, this state of affairs lasted until the advent of Martin Luther in 1517. Free discussion again became rife; men stumbled and groped their way toward the Light which had once illumined their path, to the Truth as it is in Christ Jesus. Timidly, however, they were content to abide in denominational half-way houses, and to a later generation was left the complete return to the New Testament order of things, the restoration to the earth of the church which Christ had died to establish.

Restoration The Result Of Controversy

This restoration of the church grew out of religious discussion, nothing else. Men and women of the later eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were dissatisfied with the harlot's children who filled every landscape. They grew sick of mere reform, saw that no amount of butressing a building founded on sand could remove the unsightly cracks. The Campbells, Walter Scott, Barton W. Stone, many others at sundry times and in divers places, all saw that the solution to the problem of religious differences lay in a return to a "thus saith the Lord" in everything. The more they discussed the matter, the clearer the truth became. Thousands as individuals, many times whole congregations, became convinced that acceptance with God depends upon a strict adherence to that which is written, no less-and no more.

Determined sectarianism was not long, however, in entering the lists against the Plea. They held opposition meetings so that their devotees could not conveniently hear plain gospel sermons, forbade their attendance upon any "Campbellite" teaching anytime, anywhere. In answer to the light of sound words they offered the heat of perverse emotions.

The Advocacy Of False Religious Ethics

When not jointly attacking disciples the sects were squaring off against each other, boxing many weary rounds to fruitless "draws," none packing enough spiritual dynamite to lay the other low, the disciples meantime being edified, and walking in the fear of the Lord, and in the comfort of the Holy Ghost, multiplying.

Realizing this at length, the denominations dropped their "dukes" to stand shoulder-to-shoulder against the new threat to their existence. Observing that discussion was not helping their cause, and that the opposite was true of those who declared themselves to be Christians only, they one by one joined in a conspiracy of silence. After Campbell's rout of Bishop Purcell, the Roman Catholic hierarchy forbade its members to engage in public debate on religious matters. The Protestants soon aped them when they began to form "councils of churches," whose purpose was, and remains, the stifling of religious, investigation by the fostering of union meetings and pulpit exchanges; by the extolling of a "common heritage"; by the willingness to let each seeker for salvation "join the church of his choice"; by the establishment of "inter-communion ethics," chief tenent of which was and again still remains, the elimination of proselytizing among each other's members.

Hardly a town in America is without its council of churches and ministerial alliance to reach this objective. This is not strange. It is strange, however, for preachers who call themselves evangelists after the New Testament order to become associated with such organizations, and even to be come officers. Surely they have misunderstood our history, or our plea, or the New Testament Scriptures, or all of them, to become so entangled. The unsullied restoration platform agrees as well with membership in a pastors' union as God with the devil. No gospel preacher can possibly be worthy of the name who, knowing what needs to be said, permits himself to be gagged by such dodges.

The New School Of Innovators And Compromisers

In some quarters, this tendency takes another direction. It is the joining in a conspiracy of silence against the open rebuke which needs to be given a new school of innovators: the pious propounders of a theory whose burden is the reestablishment of fleshly Israel in a Palestinian kingdom, wherein Christ shall personally reign a thousand years. Or if not this, then the putting of the cat of a complaisant tolerance of instrumental music into the cage with the canary of doctrinal purity. No amount of hush-hush will eradicate the deep-seated evils of which these two manifestations among us are but the outcroppings. The church must in its
LONG LIVE THE BIBLE BANNER!

"Jehovah-nissi-The Lord My Banner" Is a Battle Cry. War Has Been Declared Against The Enemy. The Cry for Affirmative Preaching is But a Masquerade of Soft-pedal Preaching and a Smokescreen for Disloyal Preachers.

