"Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of truth." - (Psalm 60:4.)

"Lift ye up a banner upon the high mountain, exclamation; voice unto them." - (Isa. 13:2.)
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"BE NOT ASHAMED OF THE TESTIMONY"

FANNING YATER TANT

If a man has a truly Christian conscience, there is much on every hand that will cause him to hang his head in shame and mortification. Paul could write that he was "not ashamed of the gospel of Christ," but we are sure there were many things in the Roman civilization of that day of which he could be, and was ashamed. We know that he would be ashamed of much in our generation we are living today. For example, how can a man view but with feelings of deepest shame the atrocities of a Hitler against the Jews of Germany, or the brutality of a Mussolini in his rape of Ethiopia? In the political world we view with real mortification the dishonesty, chicanery, abuse of authority, and disregard of promises in both the national and international spheres. That human beings should reveal themselves so entirely devoid of principles of right and wrong is a source of chagrin to all those who have faith in the fundamental decency and honesty of mankind. The whole political picture, national and international, can be summed up in two words: "It stinks."

Shame of Sectarian Shams

Not only does one feel shame at the political dung-heap, but the religious situation is hardly calculated to lessen that blush. What, for example, should one think of the ethics and the sincerity of a preacher who will stand in the pulpit of a church costing $10,000,000 (ten million dollars! read it and weep-Riverside Church in New York City) and in unction tones plead for money to "feed the poor"? Or what of a church that will build a house costing $4,000,000 (a Presbyterian church in Pittsburgh) when some of the members on the roll of that very church are shining examples of the "third of a nation which is ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed"? Or what of a Disciples' church (in Cincinnati) which has let the word get around that people of the laboring classes are not welcomed as members of that congregation? Or, to come closer home, what of men who will speak much of a "Christ-like spirit," and then actually go (we use the term advisedly, for we saw it happen) over a scurrilous and libelous letter sent forth for the sole purpose of injuring another Christian, whom they happen to dislike? When such things as these can happen among "religious" and "Christian" people, the truly spiritually minded, those with a sensitive conscience, will be filled with deepest shame and mortification. Is our vaunted "Christianity" of no more practical application than this?

Glory In The Gospel

But while there is much to cause us shame, there are some things for which we do not, and will not feel the least tinge of humiliation. In these things we can glory and exult-even as Paul did in the gospel of Christ and its power to save the sinner from his sin. Too often we get our wires crossed in this matter; we feel shame over that in which we should glory, and we rejoice over that in which we should feel shame.

For one thing, we are not ashamed of the fact that the church of Christ considers herself the only organization through which men can offer acceptable worship and service unto God. She is not the best church in the world; she is thechurch. Other religious organizations are simply not to be considered in the same category. The church is as far superior to them as she is to the Masonic Lodge or the Ku Klux Klan. When people ask us if we don't think souls will be saved out of the Methodist and Baptist churches as well as out of the church of Christ, we can only answer that if God saves them in those institutions, it will be in spite of, and not because of their membership in them. Membership in the Methodist church no more commands one to God than does membership in the Ku Klux Klan or the Over The River Burying Society. It simply does not signify. If anything, it is calculated to condemn rather than to commend. For this organization has arrogated to herself the privileges and authority belonging only to the true church.

Separateness Stressed

We believe there are some who do feel shame over this separateness of the church. They show this in their efforts to make the church as nearly as possible like the denominational groups-stressing our similarities rather than the fundamental and basic elements which set us forever apart from them. Now it is very good to rejoice in the many truths which denominational groups hold; but we must realize that one in error is never converted from that error by preaching on that which he already accepts. One might preach to a Moslem for twenty years on the existence, power, unity, and glory of God, and at the end of that time the Moslem would be no less a Moslem and no nearer a Christian than when the preaching first began. And he would have agreed heartily with every word spoken. So if we are to win people from error, we may well begin by preaching on the things wherein we are agreed, but if we fail to do so from that and preach plainly and positively on the things wherein we differ, we have betrayed our trust and confirmed and encouraged people to continue in error.

(Continued on page 15)
EDITORIAL

RENDERING A SIGNAL SERVICE

A lawsuit is always too bad and it has been said that the winner is also the loser. At McAlester, Oklahoma, some months ago the elders of the church attempted to save the property from a lawless element in the church, the result of which was legally nothing. The court ruled no jurisdiction, and returned the case to its original status. Brother B. M. Strother, than whom there is none more capable and qualified in personal character, knowledge and ability, as an elder of God’s church, is giving to the brethren, at his own expense, Brother C. R. Nichol’s testimony before the court on the organization and government of the church. Brother Nichol was the star witness for the elders and the cause of truth which they had striven to uphold. His expositions before the judge on the witness stand in answer to the questions of attorneys, and under cross-examination, should be in the hands of every gospel preacher and elder of the church in the land. Brother Strother has decided that it shall be—and at much expense he has had the testimony transcribed, and printed in booklet form, and expects to put not less than 10,000 copies into circulation, as his personal contribution to the Cause of New Testament organization and government in the church. Because of my own knowledge of the conditions, it was Brother Strother’s and Brother Nichol’s request that I should write an introductory chapter to this booklet, which request I did not feel justified in refusing. The introduction will include some valuable contributions to the truth, on the subject with which it deals, from R. L. Whiteside, and quotations from others, on points where wisdom is needed in the application of certain principles of church polity as taught in the New Testament. There is no spirit of vengeance or retaliation in Brother Strother’s action in bringing forth this treatise. It is born of the desire to save other churches, as far as possible, from the disaster anarchy leaves in its wake. A war-ravaged world or a storm-torn town presents no sadder spectacle than a strife-torn church. The church will be indebted to Brother Strother for this unsellish, sacrificial and signal service he is rendering by the mass circulation of this booklet. If it may save other elders of the church the sad experience that has been his, and the Cause in other places the humiliation it has received in McAlester, great will be his reward in that fact alone to say nothing of the reward of a commended conscience in having met duty’s demands. Personally, I honor him for the enemies he has made in standing for the right, and this effort of his to disseminate the truth on this question of moment should be applauded by faithful elders everywhere.

In the Gospel Advocate several months ago W. E. Brightwell gave a timely treatment to that form of anarchy known as the “sit-down strike.” He used the rebellion in the church at McAlester as an example of the effects of such propaganda on the church. Political revolution and economic anarchy are contagious. Members of the church who belong to political and industrial unions and clans imbibes the spirit of such organizations and through these members that spirit gets into the church. 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.

When the devil possesses people to such an extent that they will start a sit-down strike in the church building at seven o’clock on a Lord’s Day morning and occupy the building through the day in order to keep the elders out, exactly as labor strikers have occupied industrial plants, rope off the pulpit and the space around the communion table as “no trespass zone” in order to bar certain ones from leading the service, and other misdemeanors that would shock the spiritual sense of normal people, it would be difficult to misrepresent the affair by overdrawing the picture. Such was the spirit that imbued the church strikers at McAlester and such were some of the acts they performed.

As a shield in their seizure of property they sought refuge in 1 Cor. 6, which they interpreted to mean that the elders should submit to their holding of the building and surrender all rights under the deed without civil action to defend the title to the property vested in them as elders and trustees. If that is the import of 1 Cor. 6, brethren cannot transact legal business. A warranty deed, deed of trust, vendor’s lien, chattel mortgages, legal foreclosures, and other forms of legal action could not be executed between brethren, for there would be no basis of civil rights and protection. No church could have a warranty deed to property at all, for they could not petition a civil court to defend their title against seizure by any person or group of persons who happened to be brethren. Any individual or faction in the church could claim it and take it! If that is the force of 1 Cor. 6, all the digressives in the church anywhere may just disregard the restrictive clause in the deed, walk in, sit down and take possession with no legal action to hinder. These brethren would not apply their own argument to the digressives, nor even to the anti-Sunday School element in the church, should they insist on taking over the property. In fact, they did not abide by their own argument in this case, for they went to law with their brethren as defendants when consistency would require them to do what they insist 1 Cor. 6 required the others to do. It seemed not to occur to them that Jesus said, “If any man sue thee at law, and take away thy cloak, let him have thy cloak also.” If 1 Cor. 6 applies to the elders as plaintiffs in such a case as this, then Matt. 5 would apply in no less degree to themselves as defendants. But since the men the elders took court action against were previously withdrawn from as factionists, how does it violate 1 Cor. 6?

True to form, the strikers in this case attacked the characters of the best men in the church. They were accused of being everything from popes to republicates. There never was an elder that majority-rulers objected to who was not called a pope. The particular elder in McAlester who is called pope (because he was in their way) is the man who has done more for the church during thirty years he has been an elder than all these strikers put together have done. He has been there from the beginning, while those who caused the trouble, many of them, have come in later, even recently. B. M. Strother is respected by his fellow townsmen, as honorable in all his dealings, upright in personal life, known to be a good man, and has been a friend in need to some in the church who now malign him. Such an elder in the church of the Lord must suffer calamity at the hands of a rebellion in a church that is ruled by the mob spirit. Brother R. L. Whiteside told me that he regarded Brother Strother one of the best qualified elders he has ever known except in one point—he has been too lenient with those who caused the trouble in the church. Brother D. B. Killebrew, his senior (in age) and fellow-elder, insisted on dealing with the disorderly long ago, but Brother Strother believed patience would solve the difficulties and save the offenders, and he wanted to save them. Brother Killebrew was right, as Brother Strother now sees, but the anomaly of the situation is that this lenient man is the one who is called pope by the rebellion, and they vent their spleen at the man who for their sakes waited too long to deal with them. Brother Killebrew has recently suffered a partial
stroke, evidently brought on by the pressure brought upon him by these insurgents-a strain too great for his years.

The mistake of the elders in many instances has been in not dealing as firmly as they should with preacher situations. Too many members do not know when a preacher is right and when he is wrong. If they like him he is always right. It is the duty of the elders to guard the church and protect it against designing men. Often a fairly good worker in the church is spoiled when some preacher succeeds in getting a novice appointed as an elder, and from the day of his appointment he becomes a cat's paw for those who promote factions and rebellions. It is from such sources that opposition to the real and long time elders of the church usually comes, and their names defamed.

There is a cure for such conditions-it will be found in a complete return to the New Testament order of things. The professional preacher complex is largely responsible for these disorders. The training young preachers are getting in some of the colleges is responsible for their professional ideas. It is not uncommon to hear student preachers talk of "getting a church" when they finish their work. Wide harvest fields offer little inducement to them. The ambition to preach the glorious gospel of Christ to unsaved millions over continents of unevangelized English speaking people does not stir within them. They want a church! But they are not to blame-it is the system under which they are being trained. It is no wonder that the pastor idea is developing so rapidly among us, for the schools are making pastors, and the churches are taking pastors.

The return to the New Testament order of elders to rule, deacons to serve, members to work, preachers to preach—and that will preach—would revolutionize the Cause of Christ and there would be a better day for the church and a brighter day for the gospel. And to thus put the preachers to preaching would put an end to many "a shameful situation."

Every church in the brotherhood is within the reach of what happened at McAlester—and the present status of that case lends impetus to anarchy. All such elements in the church everywhere will make it a model to go by. For this reason Brother Strother's effort to get this teaching into the hands of every elder of the church in the United States is timely. We pray God's blessings upon this noble effort to promote it.

ETHICAL JOURNALISM

Much has been said for months of ethical journalism. It was precipitated by the flood of questionnaires sent out to preachers and elders. Replies were collated and put into a so-called survey, and copyrighted. Whether or not these replies represented the actual sentiment of leading preachers and elders, known to the churches as men of soundness, remains a question in the public mind. Why not publish the names of the men who answered the questionnaire? As to percentage—how many replied? And who? We could then tell whether the percentage, or the sentiments, really count anything or not. The editor of the new paper said in his first editorial statement that not to heed the opinions of the many from whom they heard would have been foolish. That's what Saul thought when he heeded the voice of the people, instead of the voice of God. The new paper seems to be much bent on giving people what they think they want.

But the new ethical journal has appeared. We have been waiting to find out what its promoters mean by ethical journalism. We now know in part. It begins by copyrighting the contents of the paper so that no writer can be quoted unless his entire article is quoted. If a writer makes a statement in one sentence as false as the Devil's "thou shalt not die" in the Garden of Eden, we would have to bring out another edition of the paper to deny it. But these gentlemen cannot copyright words and we can talk and write about what they say by just saying, "in other words." As for the questionnaire, it was released to the public before the survey was published and copyrighted-hence no copyright is valid. The questionnaire is enough. In due time we will pay it our gentle respects.

In looking over the new paper for a sample of ethics we were treated to the following: An alleged prevailing unfairness in the old papers: thrusts at writers of other papers for personalities and fighting; getting below the dignity of Christians; statements reflecting on the spirituality of other writers: references to their haughty spirit and egotism; editors are dictators; much of being a high plane paper. Personally, I regard it the lowest plane a paper or policy.

There have been not less than three dozen references in the nature of implications, insinuations and reflections in the new paper by actual check. It would be interesting to quote these and let the reader see them, but they are copyrighted, and we would have to reprint their paper to do it! Weak, indeed, must be the cause that requires the cloak of copyright laws to escape exposure.

Once upon a time an old sage said that consistency was a jewel. If this be true, it is not the jewelry of the New Leader that makes it glisten. The editor of it tells his readers not to discontinue the old papers, but subscribe for the new paper do addition, or if they can afford only one, then stay with the ones they now subscribe to. That sounds good—but the new paper was formed on the propaganda that the present papers were unfair, below the plane of proper dignity, dealing in personal fighting and abuse, devoid of spirituality, dictatorial in editorship and management, exhibiting haughtiness and egotism in writers, and withal generally bad. One article in the new paper even compared present papers to putting out filthy laundry for outsiders to look at. (These are not his exact words—they are copyrighted—but these words are the twin sisters to the words he used.) Now my point is this-if the papers are all that bad, why does the new editor want people to keep on taking them? He ought to tell them to quit taking such sheets if they are unethical even if he has to be unethical to do so. It only shows a forced effort to be the will. Ethics. Policy. Diplomacy. We shall see more of it.—F. E. W. Jr.

