HEALING THE BREACH

CLED E. WALLACE

It is significant in the light of Brother Murch's article in the Christian Standard on "Our Forgotten Brethren" that "an insignificant, ignorant, cantankerous minority, unworthy of any consideration" has made such phenomenal advances without such "aids" as missionary societies, instrumental music and goo-goo eyes cast in sectarian directions.

In Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama and Georgia they have more churches than we have, and in many communities are the leading religious force.

And in some other states where the "liberals" "progressives" or "dissidents" depending on your point of view, exercise a predominating influence, they have departed so far from gospel principles, they are just another church and have about as little zeal for distinctive gospel teaching as the Methodist Conference. It is safe to say they would prefer a Jewish Rabbi for a series of moral or patriotic talks than to have a man like N. B. Hardeman deliver the series of sermons which to Brother Murch's amazement "packed thousands into Nashville's largest auditorium nightly for several weeks." According to Brother Murch great strides have been made by "our forgotten brethren" in the face of great obstacles.

They have not traveled an easy road. For their convictions they have suffered ostracism, been heaped with ridicule and abuse, and now by indifference is ignored. They have sometimes aggravated us to the limit, but I, for one, am glad to pay tribute to a people who are willing to stand like Gibraltar for the principle, "Where the Bible speaks, we speak; and where the Bible is silent, we are silent." I may not interpret it like they do, I may not like some of their methods, but it is thrilling to see their unshakable faith in God's Word in these days of doubt and confusion; it is challenging to witness their stand for a pure and apostolic church when the popular thing is compromise with denominationalism and the world.

In the light of this what would have happened had there been no "breach?" If all had continued to stand "for a pure and apostolic church" instead of compromising "with denominationalism and the world" by introducing instrumental music, going in for societyism and soft-pedaling the gospel, where would a "united church" now be? If "an insignificant, ignorant, cantankerous minority" has accomplished as much as Brother Murch says it has in the face of ostracism, ridicule and abuse from the world, the flesh and the devil and a part of the church, it is a downright pity that the significant, enlightened part of the church did not at least remain "cantankerous" and help us conquer the world for Christ instead of "compromising with denominationalism and the world" and throwing obstacles in our way.

We really have never been "forgotten brethren." "They have sometimes aggravated us to the limit" clearly shows that. "Ridicule and abuse" are not "heaped" on "forgotten brethren." There may have been times when they would have enjoyed forgetting about us but we wouldn't let them. The denominations have not forgotten us and it would please them mightily if we would just let them alone. We have aggravated them to the limit too. The reason we started to aggravating the "us" that Brother Murch is identified with was because they quit aggravating the denominations and began to throw in with them and oppose those of us "who stand for a pure and apostolic church." Some of us are frankly suspicious of Brother Murch's present fit of love-making for the reason that we fear that he is trying to inveigle us into a cessation of aggravating hostilities against the things we consider out of joint with "a pure and apostolic church." So far I have seen nothing from his pen to indicate any change of mind in him regarding instrumental music or the societies. Brother Witty is also suspiciously quiet on that phase of the problem, even though it is a main phase. As far as I am able to discern the signs of the times, the Standard's hope in these unity meetings is to stop our aggravating criticisms of its unscriptural practices without giving them up. If that is the lineup we can guarantee that Brother Murch will at least still have a "cantankerous minority" on his hands who will continue to aggravate him "to the limit" unless he chooses to ignore them. This is not a personal fight but involves principles some of us are devoutly willing to be "cantankerous" over. Brother Murch pays tribute to the Christian Leader as "probably the most creditable journal of the 'conservatives.'" This is understandable, as the Leader's announced policies and the nature of its angling for brotherhood sentiment promises a minimum of aggravation for Brother Murch and those who stand with him. If Brother Murch and the Standard should grab the Restoration Movement, they talk so much about, run past Jericho with it and dive into the Dead Sea, the Leader possibly wouldn't say much about it. It would really take something terrific to break up the beatific serenity of the Leader. Its imperurable calm is even protected by copyright. Brother Murch makes honorable mention of the Gospel Advocate, the Firm Foundation and under the qualification "of varying size and quality" mentions Word and Work and the Bible Banner but he bubbles over with genuine affection when he talks about the Leader. "The new paper comes well with our own journals and gives much promise." "Much promise" of what, in the back of (Continued on page 6)
THE FIGHT THAT HAS CHECKMATED THE PREMILLENNIAL BROTHERS

The Gospel Advocate has recently featured some special articles by G. C. Brewer on Sectarianism, Papers and Faction, and Premillennialism. Brother Brewer is finding it difficult to decide whether we are sectarian or not, just who the faction is, and if premillennialism is of major, minor or no importance. After a long and laboried effort he emits the admission that “the fight (meaning the premillennial fight) has just about completely checkmated our brethren who teach premillennialism, unless my observations have deceived me. They are making no gains unless it is from outside sources.”

Criticisms and Compliments

This statement fairly represents Brother Brewer’s attitude—about all he has done is to occupy an “observation” post, and criticize the fighting. He certainly has done none of the fighting that has “checkmated our brethren who teach premillennialism,” nor has he done anything to stop their gains. On the contrary, from his “observatory” he has criticized the ones who are fighting to stop their gains, and complimented the ones he now observes have been checkmated. So reporter-like he gives the public “observations” of what has been going on in the front line and trenches! Great is the courage! mighty is the valor! marvelous is the loyalty! that dares to release such “observations” during such a fight! All the neutrals are now assured as to who has won the fight, and can get on the winning side! Men who love the truth do not write in such vein. It is the parley and nomenclature of neutrals. The time was when such an article on any subject would not be allowed to represent the Gospel Advocate. It might have been published, but it would have received due and proper attention.

There is a cartoon in some of the dailies entitled “Always Belittlin.” It fits Brother Brewer exactly. He is on all sides of every issue, without taking any side, but his whole effort is to belittle the issue and to discredit the men who lead the fight. Asserted loyalty will be taken with a spoonful of salt by many of us who have not forgotten the record on these questions over the past few years of this fight. If all gospel preachers had taken Brother Brewer’s attitude, manifested his spirit, and pursued his course—would “our brethren who teach premillennialism” have ever been checkmated? Every article Brother Brewer writes gives him a way on the issues involved. He cannot conceal his sympathy for “our brethren who teach premillennialism” nor his antipathy for the brethren whose fight has checkmated them. His very denial of the belief of the actual doctrine, as a whole, is weakened by his personal flings and manifest sympathy for and with those who are on the wrong side. He cannot even state his views without throwing kisses at them and thumping his nose at us. Thus every statement he makes is ruined.

Concealing The Facts

But that seems to be characteristic of all the neutrals. Doctor Benson, of Harding College, recently ruined a fairly good radio speech on premillennialism by unnecessarily saying at the close of his arguments against it, that Doctor Armstrong believed and taught the same thing, as did also all other members of his faculty. Too many people, including nearly everybody in Arkansas, know that the statement was untrue. Brother Armstrong has very recently committed himself, in correspondence with some of his students, to positions directly opposite the views to which Doctor Benson has committed himself and faculty. He must know that such is the case, and even some of his friends are wondering why he attempts to conceal it. We have documentary information concerning discussions that took place between young preachers in Harding College and some of their teachers on the premillennial question. President Benson is said to know about it, that he took a hand in it afterward and promised the young preachers that he would do something about it. This has happened too recently for his memory to have lapsed, but if perchance he has forgotten it, we shall be glad to refresh his memory with the details. The least that these brethren can do on these issues is to tell the truth about things when they do speak.

A Retrospective View

In the light of Doctor Brewer’s recent ramblings (he is also a Harding College Doctor), it will not be amiss to take a bird’s eye view of “the little fight” as seen from the “G. C. Brewer Observatory.” Some do not know the developments, others may have forgotten, but many will remember the course of things the past few years.

1. The A. C. C. Lecture

Back in 1934, in a lecture at Abilene Christian College. Brother Brewer criticized the debates that had been held on these issues and censured the Gospel Advocate for its policy of opposition to that system of prophetic misinterpretation called Premillennialism. Brother G. H. P. Showalter, of the Firm Foundation, heard the address and reported it editorially. He quoted Brother Brewer as saying that he “differed widely” with the editor of the Gospel Advocate at that time on “so-called Bollism”; that he thought the issue unimportant and nonessential; that debating the question had only “widened the breach”; that the whole thing was too inconsequential to discuss; that issues were often debated merely because the debaters desired to distinguish themselves etc. etc.-G. C. Brewer fashion. In response to this report, with liberal compliments to Brother Showalter for the “fair summary” of his speech, Brother Brewer said: “It will add incalculable force to my speech . . . To have you indorse my effort is gratifying indeed.” A report of a speech is not within itself an endorsement.
but Brother Brewer called it that, and thanked the editor for indorsing his effort. And what was his effort? It was to prove that the issue was “unimportant.” Hear his own words: “I did not regard the proposition of sufficient importance to merit so much attention.”

2. The Signed Statement

After the foregoing statements had been made in his lecture, the Gospel Advocate called Brother Brewer’s hand. Shortly afterward, in order to patch the matter up, he signed a statement which was published in the Advocate in which he said: “I am in complete harmony with the stated position of the Gospel Advocate on the premillennial theories and the establishment of the Kingdom.”

Now, the stated position of the Gospel Advocate on these theories was that they were positively destructive of the Gospel, and should be both opposed and exposed. Brother Brewer’s stated position on these theories in his own words, was that “the proposition is not of sufficient importance to merit so much attention.” Still, he says he is in complete harmony with the Gospel Advocate’s stated position on the proposition. That sounds like a contradiction.

3. The Future-Kingdom Baptist

Following his signed statement Brother Brewer began, himself, a review of a “future-kingdom Baptist in his department of the Gospel Advocate. Of this “effort” he said: “This request has been in our hands for many weeks, but other matters have demanded our attention, and this has been made to wait.”

So it appears that when Brother Brewer criticized us for “arguing upon that question” he was about to do that very thing himself in his department of the Gospel Advocate; for at the time of his Abilene speech the request to review the future-kingdom Baptist was waiting for his attention. Thus he criticized us, for doing extensively the very thing he had attempted to do in a more limited extent —so limited in fact that he did not refute the real premillennial theory and never has. Later articles of his reveal an underlying lack of information on the premillennial question. But if the proposition was “not of sufficient importance to merit so much attention” on what ground could Brother Brewer justify himself in giving it any more attention at all at that time? That looks like an inconsistency.

With reference to this future-kingdom Baptist Brother Brewer wrote: “He says the Kingdom is yet future, and he gives the brethren trouble.” When a future-kingdom Baptist preacher “gives the brethren trouble” it demanded attention, even if it had to wait until Doctor Brewer could get to it. But when a group of our brethren gave us trouble on the same question it was “not of sufficient importance to merit so much attention.” That is an inconsistency.

4. That Devout Wish

Explaining his attitude in the Firm Foundation, with a final flourish Brother Brewer says: “I could devoutly wish that it were never again mentioned among my brethren.” But the ink had hardly dried on the paper bearing that statement until Brother Brewer himself began writing the articles for his department on the very question he so devoutly wished would never again be mentioned. Inconsistency is hardly the word for that.

Beginning his reply to his “future-kingdom friend” Brother Brewer asked his readers this question: “Why should we not just accept these arguments as scriptural and agree with our friend that we are to enter the kingdom after the second coming of Christ?”