R. A. TURNER

There came a split in attitude. It was followed by a season of discontent and unrest. It was evident that some had turned traitor to the Lord. The clouds lowered and everywhere the darkness grew and prevailed. Suddenly there was a cry of no uncertain sound—it was a war cry! "Jehovah-nissi-The Lord My Banner." This cry sent a thrill into the souls of all who love the truth and a distressing fear to those who have an outward demonstration of piety with an inward attitude of tolerance and compromise. War has been declared against the enemy.

The battle is on and the hottest of the fight is just beginning. Unlike other wars of the past few years, it is not a fight against the sects and sinners merely, but a bombardment against the spiritual host of wickedness in heavenly places—a fight to salvage the church with as little sloughing off as possible.

The army of "spiritual host of wickedness in heavenly places" has arrayed herself in all the pomp and ceremony of sin. Elders who should be exponents of New Testament Christianity are not. Because they have not respected the command of the Spirit to "purge out the old leaven" and "withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly," but harbor within the church dissipating, passion-driven, morally reprobate, and spiritually degenerate men, often a leader, sometimes a preacher, congregations become abominated of God, rejected, and despised by the world. Discipline in the average church is a lost virtue.

Besides figure-head elders are window-dresssed-with piety, lily-fingered, please-us-pray-type-of-a-preacher-pastor! We also read the "testimonials" of a certain college relating the "experience of grace" of their students, apparently aped from some sectarian testimonial meeting.

So with the ensign of lust, the near-nude bathers, the wobble-wobble, dancing church members, cigarette-smoking, beer-drinking, card-playing men and women of the church (including preachers), the adultery of the movies (hatched from the incubator of whoredom in Hollywood) these all form "spiritual host of wickedness in heavenly places" and "there is no restraint to Jehovah to save by many or by few."

Long Live The Bible Banner as a medium of expression for those who love the truth and want to engage in this spiritual warfare.

Even though he did not sign his name we know his doctrine and also his character. His doctrine is Premillennialism and his character is of the devil. He is trying to destroy Brother Wallace's character and thereby his usefulness to the church because Brother Wallace has had the courage to fight against the doctrine of Premillennialism and all other "isms." and he also has courage enough to sign his name to what he writes.—F. F. Conley, Burnet, Texas.
SHALL THE GOSPEL BE PREACHED TO THE INDIANS?
JAMES E. WHITE

Since the discovery of this great nation in the year 1492, my people, the "Indians," have been (more or less) a problem. Early history is filled with fascinating events in their slow gradual development toward civilization, tell us how peaceful they were with the early colonists. As the new country slowly formed its government later to be a great nation, the original inhabitants, the American Indian, has made his contribution and played his part, forever to remain with us as a background picture of our nation. A great task was set in motion on the part of the early government to bring about peace, happiness and success to the Indians by creating treaties with each and every tribe now residing in these United States. This was truly a great task undertaken at a time when Indian people were roaming over the entire area of what is now the United States.

There are many outstanding facts about these remarkable people, whose abilities and colorful ways deserve real study.

Indians Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow

Indians of today and tomorrow seen against the background of yesterday will be my theme as part of my work as evangelist among them. This presentation of the Indian past will give to the churches of Christ, it is hoped, a new understanding of the proud Indian heritage, and if he is given a chance to become a Christian, he can also prove that he is today a keeper of values which, if they were better known, could be an important contribution to New Testament Christianity and the means of finding a better place in the contemporary world.

The purpose of this article is to give to the churches of Christ the information with reference to the much needed evangelistic program among the redmen of this country. I have before me the final report of denominational religious activities of the entire Indian population of this country. Perhaps not accurately surveyed, the document is as readable as it is comprehensive. The picture it gives is a dark one yet I can see rays of light pierce that darkness. As for what could be, as a religious matter, if given enough attention and planned effort, a happy future is possible for my people.

Some Striking Facts

Religiously-denominational development has been going on among my people for half a century. Systematic religious program has been promoted by almost one hundred and fifty different religious bodies, each one teaching and practicing things contradictory to all the others, which is sufficient proof that they are misinformed.