Jesus made it his meat and drink to do the will of the Father and to accomplish his work. Churches to day a y scheme and devise inventions of their own and ignore divine wisdom. The papers inform us that a Methodist will "was calories to pay off debt of church at one cent a pound." They eat all they can for a week and pay a cent
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We will now review Chapter V in Brother Boll’s book. He begins by saying:

“In the Kingdom-doctrine of the Bible the nation of Israel holds an important and essential place. Once more then, before taking up the New Testament teaching on this great theme, we must turn back to the Old, to see what were the Kingdom-promises made of God to His ancient covenant people. We do this in the recognition of the fact that the teaching of the Old Testament is not antagonistic to that of the New, nor that of the New subversive to that of the Old. The same God spoke both. They are therefore harmonious with each other. The truth of each is confirmed in the other.”

After paying this splendid tribute to the inspiration and harmonious teachings of the Old and New Testaments, he declares:

“We must turn back to the Old, to see what were the Kingdom-promises made of God to His ancient covenant people.”

Yet he did not do what he said “we must do,” that is “turn back to the Old.” But he says:

“In considering the people of Israel we take our stand upon the high vantage ground of the apostolic teaching of the New Testament.”

We will notice his “stand upon the high vantage ground of the apostolic teaching” directly; but just now I want to remind the readers that to Brother Boll “the Kingdom-doctrine of the Bible” has no reference to the Church or spiritual Kingdom of Christ; but to a future national conversion, and restoration of Israel to the land of Canaan, with Christ as King over an earthly Kingdom.

There is not enough money in the world to get me to knowingly or intentionally misrepresent R. H. Boll’s position on the Kingdom question, and if the above statement is not true, if he will drop me a card, correcting the statement, I will publish it in the next issue of the Bible Banner. This shall be my attitude throughout my review of his book. We will never get anywhere here, nor go to where we hope to go in the hereafter, by asking questions or making statements trying to put those from whom we differ in a false light or position. And to me there is nothing more contemptible. I believe Boll’s teaching on “the Kingdom-doctrine of the Bible” is false, and subversive to the teaching of both the Old and New Testaments, and this I propose to show; but not by misrepresenting his position.

Paul says: “Wherefore I testify unto you this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I shrank not from declaring unto you the whole counsel of God.” (Acts 20:26, 27) If therefore what Brother Boll says about the national conversion and restoration of Israel to the land of Canaan, with Jesus Christ as King reigning in Jerusalem over an earthly kingdom, is the “harmonious teaching of the Old and New Testaments” on “the Kingdom-doctrine of the Bible,” then I am not free from the blood of all men, because I do not teach it. This review of “The Kingdom of God,” is my answer, and reason, for not teaching it. If however I am not free from the blood of all men because I do not teach the vagaries of R. H. Boll, then those who term themselves “neutrals” among us, whose only fight (?) against his cock and bull teaching on “The Kingdom-doctrine of the Bible,” and who are not personally committed to Brother Boll’s views in these matters and never have been,” are just as guilty before God as I am. Yet they would stoop to anything as low as scurrilous, anonymous letters, and if you get any lower than that you are under the sills, to assassinate the character and ruin the influence of “Brother Johnson” because of his relentless fight against what they mildly call “Brother Boll’s views.” But again I remind the readers that it is not just a matter of “Brother Boll’s views,” as the “neutrals” would have you believe: but rather the teaching and urging his views upon the church as “the harmonious teaching of the Old and New Testaments” on “the Kingdom-doctrine of the Bible.”

But back to the issue. We have learned that when Abraham came into the land of Canaan, he considered himself: a sojourner, and was “looking for a city which hath foundations whose builder and maker is God.” Therefore he did not consider the land of Canaan their permanent home. But when he left his native country, “Ur of the Chaldees,” and came into the land of Canaan, God’s promise to him to give the land to his posterity, became an irrevocable promise as Brother Boll says on page 22, “based upon the fact the Abraham had obeyed God’s voice; which fact was in the past and could never more be undone.” Therefore God was bound by His promise and oath to give the land of Canaan to Abraham’s posterity. More than eight hundred years after the promise was made to Abraham, we read in Joshua 21:45, “So Jehovah gave unto Israel all the land which he swore to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein.” After God gave the land of Canaan to Abraham’s descendants, “and they possessed it, and dwelt therein,” he said: “Neither will I any more remove the foot of Israel from off the land which I have appointed for your fathers, if only they will observe to do all that I have commanded them, even all the law and the statutes, and the ordinances given by Moses” (2 Chron. 33:8). Therefore their observing “the law and the statutes, and the ordinances given by Moses” became the irrevocable condition of their remaining in the land.

Now if Abraham’s obedience to God’s voice made God’s promise to him: “a sure and unchangeable promise,” a promise God was bound to fulfill to his posterity, would not the disobedience of his descendants, to God’s “law and statutes, and ordinances” revoke the following promise? “Neither will I any more remove the foot of Israel from off the land which I have appointed for your fathers.” If not, why not?

More than a thousand years after the children of Israel entered the Land of Canaan, possessed it, and dwelt therein,” God said to them through Malachi, the last of the Old Testament prophets, “From the days of your fathers ye have turned aside from mine ordinances, and have not kept them” (Malachi 3:7). There was nothing therefore left for God to do, but to “remove the foot of Israel from off the land,” and that is exactly what he did, and for more than two thousand years they have been scattered, wandering among the nations of the earth, a race without a country, as a living miracle to the inspiration and “harmonious teaching” of the Old Testament on the integrity of God in fulfilling his promise to Abraham, and executing his threat upon his posterity.

The promise of Abraham was based upon his obedience to God’s voice, the threat to his posterity was conditioned upon their disobedience. The latter was no less binding upon God than the former, and has as surely been fulfilled. Therefore the hope of Israel today, and our hope alike, are based upon “the oath, and promise of the universal blessing” in Christ. “For he is our peace, who made both one, and broke down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; that he might create
in himself of the two, one new man, so making peace;
and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby: and he came and preached peace to you that were far off, and peace to them that were nigh; for through him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father.” (Eph. 2:14-18)

It is distressing and deplorable that these simple, yet profound truths have been confused in the minds of many good brethren with the vagaries of “a future national home of Israel,” fathered and featured by one unduly obsessed with the ideas of heading a reformation in the church of Christ. If the land of Canaan, based upon the “land promise” God made to Abraham, is to be the “national home of Israel” during the millennium, then the “law and the statues and the ordinances given by Moses” will automatically become binding upon them. If not, you have God bound by an unconditional, and irrevocable promise, for one thousand and years, to Abraham’s posterity, with no commands or conditions binding upon them. Baptist preachers could preach a doctrine like that; but gospel preachers doing it, is another thing.

We will now notice Brother Boll’s “high vantage ground of the apostolic teaching of the New Testament.” Writing under the heading, “Paul’s Teaching Regarding Israel,” Brother Boll wanders around through the arguments Paul made in Chapters 9, 10 and 11 of the Book of Romans and evolves the national conversion, and restoration of Israel to the land of Canaan, as a future national home, based upon God’s promises to their fathers. I believe such application of Paul’s teaching in the Roman letter is not only erroneous; but absurd. To understand Paul’s arguments in the first eleven chapters of Romans, which I believe to be the most profound arguments ever made, it is necessary to begin with his theme announced in Chapter 1:16, and follow him through as he unfolds and develops that subject. If Paul had said: “I am not ashamed of the promises God made to our fathers, for they vouchsafe the future national home of my people, Israel” then Brother Boll’s conclusions would inevitably be correct; but since that was not Paul’s subject, his conclusions must be inevitably false. Later we will take up Paul’s theme and arguments, and show that he was unfolding and developing “the promise of the universal blessing” God made to Abraham, and that “the land promise” was in no sense under consideration.

But let us follow Brother Boll’s meandering. He quotes Romans 9:1-5, and says:

“The calling, position, and greatness of the nation of Israel is here pointedly set forth; as well as the heart-breaking misery of their present condition.”

We read of the three great calls God has made. He called Abraham out of “Ur of the Chaldees” into “the land of Canaan,” he called Israel, Abraham’s posterity, “out of Egypt” into the “land of promise,” and he calls us “through the gospel.” Which one of these calls do the readers think Paul was urging upon his people, Israel? Brother Boll continues:

“As a nation they are what Paul in his love would gladly have been for them-anathema from Christ.”

Yes, Paul “would gladly have been” anathematized from Christ for his people, if that would have caused them to accept Christ. Certainly this is all Paul’s statement could mean. But we go on with Brother Boll, he says:

“As he shows again in Romans 10:1, they are unsaved. A mere remnant ‘according to the election of grace’ has found acceptance with God, and the rest were hardened. (Rom. 11:3-7) Is the nation, stands today seemingly abandoned of God; and there are not a few teachers who think themselves able to prove that the nation of Israel is forever cast off. (Cont’d off) only as concerns the land of Canaan as a national home; but not from Christ. Jno. T. L.) But let Paul speak further: ‘I say then, Did they stumble that they might fall? God forbid; but by their fall salvation is come to the Gentiles to provoke them to jealousy.’ (Rom. 11:11) The two words translated ‘fall’ here are not the same; the former signifies an absolute downfall, as unto destruction; the latter, a lapse, a trespass; so that Moffat renders it: ‘Have they stumbled to their ruin? Never! The truth is that by their lapse salvation is come to the Gentiles, so as to make them jealous.’”

I think Brother Boll and Moffat both are wrong when they say: “by their lapse salvation has passed to the Gentiles,” as though the Jews had salvation and it passed from them to the Gentiles. “The truth” is Paul shows in the last part of the first chapter of Romans why God rejected the Gentiles, it was because of their sins, and he mentions the sins they had been guilty of, he then shows the Jews that they had been guilty of the same sins, and since God was no respecter of persons there was nothing for him to do but reject the Jews too. Therefore the Jews, as well as the Gentiles, stood condemned, and rejected of God. So God made the fall of the Jews the occasion of Christ’s coming into the world to fulfill his promise, and oath to Abraham—“And in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed; because thou hast obeyed my voice.” (Gen. 22:18) This is “the promise of the universal blessing.” In Christ.

Thus, “salvation has passed to the Gentiles,” as it has passed to the Jews, “to all the nations of the earth,” through their obedience, as individuals, to the gospel, which “is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jews first, and also to the Greek.”

Let us go on with Brother Boll and Moffat.

“Now,” the apostle continues, “if their fall (their lapse) is the richer of the world, and their loss the richer of the Gentiles, how much more their fullness? ... For if the casting away of them is the reeling in of the Gentiles, how much more their coming of them be but life from the dead?” (Rom. 11:12,15)

How do Brother Boll and Moffat think God will receive the Jews? Do they think it will be other than through their obedience to the gospel? The Jews are dead to God through their trespasses and sins, and when the masses of them accept Christ, as Paul indicates they will, of course it will be “life from the dead.” But that does not mean a national home for them in Palestine. Listen to Brother Boll again:

“Manifestly it is the nation of Israel which descended from Jacob through his twelve sons, of whom the apostle is speaking. He carefully denies that they have fallen into final ruin. ‘(There is nothing “final in their ruin,” but their national home, and their claims based on blood relations. Jno. T. L.) He declares that through their ‘trespass’ (R. V. mg.) salvation has come to the Gentiles — and even that privilege is granted to the Gentiles in order that disobedient Israel might be stirred to jealousy. (To accept Christ. J. T. L.). In the future national salvation of Israel looks to a glorious day opening to all the whole wide world resulting. It will be a veritable resurrection out of the death of the ages to all the earth. (That would be glorious, but no more than the individual that has died. But let the readers think Paul was urging upon his people, Israel! Brother Boll continues: ‘As a nation they are what Paul in his love would gladly have been for them-anathema from Christ.’"

Yes, Paul “would gladly have been” anathematized from Christ for his people, if that would have caused them to accept Christ. Certainly this is all Paul’s statement could mean. But we go on with Brother Boll, he says:

“As he shows again in Romans 10:1, they are unsaved. A mere remnant ‘according to the election of grace’ has found acceptance with God, and the rest were hardened. (Rom. 11:3-7) Is the nation, stands today seemingly abandoned of God; and there are not a few teachers who think themselves able to prove that the nation of Israel is forever cast off. (Cont’d off) only as concerns the land of Canaan as a national home; but not from Christ. Jno. T. L.) But let Paul speak further: ‘I say
they continue not in their unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graft them in again" (Verse 23). It was upon these facts that Paul based the adverb phrase, “and so all Israel shall be saved”—that is through their individual faith and obedience to the gospel.

Brother Boll skipped all this, and quoted verse 25, and one line of verse 26, and continues:

“Again it is evident that he speaks of the nation of Israel who is now hardened and set aside. He has a mystery—that is, a secret—to tell us: to-wit—that Israel’s hardening is limited as to extent and as to time; as to extent, for it is “in part”; as to time, for it is “until” something is accomplished—namely, until the full count of the elect Gentiles shall have come in. Then Israel’s tile shall turn. Then their great Deliverer shall turn away their ungodliness, and they shall no longer abide in unbelief. So all Israel (not, as now, a remnant merely, but the distinction between ‘the remnant’ and ‘the rest will disappear—the whole nation shall be saved. This glorious hope is yet laid up for that nation. They are now indeed ‘enemies’ as touching the gospel; but for their father’s sake with whom God entered into an inviolable covenant, they piously think in God’s purpose elect and beloved. ‘For the gifts and the calling of God are not repented of’ (Rom. 11:29).”

Thus ends Brother Boll’s explanation (?) of Paul’s arguments in Romans 9, 10, and 11. If Brother Boll does not understand Paul’s arguments any better than the above indicates, then I am glad to help him; but if he thus knowingly perverted Paul’s arguments to make his theories of a future earthly, kingdom, appear to “stand upon the high vantage ground of the apostolic teaching of the New Testament,” I want the “neutrals among us” to know this.

I will now quote one paragraph from Romans 11:26:

“But in endeavoring to forecast the probable future of the Jews, two things are to be steadily kept in mind. First, that no miracle will be worked in order to effect their conversion. The gospel is God’s power for salvation. Consequently, he who is not saved by it will never be saved at all. All will be done to save the Jews that is now being done to save the Gentiles, but no more. Second, that the future salvation of Israel does not imply their restoration to their ancient home in Palestine. The former is a grace, whereas the latter is not. When converted, the Jews can be just as happy, dispersed as they now are, as ‘though they were all crowded back into Judea; and certainly they can be far more useful. The gospel is not designed to prepare man for an earthly Canaan, but for a heavenly.”