That is exactly what he should have done instead of arguing with him, since he was on record that he regarded the issue as unimportant, insignificant, inconsequential and non-essential, and wished it might never be mentioned among his brethren. By “arguing upon that question” he ran counter to his own “judgment” on how to handle the question which he said we should ignore. That is meeting himself coming back.

5. Taking A Stand

Hear him in the Firm Foundation again: “There will probably be some criticisms of my stand upon the “so-called Boll question” but I do not believe any person who heard my address can criticize my purpose or the spirit in which I spoke ... I have not heard anything but complimentary and congratulatory remarks and messages from those who heard the speech and those who have read your editorial. I well know that there are some who will not approve my stand but so far I have not had any criticism to reach me—from anyone.”

If Brother Brewer stood in such “complete harmony” with the Gospel Advocate’s position, per his signed statement, then what stand did he take that he so well knew would not be approved? Did he mean that his stand “in complete harmony with the Gospel Advocate’s stated position” would not be approved? Or did he take more than one “stand”? That is going around and around like a boy in a revolving door.

Yielding to flattery and praise Brother Brewer was revealing somewhat in “complimentary and congratulatory remarks and messages” which swelled his bosom, and apparently his head also. But he should not have allowed it to do that, for he just recently told us in his articles on “papers and factions” that anybody could start a paper and get bushels of commendations—even Price Billingsley’s paper! He didn’t mention ours, and possibly wouldn’t admit that he has ever seen a copy of it, but I have an idea he was making reference to allusions in the direction of the Bible Banner when he said that. Anyway, if Brother Brewer could have seen several hundred letters which came to this editor, from over a wide area and representing a widespread sentiment, in criticism of his stand (?) he, at least, could not have flattered himself by thinking that there had been no criticism of his Abilene College ebullitions. Among these letters, still in file, are expressions from numbers who heard the address, including some who lived in Abilene and who were connected with the school. So it might be well for Brother Brewer not to revel too much in “complimentary and congratulatory remarks and messages,” especially when he has scorned such in his “Papers And Factions” article. He might also profit by the words of the wise: “Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth.”

If in his efforts to explain all of these and many more of his equivocations Brother Brewer had made a plain and unequivocal statement that he had erred in his Abilene address; retracted in full his criticisms; stated that he stood with the rest of us in the opposition to this new party in the church (if indeed, he did or does) and had thereafter taken a forthright part in “the fight” which “has just about completely checkmated our brethren who teach premillennialism,” the situation with him might have been different. But he did not do this, nor has he done so yet. To the contrary, he has waivered, side-stepped, apologized, criticized, complained, and at ill-timed intervals with an air of superiority issued “comments” and “reports” from his “observation post” on “the fight,” as though the world awaited his word.

Down To Date

The foregoing citations do not complete the record of Brother Brewer’s tergiversations. At no time has he come forward in a straightforward and forthright defense of the issues.

1. Off The Record

In correspondence and conversations with young preachers, in various instances, he has told them that there is
nothing about the teaching of R. H. Boll that is destructive of or vitiating to the gospel, or the church, or of Christianity. This is both in the record and “off the record.” At Plant City, Fla., to a group of younger preachers, he praised R. H. Boll (the chief divider of the church in this generation) as the one scholar in the church today (if we had any at all), extolled his virtues and piety, but was quite liberal also in his criticism and condemnation of those brethren who have waged relentless war on his heresies.

2. Communism And Premillennialism

It will also be remembered that Brother Brewer made a veiled defense of “those brethren who teach premillennialism” sometime back in a series of articles (he is long on series) against “charging the consequences” of the theory against them. Hardly had the typewriter cooled off until he himself signed a proposition with the Communist Coleman in California to debate the consequences of Communism! The following telegram was sent to the Gospel Advocate: “G. C. Brewer, affirming, meets Dr. J. C. Coleman, of Los Angeles, Feb. 28, 29 (1936) at Central Church of Christ. (Proposition) Resolved, that Communism or Sovietism as it today reigns in Russia contemplates world revolution, and as a means to that end seeks to destroy the Christian religion.”

Brother Brewer had been contending that one may hold a theory without espousing the consequences, and objected to pushing the consequences of the doctrine on “our brethren who teach premillennialism.” Anybody can see at a glance that the proposition he debated with Coleman, the Communist, was based solely on the consequences of Communism. The man Coleman did not have to deny Christianity in the negative of this proposition. He only denied that Communism destroys Christianity. So Brother Brewer found himself in the same relation to debating Communism in that proposition that we sustain to the premillennial discussion, showing the consequences of it. We then proposed the following proposition, and offered to affirm it: “Resolved, That Premillennialism As Taught By R. H. Boll And Others Contemplates World Revolution In Order To The Establishment Of A World Kingdom By Jesus Christ On The Earth, And Its Consequences Tend To Destroy The Christian Religion.”

The above proposition is straightforward. We believe that Premillennialism does for Christianity exactly what he believes Communism does. Why, then, should we not debate it? It would seem that he attaches more importance to Communism, Sovietism, World Revolution, and other questions that involve political angles, then he does to issues that directly involve the kingdom and reign of Christ and scheme of human redemption. It does seem so for he debates one and does not debate the other.

3. On Refusing To Debate

But he said recently in the Gospel Advocate that he has never refused to debate premillennialism. Why, then, was the premillennial proposition rejected in the proposed debate with J. Frank Norris at Memphis? Will he say that the elders of the Union Avenue church did not want that question debated? Maybe so; but Brother Brewer was one of the elders and he usually debates when he wants to. He debated companionate marriage with Judge Lindsay, in Memphis. Incidentally, did he debate that question to distinguish himself as he said others had done on questions he does not debate?

But if he has never refused to debate premillennialism, why did he discourage the debates at Winchester and Chattanooga, and (in his words) try to “dissuade” me from debating the question? Is that inconsistency, or is it inconsistency? Anyway, the above proposition is a standing offer if Brother Boll and his tribe will consider it. Our opinion is, it would make an interesting event for Louisville, Kentucky, or Nashville, Tennessee.

As for Brother Brewer, he should not debate premillennialism in his present state of mind. The brethren would be very foolish to call on him to go so, unless they should want to hand over a victory to the premillennialists. They can take Brother Brewer’s own admissions and disarm him in any discussion of the subject.

4. The Brotherhood Committee

The latest of all Brother Brewer’s devious devices to help his checkmated brethren and apparently his last stand on the question is the proposal to pick a committee and turn the premillennial question over to it for a decision, with recommendations to the brotherhood! With that great stroke of genius, he says his responsibility has ended and his duty has been done. With a committee to settle the issue for “the brotherhood,” he could then descend from his observatory elevation above battle lines and bullet range to enjoy the fellowship of his checkmated brethren. So, “Peace Is In Sight,” per the caption of a promiscuous circular sheet which is going the rounds. But what price peace!

Committees seem to be the order of the day. Church committee, a brotherhood committee, editorial committees—give me a committee to hide behind! Whence has courage and forthrightness fled? Imagine a “committee” telling the founders of the Christian Leader or the Gospel Advocate, or even the founder of the Christian Standard, what to publish! And I would not want to be on the committee to tell Brother G. P. H. Showalter of the Firm Foundation what he could publish.

5. A Significant “If”

Finally, Brother Brewer said recently to a young preacher, who repeated the statement to me in the presence of E. R. Harper, that “if the split comes he would, of course, stay with the brethren—that is, those who are against premillennialism. This only confirms the feeling that so many have expressed—namely, if the premillennial, or Boll party, were large enough to accommodate these brethren, they would be right over there with them. And if the New Christian Leader has its way, or the Gospel Advocate modifies its past militant policy, that party might yet become large enough to gather these brethren to the bosom of its patron saint—R. H. Boll.

It is history repeating itself. The digression that swept the church before it fifty years ago employed exactly the same methods and displayed the same spirit. The younger generation may have to learn it by experience as did the former. Preachers who were “conciliatory” in their attitude then-went with the digressives when their party became large enough. The New Christian Leader now, would have been a first class organ for the digressives then. Clinton Davidson, its present promoter is in considerable degree a digressive now. He has for years attended a digressive church in New York, or vicinity. We are informed that until comparatively recent months he taught in their Sunday School. A man of unquestioned integrity wrote me recently that Davidson admitted to him personally that he still saw no harm in instrumental music, and that his own words proved him definitely to be of Boll sympathy and digressive sentiment.

Shall we stand by, brethren, bowing to a false idea of “ethical journalism” and see a digressive leader arise, take over a large paper, and promote digression through committees seem to be the order of the day. Church committee, a brotherhood committee, editorial committees—give me a committee to hide behind! Whence has courage and forthrightness fled? Imagine a “committee” telling the founders of the Christian Leader or the Gospel Advocate, or even the founder of the Christian Standard, what to publish! And I would not want to be on the committee to tell Brother G. P. H. Showalter of the Firm Foundation what he could publish.

It is history repeating itself. The digression that swept the church before it fifty years ago employed exactly the same methods and displayed the same spirit. The younger generation may have to learn it by experience as did the former. Preachers who were “conciliatory” in their attitude then-went with the digressives when their party became large enough. The New Christian Leader now, would have been a first class organ for the digressives then. Clinton Davidson, its present promoter is in considerable degree a digressive now. He has for years attended a digressive church in New York, or vicinity. We are informed that until comparatively recent months he taught in their Sunday School. A man of unquestioned integrity wrote me recently that Davidson admitted to him personally that he still saw no harm in instrumental music, and that his own words proved him definitely to be of Boll sympathy and digressive sentiment.

Shall we stand by, brethren, bowing to a false idea of “ethical journalism” and see a digressive leader arise, take over a large paper, and promote digression through compromise in our very ranks? If the brethren all over the country knew the actual facts, these movements among us would not be countenanced. But the very papers among us that have the circulation, and could furnish the facts, have apparently got scared and squatted. So the fight must be waged by some of us at the disadvantage of personal handicaps and limited means. We may lose the fight, we may be slandered, sued and prosecuted, but we will not surrender. To the last man our password will be: THEY SHALL NOT PASS.-F. E. W. Jr.
BROTHER DENNIS WITH GOSPEL ADVOCATE

The following word has been received from Fred E. Dennis, of Marietta, Ohio:

Dear Brother Wallace: Brother Goodpasture has invited me to be one of the staff writers for the Advocate and after careful consideration I have decided to accept. So this will prevent my being on the staff of the Banner. I am away from home sick in bed. I was in a meeting, and had preached two nights when taken ill. I may have to have major surgery in near future. I crave the prayers of all Christians. This is the Lord's Day, and how I would like to be at worship and preaching the Word. May God bless his faithful servants.

Fred E. Dennis.

The Gospel Advocate has acquired a good man in Brother Dennis. He is among the best evangelists in the church and is busy all of the time. We are glad for him to serve where he believes the medium for good from his writings may be larger. Our prayers are for his early recovery. His many friends, when advised of his illness, will doubtless supply all needs and demands incident thereto.

In this connection it is also in order to say that another staff contributor to the Bible Banner, Brother E. R. Harper, has been chosen by the Gospel Advocate for a place on their general Editorial Committee. We were glad to have these men with the Bible Banner but if other connections afford them larger opportunities for service to the Cause, that is the chief thing, and we shall be just as glad for all good that they may do in other columns.-F. E. W. Jr.

QUESTIONNAIRES AND SURVEYS

It was recently suggested by R. L. Whiteside that if it is a good thing to take a survey of the “brotherhood” through questionnaires to ascertain what kind of articles the brethren want, why not apply the same methods in the local church, canvass the membership with questionnaires, take a survey, and find out what kind of preaching is wanted. The principle is the same. The results of such a questionnaire could then be submitted to all preachers applying for the place and he could let them know whether or not he could teach it either round or flat. It is about to turn out that the New Christian Leader ought to be named the New Digressive Leader.-F. E. W. Jr.