When the government saw fit to isolate the Indians tribe by tribe, they were left where the government found them geographically. The White man was anxious to take to the Indian his religion. White preachers from every known religious body scattered among them doctrines of human origin, and today the first doctrine that entered the various reservations claims the large percent of that particular reservation.

To illustrate: Fifty two years of teaching the Episcopal creed in the Oneida tribe, of Wisconsin, has made 80% of that tribe disciples of the Prayer Book. Sixty-two years of teaching Catholicism among the Menominee tribe, of Wisconsin, has made 90% followers of the Catholic faith. Fifty years of teaching by the Presbyterianians among the Sioux tribe of the Northwest, has made 50% of the 43,000 population of that tribe, Presbyterian. This is true with every tribe. The church of Christ has no claim of percentage in any of these reservations. It is not known among my people.

The annual report of the 1930 Census an Indian population of 350,000 now living in the reservations scattered over widely separated places. 108 Indian tribes make up 108 Indian languages. There are 128 Indian reservations, large and small. There are thirty-five states in which Indians reside. In this immense evangelistic field of one particular race in our own country, there is only one active evangelist of the church of Christ, working among them. The first systematic mission work the church undertaken among the Indians was with the Sioux tribe of South Dakota. This effort was abandoned due to the lack of financial support and lack of interest. Brethren L. L. Brigance and N. B. Hardeman assisted and encouraged my effort in every way possible. This was in 1930. The work from that time to the present will be discussed in another article.

A Challenge To The Church

The deep and troubling question on my heart is: Can Indians become New Testament Christians? Can this work be done? Can it triumph? I say "yes"! Up to this time the effort has been small, but we have gone as far as the church has enabled us to go. Since April 1, 1938, my work has been managed by the Murray Hill Church of Christ, Flint, Michigan. It has been a hard fight to secure adequate financial support to carry on the work. We believe there are many churches and individuals who will assist us in this work, if they can be reached and shown the need.

If this article reaches some of you, and you will assist, send your contribution to Forrest B. Stwalley, 1026 Dye Road, Flint, Mich., or, if you prefer to do so, send it direct to me at Oneida, Wisconsin, Box 7, and all contributions will be promptly acknowledged and reported. In His service.
Very “Passionately Prejudiced,”

Yours

Louisville, Ky.,

November 2, 1938

Mr. A. B. Keenan

1515 W. Grand Blvd.

Detroit, Michigan

Dear Brother Keenan:

I have received your letter, with request that we withdraw your commendation of our new hymnal from our advertisements. We have not over 25 of these circulars on hand, and your commendation will be withdrawn when we go to press again.

Your letter concerning the new hymnal is the first one we have received of its kind! Does not this give you pause, Brother Keenan, in view of the scores of faithful brethren who have commended it? I think you will live to see that you came temporarily under the thinking of a passionately prejudiced preacher.

Living, as you say, “out on the edge of things,” is it possible that conditions are not as bad as Brother Wallace thinks or makes them out to be? Are you unaware of the great reaction that has come within the last year, caused by Brother Wallace’s extreme “Ishmaelite” attack on brethren and schools everywhere? Our observation and experience indicates that the Wallace scare is nearly over. Right in Texas we have 147 churches using our hymnal, including the largest churches in the state, and they are replacing it with the Number Two right along. All the colleges, except Freed-Hardeman, have the new book, or at least a quantity of them: David Lipscomb, Harding, Pepperdine; and the Abilene C. C. Chorus.

Your four objections briefly: 1.2. 1. I venture there is less teaching in the Number Two that cannot be actually read in the New Testament than the average hymnal among us. I agree that “reconciling” (in No. 485) is a better word than “reconciled,” though “reconciled” is the original. I may make this alteration in the next edition, and it would be a simple thing for any church to make it in their own books. It seems to me, however, that the smiling face of the prodigal’s father might be called a reconciled face, though the son was alone to blame. 3. There is no “schism” in the church over the questions you mention, except where someone of Brother Wallace’s radical spirit has seen to it that it will result. 4. Purchase of our hymnals in no way aids the Word and Work financially. Brother Wallace’s published statements to the contrary notwithstanding. Not one cent from hymnal sales has ever been turned to the Word and Work or any of its publications.