That is common sense, and the teaching of the Bible too. I will now quote the last paragraph of Lard’s comments on verse 29.

“The Calvinistic mode of interpreting this verse is as follows: When God purposes to call and favor a people, his purpose is unalterable. He long since purposed to call and favor Israel; and therefore he will not let anything interfere. This is partly true and partly not. When God purposed unconditionally to call a people, he will certainly call them; but he purposed unconditionally nothing more than the call. He now unconditionally purposes salvation. This he confers onlv on condition of obedience to Christ. But he has already called the Jews by the Gospel, and is still calling them. Thus far, then, his purpose has been executed. But whether he will ever favor them with salvation depends, not on any unconditional purpose of his, but on their own voluntary acceptance of Christ. This done, He will bless; this not done, He will not.”

These quotations are from Lard’s Commentary on Romans. I have quoted from Lard because “the neutrals among us” say, that the Lord taught the same things that Boll teaches, and nobody divided the church then. Such statements pervert the facts, and slander the dead, as the above shows.

**MORE AMUSING THAN SERIOUS**

CLED E. WALLACE

Sometime ago, Brother Jorgenson heaved a sigh of genuine or feigned relief, and since I am not a mind reader he may have the benefit of the doubt. He was looking for and found some signs that “the Wallace scare is nearly over.” About the same time, Brother Davidson of “new paper” fame writes in that he had been informed by eminent legal counsel that certain matters in the Bible Banner “is libelous.” He requested a conference of “the owners of the Bible Banner” looking to a settlement with the implied threat that something must be done—or else. He signed his name right under “Sincerely yours” which suggests that the brother means business. Had I been in his place I believe I would have signed up “yours outraged” as a digressive preacher did many years ago who wrote F. D. Srygley, who was then first page editor of the Gospel Advocate, and threatened him with “a case of law on your hands” as soon as he could get the matter “in the hands of my attorney.” Brother Srygley was not easily scared and generously offered to furnish more material “for reflection and more business for my attorney’ and yours outraged.” Nothing, of course, came of it, except “yours outraged” showed that he couldn’t take it.

It seems that scares are to be the order of the day and since the “Wallace scare is nearly over” a Davidson “scare” will keep things from settling down too peaceable like. This latest “scare” has its tragic features but I do hope that it turns out to be more amusing than serious. Possibly Brother Davidson, if left to cool off of his own free will and accord, could be trusted to do nothing rash, but there is no telling what that “eminent legal counsel” will talk him into. I take it that a lawyer would have to be pretty dumb to sue a preacher on such flimsy evidence as Brother David-

son has, but then it has been freely published that he has made more than ordinary success in business, and whispered about that he has plenty of money, and under the circumstances “eminent legal counsel” might be too interested in their client to note the ragged condition of the defendant in the case. The editor of the Bible Banner is a pretty good friend of mine, I used to “nuss him” when he was a baby, and he has. vast resources but Brother Davidson’s “eminent legal counsel” would not classify them as tangible assets.

Now, I want to talk Brother Davidson out of this if I can. I’m the only member of the Wallace family I know of that anybody could scare even with “eminent legal counsel.” As for the editor of the Bible Banner, if he was ever scared, it was before I could remember and I’m enough his senior that two of our sisters are younger than I and older than he. So that’s out! So if you are out to scare Foy, you might as well call off your lawyers, or should disperse with figures of speech and say lawyers? If more money is what you want out of it, you had better forget about him and sue me. If satisfaction of honor is what you have in mind, I suggest that you fight a duel. Of course I understand that you will have to take up these suggestions with “eminent legal counsel” before you will feel free to act upon them. I’m just hoping that Brother Davidson is not as hardheaded as Brother Foy is. If he is, I’m afraid we’re in for a legal fracas and wouldn’t a gang of preachers and a lot of rolled up lawyers make a pretty scene trying to rescue Brother Davidson’s honor or replenish his purse! Personally, I have a little bit more confidence in Brother Davidson than some seem to have. I have been slipped a warning to the effect that he “will sue the socks right off your feet.” Now, Foy is stubborn when he thinks he is right, and he always thinks he is. He would surrender the only pair socks he has, even
if they had holes in them, and go home in his shirt-tail to boot before he would back out. So I'm begging Brother Davidson to settle with his "eminent legal counsel" and call this whole thing off in the interests of peace. If you get tired of reading what Foy writes, switch off on me, it will be easier on your nerves.

I might not qualify as a mediator due to my relationship to the editor, but I do feel that I'm qualified to remind our brother Davidson of a few things he seems to have forgotten. After being "lost to us" for a number of years, as Brother Rowe expresses it, he has decided to dedicate himself to "things spiritual." He wants to use some of the money he has made in spiritual conquests. He is prominent in the establishment of a new paper whose pages are to be unsoiled by the sort of articles which sometimes get into the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation and nearly always do in the Bible Banner. Its diatonic scale is blessing and its upper octave is joy. And now, for Brother Davidson to frown up and threaten to sue a brother editor for libel just doesn't make sense. Don't do it for some innocent bystanders are liable to get the idea that you are not thoroughly dedicated to "things spiritual."

In order to have an air-tight case against the brother's threatened action, I think I'll appeal to the scriptures. Let it be granted for the time being that the brother has been slandered and libelled. I have been slandered a time or two in my life and I didn't have to consult "eminent legal counsel" to find it out. He claims he has been wrongly used in print and resents it now. What course should he pursue? The record is clear. "Take heed to yourselves: if thy brother sin, rebuke him; and if he repent, forgive him." Give the editor of the Bible Banner credit for believing that he was administering a case of "rebuke." A charitable man like Brother Davidson ought to be able to reduce "libelous" to "rebuke" under the circumstances. At least he ought to be able to see that Jesus did not say "if thy brother sin sue him."

Besides, he can administer a case of rebukiing without the help of legal counsel. He cannot do it in the new paper for it is against the declared policy of the paper to carry such rebukes. It looks as though what he cannot afford to put in his paper he is prepared to turn over to his lawyers. Does it all come under the head of "things spiritual?"

I may do a little side-line work on the editor, since I'm his elder brother, if there's anything left of him after Brother Davidson's lawyers get through with him, but I'm trying to hold Brother Davidson now and prevent the slaughter. Here are some of the "things spiritual" I want Brother Davidson to dedicate himself to. "Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also. And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." "Love thy enemies and pray for them that persecute you."

If Brother Davidson decides to sue, he should insist on opening each session with prayer, since he has dedicated himself to "things spiritual." One more reference ought to furnish the brother an occasion for great rejoicing. "Blessed are ye when men shall reproach you, and persecute you, and say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets that were before you." If the brother thinks he belongs in the company of the persecuted and slandered, he ought to pray for his detractors, pass the whole case up to a higher court and leave his "eminent legal counsel" out of it. And you know some of our starving missionaries might be glad to get the money that can easily be wasted on "eminent legal counsel" and the appurtenances thereto.
The following paragraph is taken from the December issue of Word and Work. It was written by R. H. Boll in his discussion of “The Marvel of the Jew.” It gives us some idea of the fantastical interpretation that these modern Judaizers give to prophetic statements in their effort to prove the future return of Israel to the land of Canaan. But before making further comment let us read the paragraph as follows:

“At this writing an international proposal is taking shape to give the homeless, outcast Jews a land where they may settle, the security of said land to be guaranteed by the several nations in which the proposal has been suggested—Tanganyika and Kenya, former German colonies in Africa (the mere mention of which proposal has whipped up Nazi wrath into boundless fury); British Guiana or other parts in South America, or Australia. Even that phase of their restoration seems to be foretold in their prophets. In the closing verses of Ezekiel’s message says, ‘As I live, saith the Lord Jehovah, surely with a mighty hand, and with an outstretched arm, and with wrath poured out will I be king over you. And I will bring you out from the peoples, and will gather you out of the countries whither ye ‘are scattered throughout the nations; I will bring you into the wilderness of the peoples, and there will I enter into judgment with you face to face. Like as I entered into judgment with your fathers in the wilderness of the land of Egypt, so will I enter into judgment with you, saith the Lord Jehovah. And I will cause you to pass under the rod, and I will bring you into a bond of the covenant; and I will purge out from among you the rebels, and them that transgress against me; I will bring them forth out of the land where they sojourn, but they shall not enter in to the land of Israel: and ye shall know that I am Jehovah.’ (Ezek. 20:33-38.) Note 1. that this is still a step in judgment and death; 2. that Israel will be brought forth out of the various lands and countries in which they have been scattered; 3. that they will be brought into a place called the wilderness of the nations; 4. that there God will deal with them in judgment as he dealt with their fathers; 5. that there will be passed under the rod (a shepherd’s term, Lev. 27:32; Jer. 33:15); and 6. that they shall know Jehovah for the fulfillment of the prophecies.”

Some Points Overlooked

But while pointing out seven items of the prophecy in an effort to make it apply to a future restoration of Israel to Palestine, Bro. Boll overlooked and failed to point out some other things that are distinctly a part of this prophecy. When these points are numbered and called to your attention you may be able to see why he passed them by in silence—why they are of no help, but a serious hindrance to his application of the prophecy. But let us note some things he failed to mention in this prophecy.

1. Bro. Boll failed to tell his readers that Ezekiel delivered his prophecies during the period of Babylonian captivity. (Ezek. 1 :1-3) Any prophecy, therefore, delivered by him during this period respecting a restoration to their land would very likely concern their return from this captivity. But Boll failed to mention that.

2. The particular prophecy in Ezekiel 20, which Bro. Boll uses, was delivered in the seventh year of that captivity. (Ezek. 20:1) Consequently, a restoration to their own land has already been accomplished since that prophecy was delivered. But Bro. Boll skipped this point.

3. That this particular prophecy was delivered as a result of a request, or inquiry, made by certain “elders of Israel” who were then in captivity. (Ezek. 20: 1-3).

4. That the captivity concerning which the prophet speaks and from which he predicts deliverance was brought about by the idolatrous worship of Israel. (Ezek. 20: 28-33) This prophecy Bro. Boll could not afford to mention for it would demolish his application of the prophecy to a dispersion that idolatry did not produce, for it is a well known fact that since the Babylonian captivity the Jews have not been idolaters. This would spoil his playhouse; so he did not include it with his other points.

5. That the restoration promised in this prophecy was to be accomplished during the existence of the Jewish law, of Jewish offerings, rites and ceremonies. (Ezek. 20: 40) It would be a good idea to read this verse just here: “For in mine holy mountain, in the mountain of the height of Israel, saith the Lord God, there shall all the house of Israel, all of them in the land, serve me: there will I accept them, and there will I gather YOU out of the countries whither ye ‘are scattered throughout the nations; I will bring you into the wilderness of the peoples, and there will I enter into judgment with you face to face.”

6. That after Israel is brought back to their own land, they will be delivered from the captivity here-mentioned, and after they were brought back to their own land, they would offer to God their offerings and the first fruits of their oblations, with all your holy things.” So after Israel would be delivered from the captivity here-mentioned, and after they were brought back to their own land, they would offer to God their offerings and the first fruits of their oblations. This at once points out the time of this restoration—that it would take place during the existence of the law that required such offerings and oblations. But the law that required such was abolished at the cross of Christ. (Col. 2: 14-7) Hence this prophecy had to be fulfilled during the Jewish dispensation; it does not point to some future event and time. I wonder why Boll failed to number this point. He could not have overlooked it (unless purposely) for he quoted the verses.
just preceding this statement and the second verse following it. Yet to have mentioned this point would have taken the very heart out of his argument. So his readers were not told about it.

**Jewish Offerings Re-established**

However, when premillennialists are confronted with the fact that such prophecies were fulfilled while Jewish ceremonies were to be offered, they will contend that such ceremonies are to be brought back in the Millennium. This position they are forced to take in order to have any semblance of proof of a future restoration of the Jews. This is Bro. Boll’s position. And it will not do for them to say that when the Jews are restored to Ca-naan, and prior to their acceptance of the Lord, it will be the natural thing for the Jews to re-establish their former system of worship; for the prophecies used to prove their restoration do not point out animal sacrifice, offerings and oblations as a matter of their own choosing before knowing the Lord, but such are pointed out as a divine requirement of them. The text just given from Ezek. 20:40 declares this to be true. The Lord says: “There will I require your offerings, and the first-fruits of your oblations. For if the Lord re-establishes such system by the Jews in rebellion but in obedience to the requirement of God. But if the Lord re-establishes such system then, the plan in the Millennial age will be a distinct let-down from the plan in this age. Let us take a look at some of these things.

1. The restoration of animal sacrifice.

The plan for the Millennium as proclaimed by these modern Judaizers demands the restoration of the sacrifice of animals. Their use of prophecies found in Isaiah 60, Jeremiah 33 and Zechariah 14 makes such restoration necessary. This will be seen by reading Isa. 60:7, Jer. 33:16-18 and Zech. 14:21. That this will be a let-down from the plan of worship in the gospel age is shown by the following considerations:

(a) Animal sacrifice was but a shadow, figure, or type of the sacrifice that pertains to this age. In Heb. 10:1 Paul said: “For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.” Hence the law with its sacrifices was but a shadow of things to come. This point will also be seen by reading Heb. 9:9. So to return to the Jewish system in a future age will be to return to the shadow instead of the substance, to exchange the thing typified for the type, to revert to the blood of animals instead of the blood of Christ. Who would dare says this would not be a let-down?

(b) The blood of animals is inferior to the blood of Christ. A contrast is drawn between them in Heb. 9:13, 14 in which the blood of animals is said to sanctify to the purifying of the flesh, but the blood of Christ does much more in purging the conscience. Then verse 23 tells us that the blood of animals purified the “patterns of things in the heavens” but “the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.” So to return to the offering of animals in sacrifice will be to go from a better sacrifice to that which is much inferior.

(c) Animal sacrifice could not take away sins. This is evident from the language of Heb. 10:3, 4. But the blood of Jesus Christ can fully atone. (Heb. 10:10). To return to animal sacrifice will be to return to that which cannot bring remission. Will that be progression or retrogression?