MORE CIRCULARS

Brother Clinton Copyright Davidson feels indisputed because the Bible Banner printed his letter which he wrote to several brethren threatening them and the Bible Banner with “eminent legal counsel.” He admitted that it was a bluff (he was just spoofing) but thinks he has been badly mistreated. So he brings out another circular in which he pleads for sympathy. He came in like a lion and went out like a lamb.

But he reproduces a letter to Brother Akin in which he explained that he did not really mean to sue anybody. For his information, the letter which was published in the Bible Banner was the one he wrote to J. E. Williams, of Pampa, Texas. He wrote several other men at the same time. He did not cancel his letters to them. Furthermore, some of us know of the private boasts he made to various individuals in Nashville, Tennessee, and around (according to men whose veracity would not be doubted) that he had no scruples against suing some of us and that he intended to do so at the first good opportunity. What about that, Brother Copyright? If the policy of the Leader will not let you answer it in the paper, get out another circular letter and tell us more about this matter.

Intelligent and honest brethren will not long tolerate a paper or a movement which employs such tactics. The indications are that the subscription list of the New Leader is being used for private purposes as well as paid subscription list.

In addition to circularizing the brotherhood with matter that high ethics bar from his sugarcoated paper-Brother Copyright Clinton has another plan. He banquets the preachers at his estate. Salesmanship and promotion are his lines; so he sells himself to the preachers; sends them airplane transportation to his New Jersey estate and well, is he trying to sell himself or buy them? Personally, I would not cross the street to attend one of his conferences. Of course, if he wants to bring that “eminent legal counsel” to see me, I will let him know when I can be at home.

But what will the “brotherhood” think of a man who writes threatening letters, and admits that he was bluffing—just trying to scare somebody? The answer will be: Exit, Mr. Clinton Copyright Davidson.-F. E. W. Jr.

WHO KILLED COCK ROBIN?

Much ado has been made of the so-called “brotherhood survey” published by Clinton Davidson, whose middle name is “Copyright,” and whose spiritual advisors are “eminent legal counsel.” It is claimed that this survey is based on an extensive questionnaire, or the answers received from it, which is supposed to have been sent to the leading preachers, elders, teachers, leaders and potential writers of the brotherhood, to ascertain what kind of papers and writers they wanted. They report an overwhelming straw vote in favor of soft-pedal journalism—of course, “ethical” is their word for it. James DeForest Murch, of the Christian Standard (Brother Witts’s Siamese twin) said that this survey was taken in an “efficient and business-like manner.” Wonder how he knows? Did he help take it? It would not surprise us to find out that Murch and his followers were among the ones who answered it. Murch also says that the survey “reveals that the younger and more progressive elements” among the “conservatives” simply “overwhelmingly favor their views!” Again, we wonder how he knows so much about who participated in this straw vote, and whether they were younger or older people? If Brother Murch’s digressive members did not actually participate in this voting, it is evident that it was the digressive element among the “conservatives” that did. The few answers that were published, with names withheld, have the digressive ring—and sound rather childish, which could be either youth or age—for instance such answers as No! No! Never! and a lot of other silly twaddle.

Since the names of those who answered the questionnaire have been withheld, we are all wondering somewhat who it is that has so “overwhelmed” the rest of us. In all my travels, which have been quite extensive, I have learned of only one gospel preacher (and no one else) who even answered the questionnaire. He was H. Leo Boles, neither young nor “progressive,” and his answer must not have suited anybody, and was evidently thrown out, as Davidson afterward said that he did not know Brother Boles and had never heard of him!

As a matter of curiosity, we would like to know more of this “ninety-five percent” who “favor their views.” Brother Thornton Crews, of Houston, Texas, has suggested to us that all the preachers who did not answer this questionnaire, send in a card. We can then know who did not kill Cock Robin. The preachers who have ever mentioned the thing to me, young and old, say that they threw it into the wastebasket. The only elder of the church I know that received one, did not answer it.

It would be interesting, at least, to know how many preachers did not answer the questionnaire. A one-cent card will do it, and the Bible Banner will be glad to publish their names, and reasons. “Ninety-five percent”—of whom, how many, and what?—F. E. W. Jr.
JUST THE FACTS

The very latest flash on going to press is that anony-

mous six-page sheet, mailed at Atlanta, Ga., by one who

subscribes himself "a friend of Abilene Christian College." Its burden is to give "facts free from opinions" about the Bible Banner and its editor, with special reference to an-
nouncements that the Bible Banner would be incorporated

through certain men, whereas it was not incorporated by

anybody at all. In the next issue of the Bible Banner the exact facts concerning that particular matter will be stated

and somebody's face will be red. These purveyors of gos-
sip should be seen in their true light-as meddlers in other

men's matters. A townclerk once said to a crowd which

possessed about the same spirit displayed by this pious

group: "Ye ought to be quiet and do nothing rashly. For

*.*.*.*.

... responsible for the low state of journalism exhibited by the

Advocate and the Firm Foundation and other papers among


those whom "Clinton Davidson and other men" hold re-

vey" was being executed a "vitriolic personal attack" was

anonymously circulated against a prominent and honorable

man among us which could not be described as anything

as mild as "hair-splitting argument and divisive tactics." But let's keep

anything concerning other matters, it shall be de-

termined in a lawful assembly."

So say I to this modern Demetrius and his anonymous

craftsman. If they have a legal matter against me, "the

law is open." If there are other matters, let them also be
determined in lawful assembly-I belong to the church. The

elders of the congregation in which I hold membership have

known me and my manner of life through the years, even

details of personal affairs. This dark effort to adver-
tise the editor of the Bible Banner as a crook and a crim-

inal has gone about far enough. He is ready for the show-
down. Let them come out into the open and fight face to

face and fair.

While you are all standing by, remember this: If the

man they are attacking (even Foy Esco Wallace Jr.) is as

bad as they make him out to be, that does not affect the is-

sues at stake, nor change the principles which are being

upheld. The truth stands in triumph as error crumples in

defeat. That is the thing that hurts these men so. Defeat

is written all over their circulars and anonymous communi-
cations-F. E. W. Jr.

HEALING THE BREACH

(Continued from page 1)

Brother Murch's head? He is an avowed premillennialist

and married to the organ and societies to boot!

Clinton Davidson and other men of his standing

were growingly conscious of the need for higher

journalistic standards in the brotherhood. They felt

that the days of vitriolic personal attacks on honor-
able men, hairsplitting argument and divisive tac-
tics were over. They wanted to see a thoughtful,

constructive presentation of their religious convic-
tions in an attractive format. They agreed on a sur-

vey of the brethren. It was taken in an efficient

and busineslike manner, and revealed that the

younger and more progressive elements overwhelm-

ingly favored their views.

There is a striking difference of opinion as to how "effi-
cient and busineslike" this "survey of the brethren" really

was and what it "revealed." Brother Murch talks as though

somebody had pulled the wool over his eyes. But let's keep

the record straight on one point. About the time this "sur-

vey" was being executed a "vitriolic personal attack" was

anonymously circulated against a prominent and honorable

man among us which could not be described as anything

as mild as "hair-splitting argument and divisive tactics." It was abominable and cowardly and did not originate with

those whom "Clinton Davidson and other men" hold re-
sponsible for the low state of journalism exhibited by the


Advocate and the Firm Foundation and other papers among

us have for many years made a "constructive presentation

of their religious convictions" regarding digression from the

faith and practice of the early church but it must be admit-
ted that they have not made it very "attractive" to the

Christian Standard. If the Christian Leader, a semi-month-

ly infant, whose spurs are short, blunt and shining can do

so without diluting "their convictions" it will be something

new in our history. Our skepticism should be accorded

a large degree of tolerance until something tangible shows up

along that line. According to Brother Murch we have

made rather commendable progress against great odds

without the "higher journalistic standards."

Brother E. W. McMillan, editor of the Leader, is a per-

sonal friend of mine. I knew him when he and I were pret-

ty small potatoes "in the brotherhood." I have played golf

with him, lounged around and discussed kingdom matters

with him and been tickled over his eulogies of my preach-

ing and writing. He conducted a written discussion with

Homer Strong on the music question. If he ever thought

I was a low-brow pencil-pusher, he never said so. But that

was before he came under the influence of Clinton Davidson

and his highfalutin' ideas "of the need for higher journal-

istic standards in the brotherhood." In those days we hit

at sin and digression wherever we found it, high or low.

I can't think he has changed much and I have a sneaking

notion that he will chuckle when he reads this unless "Clint-

on Davidson and other men of his standing" are watching

him. Brother Davidson was "lost to us" you know when

Eddie and I were having good times together. Brother

Murch reaches a climax in these words:

What a force for righteousness our combined

strength of more than 2,000,000 would be if we were all

working together according to the divine pattern!

God grant that we may all humbly seek His

guidance in healing the breach that for three genera-
nations has been such a hindrance to our plea for a

united church!

It is a consummation devoutly to be wished but it must

be according to the divine pattern. That can mean noth-
ing less than that instrumental music and the accouter-
ments that have been borrowed from the denominations

must go. The breach was made when these things were

introduced and it can be healed by removing them. If

Brother Murch and the Standard are willing to remove them,

they have not said so. If Brother Witty has asked them
to do so, I do not recall it. If he asks them to do so in the

"National Fellowship Meeting" in Indianapolis in May

"where there will be a great speaking program" I hope he

will tell us about it.

R. H. BOLL'S ARTICLES OF FAITH

JOHN T. LEWIS

Dear Brother Boll:

I regretted that it was not convenient for you to attend

the lectures at Freed-Hardeman College January 16-20. I was

lucky for you to hear my lectures on "God's promises and
covenants with Abraham, their development, and fulfill-

ment," and to offer any comment, or criticism you saw fit
to offer. I am not ashamed of what I teach because if I

have not the truth, I want it.

Forty years ago now, you and I were school mates sit-
ing at the feet of David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding, in the

old Nashville Bible school, then on South Spruce Street, Nash-

ville, Tennessee. Later came D. H. (Dick) Friend, Stan-

ford Chambers, Charles Neal, and later E. H. Hoover.

We were friends then, bound together with ties of Chris-

tian love and fellowship. Now that we have passed the merid-

ian of life, and are rapidly descending the Western slopes
toward life's setting sun, it is no pleasure to me to think of

the alienation that has severed those ties, and separated

us for nearly a quarter of a century, caused by the peculiar
prophetic views fathered and developed by you.

You possibly know I am reviewing your book, "The Kingdom of God," in the Bible Banner; but I now have before me the twenty-two articles of faith you wrote out and sent to Brother Harderman. Every religious denomination known to me, except the Jews, would accept your first eighteen articles with their explanation of same. Of course the Jews would reject your third article which says: "I believe in Jesus Christ, the Son of the living God," and I suppose they would accept him if you could get him back to Jerusalem on the throne of David. I will therefore publish only your last four articles of faith, and ask some questions that they suggest, and will be glad to have your answer to the questions that I may publish them with the article I will send to the Bible Banner. I will also be glad if you will publish it in Word and Work.

Articles

No. 19. "I believe that the throne of David is that sovereignty and sphere of rule which God delegated to David, namely the rule 'over the house of Jacob'; that Christ by virtue of His Davidic descent has the right to the same; that His future occupancy of the said throne involves no demotion or curtailment of His power, but rather the further extension of the same; that Jerusalem will be the local center from which His rule will extend 'from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth.'"