I have written you frankly, believing that you are not entirely closed to a consideration of the facts involved. With good wishes, I am,

Fraternally yours,

GREAT SONGS PRESS
By E. L. Jorgenson

ELI/ga
Encl.

Reply

1515 W. Gd. Blvd.,

Detroit, Mich.,

Nov. 7, 1938

Mr. E. L. Jorgenson,

c/o Great Songs Press,

Baxter Station,

Louisville, Ky.

Dear Bro. Jorgenson:

I take pardonable pride in being the first to send you a letter of dissent. Your appeal to the testimony of “scores of faithful brethren” is, as of course you know, what logicians term “argumentum ad hominem.” Reams of letters could be obtained from Roman Catholic clergymen, I do not doubt, to support the claims of the Papacy. Paul condemns such subjective evidence of doctrinal acceptability in II Cor. 10:12.

You have an inordinate fondness for prophecy, and include me in one of your own visions. But I am afraid that, as I believe you misread the facts of the Old Testament, so you misread the facts with regard to the unique contribution to the Cause in our day of Bro. Foy E. Wallace, Jr. You style him “passionately prejudiced,” and I agree: he has not the slightest use for those whose teaching, either directly or by implication vitiates the gospel.

It is of course possible that conditions are not as bad as Bro. Wallace describes them, but it is not at all probable. He has eyes, he has ears he is unusually well endowed mentally, and he has a conscience and a love for truth which will not permit him to deceive anyone into a false security, crying “Peace” when there is no peace. May not the “great reaction” you cite be actually degeneracy of alarming proportions? Are legitimate criticisms of brethren and schools to be dismissed as “extreme Ishmaelite” attacks? Whence have arisen these sacred cows? I am glad that we have a few Bro. Wallace’s around us to scare us, and scare us plenty. We are of all religious people in the world the most idiotic the moment we see to it that it will result. 4. Purchase of our hymnals in no way aids the Word and Work financially. Brother Wallace’s published statements to the contrary notwithstanding. Not one cent from hymnal sales has ever been turned to the Word and Work or any of its publications.

I have written you frankly, believing that you are not entirely closed to a consideration of the facts involved. With good wishes, I am,

Fraternally yours,

A. B. Keenan

Comment

Brother Keenan has set an example. The names of other prominent preachers who do not indorse the Boll faction are being capitalized and their influence thus appropriated to a factious cause. Brother Keenan’s objection to the Jorgenson book on the ground that it not only contains many songs that teach false doctrine, but it is also connected with “confirmed schismatics” and the purchase of it amounts to “aiding and abetting” what he rightly designates “a serious schism in the church.” Is one that most any preacher or elder in the church ought to be able to see.

It is plainly evident that Jorgenson considers that he has won a victory when he gets an order for his Premillennial Hymn-book from a Texas church, or a city.

Some of the papers think ethical reasons forbid them to say these things, which they admit are facts and need saying. To me the interests of the Cause of Christ comes before mere ethics.

It would be inconsistent for a paper to oppose the book on the grounds above stated, and then accept advertisements of it. The Bible Banner will not do it. And I am not able to harmonize the purchase of the book by such a church as Sears & Summit in Dallas, for instance, which I know to be in all its past history set against this heresy, having experienced its evil effects. A little plain consistency would help much in making the victory for the truth against the blight of Bollism complete.

Yours, “Passionately Prejudiced,”

The Editor.
The Greenbelt Community Church

Good Points Do Not Make a New Testament Church. The Community Church Creed Identifies Itself By What It Does Not Say. Anything Less than the Whole Bible is Not Enough. Anything More than the Whole Bible is too Much.