(d) Where remission of sins is there can be no further offering. In Heb. 10:18 we have these words: “Now where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sins.” In the Jewish age the offerings had to be repeated because they could not take away sins, and if they could have taken away sins, they would have ceased to be offered. Heb. 10:2. Yet in the gospel age the Lord declares: “Their sins and their iniquities will I remember no more.” (Heb. 10:17). So the next verse tells us there is no more offering for sins. In this age we have remission of sins and do not need to make animal sacrifice. So may I ask: Will there be remission of sins in the Millennial age? If so, there will be no need of any offering for sins? That destroys any necessity for the restoration of animal sacrifice. If there will not be remission in that age, it will certainly be some let-down from that which is had in this age. Animal sacrifice according to the Jewish system was made as an offering for sin. (Heb. 5:1-4). So if the Jewish system of worship is restored in a future age, the offering of animals must be made for sin. But if that becomes true, there will be no remission in that age, for Heb. 10:18 plainly says that no further offering for sin and remission of sins cannot continue at the same time.

(e) And furthermore those who offer animal sacrifice have not right to Christian worship. Read Heb. 13:10-15. If the Jews restore animal sacrifice in the Millennium, they will have no right to worship at the Christian altar.

2. The reorganization of the Jewish priesthood.

The same arguments of Premillennialists made on the prophecies of Isaiah 66 and Jeremiah 33 require that the Jewish priesthood be organized in the Millennium. But bringing back that Jewish priesthood will be an inglorious let-down from the priesthood of the present age. The following points give emphasis to this thought:

(a) Perfection could not be by the Levitical priesthood. (Heb. 7:11). To return to such system in the future, therefore, will be to return from the perfect to the imperfect.

(b) If perfection could have been by the Levitical priesthood, there would have been no need for the priesthood of Christ. Read again Heb. 7:11: “If therefore perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law,) what further need was there that another priest should arise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron?” If the Levitical priesthood is restored in the Millennium, will perfection by it be possible? If not, then we must return to an inferior condition. And if so, there will be no further need for the priesthood of Christ. Let them take their choice of these results.

(c) A change of priesthood necessitated a change in the law. (Heb. 7:12). When the Levitical priesthood was done away and the priesthood of Christ was established, a change in the law had to be made. The law of Moses that governed the Levitical priesthood was done away and the law of Christ was given. Suppose then that we return to the Levitical priesthood in a future age. There will of necessity be made another change in the law, and we will have to go from the gospel of Christ back to the law of Moses that described and governed the Levitical priesthood.

(d) Christ could not be a priest on earth while Levitical priests officiated. Heb. 8-4. If, then, in the Millennium the Levitical priesthood is re-organized, the priesthood of Christ will have to cease at the same time.

The same system of reasoning could be followed with respect to the bringing back of Jewish feast days and the various things that pertained to Jewish worship. All such were but types, shadows, or figures of those things we now have in the Christian age; and to return to them in the future will be a let-down so serious in nature that the thought cannot even be entertained by any one who has anything like a proper regard for the greatness of the gospel of the Son of God.
"THE SUBTLE GAME CALLED CARDS"

A Discussion of the World’s Outstanding Game of Chance, Pointing Out its Fundamental Evils and the Basic Fallacy of the Claim that there is no Harm in Card-playing

I. Cards Defined

The term cards is defined by Webster: “Any game or games played with playing-cards, fifty-two cards of which constitute a pack, arranged in four suits of thirteen cards, each suit comprehending ten spot-cards, having spots varying in number from one to ten, the one-spot being known as the ace, and three coat-cards, the king, queen, and knave or jack. The black suits are clubs and spades; the red, hearts and diamonds.”

The striking thing about the foregoing definition is its preciseness in restricting itself to one particular thing, the spot-card, to the exclusion of everything else. If one should enquire why in condemning cards we always speak of the spot-card to the exclusion of every other form of card, the sufficient reply is that such is necessary if the very definition of the word is to be repeated.

II. The Basis For Distinction

But why is the term used with such exclusiveness? We shall understand this fully when we take into consideration the distinguishing characteristic of the spot-card system. We come face to face with this characteristic when we observe that the pack of cards is a mathematical creation whose purpose is that of basing a game on chance.

And to understand this we need to remind ourselves, first, that cards were originated by the Arabs, the mathematical geniuses of all time. (Do we sufficiently bear in mind the fact that the Arabs gave mathematics to the world? Do we bear in mind that our mathematical creation is the product of Saracen civilization.

As a matter of fact, uncertainty and the element of gambling constitute a pack, arranged in four suits of thirteen cards, each suit comprehending ten spot-cards, having spots varying in number from one to ten, the one-spot being known as the ace, and three coat-cards, the king, queen, and knave or jack. The black suits are clubs and spades; the red, hearts and diamonds.

The striking thing about the foregoing definition is its preciseness in restricting itself to one particular thing, the spot-card, to the exclusion of everything else. If one should enquire why in condemning cards we always speak of the spot-card to the exclusion of every other form of card, the sufficient reply is that such is necessary if the very definition of the word is to be repeated.

III. Cards And Gambling

That which has been brought out to this point enables us to see the constitutional connection between cards and gambling. Gambling is an operation based on chance. To understand this statement we must avoid altogether inadequate notion that gambling is merely taking a chance.

As a matter of fact, uncertainty and chance are inextricably interwoven with the whole fabric of human undertaking. But there are established certainties and endeavors to do business on them in spite of the uncertainties.

Gambling, to the exact reverse bases its operations on chance in spite of the certainties encountered. This is one of the fundamental distinctions between legitimate business and gambling.

And this analysis makes it clear that cards falls within the realm of gambling. And it ought to be observed that in spite of first appearances to the contrary the mere matter of offering a prize, or not offering a prize, does not affect this fundamental principle. If it is true that gambling is basing an operation on chance, a game of cards constitutes an act of gambling. To argue to the contrary would be parallel to arguing that a foot race run without the consideration of a prize would not constitute running a foot race. The fact is that a certain action constitutes a foot race. When that act is performed a foot race has been accomplished, quite regardless of any consideration of a prize. Even so does a certain act, that of basing an operation on chance, constitute gambling. When that act is performed gambling has been accomplished.

IV. Concluding Considerations

As must be obvious, this article is written for the sole purpose of pointing out the element of gambling embraced within the Arabian creation which we call cards. Quite frequently persons assert that as far as they are concerned they can see no difference between cards and any other game. These persons are unfortunately overlooking an element inhering in what is properly called cards. Such a course would be parallel to that of a good woman who in devotion to the principle that she was not a one-pill woman would be as willing to take one tablet as another. Suppose such a woman on feeling that she needed a tablet were to swallow bi-chloride of mercury. Anyone knows that only immediate and skillful medical assistance would save her from serious illness or horrible death. Why the difference in the matter of mere tablets? Because there is a difference in cards. Any person who argues to the contrary simply does not understand the game called cards.

Looking In The Wrong Place

Lost articles are usually found when we look in the right place. To some the kingdom of God is lost. The trouble with the premillennialists, they are looking for the kingdom in the wrong place and for an outward display of it. They are constantly looking for signs and wonders, in heathen and rebellious nations, as an index pointing to the establishment of a literal kingdom of Christ upon a literal throne of David in the literal city of Jerusalem. They have failed to learn that the kingdom "cometh not with observation," but is within us.—Chester Estes.
Much is being said lately about unethical preaching. I am wholly opposed to such. It is almost unpardonable for one to be guilty of such conduct, especially if the preacher is a man of age and experience.

The word ethical is defined thus: 1. "Of or relating to moral action, motive, or character; also, treating of morals, morality, or ethics. 2. Conforming to professional standards of conduct."

Every profession has its code of ethics. Physicians consider it unethical to advertise except through the patient. Business men regard it unpardonable for one to cut prices on a standard product-salvation! The result is that their code of ethics is that God, the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit were not conceived of a thing being unethical, that is, not the truth; and with Him it is always ethical to preach the Word.

A doctrine contradicts the Oath of God concerning the Kingship of Christ, strikes at the very vitals of Christianity, and opposes the great fundamentals taught by our Lord and His Apostles but a dear brother on the Pacific knows nothing about this error, does it not want to know, yet he tells us he is opposed to it! Wonderful logic! How can any one consistently be opposed to something he claims to be wholly ignorant of? "Selah."—W. M. T.

During 1939 may we preachers do more to establish the church where it is not known, and to build up the weak places. May the church of Christ have greater vision, and become stronger, in faith, zeal and love. But In Love For The Truth. If we love the truth we will not forsake it, neither will we compromise with error. Let us press on toward the goal, and our Lord will reward each faithful servant. —W. M. T.
SPIRITUALISM—DIVINE OR DEVILISH?

A Detailed Examination of the Present-day Belief in this Ancient Hoax, in which People Pay to Have the Wool Pulled over their Eyes and Become the Victims of a Bamboozling Humbug.

G. K. WALLACE

We are supposed to be a civilized people. However, the general belief in Spiritualism does not so indicate. It is surprising how many people believe that departed spirits hold intercourse with mortals. They believe that such intercourse is held with the departed spirit through a medium.

The belief in Spiritualism is as old as our records. In fact, the oldest record in the world records the belief in this hoax. The Greeks and Romans believed in it. Witchcraft even was a problem at one time in our own country. However, a thing of long standing and belief does not make it right. Men have always believed that there is a Devil but that does not argue that he is divine and to be believed and Followed. But what about Spiritualism? Is it divine or devilish? Is it of God or of the Devil? Is it deception or is it true?

Method of Operation

Their seances are always held with the lights turned low. Some of their operations are given below:

1. They have a wooden slip fastened underneath the wrist which they slip beneath the edge of the table and then lift it to the amazement of the dupes.

2. They use invisible ink or silicate paper to fool you in their slate-writing. You write on a pad and tear off and hide away what you have written. One of the sheets is coated with paraffin that receives an impression which can be read easily by sprinkling over it a certain kind of black powder.

3. They put their toes on top of each other. The medium has steel upper on her shoes, and she slips her feet out without being noticed and runs around the room in the dark and does all kinds of stunts.

4. They will get a picture of your dead baby and reproduce it on a white ground. (James 4:14) When a fortune-teller says that this or that will happen, he lies. He is a false prophet. "The prophets prophesy lies in my name; I sent them not, neither have I commanded them, neither spake I unto them. They prophesy unto you a lying vision, and divination, and a thing of naught, and the deceit of their own heart." (Jer. 14:14)

The fortune-teller, like unto the false prophet, gives a "lying vision" from his own heart.

Spiritualism is an abomination to Jehovah. "When thou art come into the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not be found with thee any one that useth divination, one that practiseth augury, or an enchant-er, or a sorcerer, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits." (Deut. 18:9-11)

All who consult spirit mediums are condemned. "And the soul that turneth unto them that have familiar spirits and unto the wizards, to play the harlot after them, I will set my face against that soul and will cut him off from among the people." (Lev. 20:6) What Spiritualists call a "Control." God calls a "familiar spirit." "And when they shall say unto you. Seek unto them that have familiar spirits and unto the wizards that chirp, and that mutter: should not a people seek unto their God?" (Isa. 8:19)

Sorcery is placed in the same class as adultery. (Gal. 5:20) If a brother is found guilty of adultery or drunkenness, he becomes a social outcast. However, there are numbers who consult "spirit mediums" and yet are in good standing with every one. Why should we class them separately when God classes them together?

Objections Considered

The believer in Spiritualism counts by saying, "Does not the Bible teach Spiritualism? If not, what is taught and meant by I John 4:1; Samuel 28:3-5 and Matthew 17:1-27?" In I John 4:1 the writer says, "Prove the spirits whether they be of God." This simply means to test the prophet to see if he is from God. Many false prophets have gone out into the world; therefore, test or prove them. Now let us apply the test to Spiritualism. John says, "Every spirit that confesseth not Jesus is not of God; and this is the spirit of the anti-Christ." Jesus claimed to be the Son of God. Spiritualists say, "All testimony received from advanced spirits only
shows that Christ was a medium." They teach that Christ was only a medium and that anybody can be what he was. What demonic contempt! Such blasphemous daring shows beyond a doubt that the system is of the devil.

In I Samuel 28:8-25, we find the account of the witch of Endor. The record shows that King Saul had gone into complete apostasy. God would no longer hear him. In his desperation he turns to the old witch. God overruled this circumstance to teach Saul a lesson, as well as you and me. The witch was a fraud as can be seen by these facts:

1. The witch was frightened. She did not expect what occurred. Had she not expected Samuel in answer to her call, she would not have been alarmed. The woman "cried with a loud voice when she saw Samuel," and begged for mercy at the hands of Saul. She knew who King Saul was and now she knew that she was going to be exposed and for mercy she plead. The witch did not know who Samuel was. She said, "I see a god coming up out of the earth." I see a god," she said. This fact alone shows her to be a bamboozling humbug.

2. Saul talked to Samuel, face to face. The Spiritualist requires a medium. When Samuel appeared, the witch disappeared. That is what would happen today. If some Spiritualist mediums were trying to call up the spirit of some person and God were to overrule the circumstance and allow the spirit to come, they would run over one another in getting away. They would be as badly scared as the witch of Endor.

3. Samuel brought no message concerning the life beyond. The Spiritualist readings run about like this, the message being passed to the one inquiring through the medium. "I am happy where I am, etc." Samuel did not speak of his condition and only re-emphasized what he had told Saul in the past. "And Jehovah hath done unto thee as He spake by me," said Samuel. No message from the other world will change the condition. You must suffer the consequences of your sin.

Thus we see that God used this occasion to show us that we must always rely on what He says. We must do what He says.

It is evident that no witch knows what the future holds. They never did know. It is a ruse, first, last and always. Even the demons with a superhuman knowledge, who could and did recognize Christ did not know what the future held. They could not foretell future events. J. W. McGarvey, in commenting on Acts 16:16-18, says, "But there is no evidence known to me that they could foretell future events, though it was believed by the heathen generally that they could."

All that is necessary to say about Matthew 17:1-8 is this: There was no message spoken for living people concerning the life beyond. No message was brought from the dead. If so, what was it?