No. 20. "I believe that in Rev. 20 the time-length of that age to come is given as being a thousand years; also that after the thousand years Satan will be loosed for a little season; the earth and heaven will flee away, and all the dead who were not raised at the beginning of the thousand years, will be raised then and judged before 'the great white throne'; Satan, and also all men whose names are not written in the book of life, will be cast into the lake of fire."

No. 21. "I do not believe in any 'second chance,' or that any man who in this life has rejected the gospel will have an opportunity to be saved after death."

No. 22. "I would add that I have never subscribed to any 'school' or 'theory;' that I am not a 'Premillennialist' in any sectarian or party sense; but have endeavored to be a simple Christian, that I have never set myself up as an authority but have always held to the slogan and principle 'I am not right; the Bible is right'; that I have never claimed the right to 'speculate;' that I never made my convictions on the prophetic imagery of God's word a test of fellowship; that I have never divided a church, but on some occasions have helped to reunite a congregation that had had dissensions; that in my judgment none of the disputed teachings are inherently divisive, for these and like teachings were held in fuller or in lesser extent by great good brethren, but I caused no trouble; and that such trouble as has arisen could have been caused over any matter of difference, great or small, by following the procedure adopted by those who have made it their task to 'stamp out' what they are pleased to call 'Bollism'."

Speculation

You say: "I have never claimed the right to speculate." Brother Boll that is the very core of the carbuncle that has got many of us again in the same dilemma. If what you teach about the fleshly descendants of Abraham being returned to the land of Canaan, and Christ coming back to Jerusalem to sit on David's literal throne, and rule over an earthly kingdom for one thousand years, is not "speculation," then it must be the truth, and if it is the truth, and I do not teach it, how can I say with Paul, "that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I shrank not from declaring ... the whole counsel of God?" Again you say: "I have never divided a church." Don't you know that every digressive preacher on the earth would make the same claim, and they are right in the sense that if everybody would accept their teaching there would be no trouble or division. You also say that these "disputed teachings were held in fuller or in lesser extent" by A. Campbell, Moses E. Lard, and others. No doubt, Brother Boll, you have made these claims till you really believe them. I know other good brethren who have misrepresented the dead by peddling the same groundless claims. We will now let these men speak for themselves.

Judaiizers

In Millennial Harbinger 1841, page 320, Mr. Campbell says:

"In farther illustration of the caution with which highly graphic imagery is, in general, to be interpreted, and especially symbols concerning the destinies of the ancient elect race of Abraham, I invite the consideration of our readers to a short and pithy oration of President James in the court that tried the primitive Judaiizers -Acts 15."

Brother Boll have you ever felt this "caution" in your writings of the "highly ancient imagery, and symbols, concerning the destinies of the ancient elect race of Abraham"? Again we read on page 321:

"Here, then, we have in the midst of the boldest imagery, a prediction in which, who, but for James would have thought to find the first fruits of the Jews and the calling of the Gentiles under the government, of the Son of God and his kingdom, the rule of David, of that being a bold imagery of the captivity, or temporary removal of the family and throne of David, which indeed continued in a ruined and delapidated condition till the ascension of his son into heaven; and in no literal sense has that tabernacle yet been raised or its ruins repaired. It is spiritually Fe-edified by raising from the dead David's 'root and offspring, the Messiah, and by making him spiritual Lord of heaven and earth. Kingdom of the house of David was a bold imagery of the captivity, temporary removal of the family and throne of David, which indeed continued in a ruined and delapidated condition till the ascension of his son into heaven; and in no literal sense has that tabernacle yet been raised or its ruins repaired; and therefore Edom, Israel's ancient enemy, type of the Gentiles, has been called, and the name of the Lord imposed on baptized myriads of the New Testament Edomites-the Gentiles.

Certainly James understood the prediction, and rightly interpreted and applied it; and equally certain it is, that in his hands it means no more than a spiritual resurrection of Christ's tabernacle-a spiritual resurrection of his throne in heaven-a conversion of spiritual Edom, and the union of persons of all nations, upon whom is put the name of the Lord, in one nation under the sacerdotal King Messiah, David's Son and David's Lord. Such a key from such an infallible hand is worth a million of guesses, and shows that the restoration of Israel has much more in it than a literal return to the patrimonial soil of their renowned ancestors."

Avowals and Disavowals

Brother Boll, can you, by any method of reasoning, deduce a single idea that you teach about David's throne from the above? If not, why do you put your speculative theories about David's throne in a class with Campbell's teaching on that subject, and then with affected piety, say "Campbell's teaching did not cause any trouble?"

In your letter to Brother Harderman, speaking of the articles of faith you submitted, you say: "You may submit these to Brother Lewis, and have him look them over, and, if he will do so, read them to his audience. Since it stands to reason that I know the work that I believe than anyone else, he will no doubt be pleased to accept my avowals and disavowals as contained in the following pages." I certainly will accept any man's avowals and disavowals of what he teaches before I would accept any hearsay of his teaching. So I will let you speak for yourself to our readers. In your book, "The Kingdom of God," page 30, you say:
“Involved in the perpetuity of David’s throne is the perpetuity of David’s people, this nation of Israel whom God redeemed out of Egypt, of whom God here speaks. Nor is this fact altered in the New Testament. For when the birth of the great Son of David was spoken of, it was said to Mary: The Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever’ (Luke 1:32, 33). Now the ‘house of Jacob’ is always and simply that nation of Israel of which we are now speaking. Such a term is never applied to the church. The throne of David was ‘the throne of the kingdom of Jehovah over Israel’ (1 Chron. 22:5).”

Brother Boll, if “such a term is never applied to the church,” what was Paul talking about when he said: “For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.” As many as shall walk by this rule, peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God” (Gal. 6:15, 16)? We have read your avowal of your teaching on Gabriel’s announcement to Mary. We will now read Campbell’s avowal of his teaching on the same announcement. Millennial Harbinger 1841, page 197, Mr. Campbell says:

“Gabriel, in the announcement of the nativity of the Messiah, thus speaks, ‘He shall be called the Son of the Highest; and the Lord God shall give him the throne of his father David, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob ever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.’ Surely this is not the literal and earthly house of Jacob; nor can it be said, even in the sense of 1 Sam. 17:45 he has been anointed or ‘anointed’ king of Jacob and throne of God on which David sat on earth; that he has reigned over the house of Jacob ever since, much less for ever; nor will he ever in Jerusalem sit upon the throne of David; for the earthly city shall never again be built, nor that throne established either on our hypothesis, or on that of the literalist of the Boston Convention.”

I am only asking our readers to accept Brother Boll’s avowal of his teaching on David’s throne. I am also asking the same for A. Campbell’s teaching on the same subject, and thus we eliminate all hearsay teaching on this disputed question. Is this fair?

A Bad Egg

In the Millennial Harbinger 1842, page 265, Mr. Campbell says:

“Our brethren on the Western Reserve have been troubled with two Smiths. The Boston Smith opened the way for the New York Smith. The one wrote of the literal reign of a thousand years. From that egg Mormonism was hatched by Rigdon and Smith of Mormon memory. And now from extrinsic influence some are converted to a new theory which they have almost identified with the very hope of the gospel. But of these matters we have much to say, and hard to be uttered.”

Brother Boll since you can see the strife, bitterness, and alienation in the church today, caused by the species you have hatched from that same egg, don’t you think it is rather a bad egg to sit on? Won’t you get out of your present nest, abandon that egg, and let your teaching be what is was thirty years ago—an inspiration to thousands in the church? I still have faith enough in my other schoolmates to believe they would gladly follow you back to the “old paths.” If you cannot do this, please do not disturb the ashes of A. Campbell by even intimating that he ever sat upon that egg—the literal return of the Jews, the literal reign of Christ for a thousand years, upon the literal throne of David in literal Jerusalem.

One more quotation from Campbell must suffice. In the Millennial Harbinger 1849, page 292, he says:

“With this induction of all the passages that speak of the throne of David, and all that is said of the anointing or coronation of the Lord Jesus, can any one find a vestige of authority for the assumption that Jesus Christ will descend from the throne of God in the heavens, to sit upon any thing called a throne of David, in the literal Jerusalem; and thus, in the form of a man, reign as a prince and priest over one nation and people, for any national, temporal, or spiritual purpose”

Brother Boll you may take the witness; but please deal fairly with his memory.

“A Theory—Nothing More”

You next mention Moses E. Lard as having “held in a fuller or in lesser extent” these “disputed teachings.” In Lard’s Quarterly, Volume 2, pages 1-21, there is an article of twenty-one pages from him, under the heading “A Theory of the Millennium.” Brother Boll did you ever write even one page on “the disputed teaching” and call it “a theory”? In fact you say: “I would add that I have never subscribed to any school or theory.” Brother Boll it is this cock-sure teaching of yours on “the disputed teaching” that has caused all the trouble in the church today, on these subjects. It was this same cock-sureness that led Brother Chas. Neal to issue his challenge to the brotherhood that brought about the Winchester, Ky., and the Chattanooga, Tenn., debates. After drawing some conclusions, Moses E. Lard said, on page 6, “should any one cavil at this, and say it is without proof, we beg to remind him that we are inditing a theory-nothing more.” Take your second witness, Brother Boll. If he ever wrote one page in defense of that “egg” —the literal return of the Jews, the literal reign of Christ for a thousand years upon the literal throne of David, in literal Jerusalem,” I have never read it. Have you? He never thought enough of that “egg” to dignify it by even “inditing a theory” in its behalf. After comparing A. Campbell’s, and Moses E. Lard’s teaching, with yours upon this mooted question, would you say their teaching was “in fuller or in lesser extent” than yours? Or will you admit that in no sense do you believe what they taught about “David’s Throne”?

Will you please read this, pen any answer to these questions you would like to have published with the article and return them to me?

Yours for the “old paths,”

JNO. T. LEWIS.

To the above Brother Boll sent a five page type written article; much of it has nothing to do with the questions I had asked him. He also insists that I publish all his articles of faith if I want to be fair. I cannot understand why it is necessary to publish everything a fellow believes in order to be fair. My idea of being fair is to publish what a fellow believes on the subject you are discussing. I have a one track mind and will discuss but one thing at the time. If I published all Brother Boll wants me to publish, it would take a whole issue of the Bible Banner, and the most of it having nothing to do with the subject. However, if Brother Boll will publish my letter to him in Word and Work, I will publish his reply in the next issue of the Bible Banner. Is that fair?

The third paragraph of Brother Boll’s is on the subject, and I here give it in full. “Very strange are your remarks about my attitude toward speculation. So my fault is this, that I do not believe in speculating, and do not profess to be speculating, nor claim the right to speculate. Now if I had claimed the right to speculate, you would have been among the first to condemn me on that ground; but since I don’t, I am to be condemned because, though differing with you, I am unwilling to admit that I am ‘speculating.’ Then you say that if my teaching is not speculation, then it must be the truth. Yes, my brother, I believe it to be truth, else I would not be teaching it.”