HUGO McCORD

The Federal Government went out into the woods about fifteen miles from Washington and built a little city. Constructed with the idea of aiding the government workers with low incomes, the town is a “co-operative”: profits from the grocery store, the drug store, the movies and the town’s one gasoline station are shared by all the residents. While Jamestown collapsed, and Robert Owen’s New Harmony project failed, the residents of Greenbelt, Maryland, are trying to have a workable “community of goods.”

In line with that community spirit Greenbelt citizens voted against having denominational churches, and voted for having one church, a community church. I believe we should hold fast to that which is good, and there are many good things in The Greenbelt Community Church, now fully organized and having for its pastor a genteel young scholar, Robert Kichelew.

Some Good Things

1. In our day with universities sending forth infidels and scorners of religion, I rejoice that Greenbelt did not leave religion out of its life. The citizens felt something vital would be lacking without public worship.

2. I rejoice that they affirm their belief in God and in Jesus as the Son of God.

3. That those enlightened people voted down denominational churches, condemning “sectarian bigotry,” is surely a forward step. Mr. Kichelew agrees that in the light of Corinthians 1:10-13 it is sinful to follow Luther or Wesley or any man.

4. I rejoice that Greenbelt demands clean living on penalty of expulsion from the church. “Should a member become an offense to the Church and to its good name by reason of immoral or unchristian conduct,” the deacons are not to stand idly by but may “censure such member, suspend him, or terminate his membership by due notice,” says the Constitution of the Church. It is surely deplorable that some churches of Christ are not true along the line of discipline. They will not countenance a preacher if he is soft on mechanical music but will stand behind him on adultery. They would withdraw fellowship if a member denied the doctrines of the gospel, but do nothing about it when a brother gets drunk or refuses to pay his debts. Like the Pharisees, such churches “say, and do not.” The Greenbelt Church has bound it in their Constitution that “in the case of loss of ministerial standing on the part of the pastor, relations shall cease at once.”

Some Things Not Good

It is foolish optimism only to point out good things. A man with the stomach ache does not want the doctor to brag on the patient’s fine head of hair, or to praise his big muscles; he wants something done about his ailment. Though there are fine things in the Greenbelt Church there is a vast difference between it and the church of the New Testament.

1. There is a written “Constitution,” including a preamble and nine articles. The church of the New Testament was the one God wanted His church to use, for it was the one God wrote; and it is the only one He ever wrote. A church today, therefore, wanting to be what God wants it to be, will forever reject any human document in religion and will contend earnestly for the one divine constitution.

2. One of the purposes for the organization of the Greenbelt Church, says Article II, is “to encourage individual interpretation, which is the right and privilege of all Protestants.” But the Bible says “that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation.” (II Pet. 1:20)

3. It is good that the Greenbelt Church “is amenable to no ecclesiastical judiciary,” free from any religious hierarchy of denominational machine. But it is regrettable that its form of government is just as unscriptural: it takes a vote and the majority wins, exercising “the right of control in all its affairs.” Even the Constitution “may be altered or amended by a two-thirds vote.” The number of noses on one side never can make that side right if it is wrong. The voice of the people is nearly always the opposite of the voice of God. Principles can never be settled at the polls.

The divine constitution, the New Testament, sets forth God’s plan of church government: “elders in every church” (Acts 14:23) who “feed the flock of God,” exercising the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God’s heritage but being examples to the flock.” (I Pet. 5:2,3) God says listen not with equal weight to the immature youth of the church and to the hoary man; don’t let the vote of a flippant girl cancel the vote of an aged man of God; rather, let those men who are grounded in the faith, full of years and of the Holy Spirit, let them, says God, rule the church.