**The Black "I"**

There are three black "I"s in Spiritualism. A statement of these I's will show why one should avoid Spiritualism as a dangerous and unholy plague. The first black "I" is Infidelity. A doctrine cannot be built upon the Bible and at the same time deny Christ and His Word. The noted Spiritualist, Moses Hull, says in his book, "The Christ of the Past and Present," "Jesus was only a medium, subject to all the conditions of modern mediumship." Mr. Hull, in his book entitled, "Joan, The Medium," places Joan of Arc above Jesus Christ. He says, "The subject of this essay was quite as wonderful in her mediumship as was the Nazarene. She did as much for the world as he did, and died more ignominiously and unjustly and at the hands of a more wicked mob than did the so-called world's Savior." Page 11.

Mr. Weisse, another famous Spiritualist, said, "Tom Paine is in the seventh heaven, one above our Lord, though he was so many centuries behind in entering into the spirit life."

Mr. Hall, also an outstanding Spiritualist, said, "Your doctrine of the atonement is the very climax of a deranged imagination and one that is of unrighteous and immoral tendency.

Can you think of a more blasphemous heresy than to teach that Tom Paine is now exalted above the Lord Jesus Christ and that the teaching concerning the blood of Christ leads to immorality?

Spiritualism denies the inspiration of the Bible. "To assert," they say, "that the Bible is a holy and divine book and that God inspired the writers to make known his divine will, is a gross outrage on, and misleading to, the public."

The Bible doctrine of prayer is denied by Spiritualists. Mr. Wallace, in his essay on "Modern Spiritualism," says, "The men who pray most frequently, most earnestly and most selflessly, attract towards them a number of spiritual beings who sympathize with them and who, when the necessary mediumistic power is present, will be able, as they are often willing, to answer the prayers." This is some substitute for prayer, is it not?

Now, think, Friends, about the company the spirits of our loved ones seem to prefer. Is it not a little disquieting to think that our loved ones, dead to our criples in the sanctuaries of our own homes, will yet reveal themselves to the infidel medium in the little black parlor when the lights are turned low?

The next black "I" is Insanity. Madness among Spiritualists is on the increase. An Oxford lecturer, Doctor Winslow, who is considered an authority on mental diseases, says that Spiritualism is the cause of much insanity. Professor Harris said, "The most remarkable case of mediumship I have met with was that of a lady who commenced with a seemingly innocent table-turning at a children's party, and finished up by death in a madhouse."

Go to almost any madhouse between the oceans and ask, "What is the matter with this poor soul? What is wrong with this demented man? What is wrong with this poor, sobbing, moaning woman?" The answer will be, "Spiritualism did it. Many a person has wounded himself or killed his neighbor because, as he says, "The Spirits told me to do it."

The call of Spiritualism is strong to the person who is weak in faith and who hopes to communicate with a dead loved one. Often a person in a highly wrought state of mind, yields to its subtle whisper and once within its grasp finds it almost impossible to extricate himself. Some of the best minds have gone into total eclipse by meddling with this abominable doctrine and practice.

The third black "I" is Immorality. Spiritualists teach and believe in free love. The founder of the Free Love Society, a Spiritualist, in a letter to the New York World in 1856, said, "All advanced Spiritualists, although few have the courage to confess it, repudiate marriage in its legal sense and believe in the doctrine of affinities."

**Conclusion**

It seems to me that if this doctrine is heavenly, something heavenly should come out of it. It is not likely that Jehovah will let communications between the worlds be carried on by such an unholy and unhealthy mediumship. No, Friends, God will not unlock the secrets of eternity to such a Christless, characterless movement as Spiritualism. That it is anti-Christian, we presume no one will deny.
A DRAMA IN ONE ACT

A Parody on Partisan Loyalty to Speculative Teachers and an Impro-sonation of Outward Piety on Parade.

A. B. KEENAN

Time: The Present.

Place: A Dentist’s Reception Room in a Small, Mid-Western American City.

The Characters: Dr. Allan Watson and three Patients: Thomas Harper, Clarence Stricker, and Clayton Sherman.

As the curtain goes up, a dentist’s reception room is disclosed. In the center of the stage is a table, with two chairs on either side. It is strewn with magazines. On the back wall is a large framed diploma. Underneath it is a sectional bookcase. The diploma and the bookcase are between two windows. To the left there is a door marked “Private.” Opposite it on the other wall to the right is the entrance to the office. “Dr. Watson, Dentist” appears on it to the audience whenever the door is opened, which, incidentally creaks warningly during such a process. There is a hat-rack near the door. The voices of Dr. Watson and Clayton Sherman are heard through the door marked “Private.”

DR. WATSON. How does that feel now?

SHERMAN. A little tight.

DR. WATSON. Hello, Mr. Harper.

SHERMAN. Hello, Brother Harper!

HARPER. (Recognizing Harper, who has looked up from his reading toward the door) Why, a-a- hello, Brother Harper!

HARPER. (Rising) Hello, Brother Stricker! (They shake hands at center of stage, front.)

STRICKER. (On guard) Still standing on your head, aren’t you?

HARPER. (Resuming his chair) Got a little toothache, too, or have one that is just a little “sensitive?”

STRICKER. No, just pulled an old filling loose. (Takes chair on right of table.)

HARPER. (Appearing at door left.) Well, Mr. Stricker, I haven’t seen you in a long time! I’ll be with you before very long.

(A moment or two of somewhat strained silence follow during which Harper resumes his reading. Stricker gets up in order to get better view of magazines on table. Picks up one or two gingerly, but can find nothing to suit him. Resumes place in chair. Soon he places hand in coat pocket and finally says)

HARPER. What’s “Word and Work” teach?

STRICKER. It’s a novelty, or I don’t understand the meaning of the term. I might even say—

HARPER. That’s been my impression of what they’ve been doing for some time. This whole idea of a restoration of fleshly Judaism to Jerusalem is a novelty, or I don’t understand the meaning of the term. I might even say—

STRICKER. (Interrupting) But it’s the Bible. You can’t deny it, Harper!

HARPER. Then it must be in the seventeenth chapter of Mark.

STRICKER. Be serious, will you? The idea of God’s special providence for Israel is in the Bible from Genesis to Revelation.

HARPER. Quite true. But God’s real concern throughout his dealings with man have been for the real Jews—that is, those fleshly ones who were obedient in Old Testament times. The only real Jews today are those who obey Christ, and they may be either Jews or Gentiles from a fleshly viewpoint.

STRICKER. Well, isn’t that exactly what the editors of “Word and Work” teach?

HARPER. Hardly. They seek to maintain a hard-and-fast distinction between Jews and Gentiles in umpteen different dispensations.

STRICKER. Well, the Bible teaches this.

HARPER. No, it doesn’t, Stricker.

STRICKER. Why, certainly it does. There isn’t an issue of “Word and Work” in which Brother Boll doesn’t demonstrate this to be true.

HARPER. Well, to get back where we started from—Boll does so by giving his “proof” texts a novel twist. That’s the only way he can find support for his literal thousand years reign of Christ.

DR. WATSON. (Coming through door) Say, that thousand years reign is great, isn’t it? I couldn’t help hearing you. Mussolini is sure refurbishing the old Roman Empire. Soon things will start to pop!

HARPER. (With a laugh) What would you International Bible Students do
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Again, we feel no shame over the

distinctive and simple worship of the

church. Rather we glory in its very

simplicity. While a showy and litur-

gical form of service may have its

appeal to some, we believe the hum-

ble and unassuming restraint which

characterizes true worship of God

will ultimately produce a much more

powerful influence for truth and right-

eousness. When asked why the church

of Christ has no instrumental music,

for example, we do not feel that the

occasion calls for a shamed-faced apol-

gy for our “conservatism”; rather we

rejoice in the opportunity to set

forth the controlling motive and na-

ture of our praise service-viz, that

we are “making melody unto God”

and not unto men. And we take pride

in the fact that this worship differs so

radically from ordinary denomination-

al worship that all men can recognize

the difference at once.

Finally, we are not ashamed of the

fact that the gospel of Christ has its

greatest appeal to the lowly. This has

been so from the beginning, and will

probably always remain so. It was

“the common people” who heard

Christ gladly; and “not many mighty,

not many noble, are called.” In The

True Discourse” of Celsus (died about

180 A. D.) he propounds it as one of

the chief arguments against the

truth of Christianity that it “appeals

only to ignorant slaves, women, and

children.” In all ages it has been the

lowly class which has accepted most

readily the teaching of Christ. In view

of this fact we deplore the tendency

on the part of some to view the poor

and lowly with a sort of good-natur-

ed contempt and to use all sorts of

cheap tricks and worldly artifices in

an effort to “appeal to the higher

classes.” All this mad scramble

after titles and degrees (be they fac-

tual or fictitious, fairly earned or

phoney) and the effort to impress

the socially elite is not only foreign to

the whole genus of Christianity, it is

well nigh nauseating to spiritually

minded men. That we should make a

consistent and unremitting effort to win

“the higher classes” goes without say-

ing; but that they should be won by

the same exacting, uncompromising

gospel that wins the lowly class should

also go without saying.

All we have said can be summed up

in the words of Paul, “I am not asham-

ed of the gospel of Christ.” In the

face of an unbelieving and contempla-

tious world let us take these words at

their full face-value.

CURTAIN

without that keystone in your specu-

lative arch, Doc!

DR. WATSON. But everything in the

Bible points to that!

SHERMAN. (Who has followed Dr.

Watson protestingly.) Say, Doc, I’ve

got to be to the station by four! 

DR. WATSON. Sorry, “Sherm.” Just

couldn’t keep out of something

that’s right up my alley. Come on.

Let’s get you finished up. (Playful-

ly shoves Sherman back through

door, closing it behind them.)

STRICKER. (Trying to keep calm, but

obviously having a hard time of it.)

HARPER. But everything in the

Bible and not expect us to get his

message from every book, every

chapter, every verse?

STRICKER. (Veemently.) Piffle! Do

you suppose God would give, us the

Bible and not expect us to get his

message from every book, every

chapter, every verse?

HARPER. There are passages which

are not clear, and apparently were

not meant to be clear.

STRICKER. (Doggedly.) That’s really

on account of your blinded, part-

tisan spirit. Accept the Book of

Revelation for what it says, and

everything else in the Bible fits easily

into its proper place.

HARPER. But I tell you I do accept

the Book of Revelation for what it

says. Our only trouble, Stricker, is

that I cannot accept it for what you

say it says.

STRICKER. Do you mean to say you

set yourself up against a keen and

original mind like Brother Boll’s?

He’s spirituality itself. He’s really

gone after the essence of the Bible,

not merely been content with a few

superficial scratches!

HARPER. But don’t you see, Stricker,

that to support this literal one thou-

sand and years reign business, you have

to take a symbolic passage in an

admittedly symbolic book and give

every other passage you might cite

to support it a twist from its obvious

meaning?

STRICKER. (Half rises, with a threat-

ening gesture.) I tell you we just

take the Bible!!

HARPER. (Not alarmed, apparently.)

Even to believing that God’s prom-

ises to Israel always have fleshly

Israel in mind?

STRICKER. When the Bible says Is-

rael it means Israel:

HARPER. “He that keepeth Israel

shall neither slumber nor sleep.”

What Israel is meant here, fleshly

or spiritual?

STRICKER. Israel is the Jews and

the Jews are Israel! Can’t you get

that through your thick skull?

HARPER. Then I’m to take each

verse in Psalm 121 literally?

STRICKER. How else?

HARPER. Well, there are no hills in

this particular neck of the woods.

Where’s my help coming from? Is

the Lord going to keep my foot

chained to this spot? Should I iden-

tify “thee” in verse three with “Is-

rael” in verse four? If so, then I’m

a funny looking Jew!

STRICKER. Shut up!

HARPER. Am I in jail? It says, “The

Lord is thy keeper.” Is he a literal

shield? Where then is my literal

sword? Needn’t I take precautions

against sunstroke, or lunacy? Need

I hold no fears from pestilence or

famine?

(Door of private office opens and out

dashes Clayton Sherman. He cuts

across stage in front of Harper and

Stricker, grabs his hat. During it all

he cries desperately, “I got to get to

the station by four! or I’m sunk.”)

DR. WATSON. You’re next, Mr. Har-

per!

HARPER. (Rising.) It must also mean

that the Lord will pickle in some

famine?

Stricker?

HARPER. What have you, forevermore, eh,

Stricker?

STRICKER. (Irritably.) Rot! I’ve

known you long enough to know that

you have a bitter, sectarian view-

point, and are in effect denying the

entire Bible!

HARPER. On the other hand, I’ve al-

ways believed what is plainly taught

and tried to leave to God what is

not clear.

STRICKER. (Vehemently.) Piffle! Do

you suppose God would give, us the

Bible and not expect us to get his

message from every book, every

chapter, every verse?

HARPER. There are passages which

are not clear, and apparently were

not meant to be clear.

STRICKER. (Doggedly.) That’s merely

on account of your blinded, par-
	tisan spirit. Accept the Book of

Revelation for what it says, and

everything else in the Bible fits easily

into its proper place.

HARPER. But I tell you I do accept

the Book of Revelation for what it

says. Our only trouble, Stricker, is

that I cannot accept it for what you

say it says.

STRICKER. (Irritably.) Rot! I’ve

known you long enough to know that

you have a bitter, sectarian view-

point, and are in effect denying the

entire Bible!

HARPER. On the other hand, I’ve al-

ways believed what is plainly taught

and tried to leave to God what is

not clear.

STRICKER. (Vehemently.) Piffle! Do

you suppose God would give, us the

Bible and not expect us to get his

message from every book, every

chapter, every verse?

HARPER. There are passages which

are not clear, and apparently were

not meant to be clear.

STRICKER. (Doggedly.) That’s merely

on account of your blinded, par-
	tisan spirit. Accept the Book of

Revelation for what it says, and

everything else in the Bible fits easily

into its proper place.

HARPER. But I tell you I do accept

the Book of Revelation for what it

says. Our only trouble, Stricker, is

that I cannot accept it for what you

say it says.

STRICKER. Do you mean to say you

set yourself up against a keen and

original mind like Brother Boll’s?

He’s spirituality itself. He’s really

gone after the essence of the Bible,

not merely been content with a few

superficial scratches!