Thus Brother Boll reaffirms his faith in “that egg” from which Alexander Campbell declared that Sidney Rig-
A WONDERFUL COMMENDATION

JOHN T. LEWIS

In the Christian Standard of February 18, Brother James De Forest Murch had a long article under the heading “Our Forgotten Brethren.” I quote one paragraph from his article in which he delivers himself as follows on the Christian Leader:

“A sample of this leadership is to be noted in the recent rejuvenation of the Christian Leader into probably the most creditable journal of the conservatives. Clinton Davidson and other men of his standing were growing conscious of the need for higher journalistic standards in the brotherhood. They felt that the days of vitriolic personal attacks on honorable men, hair-splitting arguments and divisive tactics were over. They wanted to see a thoughtful, constructive presentation of their religious convictions in an attitude of imprudence on the part of our spiritually minded.

The Christian Leader, with a long and honorable record under John F. Rowe, furnished the medium for their purpose. A staff or leading preachers, educators, and business men who have a flair for writing compose the staff under the direction of E. W. McMillan, of Nashville. The new paper compares well with our own journals and gives much promise.”

Brother Murch does not tell us whether this “rejuvenation” was brought about by the “goat gland” method or how; but he says, “The recent rejuvenation of the Christian Leader made it probably the most creditable journal of the conservatives.”

This makes the recent rejuvenation of the Christian Leader probably the most creditable journal of the conservatives.

Brother Murch certainly thinks the life-long policy of the Christian Leader has been changed, and that for the better. I am sure that the small journals the Christian Leader swallowed will come through the rejuvenation purified. I am wondering if “the younger and more progressive elements” among the conservatives, of whom Brother Murch speaks, will not finally turn out to be about what “the older and more progressive elements” among the digressives are today!

It is marvelous how Brother Clinton Davidson so soon after his Rip Van Winkle nap, so far as the church, its work, and writing are concerned, of all things he was thinking of in the wilderness “for higher journalistic standards” among the conservatives. And Brother Murch says, “The new paper compares well with our own journals and gives much promise.” “Much promise” of what? In Brother Davidson’s long dream, he was also inspired with the idea of copyrighting his “higher journalistic” efforts. Therefore you cannot quote a single statement from the rejuvenated Christian Leader, and commend it, without quoting the whole article. However, I see the editor, in the February issue, of this copyrighted journal, quotes from Peter in the second chapter of Acts, and comments on it without quoting the whole chapter. I suppose the committee and editorial staff of the rejuvenated Christian Leader think its articles are more illuminating than the chapters in the New Testament, and therefore need no comment.

The last page of the Gospel Advocate of February 9, 1939, was taken up, setting forth the virtues of the rejuvenated Christian Leader. For some reason this page was not copyrighted. Possibly they wanted other papers to help set forth its ideals. So I will quote Articles 1 and 22. Article 1 reads: “Feature articles on important subjects of great current interest in an attractive and authoritatively interpreted by our editor.” From this we learn that the editor of the rejuvenated Christian Leader is the sole arbiter of what constitutes “important subjects,” and who shall write upon them—a responsibility for one man; a responsibility a good man would not have and a bad man should not have.

Article 22 reads: “Editorial. Stirring pronouncements, clarifying comments, clear-thinking leadership on current problems of church and nation; home and business; individuals and groups.” High-minded statements indeed! If I should write an editorial under the heading “A Church of Christ,” it would certainly need some “stirring pronouncements, clarifying comments, and clear thinking” from the leadership of the church, because there is no such expression in the New Testament. There are no indefinite articles about “the church” nor “the gospel,” and when a preacher begins to preach or write about “a gospel” or “a church,” I get a little suspicious of his speech; it is the language of Ash-dod.

WHAT A RELIEF

Brother Clinton Davidson of copyright fame has written me that he had “made it very clear that I had neither the desire or intention of suing anyone.” What a relief! Our hearts can now resume their normal rate of speed. I still can’t see the point in his conference with “eminent legal counsel” unless he hoped to scare somebody, but if he has the time and “desire” to carry on a conversation with lawyers just to satisfy his curiosity as to the legal status of what we write it is all right with me. While the lawyers are reading it, they may learn something they would not otherwise find out. It is my opinion that “eminent legal” gentlemen in New York with a nose for libel could find a few streaks of it in some of Paul’s pointed attacks on some rather prominent citizens of his generation. They did not take time to sue Paul, they just stirred up the rabble and chased him out of town.

Brother Davidson should not be too impatient with us. He has been in the East so long he probably does not understand the psychology of us Westerners. It is considered bad form out here for a man to reach for his hip pocket or draw a gun in a fracas unless he aims to shoot somebody. Naturally when the brother drew his “eminent legal counsel” on us we inferred that he aimed to pull the trigger. It seems to be a case of misunderstanding spiced with agesture of imprudence on the part of our spiritually minded brother. So, henceforth, we shall feel free to express ourselves as we see fit and if he again becomes legally minded, we can just take it for granted that: it is just an innocent hobby of his, that he just likes to talk and play with lawyers.

The brother complains about some “incorrect statements” appearing in our paper. Incorrect statements should be corrected, of course. We are not inspired and may make some mistakes. There is a way to fix all that without bothering any New York lawyers. If the brother cannot afford to soil the pages of his own paper with a correction, I suggest that he send a correction to the Bible Banner. If he will sign his name and not copyright it, we might get in. It might make as good reading as some things that some of the rest of us write. I warn you though, that the editor of the Bible Banner is a little peculiar in some ways. He entertains an aversion toward anonymous and copyright material.—Cled E. Wallace.
THEOLOGICAL PREJUDICES OF TRANSLATORS

A. B. KEENAN

Romanists when consulting Scripture, which we fear is all to seldom, refer to their. "Catholic" Bible, the "Douay" version, by all odds the least reliable of any rendering in Christendom. It is based on the "Vulgates" of Jerome, who translated the Bible into Latin during the last quarter of the fourth century. It abounds in errors, of which the following three may be taken as examples: 1st Genesis 3:15 instead of the statement "He shall bruise," we find "She shall bruise." This change in the gender of the pronoun has been made in order to help bolster the Roman Catholic dogma as to the especial merits of Mary. Take the notable Acts 2:38. Here we find not "repent" but rather "do penance," which is a horse of a different color. An attempt is made to support the Catholic sacramental system in Ephesians 5:22. We do not find here what we should—"This is a great mystery"—but rather "This is a great sacrament." Paul in the passage is expounding the relationship between Christ and the church, and not giving authorization to one of the "seven sacraments." In the second and third of these citations is to be found the chief reason for the Douay version's being severely and deservedly censured, namely, the unwarranted practice of transferring words from the original when other perfectly good words of the language of the translation are entirely capable of conveying the meaning of the original.

It would be a mistake, however, to conclude that all translation errors of such genu are confined to the Douay version. Protestant translators have to some extent copied at least the spirit of its mistakes, if not the actual errors themselves, for it is obvious that they have had some theological hobbies of their own to ride.

King James I gave his assistants the following rules of good translating conduct: (1) "The language of the Bishops' Bible should be adhered to, receiving as few alterations as might be consistent with truth, and to pass throughout unless the original plainly called for amendment." (2) "The translations of Tindal, Coverdale, Matthey, Whitechurch, and Geneva should be used when they come closer to the original than the Bishops' Bible." (3) "The old ecclesiastical words should be retained." Among these latter is "baptize."

It is unfortunate that the pernicious error of substituting rantis for immersion is aided by such a loved version as the King James and such a reputedly accurate one as the American Revised. People will often turn to the dictionary for a definition of "baptize." They do not realize, however, that when it gives as a synonym, among other things, "to sprinkle," that it is not to be taken as an Olympic authority on the actual meaning, but only a mirror reflecting usage from the eighteenth century forward, by no stretch of the imagination apostolic usage.

In a state of despair one turns to the "modern" versions, whose chief selling point is their allegedly greater faithfulness to the original manuscripts and a more felicitous rendering of their thought into the actual speech of our day. But if we hope to find "immerse" for "baptize," we are again in for another disappointment. Observe Acts 18:6 in Moffatt, Weymouth, and Goodspeed, which have it respectively: "Many of the Corinthians listened, believed, and were baptized." "Many of the Corinthians who heard Paul believed and received baptism." "Many of the people of Corinth heard Paul and believed and were baptized."

Here are a few extracts from Goodspeed's preface to his "The New Testament: An American Translation":

"The New Testament was not written in classical Greek, nor in the biblical Greek of the Greek version of the Old Testament, nor even in the literary Greek of its own day, but in the common language of everyday life... It follows that the most appropriate English form for the New Testament is the simple, straightforward English of everyday expression... The writers of the New Testament had for the most part little use for literary art. They put their message in the simplest and most direct terms they could command, so that it spoke directly to the common life of their day... The translation of such a book demands first, the understanding of what the several writers meant to say, and second the casting of their thought in the simplest and clearest of present day English. It is the meaning, not the dress, of the New Testament that is of principal importance..."

In view of this preface, the writer could not understand why Goodspeed had used "baptize" instead of "immerse." The more he pondered the matter the more he was puzzled. Perhaps Goodspeed himself could enlighten him:

(Copy of a letter sent to Dr. Goodspeed)

Dr. E. J. Goodspeed,
University of Chicago,
Chicago, Ill.

Dear Sir:
Your translation of the New Testament has been of great assistance to me in studying the Scriptures.

But here is a question which will be well-answered if you do so: If the chief value of many of the "modern" translations of the Bible lies in their being more exact representations of the original documents, how does it happen that the Greek word for immerse is left "baptize" in these translations, including your own, instead of being translated into its English equivalent? If you could spare a moment from your pressing affairs to enlighten me, I should be very grateful.

Respectfully yours,
A. B. Keenan.

(Dr. Goodspeed's reply)

Dear Mr. Keenan:
The element of immersion in baptism is I believe admitted by scholars generally; I recognize it in such passages as Mark 1:9, 10; Matt. 3:16, etc.

But I am not translating words but sentences, and to us such a nonreligious word would distract attention entirely from the religious character of the baptism to its physical form. Its religious quality is of more importance than the other, and immerse has no religious atmosphere or connotation in English usage. I chose the word with an unmistakable religious meaning. John was not simply giving Jesus a bath, you see; it was far more than that.

Sincerely yours,
E. J. Goodspeed.

When Goodspeed wrote his translation (1923) he was professor of Biblical and patristic Greek but all his pretense to learning could not prevent
his being guilty of a singular piece of disingenuousness.

Nuf sed.

However, into the hands of the writer there recently came an edition of the Bible which is almost (though not quite) ideal, but which is hardly "just off the press": Its date is 1842, and at that it is a "Second Edition." Its title page states it to be the "English Version of the Old and New Testaments, Made by Order of King James I. Carefully Revised and Amended, by Several Biblical Scholars," who, according to the preface, were Thomson, Webster, Scarlet, Wakefield, Dickenson, Harwood, G. Campbell, Mcknight, Stewart, Dodridge, "and some others." Their purpose is commendable, as further set forth in the preface, the last paragraph of which we feel justified in quoting:

"... If common consent and common usage have completely naturalized words borrowed or transferred from the original, so that the English reader would attach to them the same ideas which existed in the minds of the inspired writers, then, and only then, no good reason can be offered for a change. But when these borrowed words are variously interpreted by different sects, it becomes an obvious duty to return to first principles. Let the words be faithfully translated, that the reader may, in view of his responsibility to the "great Author of revelation, decide whether he will receive or reject his word. To leave a single thought, which God has revealed to man; shrouded in the darkness of ancient languages, or obscured through the changes which times produced in our own, can only become those who wish to "take away the key of knowledge from mankind. The religion of the one requires no pious frauds: It 'doth not hate the light.' An apology for presenting the word, the whole word, and nothing but the word, to those who use, the-English or any other language, may be demanded, unless by such men as believe that "ignorance is the mother of devotion."