4. The set-up at Greenbelt gets worse and worse, as we read: “Membership in a church of whatever faith shall be accepted for membership in this Church.” (Art. IV) And this Church teaches and holds absolutely no convictions about baptism. Notwithstanding the Lord of heaven and earth commanded baptism for every creature (Mk.16:15), this Community Church says baptism “shall be optional.” Regardless of the fact that the Holy Spirit says “are buried with him by baptism” (Rom.6:4), this modern church ordains it shall “be administered in the form requested by the member. . . No ordinance is compulsory on any member.”

The Short Creed

The creed of the Greenbelt Church is much shorter than most such documents, and for a purpose. This is all of it:

We believe that God is a spirit and that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth.

We believe that God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of the whole earth.

We believe that God is love, and every one that loveth is born of God and knoweth God.

We believe that Jesus is the Son of God, and as many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God.

We believe that the Lord Jesus is the way, the truth and the life.

We believe that if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another.

We believe that, if we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins.

We believe that the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but that he that doeth the will of God abideth forever.

All of those statements are absolutely true, for they are taken from the one divine creed. But the Greenbelt Church is not to be complimented because they hold to the above items, because they thus reflect on other statements in the one divine creed that they did not pick out. They would never hold to the doctrine of “one baptism” (Eph. 4:5), though that doctrine is found in the same book from which they carefully select the above items. Thus the purpose of the short creed comes to light: Greenbelt religious are in the tolerance business; they are determined to get along with all, regardless of conviction. Their choice of items was not made on the
From a Veteran Defender of the Faith


M. O. DALEY
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Dear Foy——

Pardon the intrusion, please. I am full to the "popping off point" over some late developments, the forecast of which, I was unable to interpret until I read the Banner this week. Your exposure of Boll is a master piece. Your argument on "while David sleeps," is new to me, but it will prove the death knell to the whole of Boll's wild speculations. With that argument let us hope that the "they cannot pass" unless they resort to the equally foolish dodge of "two kingdoms" and "two Holy Spirit baptisms," by insisting that there will be two resurrections of Christ. To so contend would be no more absurd than what is now affirmed in the above "two's." I am now prepared for a further foolish pronouncement. Pressure has caused them to throw all sense and caution to the winds in an attempt to evade the force of truth being hurled against the theories. This is evident because his wild theories are rapidly becoming wilder and wilder!

The two-kingdom idea set me to wondering. Since Christ is to deliver the kingdom to the Father, just which one of the two will he deliver, and just what will he do with the other one? It looks like one of the two is headed for the dumpheap. Paul said he'd deliver The Kingdom-just one. But Which One? Paul says the kingdom we have received "cannot be moved." And that is the one now in existence, the one I am in. But it cannot be "moved," hence cannot be dumped, discarded or done away with, so it must be the one Christ will deliver to the Father. But what will Christ do with the other one?

The New Deal

And a new paper. Never before in our history has an attempt been made to hide behind the laws of the land while attempting to put a muzzle on gospel preachers. The proposal you mention as having been made to the Gospel Advocate is in every sense the announcement of a New Deal in the affairs of the church of Christ. For brazenness and dictator boldness, it looks like we are headed for another division—at least, lots of grief. If it cannot be avoided—and I see little prospect of it—I'll call to mind the fact that I began my Christian life in a fight against false brethren and will, if need be, end it in like manner.

I wish you everything good, but there's a hungry pack of wolves snapping at your hamstrings. The faithful tried and true among your friends and co-laborers, and Christ is your Captain. May the Lord bless and keep you.

My health is good—better than for many years, and I am working hard—this has been the busiest year in quite a good many. I am doing some good here, and believe it is being appreciated. As proof that I am working hard note this: I brought home two fine gobblers this afternoon!!

Hope I haven't taken up too much of your time. Love always,

M. O. Daley
Rock Springs, Texas

What Brethren Are Saying About "The Certified Gospel"

O. C. Lambert

Certified Gospel is the title of a recent book of Sermons preached by Foy Wallace, Jr., and published by O. C. Lambert. Those who know Brother Wallace will understand that they are plain gospel sermons, preached with power and conviction. The introduction was written by O. C. Lambert, and, without saying anything to detract from the sermons, I believe I am safe in saying that part alone is easily worth the price of the book. If there was ever a time when plain and uncompromising gospel preaching should be done, this is the time. In fact the Lord never intended that any other kind should be done.—Leslie G. Thomas.