HARPER. But don’t you see, Stricker,

that to support this literal one thou-

sand and years reign business, you have
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DELIVERANCE HAS COME
A Review of the Peaceful Journalism and the Promises of a New Era Announced by the Prospectus of the New Paper. As Prospective Writers, Paul and Luke Would Have to be Crossed off the List.
EUGENE S. SMITH

The church is saved! Let every one rejoice! Let the hills break forth with gladness and with song for in the midst of darkness and despair a deliverer has come. We were all as sheep going astray without a leader and were wandering in the shades of night without hope, but now the awakening has come. In all of our ranks no one has had the judgment or desire to conduct a magazine on the high plane of Christian love, but now deliverance has come from all our troubles. Henceforth, yea, and forever we will have a Leader in Israel for on January 1st, a new paper was born. Conceived in dissatisfaction and born in protest, it shall lead us in the paths of peaceful journalism and shall inaugurate in the church the era of peace and good will toward all. Such at least is the promise and by a review of its prospectus and its staff we may be led to believe that such will be the case. Yea, even to the point that false teaching will never be inconvenienced or caused for one moment to feel that any one is opposed to it or has any desire to expose it.

Who Is The Deliverer?
In the manner of the prophetic angelic chorus concerning our Lord and Saviour we ask, as in Psalms 24, “Who is the redeemer of the brotherhood?” What is the father of this idea to deliver false doctrine from its journalistic persecution? We dare not answer from his own writings for examination of his utterances is forbidden by copyright. However from articles of others, principally F. L. Rowe and Jas. L. Lovell we are furnished a picture of the man which we here present. He is the man who sent a questionnaire to “many of the preachers of the church of Christ but was a stranger to all.” He is the man who was lost unto us, (Christ and his church for the twenty years.) He is the man who for twenty years bowed himself in supplication and adoration at the altar of material success and there to the neglect of his soul and his God amassed a fortune. He is the man who after twenty years of neglect and disinterest so far as the church is concerned is ready to “slow down and give attention to spiritual matters.” He is the man who placed first in his life the “Almighty American Dollar” and did not stop to think of God or His work until he had gained enough of this world's goods that he could say, “Soul take thine ease.” He is the man that says by his example to all young men of future time, “Get your share, yea and more than your share of worldly things first and then if the Lord grants you longer to live slow down and think of the spiritual things. He is the man that says, “Seek first the mammon of this world and when successful take thought for the kingdom of God.” (Luke 12:33) He is the man that has acquainted himself with a stranger to all as the adjuster and regulator of the brotherhood. He is the man around whom the spineless, compromising, cork screw preachers of this generation are gathering as flies around the molasses barrel. He is the one to furnish the leadership to deliver Christian journalism from incompetence and lack of spirituality and Christian ethics. He is the father of the New Christian Leader, which is a combination of the Truthseeker, West Coast Christian, and the old Christian Leader. Surely from the accomplishments of these in the past it should be a great paper.

No longer will the writer of the West Coast Christian be able to talk as in past for his needed admonition will not be allowed under the sweet spirit-ed rule. The Truthseeker will now have both a policy and an editor. The policy will be as before to condemn those who are not friendly to premillennialism, and to apologize for all false teachers and doctrine under the false heading of love. Its editor likewise they say is to be one who would rather announce meetings conducted by those who agree with and endorse Boll and his false doctrine, than a leader such as Hardeman. Surely such a one is not a redeemer of Israel but is a betrayer of all that is just and right so far as Christianity is concerned.

What Is Wrong With Our Papers?
These papers open their pages to writers to condemn false doctrine and false teachers. For this and this alone they are criticized and condemned. It is the cause of all the dissatisfaction. Preachers of the cork screw type who try to twist around to fit both false and true are exposed and it gives them acute cramp colic to read the denouncement of the errors for which they fight and make excuse. Thus our papers are condemned for standing with the Bible and someone desires a paper builted on journalistic principles rather than Bible principles. God has always ordered and sent men to condemn error by name and false teachers by naming them to their own discomfiture. Even John, the apostle of love, did this in naming those who were in error. Men may desire journalistic excellence but as for me and mine give me Bible. No one who does not deal openly with false teachers and false doctrines is of God for God never authorized any course but an open and condemning one.

Pointed preaching and writing is the only kind that compares favorably with God’s way. It is the only kind that the Bible endorses by example. God’s preachers were always the kind of men that spoke directly of men and conditions that needed correction. Examples of this are many and these could not be allowed in the sweet spirit-ed journal which is now to be born.

Nathan said to David, “Thou art the man.” Thus God’s prophet dealt in personalities as writers today are condemned for doing the same. Christ with a scourge drove the racketeers from the temple and called them thieves and robbers. He denounced the scribes and pharisees for being hypocrites and for robbing the widows. He condemned them to their face for making their proselytes children of hell by their false doctrine. It seems that today it has remained his procedure in the last nineteen hundred years that if he were on earth he could not serve on the editorial staff under the new system. Paul, the peerless apostle, could not serve, for he said on one occasion ‘to a false teacher, “0 full of all guile and all villainy, thou son of the devil; thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?” Paul said it and Luke wrote it, so cross them both off the list of prospective writers for the new Leader.

Let us have no abatement of the open and straightforward teachings which have been given in our papers for over half a century. Let those who control the destinies of these papers today remember the character and spirit of the men who when the church was threatened by false doctrines and innovations did not yield but stood firm in their battle for righteousness and truth. They then were persecuted, maligned and ridiculed; but they stood firm and God was exalted and his church grew.
In The Extremities of U. S. A.  
(EDITOR)

My first engagement of the year was at Paden City, West Va. Enroute through the invitation of my friend, Dr. J. W. Pruett, I spoke three times at Spring & Blaine, St. Louis. Recollections of an excellent meeting there in 1935 add flavor to the anticipations of the coming meeting this fall. T. T. Carney is doing steady work with them. He is a steady preacher; no wavering.

Since 1931 it has been my pleasure and profit to return to the Ohio Valley every year for meetings at St. Mary's, Moundsville, Hundred, Parkersburg and Wheeling—and on up to Pittsburgh, Pa., and Akron, Ohio. All of these meetings, except one, have been held since the Moundsville debate (with the Christian Church) which resulted from the uncomplimentary opposition to error of C. D. Plum. The good effects of it are yet felt in the Ohio Valley. It takes men like C. D. Plum to get such jobs done. He is now at Wheeling, doing characteristic work. Boyd D. Fanning is doing likewise at Moundsville. Charles Taylor is at Parkersburg, with Lynn Street church. He succeeded Horace Taylor, now at Southside (same city). Lynn Street has been called a “Taylor-made” church.” Thad S. Hutson, dean of the Ohio Valley preachers, lives there. D. H. Hadwin is at Belpre, O., across the river; E. G. Rockliff, at St. Marys, and Joe Taylor, at Paden City. The churches are loyal to New Testament principles and the preachers are not of the straddling sort. There is no place known to the writer where he has more personal friends to the section, than along the “beautiful Ohio.” It is a great place to be—not from—even in the winter.

Other engagements were filled at Thayer Street, Akron, O., one of the best churches in the North, and at Cleveland. James Miller, a brilliant young man of twenty-three, grows in favor and stature (mentally and spiritually—he is big enough physically) at Akron. He is not a coming preacher—he has already come. C. G. Caldwell preaches at Cleveland. He is the biggest preacher in the North, like I. A. Douthitt is in the South—each weighing around three hundred pounds.

Speaking one night at Parkersburg to an overflow audience, I returned home by way of Louisville, Ky., where engagements were filled at the Bardstown Road and Haldeman Avenue churches, with brethren J. M. Powell and Cecil Douthitt, and other personal friends. Thence to Little Rock, Ark., where E. R. Harper had promoted a

I received the final issue of West Coast Christian. Many interesting remarks recorded therein. The Editor informs us that he knows nothing about Premillennialism, and does not care to know. It seems to me that this remark, either conveys the thought that “I’m ignorant and glad of it” or that there is no harm in Premillennialism. Suppose all preachers who have opposed false doctrine in any form had manifested this attitude toward error. How long would it take the N. T. church to lose its identity?

This idea of “preach the truth and let error alone” is just about as sensible as the idea “work your crop but don’t disturb the cockleburs, crab grass and carelessness.” Brother, Christ exposed error or false teaching and then sowed the seed of kingdom.

Many of the sweet-spirited among us that are so pious (?) get irritated when some one inquires of their standing on certain issues. False teachers usually manifest this sweet-spirit until they are swiped with the sword of the spirit.

There are too many neuter genders among us, and too many preachers like the teacher who could teach that the world was either round or flat. Some preachers when in a community where Eldership Rule is moving smoothly are for it, especially if they can play up to the Elders; but in other localities when the spirit of rebellion against Elders is being aroused they open not their mouths against it. Such preachers aid and abet such moves by their silence, if not secretly encouraging such moves.

New papers arise among us, some die and some live on. There is plenty of room in the world for papers of the right kind, just like we have plenty of room for the right kind of preachers and schools. When any preacher, school, or paper thinks it is their place to tell the church who to have for one-night meeting of large proportions (Harper works that way). In all of these places the brethren complimented me with large lists of subscribers to the Bible Banner.

February finds me as far south as north in January—in the flower-land of Florida—where we are having fine meetings at Trenton, Lakeland and Winter Haven, a more extended report of which will be given later.—F. E. W., Jr.

VIEWS AND VIEWPOINTS

WILL M. THOMPSON

We need no self-appointed missionaries among us. The churches of Christ ought to plan their work according to their abilities to do, and not let some wild enthusiast persuade them to undertake something they are unable to do. This very thing has reflected upon the church too much in the past. Let us be careful. No man should be supported at home or abroad by the church unless that man be sound in doctrine, and in life.

“Contend earnestly for the faith,” or “earnestly contend for the faith.” I wonder if this would not carry with it the thought of exposing error, and opposing anything that conflicts with the truth? Should we, then, manifest the spirit of our brother on the Pacific Coast, and say I do not know anything about error and I do not care to know. How can you meet error and expose it if you do not know the error, and the truth? How could you discern the one from the other? Brethren, let us be consistent. I realize this is difficult for many of us.

A brother who occupies the above position towards Premillennialism or any other “ism” to my way of thinking is more dangerous to the church than the out and out Premillennialist. We know where the Premillennialist stands. The other fellow I class as a Neuter Gender. He can fellowship most anything. He is so broad-minded, and Sweet-Spirited. I think one who thus takes his stand on both sides of an issue has more sympathy with error than truth. If Premillennialism be right, then those that oppose it are wrong. If it be false then those who refuse to raise their voice against this evil are enemies to the cross of Christ.

“Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.” (2 Tim. 4:2)

This does not sound like “preach the truth and leave error alone.” Under this commitment every gospel preacher labors. Let us meditate upon this sacred charge. And may we faithfully comply with it as through life we go.
Still Stressing The Spiritual!

Dear Brother Wallace:

Your splendid review of Brother Cox’s letter is certainly true wit:

“True wit is nature to advantage dressed:
What oft was thought but ne’er so well expressed.”

What oft was thought but ne’er so It is too bad that I have had to wait twelve long years to have my deep feelings on a certain subject so adequately expressed.

I went 1600 miles into a strange country among strange people in order to study in an atmosphere of spirituality. But when I got there the poor cupboard was bare of any such desideratum.

I expected some sort of a welcoming committee to meet strangers at the station. I found myself alone. I looked up a few names in the telephone book, but those eminent faculty leaders were all out. They were downtown getting the returns by outside amplifier of the Tunney-Dempsey fight. This was rather a shock to me, an initial bad impression that I never got over.

I had a hard time getting any place to stay that night. I was taken into the dormitory first—a horrible hole, filthy, barren, repellent, as I recall it—then across the street into a strange little house.

Bit by bit, however, I felt more at home, and found friends among the students whose friendship I value to this day: Norton, Southern, Hailey, Tatum, Dill, Bryant, etc. But they were in the minority very noticeably, and were the exceptions to the general rule of indifference. I had Brother Bell, and my judgment is the same as yours: a lack of positive conviction along some lines. But what got my goat was the failure to find in the college life anything that corresponded to the family feeling of a congregation of believers. There were clubs, cliques, parties, factions, secret orders, an aristocracy of football players who ate separately and kept to themselves, etc. etc. etc.

To make a long story short, I did not find in Abilene the very thing I took the trouble to go there in search of: spirituality pervading the school. There was worldliness on every hand. I could have found plenty of such schools in my own backyard: why go 1600 miles to one?

So in December 1926 I left for Austin, Texas. Brother Showalter might remember my lengthy outburst to him one day in the Firm Foundation office. He said nothing, merely smiled appreciatively, and I went on and on.

I was not much of a movie attendant then (nor am I now), but I did not feel it was so awful after observing the way the movie was indorsed by A. c. e.

But why go on? You’ve been quite accurate in everything you’ve said. If the president could get down stage a little bit, and not be so cold, stiff, disdainful, and distant, he might learn a thing or two: something of true spirituality, warmth, friendliness, solicitude-against such there is no law.

Don’t forget I’m still on the receiving line for any more information tending to clarify the issues among us.

Most sincerely and cordially yours,

A. B. Keenan,
1515 W. Grand Blvd.,
Detroit, Mich.

Note: The above letter was reference to the correspondence that passed between Presidents Benson and Cox of Harding and Abilene colleges, precipitated by their own letters to me, to which I replied. Because of misrepresentation of facts it seemed necessary for me, in self defense to issue quite an edition of these letters, and several hundred copies were distributed where it was thought these facts should be known and misrepresentations corrected.

On Brother Keenan’s behalf, let me say, that he is a graduate of the University of Chicago and is Professor of English in the largest High School in Detroit, Mich., editor of the school paper, and preacher for the Fairview church of Christ, in Detroit. The Bible Banner values his connection as a staff writer.—F. E. W. Jr.

Is He “O. K. and Safe?”

The editor recently received the following letter from Brother J. F. Kurfees, Louisville, Ky. Brother Kurfees is a successful business man in Louisville, but he was not “lost to us twenty years”, during the period of his success, so he does not have to “slow down and give attention to spiritual matters.” They have always been first with him. Nor does he advertise and publicize “business success.” Somehow there is always a feeling that a fellow who does that has not been the howling success he claims. Successful men are not so noisy about it.