Whatever may become of the conflicting tenets of sects, the truth of God must stand forever. Let the truth utter its voice in the language of everynation under the whole heaven. Let men believe, neither by the head nor by the heart, that tremble 'at the word of Jehovah; and then, though the distinctive tenets of sects may fade away, the Sun of Righteousness will arise on all the world, with healing in his b e a m s."

Hear them now on Acts 18:8: "Many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were immersed." Every passage dealing with immersion renders it as such and not as "baptism." These men anticipated Goodspeed by nearly a century and have been square with the word of God where he has not. Had they called Christ's harbinger "the immerser" instead of "the Baptist" I would have stood up and cheered!

We know that Christ is coming again. There are many reasons why we know this. First, he himself said so. "And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto myself; that where I am, there ye may be also." (John 14:3) This language was uttered by Christ to the apostles the night of his betrayal.

Again, we know that Christ is coming again because the angels say so. "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven." (Acts 1:11) This language was addressed to the apostles by two angels at the ascension of Christ.

And yet again, we know that Christ is coming again because inspired apostles say so. "And to you who are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." (II Thess. 1:7, 8) This was written by the inspired Paul to the church of the Thessalonians.

When is he coming? There has been much speculation and wild guessing along this line. Many dates have been set. These dates have come and gone, but Jesus has not come. What does this prove? It proves that men know nothing "of that day and that hour." When God says that men don't know that ought to settle it. "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." (Mark 13:32) We ought to thank God that Christ is coming again, and we ought to thank him that we know not the time of his coming. No doubt there are reasons as high as heaven why the time has not been revealed.

We know not the time of his coming, but we do know something about how he is coming. We have already learned from Acts 1:11 that he is coming as he went. This being true he is coming in the clouds of heaven. "Behold, he cometh with clouds; and every eye shall see him, and they also which pierced him: and all kindreds of the earth shall wail because of him." (Rev. 1:7)

What Will Take Place at His Coming?

Here the floodgates of speculation have been torn down! But let us see what the scriptures say. Let us read slowly and carefully: "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first: then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air. And so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words." (I Thess. 4: 13-18) This makes it pretty plain relative to what is going to happen when the Lord returns. The dead are to be wakened, and "then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air." Yes, we are going to "be caught up together," and all meet the Lord at the same time. What about that word "first"? "And the dead in Christ shall rise first." That is, the ones who are living shall not precede the ones who are dead. No two resurrections with a thousand years or so between taught in this passage.

When Jesus comes again the dead will be raised, and all shall be judged. In the last chapter that Paul ever wrote we hear him saying this, "I charge thee therefore before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead, at his appearing and his kingdom." (II Tim. 4:1) What did Paul say Jesus was going to do at his "appearing"? He said he was going to "judge the quick and the dead." How would you go at it to state this more plainly? If he didn't mean what he said, why didn't he say what he meant?

In Matt. 25:31-46 we have Jesus telling about the judgment "when the Son of man shall come in his glory." Yes, and he says that at this judgment the "sheep" and the "goats" both will be there! The righteous will be rewarded with eternal life, and the wicked will be punished with eternal damnation. Jesus uses the same word to describe the duration of hell that he uses to describe the duration of heaven.

When Jesus comes that will be the end of time. The gates of time shall be closed, and the doors of eternity opened. May God help us to be ready for the second coming of Christ. My reader, are you a Christian?
The religious and so-called scientific system, Christian Science, is supposed to have been discovered by Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, Lynn, Massachusetts, and is believed by thousands of people in America and Europe. Many facts about this system have been published. Very seldom do you see the unvarnished facts. A statement of these things will in no wise please the members of the Christian Science Church, nevertheless, they must be stated. They are being stated for the sake of their souls and for the sake of thousands who might be led into this strange system of metaphysics.

Mrs. Eddy

From the exchange I learn it is not best to deal in personalities, however, there are some things so closely related to a person that it is impossible to give the unvarnished facts without dealing with the person. This is true in regard to Christian Science.

Mrs. Eddy was born July 16, 1821, at Bow, New Hampshire. She died in 1910. Being unreliable in her word, suspicion naturally attaches itself to the origin of her so-called system of healing. Do we have the right to question her veracity? Note the following facts:

1. She says, “At the age of twelve I was taken into the Congregational Church.”

The official record taken from the clerk’s book of the Tilton Congregational Church reads as follows:

“1838, July 26. Received into the church, Stephen Grant, Esq., John Gil-ly and his wife Hannah, Mrs. Susan French, wife of William French, and Miss Mary A. M. Baker, by profession, the former receiving the ordination of baptism.”

Since she was born in 1821 and received into this church in 1838, she was seventeen and not twelve as she claims. Her disciples try to make much of the statement that she was received at twelve. They make a comparison of Mrs. Eddy and the Lord at the age of twelve. The Lord at twelve argued with the doctors and lawyers. Mrs. Eddy claims to have had a big argument with the church when she was received, and that certain doctrines were set aside to admit her. Does it not seem strange that she could not remember her age at so important an event of her life? This is stranger too, when you consider she was seventeen and not twelve as she claims.

2. At her third marriage she gave her age at forty as the record shows.

Yet, if she was born on the date she avows, she was a blushing bride of fifty-six and not forty. Mrs. Eddy taught that marriage was “legalized lust,” but she was married three times. She was Mrs. Mary Glover Patterson Eddy.

There is one point in which we are compelled to accept Mrs. Ed- dy’s statement at face value. On Page 246, Line 17 of “Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures,” she says, “Never record age.” She was at least consistent in this one doctrine of hers.

The misrepresentation and decep-tions concerning her age will prepare you now to appreciate her unscrupu-lous statements about the origin of the book known as “Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures.”

3. Her system of metaphysics was snatched from the brow of a dead man. She then had the audacity to claim the Lord revealed it to her.

In 1862 Mrs. Eddy, who was then Mrs. Patterson, put herself under the care of Dr. P. P. Quimby, a mental healer of Portland, Maine. This she states over her own signature in the Portland Evening Courier, November 7, 1862:

“Three weeks ago I quitted my nurse and sick room enroute for Port-land. The belief in my recovery had died out of the hearts of those who were most anxious for it. With this mental and physical depression, I visited P. P. Quimby, and in less than one week from that time I ascended by stairway of one hundred and eighty-two steps to the dome of City Hall and am improving ad finitum. This truth which he opposes to the error of giving intelligence to matter and placing pain where it never placed itself, if receiv-ed understandingly, changes the cur- rents of the system to their normal action and mechanism of the body goes undisturbed. (There is Christian Science in a nutshell, and that four years before she says the Lord reveal-ed it to her). That this a science capa-ble of demonstration, becomes clear to the minds of those patients who reason upon the process of their cure. The truth which he establishes in the patient cures him and the body, which is full of light, is no longer in disease.”

Signed, Mrs. Mary M. Patterson.

Dr. P. P. Quimby died in 1866. It was in 1866 when Mrs. Eddy claims to have discovered Christian Science. Mrs. Eddy wrote some lines about Dr. Quimby entitled, “Lines on the death of Dr. P. P. Quimby, who healed the sick as Jesus did.”

Now, if Dr. Quimby healed the sick as Jesus did, and so states Mrs. Eddy, her system existed before 1866, the year she says the Lord revealed it to her. The Christian Science book was plagiarized from the manuscript of Dr. Quimby. A copy of the same man-uscript is in the possession of Mr. Horace Wentworth, and a comparison shows them to be the same in every fundamental concept.

This system is one of the darkest and most damnable ever belied by hell. Its only protection is in its “refuge of lies.” It is a combination of jumbled philosophies, Deism, and Stoic. It is the old basic philos-ophy of Berkeley’s Idealism gone to seed. The unreality of matter was af-firmed by Berkeley.

Pundita Ramabai, a native of India, said, “On my arrival in New York I was told that a new philosophy was being taught in the United States and that it had won many disciples. The philosophy was called Christian Sci-ence, and when I asked what its teaching was, I recognized it as being the same philosophy that has been taught among my people four thousand years.” Yet, Mrs. Eddy says she dis-covered it in 1866. With these facts in hand, who can believe her?

The book “Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures,” is nothing but a series of disjointed, inconsequential, dogmatic and egotistical assertions. One can start in the middle and read in either direction without affecting the argument or the sequence of the ideas. It will make just as much sense one way as the other. Words are used in an unheard-of sense. A glossary is even added to try to explain words in a way contrary to every meaning in the world.

There are three charges I wish to bring against Christian Science.

Contradicts Human Experience

Her system contradicts human experience. We know by experience that her principles are wrong. Note ex-amples of what I mean:

1. Infant held under water for twenty minutes and without harm.

“It is related that a father plunged his infant babe, only a few hours old, into the water for several minutes, and repeated this operation daily, until the child could remain under water twenty minutes, moving and playing without harm, like a fish. Parents should remember this, and learn how to de-velop their children properly on dry land.” Page 557, 1906 Addition.

The world record for staying under water is a little over two minutes. I wonder why some Christian Scientist does not beat this by at least seven-
There is no such thing as pain.

Strange, is it not? How could what a profit insurance companies buried alive? Do they live any longer to find a way out of this difficulty, however, by saying, “It would be better constitutions and less disease.”

Why then, do they eat? Why do they grow teeth at ninety. Why then, do they go to the dentist? Why don’t they cut off the gas and save the fuel bill? Why do they stay by the fire when it is cold?

Why do they drink water? Why do they collect on a policy, if they cannot and do not die? Why do they get sick and die? Why do they die? Mrs. Eddy died in 1910. If she did not die, why did they bury her? Was she buried alive? Do they live any longer than the rest of humanity. Just think what a profit insurance companies could make by issuing policies on their lives. How can they collect on a policy, if they cannot and do not die? If death is not real, then they are not dead. The claim should not be paid.

Poison is not poison, (Page 178).

It is poison simply because “the majority of mankind believe” it to be so. Why will “arsenic” and “strychnine” kill grasshoppers if it is just a belief. How did these poor creatures ever get such a notion anyway? What a tyrant-this majority “opinion.” It is worse than “majority rule” if anything could be worse. Suppose some one induces people to believe that milk is poison and thus will kill everybody. On the other hand, if people could be made to believe that whisky has the same food value as milk and will not intoxicate a person, the temperance problem would be solved. Why doesn’t this church start a campaign to make people believe that whisky will not make people drunk? They know better, and so do you. Yet, their Bible teaches to the contrary.

Thus you can see that it is contrary to your experience and to human nature.

Their doctrine is not proclaimed in some places. Christ preached among the “poor.” Not so with the Christian Scientist. Money may not be real, but they work on people who possess it. Strange, is it not? How could they have the courage though to preach this strange doctrine in a home where they have the poorest food and barely a living. Could they say food is of no value? Suffering not real? Where is the Christian Scientist who has the courage to stand over a body torn and bleeding because of an accident and say in a clear vibrant voice, “He is not hurt, not a bone is broken, he is not bleeding”?

Results In Absurdity and Tragedy

In practical life it results in absurdity and tragedy. The following story illustrates my meaning:

In a crowded auditorium in Chicago a large gentleman arose and, in stentorian tones and defiant manner, inquired, “Are there any Christian Scientists here?” A small, sallow-faced, meek-eyed, dreamy-looking woman, who sat on the second seat from the front, thinking her faith was being challenged, arose and said in a falsetto voice, “I have the honor, sir, of being a Christian Scientist.” “Well,” said the man, “please exchange seats with me. I am sitting in a draught and don’t want to take a cold.”