The price of Certified Gospel (thirteen sermons) is $1.00. Order from O. C. Lambert & Son. 1710 Ninth Ave., Port Arthur, Tex.
MORE WORDS OF ENCOURAGEMENT

I want to compliment you on the Bible Banner. I have never enjoyed any paper as much as I did the November issue. Your answer to R. H. Boll’s “ecclesiastical tirade” was a masterpiece. The church here commends you and is behind you in the fine drive you are making for pure primitive Christianity. May God bless you and long uphold your fight. I assure you I have read every word of the Russellite debate of the Bible Banner. It is their admission of defeat, an acknowledgement of inability to defend their Russellistic teaching; but proof that your sledge-hammer blows at error are felt.—Frank D. Young, Florida.

Have just read the November Bible Banner, and like the other issues, it is fine. I appreciate you and your fight for truth hand right. Trust God and keep up the fight. -J. B. Hold, Neudegger, Ala.

The last number of The Bible Banner is simply fine. It puts a number of timely issues on the spot. The discussion of the threadbare question, What difference does it make? which is constantly coming from Premillennialists and their sympathizers is complete. I wish all of them had a copy of that number.-A. L. Colson, Lake Park, Ga.

You are doing fine with The Bible Banner. You have backed to the wall the admirers and promulgators of “Bollism.” These clique meetings and jabs in the dark (anonymous letters) show this. —All this sounds like the play boys, “You hold him! I will hit him.” Then prance around a victor, he will, until the hit boy is released. A different story then follows. There will be a releasing of words that will be too late to say “hold him! ...” The preacher who will not contribute to keep the New Testament teaching pure, but will act like babies with their brethren. I am with you on the preaching ... Accept my thanks and best wishes for what you are doing. —A. H. Maner, Mobile, Ala.

I knew that a storm of protest would go out against those anonymous letters sent out from the underworld. The code is not to sign their names. A casual observer can see that there is more than one in the game. I would not give The Bible Banner for all the other papers. I like them all, but the Banner speaks out when it is time to speak. Loyal members of the church of Christ will not forsake you in this just fight. A few have spoken, but thousands will speak when the time comes.—L. N. Moody, Vernon, Texas.

Allow me to say that I am ready to be of assistance in establishing the Banner in my home country. Canada. —Mr. Reed-Harden College, Henderson, Tennessee.

Received The Bible Banner—have read it will say it is a readable sheet, mechanically okey, and not in the least “Laodicean.” —B. M. Strother, McAlester, Okla.

We have received The Bible Banner, and I have read everything in it. The make-up is very nice, and the articles are exceptionally good.—L. R. Meritt, Wheeling, West Va.

The need of such a publication is apparent. I am sure, to the entire brotherhood. I am glad to note that it is not to be competitive with the Firm Foundation and the Gospel Advocate but rather cooperative and complementary to these publications in the defense of the truth.—A. W. Turner, New Orleans, La.

I am very busy and feel that I never have time to read all of any of the half dozen or more religious papers that I receive, yet I devoured the last line of every article in the November issue. Stand by the old Book one hundred per cent—and we believe you will—and I am with you one hundred per cent. ... I received and read the two anonymous letters mailed, one in Chicago and the other in Saint Louis. I try to be Christ-like in my conduct toward my fellowman, but my righteous indignation gets the better of me at the very thought of one’s being able to eat this kind of thing and have the audacity enough to write that which reflects upon a fellow mortal, and then too little to sign one’s name.

I hope that I shall never know who wrote those letters, after a man’s life is gone, but my sense of fairness compels me to hold the author of an anonymous letter in contempt.—T. Q. Martin, McMinnville, Tenn.