Anyway, Brother Kurfees gives us a line on this business-promoter of ethical, copyrighted journalism, and with his permission the letters are printed for the readers reflection. There is much between the lines as well as behind the lines in all of these matters.

* * *

Dear Brother Wallace:

On receipt of the last issue of the Christian Leader, I wrote Brother T. Q. Martin and I enclose copy of my letter to him, which gives you an idea of how I feel in regard to this paper combination. Brother Martin replied that he had written Brother Rowe that he had just as well have turned the Leader over to the “Word and Work,” and I believe he is exactly right.—J. F. Kurfees.

* * *

Cincinnati, Ohio
June 18, 1938

Mr. J. F. Kurfees
Louisville, Ky.

Dear Brother Kurfees:

Can you give me any information regarding Clinton Davidson? I have a recollection that he once lived in Louisville. He has written to me from Jersey City and is anxious for me to come over there and make him a business visit, but does not indicate the nature of the business. He offers to pay my expenses and I rather think I will go.

I am anxious to get a little line on him before I do go. Thanking you, I am yours

Fraternally,

(Signed) F. L. Rowe.
Mr. F. L. Rowe, 
434 Elm Street, Cincinnati, Ohio

Dear Brother Rowe:—

In answer to your letter of the 18th, I regret that I cannot give you much information about Clinton Davidson, as he left Louisville many years ago, going I think to New York, and it is my understanding that he made quite a good success in business there. Think it was in the insurance business.

As a young boy here, he grew under good home and religious influences, became a member of the Church in boyhood and was well liked by all, so far as I know; but when the division came, he, as I recall, cast his lot with the Boll side of things and has, so far as I know, continued on their side; at least, he ceased to have any part with us religiously.

I do not remember of having seen him for at least ten to fifteen years; so am unable to give any information of a more definite nature.

Fraternally, 
(Signed) J. F. Kurfees

Louisville, Ky.
December 12, 1938

Mr. T. Q. Martin,
Mcminnville, Tenn.

Dear Brother T. Q:

Well, it seems that the Leader is going to be "Enlarged"-swelled quite a bit, as announced in December 6th issue.

On page 10, issue of December 6th, in Rowe's announcement (which is not marked "Copyrighted," so I suppose I can at least refer to it), as he says this goes for his various Davidson, he made "all possible inquiry concerning Brother Davidson"—that S. H. Hall visited Davidson and gave him "a good send-off." But it seems that Davidson's two full page articles in the Advocate and his address to the students at the David Lipscomb College fully, or as he says, "further satisfied" him that Davidson was "0. K. and safe." Personally, I am just wondering "0. K. and safe" for what?

As to his "all possible inquiry concerning Brother Davidson," I am familiar with only one of his inquiries, and as neither this particular inquiry, nor the answer to it, were "copyrighted," so far as I know, I enclose copies of each for your amusement. If my reply had anything to do in influencing Brother Rowe that Brother Davidson was "0. K. and safe," I can only say that I am truly sorry.

To me, it is very significant that Davidson "copyrighted" the "soft, sweet" suggestions made by that great host of preachers and their congregations in the Leader of December 6th, but I think it would have been more interesting to publish their names than to have "copyrighted" their sayings.

If we are to accept these soft, sweet "copyrighted" sayings of these preachers as an indication of the kind of teaching the Leader proposes to feature, I think they should have included "Word and Work" in their combine.

Sincerely,
(Signed) J. F. Kurfees.

Our Attitude

Some of our brethren are very much disturbed about our "attitude" toward some of the modern teaching on the subject of the kingdom, the church, and the Jews, Premillennialism, etc. Their comparisons are something like the following. G. C. Brewer, in the Gospel Advocate gives us a short history of the brotherhood a few years ago, as to controversy over various questions, such as the "order of worship," "Sect Baptism," etc. Then, we had a warm controversy, various ones lining up on the side of the Advocate, Burnett's Budget, Firm Foundation, and some other papers, which were started to advocate the several peculiar notions. The fight was waged warmly for a time, and many "took sides"-this side and that-and often someone would not fellowship some others because of his "attitude." Yet we finally lived it down, some of the papers died for want of support, and we pulled through without a "party" being formed.

In Brother Brewer's write-up of this passed history, which appeared in the Advocate, I looked for the conclusion at which he seems never to have arrived. I could see that he intended to lay down a "premise" in this historical detail, but I could only see the "therefore" to introduce the conclusion, by reading between the lines.

Brother Brewer has been accused of apologizing for some who have taught and now teach Premillennialism, and it seems to me he, like Ernest Beam, who wrote an apologetic article not so long ago for R. H. Boll which was published in the Firm Foundation, is shielding those who teach this absurd doctrine. Brother Beam indicated which side he was on. He said, "A few of us here in California had a meeting to discuss the Premillennial question, (and Foy E. Wallace Jr. was one of the number) and we decided we should not disfellowship over the matter.”

Brother Brewer’s article, though he did not say so, seems to me to be an apology for R. H. Boll and others now teaching Premillennialism. As we pulled through in the past in controversy over various questions such as Rebaptism without disfellowshiping and party-forming, why not now go on fellowshipping Boll and his votaries, and not be sectarian by forming another party?

I will call Brother Brewer’s attention to one thing our former controversies did on the Rebaptism question—the "shakers" were shaken loose from their moorings, and we now hear no more reports from the field where "so many came from the Baptists-came out of Babylon and took their stand with us on the Bible, who were satisfied with their baptism.”

Those former pathetic appeals: to come out of Babylon and take a stand on the Bible and that alone, you do not hear now, but contrariwise a comparison of truth and error on the subject of scriptural baptism and an appeal to submit to the one baptism as taught in Acts 2:38. You do not now see in our papers a whole page article trying to establish the false idea that baptism as taught in the gospel has several “designs” or purposes. I rather think our brethren learned and profited greatly in bygone days, by discussing these differences and drawing the line where it belonged. Many of those who could not disfellowship sectarianists went to the digressives where they could work and worship with them. Just so will our Premillennialists land where they belong—with Norris, Webber, John Rice and the Digressives. Look at Frank and Earl Smith, O. E. Phillips, and others.

I am glad we have some who will not "look with the least degree of allowance" on false teaching among our brethren but who regard with much sympathy the total ignorance of many who have been raised in denominationalism. Yours in the faith, H. E. Warlick, Norman, Okla.

(And thank you, Brother Warlick. For general information, I have not the slightest recollection of having any part, or even being present, in such a meeting in California as Brother Brewer mentioned in which "we" were supposed to have "decided" that "we" should not disfellowship somebody over "the matter." I never attended such a meeting in my life anywhere with anybody-and if such a meeting should be called now anywhere by anybody, I would be conspicuous by my absence.—F. E. W. Jr.)
The Crisis That Confronts The Church

Dear Brother Wallace:

I write to clarify and impress my recent word-of-mouth plea that you bring to bear upon the brotherhood the full weight of your influence in a sustained effort toward our awakening to full consciousness regarding some current growing evils, that the church will be stirred to grapple worthily with the problems which said evils present.

The whole world lieth in wickedness, rotting at the core, dragging down all who fall under its sway. Worldly standards are never high, and without the leaven of divine truth steadily worsen. In our world there is undeniable evidence of a general loosening and lowering of standards of conduct and character. Many now scout or laugh at what they once felt was a breech of good form or outright sin. Proofs of this change for the worse are to be seen in the sharp reverse of public sentiment toward the use of intoxicants, the growing national scandal of disregard for the marriage bond, the brazen infidelity taught in most educational institutions and abetted by leading pulpitists, and the loss of saving home influences through the wide breakdown of parental authority. On every hand vulgar shows and lewd publications widely read, popular shames of semi-nude attire, promiscuous bathing, drinking, dancing and petting parties threaten the utter destruction of that modesty which is the bulwark of good morals. This general scorn of God’s great rules of conduct exerts a terrific sinister influence upon Christian character and conduct, all the more so when we do not make war upon it.

It seems to me a crisis confronts the church. We drift into a perilous attitude toward sin. So many members heedless of warnings and entreaties stubbornly absent themselves from the Lord’s house and from holy contacts of prayer and ministry of the world, giving themselves over to the fads and pleasures of a godless age. And for the most part not one thing is being done to correct this tragic retrograde; there is no strong consistent effort to enforce God’s laws for dealing with wrong-doers. Our leaders, instead of sharply rebuking those who have disgraced the cause, restor- ing the weak and wayward, and separating from the incurables, largely fall short of discharging their God-appointed tasks of feeding and guarding the flock. They suffer many in their care to drift and die, apparently lit- tle disturbed over these fearful fail- ures. Do they offer direct challenge to sin in the church? Do Israel’s leaders lift up their voices and cry mightily against our plagues and perils? Rather do not many fail even to press the pure word in pointed contrast with false religions in the land, while many in our midst excuse those who grossly fail in these grave matters?

When will our preachers give the church the attention required of God? Jehovah gives much more instruction to his child than to the sinner. Yet our preaching does not square with this example. Our teachers spend most of their time with alien sinners, to the sore neglect of the church. Yet 0 how the church needs schooling! How our youth need to be developed, restrained, and guided! It seems to me high time to blow the trumpet and call sternly for return to the old paths. Those in high place amongst us should stand up and speak out forthright warnings, rebukes, and exhortations. Let the rules of common decency be reaffirmed. Let the old fundamentals of personal consecration and zeal for the Lord be iterated and reiterated. Let our eyes be kept clear and our sense of moral values so keen and true that we shall beware of the shocking, damning stains of sin, and hate and shun it!

I grieve at gross evils, yet am powerless to speak and warn and plead, for must I not humble myself under the mighty hand of God that in mercy he may lift me up? We know that God’s word is the one hope of men, that an open rebellion against God and His order of things, Digression, premil- lenialism, and other destructive agen- cies of Satan usually find their way into the churches through this avenue. Self-willed persons manage to have their own way, and almost any preacher (that once gets a foothold) no matter how corrupt can get the majority to vote for him. Sentiment reigns in the place of God’s word.

Granting that some of the churches which Paul established did exist for a while without elders, this fact gives no excuse for a temporary leadership to continue on for years and years. Ef- forts should be made to develop qualified men for such offices. Although the churches of Christ have made great strides forward, and many great preachers have been developed, very few elders have been developed. We have not stressed this end of the work. In fact many preachers have discour- aged it. If we would teach and em- phasize this phase of the church work as much as we emphasize the things that we should not do-sing with insti- ments, put colleges in the church budget, preach speculative theories, etc.-there would not be such a dearth of scripturally qualified elders. A corps of scriptural elders in the churches could and would do more to prevent modern departures from the faith, than all of the preachers in the brotherhood “combined could pre-
“What Is It All About?”

HUGO McCORD

Word and Work (October) again disclaims all responsibility for the divided condition of our Lord’s body today. That magazine, notwithstanding all that M. C. Kurfees, John T. Hinds, J. M. McCaleb, and others have written, still professes ignorance of the trouble, and with wide-eyed innocence inquires: “What is it all about?” Innocence is beautiful in a child, but when it comes to grown men with facts before them still saying, “What is it all about?” they at once mark themselves.

With the facts of Bro. H. Leo Boles’ article, “The Issue Then-and Now,” (Gospel Guardian, October, 1935) before the staff of Word and Work, it is not possible to affect innocence.

With the facts of Bro. J. M. McCaleb’s letter to Bro. Boll, so kind and firm, before Word and Work, it is not possible to be innocent.

And when logic and an honest regard for facts rode over all sentiment in the heart of Bro. G. C. Brewer, he made himself say Bro. Boll’s teachings have caused the division. In the face of that statement from a Boll sympathizer, Word and Work cannot cry, we do not know what it is all about.

Bro. Boll asks: “What excuse can there be for fomenting strife and division over prophetic teaching?” Surely a fine question! What excuse does Bro. Boll have? His rhetorical question allows only one answer: “None.” Thus Bro. Boll convicts himself and all his followers of being a Bollite. Word and Work cannot cry, we do not know what it is all about.

Bro. Boll asks: “What excuse can there be for fomenting strife and division over prophetic teaching?” Surely a fine question! What excuse does Bro. Boll have? His rhetorical question allows only one answer: “None.” Thus Bro. Boll convicts himself and all his followers of being a Bollite. Word and Work cannot cry, we do not know what it is all about.

Because some good brethren do not agree with Bro. Boll when he puts a thousand years on earth in Revelation 20, he says those brethren: “brand the plain import of those scriptures as false teaching.” Is that the right spirit, Bro. Boll? They say some of us do not have the right spirit, but if that is the right spirit, I want none of it. When a better spirit comes in there will be mutual regard, tolerance, kindness, helpfulness, love, brotherly unity, and without these things religion is hardly worthwhile.” Amen and amen!

A “Neither For It Nor Against It” Journal

THAD S. HUTSON

One whom we here call Uncle Steve has suggested that we start another religious paper, and name it “Neither for it nor against it journal.” But before we start it, he thinks we should mail out questions and find out what the people are “for” and what they are “against.” If they can but tell us what they are “against,” then we can give them what they like. This will depend on the “majority” and the sort of answers to the questions. After thinking it over, he finds that much of the writings of Paul would not be fit to go into this journal. Of course, it will be all right to preach and exhort, but this reproving and rebuking will just have to be cut out, and no mention shall be made of those “who will not endure sound doctrine.” (2 Tim. 4:2-4.) Paul makes an attack on Bro. Demes and Bro. Alexander, the coppersmith, which can only justly be classed as “ugly personalities.” What good is there in printing such stuff? “Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world.” “Alexander, the coppersmith, did me much evil, the Lord reward him according to his works; of whom be thou beware also: for he hath greatly withstood my words.” (2 Tim. 4:10-15.)

Now, what will our questionaire folks care for Paul’s disagreement with Demas or Alexander? And why should Paul have a warning against Bro. Alexander, to be read by the people of all future ages? Then don’t you think that Paul cracked down a little too hard on all the preachers who did not preach the same as he did? Why, he said, “let them be accursed.” (Gal. 1:8-9) Then, that personal conflab between Paul and Peter should never have been allowed to see the light. “But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face because he was to be blamed.” (Gal. 2:11) We surely would have had a different Bible, if they had first consulted the readers.