Mark Twain’s story of Christian Scientist ought to be told everywhere. His book on Christian Scientist should be carefully read by all. In the first part of this book, reviewing Christian Science, he relates the following interesting story:

Mark Twain imagined himself climbing the Alps. He fell and rolled to the foot of the mountain. He was badly bruised, his flesh lacerated and his arm broken in two places. Having been taken to a hotel, where a surgeon set his arm and treated his bruises, a Christian Scientist Healer came to refresh him with her theories.

“Mr. Clemens, you are not hurt at all. There is no such thing as pain. I am amazed that so intelligent a man as you should be under such a delusion.”

“Madam,” said Mr. Clemens, “I am in excruciating agony. My arm is broken in two places. If you were suffering as I am, you would have hysteria.”

Day after day the “healer” came but the surgeon was retained. In due time Mr. Clemens was ready to leave the hotel. The Christian Scientist healer sent him a bill for her professional services. “Whereupon,” said Mark Twain, “I paid her with an imaginary check.”

“At Mineola, Long Island, Mrs. F. Kirk, a Christian Scientist, brought suit for injuries suffered in an automobile collision. Justice Paul Bon-yoge told the jury, which agreed with him that if pain and injury are not real, but imaginary, as Christian Scientists teach, then a Christian Scientist can not properly claim damages for personal injuries. The justice said to the jury, ‘If pains are not real and fractures do not exist, obviously you men are in no position under the law to award damages that do not exist. If they (the injuries) are not real, as according to the teaching of the departed patron saint of Christian Science, then of course, she, the plaintiff, has no place here.’”

“The justice pointed out that the plaintiff had refused to accept the assistance of a doctor. The jury found for the defendant, against the Christian Scientist.”

This is a matter of court record. It ought to be a lesson to all Christian Scientist. Thus you see how ridiculous and absurd this doctrine is in practical life.

In the back of the book, “Christian Science and Health with Key to the Scriptures” is found a chapter entitled “Fruitage.” This chapter gives one testimony after another of how certain people were healed. Any Mormon elder or Holy Roller preacher can tell bigger stories. There is one thing not found in the chapter on “Fruit-age” and that is the account of the thousands who have been allowed to suffer and die because of their belief in this doctrine. Many a little baby has suffered and died while some old woman sat and read to it out of the book Mrs. Eddy stole from Dr. P. P. Quimby. Christian Science is neither Christian nor Science. It does not contribute to health and is a key only to forever lock the scriptures to all who accept it. Its “Key” is the “Key” to hell.
It Contradicts The Bible

A system that contradicts the Bible cannot be built upon the Word of God.

1. Christian Science teaches there is no such thing as sickness. “Sickness is not real” is the way it reads. Paul says, “but Trophimus I left at Miletus sick.” (II Tim. 4:20) It does seem a shame that Paul did not know that sickness was not real. If Trophimus was not really sick Paul made a mistake in saying he was sick. It was the Holy Spirit, too, who said that he was sick. Mrs. Eddy’s book flatly contradicts God’s book in this respect.

2. Christian Science says that “sickness’ is not real and that the trouble is only in the “mind.” You just think you are sick. Now read from God’s book; “Be no longer a drinker of water, but use a little wine for thy stomach and thine often infirmities.” (I Tim. 5:23) Mrs. Eddy says the trouble was in Timothy’s “mind” and Paul by the Holy Spirit says it was in his “stomach.” God said the trouble was in his “stomach” and Mrs. Eddy says it was in his “mind.” To me this proves that Mrs. Eddy does not know what she is talking about. It shows her doctrine to be antipodal to the doctrine of God.

3. There is no such thing as “sin” according to Christian Science. Yet the Bible says that “Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.” (I Tim. 1:15) “The wages of sin is death.” (Rom. 6:23) If “sin is not real” as Christian Science avows, why did Jesus come into this world? This doctrine makes Christ die in vain. If no sin-no need of conversion. If no sin-no need of the cross of Christ. Christian Science denies the mission of Christ, makes the cross a mockery and yet they call it Christian.

4. The death of Christ is even denied. “Jesus’ students, saw him after his crucifixion and learned that he had not died.” (Page 46) Paul says, “That Christ died for our sins.” (I Cor. 15:3). Peter says, “God raised him from the dead.” (Acts 3:15) In fact ever disciple proclaimed the “resurrection of the Christ from the dead.” (Acts 4:1-3) In view of all this, Mrs. Eddy has the effrontery to say that Christ did not die.

Key To The Scriptures

On page 501 will be found the part of Mrs. Eddy’s book called “Key To The Scriptures.” A “key” is that which affords entrance or serves to explain. No man, according to Christian Scientists, can know and understand the scriptures without this “Key.” You see, that in order for Mrs. Eddy to propagate her philosophy stolen from Dr. Quimby, she had to put the Bible under lock and key.” In Christian Science Churches they have two readers. First, the Bible is read. Then some one reads from Mrs. Eddy’s book the explanation. Her book is exalted above the Bible. In fact they teach that no man can understand the Bible without the “Key” to unlock it. Can you think of anything more blasphemous? Decency forbids giving this the maximum our vocabulary affords.

This “Key” is the rule by which they follow what they call, “scientific” and “spiritual interpretation.” It is written about like the ordinary commentary. Let us now notice some of the comments and “spiritual interpretations.”

1. In commenting on Gen. 2:2 Mrs. Eddy says, “Principle (God) and its idea, man, are co-existent and eternal.” She teaches that “all is God and God is all.” There is nothing but God. This is pantheism as you can see. Since, according to Mrs. Eddy, God is all and there is nothing but God, God is as much in a serpent’s bite as in the plan to save man.

2. Commenting on Gen. 2:6, she says, “The second chapter of Genesis contains a statement of this material view of God and the universe—a statement which is the exact opposite of scientific truth as before recorded.” Thus she teaches that Genesis the first chapter is contradicted by Genesis the second chapter. This is some “Key” is it not?

3. In Gen. 2:7, God says, “And the Lord God formed man out of the dust of the ground.” Mrs. Eddy says, “It must be a lie.” She thus calls Jehovah a liar with the first turn of her “key.” “Mankind represents the Adamic race, and is a human, not a divine creation.” Thus she denies the creation of man.

4. She turns her “Key” on Genesis 2:9 and says, “That all life is God.” If “all life is God” then God is just as much a frog, a mouse or a mole as he is our Father. What demonical daring to call this system Christian.

5. In Genesis 2:21, 22, where it is said that God made woman from one of Adam’s ribs is explained by the “Key” as the first record of “magnetism.” It is called a lie and the “supposed basis of the creation of woman.” The record of creation is called by Mrs. Eddy a belief in a “superstition.”

6. “Man is not born and never dies, according to the “Key.” “Science rolls back the clouds of error with the light of truth, and lifts the curtain on man as never born and as never dying, but as co-existent with his creator.”

a. “Man is never born”-yet she says she was “born” in 1821.

Mrs. Eddy claimed her life to be a living demonstration of her principles. Her birth and death are a demonstration of the falsity of her doctrine.

They say there is no such thing as sin, sickness and death, and yet they do more talking about it than anybody. If as much effort as has been put forth by Christian Scientists is required to heal nothing, I wonder how they would fare if something did really exist. Since the Science practitioner requires the patient to pay for the healing service, they are admittedly practicing a fraud in that they make the patient pay for nothing. They always take “something” for “nothing.” Nothing is real with them, except “money.” They will not take an “imaginary check.” You just try it.

Conclusion

Christian Science puts a premium on ignorance. “The less mind there is manifested in matter the better.” (Page 489)

Why has not Christian Science developed a perfect specimen during all these years? Why is there to be found not a man to demonstrate the claims of this strange cult? The only perfect specimen to which they can point is a LOBSTER.

“When the lobster loses its claw, the claw grows again. If the Science of Life were understood, it would be found that senses of mind are never lost and that matter has no sensation. Then the human limb would be replaced as readily as the lobster’s claw, --not with an artificial limb, but with the genuine one.” (Page 489)

If, then, a man did not have any more sense than a lobster he could replace his lost limb, not with an artificial one, but with the genuine limb. No wonder she said, “The less mind the better.”

If this doctrine is true, there is no need to go forth to the battle field at all. We can remain in our homes and kill our enemies with an idea. And if they fall, we shall not grieve, for they are but illusions, we are but illusions, the battle is an illusion and we but dream that we dream. If this system is true, we have no need of surgeons and other doctors, for folks never get sick nor have pain.

The Best Way To Refute This Doctrine Is To Stub Your Toe Against A Rock.
A Heavenly Home Versus A Homely Heaven

EDD HOLT

In the word “heaven” are concentrated our fondest dreams and affections, our highest hope and purposes. Heaven is “the recompense of re-ward”; for which we might, like Moses, refuse the riches and honors of an Egyptian nation. When heaven is described as a city, it is done in terms of jewels and metals most precious to man. The fellowship there is with celestial intelligences-God and Christ with all the redeemed of all ages. However dear the word “home” may be here, it is insignificant when compared to the home in “a better country, that is, a heaven.”

Yet there are many whose desires are so carnal that the power of the gospel of Christ does not divorce them from the things of the world. Many will not “flee youthful lusts” for the spiritual blessings in Christ. Their idea of pleasure is base and coarse. They doubt that “in the presence of God is fullness of joy and in His right hand are pleasures for evermore.” Then, there are others who are more bent upon going to Jerusalem than upon going to heaven. Their affections are set upon things below-not upon things above. But our discussion has to do with those whose animal devotions burn within them for the things of the world to enliven their worship. When they hear the sweet strains of the organ, chills play up and down their spines while their thoughts bend upon going to Jerusalem than what was right in the home was sin without sinning, they were not to eat in the church, in that case. It is legitimate to wash hands or feet in the Holy Place while the table of shewbread should never have been in the Holy Place while the table of shewbread should never have been there for it was not in the Most Holy Place. To continue: What the people had in their tents (homes) ought to have been in the Holy Place of the tabernacle, and what they did not have in their tents ought not to have been in the Holy Place. We see, What the Lord wanted He did not know and what He gets He surely must enjoy! (7)

So, the big-fat arguments have, by these exercises, been reduced-reduced to absurdities. It is not a case of “twiddle-dee and twiddle-dum” but the singing “fiddle is whistled dumb.” So, burst those drums, and beat your bazookas into pruning hooks and cut off all additions such as instrumental music being in heaven, and what heaven ought to be in the church? If what is done in heaven ought to be done in the church, what what is done in heaven ought not to be done in the church. Except for those who are unwilling to “Let marriage be had in honor by all,” the argument proves too much, hence, proves nothing. If such arguing could succeed, it would be no advantage to go to heaven, for all that is in the church and home would be argued into heaven. Can you imagine angels singing, “I am bound for the promised land,” when “all in the heaven” they wanted was a home on earth where they could be in a human church, where God’s will is changed to suit men?!

The argument has been advanced, it is one of the most common, that in instrumental music is in the home, therefore it ought to be used in the church. Paul “cuts that off right even with the ground” when he asked, “Have ye not houses (homes) to eat and to drink in?” Showing that though they could eat their meals at home without sinning, they were not to eat them in their assembly for worship. What was right in the home was sin in the church, in that case. It is legitimate to wash hands or feet in the home as acts of cleanliness, yet they worship God in vain who do either as acts of worship to Him. It is not in heaven. (Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other). But farther.

1. What is in the home equals what is not in the church.
2. What is not in heaven equals what is not in heaven.
3. What is in the home equals what is in heaven.