Then Paul had to write up the division and carnality of the church in Corinth. Of course, some think that he did it, in order to show both the world and the church, that the Lord does not approve of such division and carnality. But you must remember that times have changed. Still the gospel has not.

Some fine writers teach that the Jewish worship will be restored in the millennium. In the literal Jerusalem, when Christ is literal king, in the literal thousand years.

But Paul wrote, “Christ is become of no effect unto you, whatsoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace.” (Gal. 5:4.) Why should Paul bring that up, and disturb the peace, or “widen the breach” between the real Christian and these modern judaizers? Such marked differences must not be allowed in our new “neither for it nor against it journal.”

Then Paul seems determined to disagree with Russell, Rutherford, the Advents, and other writers as to the coming of Christ. Paul says “he will descend with his angels in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them who know not God and have obeyed not the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting
destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power."

"When he shall come to be glorified in his saints," (2 Thess. 1:3,9). Our questionnaire folks would not like that. They teach that the wicked will not be punished till one thousand years after the coming of Christ. Paul will not be allowed to write on that subject in our "peaceable" paper.

It may be that Paul had read the parable of the sower (Matt. 13:30). "Let both grow together until the harvest. In the time of the harvest, I will say to the reapers, gather out first the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them; but gather the wheat into my barn." Why did he not say first the wheat, then, one thousand years later the tares?

Paul said to the church at Phillippi, "beware of dogs." (Phil. 3:3). At Miletus he warned against "grievous wolves." Jesus called Herod "that fox."

John the Baptist called the scribes and Pharisees, "a generation of vipers." Jesus said, "give not that which is holy unto the dogs."

Two legged wolves, foxes and dogs were human beings. Two legged vipers were human beings. They were called because they possessed the characteristics that fit the name. No one can rightly call a man a skunk, or a "copperhead," unless he manifests these characteristics. "Speak as the oracles of God."

As I See It

GLENN A. PARKS

I believe with all my heart that gospel preachers, generally speaking are the finest class of men on earth. I believe them in the main to be genuine Christians with the cause of Christ upon their hearts, and with a desire to serve God in reverence and fear. I think them to be among the first to make personal sacrifices for the advancement of truth and righteousness, with the glory of God as their aim and the salvation of souls the burden of their thoughts and hearts. As I view them, and as I know many of them, I believe them to be the cleanest men morally on the earth today. However, I am sure that some may not fill this description, but largely I know the above to be true. I believe them to be worthy of all the encouragement and assistance that they are getting and that they will continue to need. So you may just count me out of the number who believe that the majority of preachers of the gospel are serving the Lord for the bread and fishes: There are not many men who would take up any other work that paid off in sacrifices, criticisms, without the privilege of providing a place of abode when the brethren get tired of him and place him on the shelf. But such is the experience of the majority of preachers of the gospel. Let the above serve as to what I think about preachers in the main.

Preachers Are Subject To Sin

Certainly they are. Maybe as much so as anybody else. He is not above exposure. The lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and pride of life to him are the avenues through which the devil operates just as they are to all other men. The preacher’s nature is the same as that common to all human beings. Through his careful and prayerful life, he may have been able to develop his heart and control his passions and appetites so that the things that cause the ruin of others have less appeal to him. On the other hand, the nature of temptations to sin that have wrought havoc in the lives of others are the same that wreck and ruin the lives of preachers. Just the same old temptation with an appealing dress on, designed to ensnare its victim. Preachers are thrown many times into places and situations where there is an inducement to sin that have wrought havoc in the lives of others. The surroundings are altogether suitable for him to lower his resistance and follow the path of the many. Every precaution should be exercised in keeping his soul from sin and in maintaining the standard of life he has set out to elevate. But suppose a preacher does wrong.

The Bible teaches that “I am my brother’s keeper.” “Bear ye one another’s burdens.” Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such a one in the spirit of meekness, considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted. Brethren if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert him; let him know, over against the sinner, that he himself was one day in the same sin. Brethren, if the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins.” He who sins be it preacher or any other Christian, is in need of forgiveness. His soul is at stake; his salvation endangered. And I am responsible unto God as I am able to influence, and as I have the opportunity in helping him obtain the forgiveness which he so surely needs. Let a man be sentenced to the penitentiary for stealing and society as it knows about his past will never forget the crime. He may repent in bitter tears, and exemplify the genuineness of it by conducting himself honestly and uprightly, yet society in the main looks on him with a suspicious eye. Some of that is among preachers and churches. He may have made the thing right with God, but that is not enough for us. Church doors are closed against him, and he remains the central character for talk and suspicion. Sight is lost of the obligation imposed upon us by the God of heaven to “restore” him, and to give him a lift by way of encouragement as seen both in word and in deed.

Motives Impure

The order of the day it seems is to besmirch character. What is the matter? Could it be that soul-withering sin of jealousy? Preacher jealousy is about the ugliest thing I know of. It expresses itself in misrepresentations, unfair dealing, downright falsifying. Preachers of the gospel ought to be among the last men to harbor jealousy in their hearts. Should he not feel grateful unto God for the ability that has been given his fellow even though it overshadows his own? The world needs every preacher of the gospel, and his life is hard enough at the best. Let’s not add any more crosses, discouragements, and hardships.

Conclusion

When a preacher’s character is being stripped of all good qualities before me, I have made up my mind to investigate it if I think there is any possibility or probability of its being true. If I know that the thing is false, correct it with the bearer of it there and then. If he persists upon making his speech, I reserve the right of excusing myself from his company. If a man has done wrong the fellow that ought to be told about it, above all others, is the man himself. If I do not know the facts in the case, I care not about becoming a party to the gossip. Please just count me out as a disinterested party.

Rooting Time $ is Here

Jesus said, "Every plant, which my heavenly Father has not planted, shall be rooted up." The only thing which God plants is his word, the seed of the kingdom. God intends for every plant now growing, which is growing as a result of something he did not plant, to be rooted up. But the question is, "When will these plants be rooted up?" All must agree that the last vestige of them will be rooted up when Jesus comes again. But God has ordained the preaching of the Gospel as a means, not only of saving men and women, but also as a means of uprooting everything contrary to the will of God. The "rooting time" is going on now.-Chester Estes.
The Sin Against The Holy Ghost
A. W. DISCUS

This is a much controverted subject and one in which many have been misled. Because of the danger of the erroneous teaching it is a serious one. An unpardoned sin should not be mistaken for an unpardonable sin.

Alford says, “Sin against the Holy Ghost is not one sin but a state of sin. A wilful determined opposition to the power of the Holy Spirit.” Lang says, “Open and full rebellion to conversion. Rebellion is opposition to ones better knowledge and conscience against the manifestations of the Holy Spirit.” Such conceptions, though coming from intelligent men, are biased by sectarianism and lack of sufficient study of the Divine Scheme of Redemption.

Paul says that where no law is, there is no transgression. (Rom. 4:15)

John says, “Sin is the transgression of the law” and “Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law.” (1 Jno. 3:4)

Hence where sin is, a law has been transgressed and offense comes to the maker of the law. A civil government can be offended. A temporal parent can be offended. Heavenly authority can be offended.

God decreed. Christ delivered. The Holy Spirit revealed. The Holy Spirit did not give commands, neither in the days of Christ nor since. His duty was to reveal and to confirm, and not to command; for in Jno. 16:13, we read, “He shall not speak of himself but whatsoever he shall hear that shall he speak.” Even His directing of the apostles was from higher authority for Jesus says, “The servant is not greater than his Lord, neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him.” (Jno. 13:16, Jno. 15:20)

The Holy Spirit was sent by God (Jno. 14:25) and was to be sent in Christ’s name, by Christ’s authority, and he was not sent until after Christ received such authority (Matt. 28:18).

The direct guidance as taught by some is unfounded for the Holy Spirit brought to the Apostles those commands previously given by Christ. God speaks through His Son, not the Holy Spirit. (Heb. 1). If the Holy Spirit didn’t bring to the Apostles anything different, how can one expect a special revelation since the days of the apostles? If the Holy Spirit gave commands and the doctrine of direct Holy Spirit guidance was true, then a transgression of this guidance would be not only a sin, but an unpardonable sin. This is a dangerous faith and a dangerous position to take on the Sin against the Holy Spirit.

The Law of Moses could be transgressed. This was a sin against God. The command of God delivered by Christ could be rejected which was rebellion against God and Christ. To transgress a law given by God, delivered by Christ and revealed by the Holy Spirit is complete rebellion against the Godhead from which there is no escape, neither in this world nor the world to come. God was patient with the rebellious Jew and sent his Son to plead with him. Even after the Son was rejected and His teachings ignored, God sent the Holy Spirit as the third member of the Godhead. This is the last member, hence the last agent. To reject the third member is final. The New Testament teaching is the Law of God. At the time this statement was made to the rebellious Jews (Luke 12:10), it was the law of Christ. God was speaking through His Son. After the law was revealed on the day of Pentecost, the Holy Spirit became involved and to reject it now is to reject all hopes of pardon.

To infer that a sin against the Holy Spirit is unpardonable is to intimate a greater crime in transgressing a law of the Holy Spirit than one given by God or Christ for such sins can be forgiven. This would be placing the Holy Spirit in supremacy in the Godhead. But Paul says we are Christs, and Christ Gods. The one thing not put under the feet of Christ, God. Now if the Holy Spirit is subject to the one that sent Him and Christ is subject to God and the Holy Spirit came by the authority of Christ, why should a sin against the Holy Spirit be a greater crime than a sin against either other member of the Godhead. God reserves the Omnipotence; even Christ is to deliver up the Kingdom. The religious world professes to believe this but to accept the general idea of a sin against the Holy Spirit is to deny the omnipotence of God. What then, must we conclude? The direct operation of the Holy Spirit is unscriptural. If it were true, a violation of such would be unpardonable, and to admit such rejects the omnipotence of God. God decreed. Christ delivered. The Holy Spirit revealed. We now have the revealed command in printed form, the New Testament. To reject this is to reject the Godhead bodily, hence no pardon in this world nor the world to come.
CRIMES UNDER COVER

HUGO McCORD

The Congressional Record of January 13 carries this statement: "Madame Roland is said to have exclaimed, shortly before she was guillotined during the French Revolution: 'Oh, liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!' If she lived today she could well say: 'Oh peace, what crimes are committed in thy name!''" Representative Shannon had those words inserted in his speech against war. If that miserable condition exists in the realm of politics, we should not be surprised to find it in other fields too. And certainly every calm Christian today is sadly aware that the above political deceit has pushed its ugly head into (of all places!) the holy sanctuary of religion. The tactics of axe-grinding politicians and selfish war-mongers in the hands of religion! Crimes they are in politics, but sins they are in religion when men use high and noble names to cover wrongdoings.

Liberty

In the pure and attractive name of liberty premillennialists among us defend their teachings. Bro. Boll says he quit a pope once for all when leaving the Catholics, and that now he is at liberty under God to teach as he interprets the Bible. Thus under the good name of emanicipation from controlled thought he says he has liberty to teach his theories. All of us readily applaud any man with courage enough to throw away a papal yoke, or any other human yoke. But am I not going too far with my "liberty" when I persist in teaching a doctrine that divides the body of my Lord and that I admit is unnecessary to salvation? Why, of course, I have freedom to hold to the idea if I conscientiously think it the truth, but if I admit it is unnecessary to salvation, why should I waste time with it? Especially when it causes confusion? Then when I go ahead to justify my course on the basis of "my liberty in Christ," I am using a high name for a low purpose; I am putting my crime in holy clothes.

Nobody is trying to get Bro. Boll and his coadjutors to bow to any other "interpretation" of Revelations 20. Nobody is withdrawing fellowship because Bro. Boll believes in premillennialism. Nobody is even trying to put a yoke on him. If he would only agree not to teach his interpretation, all would be well. For him to say such an agreement deprives him of his liberty is for him to use the same argument of the "wets." Liquor drinkers objected that prohibition laws took away their liberties. A drunk staggering down the street has no liberty to bump everybody else off the walk. And it is crime in the name of liberty when alcoholics and speculators cry for freedom.

Peace

The same high crime and sin has been committed in the lovely name of peace, Sympathizers toward Bro. Boll and some who do not know what the theory means cry. "Peace, peace! It is a harmless theory. Let him teach it. Don't fight about it. Peace!" All of us want peace, but some things are more valuable. "First pure, then peaceable," is the way our God ordains. And premillennialism is false doctrine, impure teaching with dangerous consequences. Let a doctrine alone for peace when it gives false hopes to few? That kind of peace is not honorable. That kind of peace Paul could have had with Hymeneus and Philetus-men who had erred in doctrine; but Paul a lover of peace, would have it only on the ground of purity. He was determined their doctrine would not be taught in the churches. In like manner, Jesus could have had "peace" in Pergamum and in Ephesus, but he said, Clean out that rotten doctrine, I hate it; that is the way the Prince of Peace felt about it. And so, brethren, surely the Bible teaches you and I are not to sit still when private interpretations and false doctrines are taught.

Piety

If high crimes are committed in the noble names of liberty and of peace, the same thing is true with the godly name of piety. So pious is Bro. Boll, so spiritual and prayerful is the Word and Work that many have said: "They are so good and godly and pious, they cannot be the bad actors as reported." But those for pretense making long prayers in the Savior's time seemed just as "good and godly and pious." Outside piety is hardly ever real. True piety is never carried on the shirt sleeves. If it is on the outside it is for somebody other than the Lord to see. Obvious piety is pageantry, and has its own reward. No doubt the Word and Work contingent do pray much, and no doubt they are sincere: so are many Catholics, Mohammedans, and others. No doubt the Word and Work group, from all outward appearances, earns the title of piety. But I cannot appreciate any man's piety much that will lead him to persist in teaching an admittedly unnecessary theory, and that when it causes division! I don't want the kind of piety that leads me to act so. And when brethren today, even preachers, justify the Louisville Schism, saying, "They are pious and sweet-spirited," those brethren are committing a crime under holy names.

Oh, liberty, oh, peace, oh, piety, what crimes are committed in thy names!