What is the difference in the home, the church and heaven? If heaven is like the home and the church, what advancement will be made when we go there? It looks like a homely heaven instead of a heavenly home if such reasoning is correct. But the “yea fools” of Isaiah’s prophecy (35:8) can see the absurdity of such nonsense.

The Holy Place in the tabernacle was a type of the church, and the Most Holy Place typified heaven. (Heb. 9) Now, according to previous arguments, what is in heaven ought to be in the church and what is not in heaven ought not to be in the church. Reasoning backward from antitype to type: What was in the Most Holy Place ought to have been in the Holy Place and what was not in the Most Holy Place should not have been in the Holy Place either. To illustrate: The ark of the covenant ought to have been in the Holy Place while the table of shewbread should never have been there for it was not in the Most Holy Place. To continue: What the people had in their tents (homes) ought to have been in the Holy Place of the tabernacle, and what they did not have in their tents ought not to have been in the Holy Place. You see, what the Lord wanted He did not know and what He gets He surely must enjoy! (7)
Every Mrs. Smith wants to be assured that she receives three full yards of velvet when she pays two dollars a yard for it. And now that grapefruit and oranges are sold by the pound, she wants to be certain the grocer's scales measure true pounds. What a condition our country would be in were there no standards, no models, to measure pounds and yards! Business would be slowed nearly to a standstill. The housewife would distrust the meat man more nearly than she does now. Everything in buying and selling would be in complete and continuous turmoil.

All of us, without an exception, agree there must be standard weights and measures. So important is that fact, the Federal Government maintains a special “National Bureau of Standards,” in Washington, D. C. The Government knows that for merchandising to be honest every gallon of gasoline must be as nearly a gallon as possible, and every pound of potatoes must be sixteen ounces. Because scales and measures vary so much, Uncle Sam keeps a model, a standard, to which all must be compared. He has made his models of materials that expand and contract the least of all metals, for he wants a yard to be 36 inches in August, and to be exactly 36 inches in January. He intends that all weights must meet the standard of that plain cylinder, 90 percent of platinum and 10 percent of iridium, kept in a vault; and he intends that every inch must meet the standard of the “National Prototype Meter,” 3.28 feet, likewise made of platinum and iridium.

If purely mercenary matters are important enough to be regulated by models, how much more important is it that in religious affairs there be a standard model, unvarying and invariable. Potatoes deal only with our animal nature, but souls live on and on and on! Souls never go out of existence. And God Almighty recognized the supreme importance of a model church, and has made that church to be seen yet, that by it all churches might model themselves. That standard model of God's church is not housed in a bureau building in Washington, or in any other city. God's model lives in the undying Bible. Though the heavens and the earth pass away, the picture of that model will survive. Churches come and churches go, but God's church stays the same. A platinum and iridium model, even with meticulous care, varies, but the Almighty's model inscribed in Holy Writ is affected neither by summer nor winter, neither by the passing of ages nor the fall of nations. Man's standard is admittedly imperfect, but God pronounced his model as the "perfect law of liberty," (James 1:25.)

There are so many different kinds of churches in America-over two hundred. Sincere people have often been in the difficulty: what church is right? All of them have good people in them, and all have hypocrites. All of them teach good things. Yet a man cannot conveniently join all of them. How can a man be sure he is right?

Friends, we appeal to you to cut loose from all denominations, turn back to God's approved model church, and compare yourselves with it. Let me do that; let us all do that.

If we all will go back to the divine model, what a marvelous unity there will be in religion. There will not be a Methodist Christian, a Mormon Christian, a Catholic Christian. They will all be one, and be willing to worship in the same house, and eat the Lord's supper together. As there is only one approved model yard, 36 inches, there is only one approved model church. When Americans follow the standard yardstick, they don't have over two hundred different measures; and when Americans follow the standard church, they will not have over two hundred different churches!

Permit me to mention some of the characteristics of God's model. It is the only one that matters. No matter how many counterfeit scales are in circulation, the standard scales in Washington are the only ones that matter. Study first The Law of Admission into God's church. When Jesus Christ had flown through the clouds back to his Father, his instructed apostles went to Jerusalem to wait for the baptism of the Holy Spirit. When God's Spirit came, they were all with one accord in one place; they need not worry what to say, what to preach, for God's Spirit would put the words on their tongues. They were different from every race, every country, but they could make no error in their words, in their doctrine, for God's Spirit cannot make errors. Hence, we see the importance of studying this model of 2,000 years ago, for if ever the things were preached in this world that God Almighty wants preached, it was when preachers were guided in every word by the Holy Spirit. What did those inspired preachers say about the law of admission into God's church?

1. They preached. What does that mean? It means they were not talking to babies, nor anybody else that cannot reason and act for himself. It means they wanted to influence responsible people by the words of their mouths. It means the people were not expecting an outpouring of the Spirit upon them to save them; for if so, preaching would have been unnecessary and the God of Heaven does not waste time in unnecessary matters. Preaching was essential. It has pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save people. (I Cor. 1:21) “For whatsoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?” (Romans 10:13,14) Because people cannot be saved without preaching, Christ carefully trained his apostles to do that very work. Well, what did they preach?

2. They preached Jesus Christ. "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you by miracles and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you, as ye yourselves also know: Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death: because it was not possible that he should be holden of it...His soul was not left in Hades, neither his flesh did see corruption...He being set at the right hand of God...And all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.” (Acts 2:22-36) When the Spirit-inspired preacher had announced those bold and glorious facts, the listening crowd "were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do?” (Vs. 37) To that grave, soul-searching question, what did the preachers say? They told the people what to do. God's preachers not only told the good news of Jesus' resurrection from the dead, the first born of all creation, but they told the people what they must do to be saved. Those preachers believed that Jesus died for everybody, but they did not think that was enough; they thought men and women must know about that sacrifice of Jesus, hence, they preached the story of the cross; they thought men and women must do something them-
selves, even though Jesus had died. Those people did not believe every body will be saved, regardless of what he does, or how he lives. Those preachers told the people they were in sin, and undone before the God of the universe. The people believed they were in sin, and begged for the way to get rid of that sin; they did not want to die without God and without hope. What did the preachers say? “Get saved and join the church of your choice?” Well-meaning pastors talk that way today, but did God’s preachers, in a model sermon, talk that way? What did they say? “Believe only and you will be saved?” Peter said, “Re-pent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” (Acts 2:38) That record has not been changed by God’s approval. And it is in perfect harmony with every statement in the Bible. If I say that to be saved all one has to do is to believe, I flatly contradict the divine model. One has to believe; without faith he cannot please God; but even the devils believe; thousands believe, who are not saved. One must have faith enough to go ahead and repent of his sins, and be baptized unto the remission of those sins. All other statements in the Bible harmonize with the utterances of Acts 2:38, for the same Spirit of God wrote every statement.

Furthermore, every preacher will tell you that if a sinner believes in Jesus, repents of his sins, is baptized, that sinner is saved, has become a Christian, has been born again. Nobody doubts that arrangement; and it fits perfectly with the model God left in the Bible. Men give other ways today, but they all say, the divine model is right. Can you and I afford to put our souls in an unknown balance? For the sake of eternity, we had better use a balance about which there is not one question!

What, then, was the law of admission into God’s church? 1. There was preaching. 2. They preached Jesus Christ. 3. They told the people to repent and be baptized. And the record tells us that as many as gladly received the word were baptized, and there were added unto them that day about three thousand souls. What if you and I do the same things? If then we do not know we are saved, how can we ever know it? If following the standard model will not guarantee us, what can we follow? After those people were saved in that model church, what did they do? How did they worship? We do not have to guess how the first Christians worshipped, for in the same divine book the pattern, the model of Approved Worship is set forth. Acts 2, verse 42, tells us: “And they continued steadfastly in the apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, in breaking of bread, and in prayers.” Those people continued steadfastly in the doctrine of the Spirit-breathed preachers. Theirs was not a particular denominational notion, not the writings of some human creed book; the apostles’ doctrine was true and as broad as God wanted it to be; in religion, any other doctrine than the apostles’ cannot be true. (Matt.10:14, 15, 40) Many churches today in America are continuing steadfastly in current events; their pastors give lectures on the political situation; and unless the pastor is able to review some of the recent books from the pulpit, he is ashamed of himself.

One professor in a theological seminary advised the evolving pastors to read all the popular magazines that they might keep informed enough to talk with all their parishioners.

Not only is it true that the popular denominations refuse to continue in the apostles’ doctrine, but many people claiming to be Christians only, do not study the Bible steadfastly. Too many satisfy themselves up the weekly Sunday School lesson. Friends, nobody can be right in religion if he does not continue steadfastly in studying the apostles’ doctrine; he cannot know what is right in any other way.

The first members of the church, in following that doctrine, continued in the fellowship—they were partners one with another, members one of another, and thus in fellowship contributed freely of their means. They did not continue steadfastly in pie suppers or in any other church merchandising scheme; they gave, from their hearts. The apostles’ teaching also led the first Christians to continue steadfastly in the breaking of bread, the observance of the Lord’s supper. They would not leave known that they should break bread steadfastly if the apostles’ doctrine had not been planted in them. Many people today continue in the breaking of bread irregularly, spasmodically; but in the long ago God’s model of an approved church broke bread steadfastly. From Hebrews 10:25, I Cor. 16:2, and Acts 20:7 we learn that the apostles’ doctrine led Christians to assemble on the first day of the week to break bread. Under the same doctrine, learned from the same teachers, the Jerusalem church broke the bread and drank of the cup on the first day of the week, the day in which the Lord arose from the dead. Hence the divine model, God’s approved standard, was of a church observing the communion every week. What if we today fell short of the model set forth for our guidance?

Prayers were another item of the worship of God’s model church; in them the brethren likewise continued steadfastly, believing their petitions effected much. Some so-called Christians and preachers today do not believe in prayer; they are modernistic Christians; they cannot see how prayer can change anything in the running of the universe. I am not entering into a discussion now of the value of prayer; I am just trying to set forth the fact that in the first church on this earth, a church taught by God-inspired men, the members continued steadfastly in prayers. What if we today fall short of the model set forth for our guidance?

Those same apostles taught other churches to sing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs unto God and to each other, making melody in their hearts. What they taught one church we know they taught every church. Hence, the doctrine of the apostles is that singing praises, the fruit of our lips, is part of true worship.

A Yardstick

B. L. Douthitt tells of a old-time general store far back in the country. A Government inspector came one day, checked the yardstick and found it an inch short of the approved standard. Would it have done any good for the storekeeper to say, “An inch is a small matter?” Would it have done any good for him to say, “Well, my father used this yardstick before me, and what was good enough for my father is good enough for me.” The inspector would tell him, “Though your father was undoubtedly a good man, he was mistaken; he did not know he was wrong, but you do; and you cannot be honest and keep using a false yardstick.” There are people in religion, right here in educated America, that talk just the way of the country storekeeper. Concerning instrumental music, or money schemes, or other innovations, they say, “Such are small matters; say nothing of them.” But who are we to decide what is a small matter and what is a big one? Even if the storekeeper considered one inch a small matter, the Washington official was the one to decide; just so, though we consider some things insignificant in the worship of the church, it is not our place to decide what is insignificant; the divine model given in the Bible is our only standard; we had (Continued On Page 21)
One apostle speaks of the writings of another apostle after this manner: "And account that the long-suffering of our Lord is salvation; even as our beloved brother Paul also according to the wisdom given unto him hath written unto you; as also, in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction." 2 Pet. 3:15, 16.

To wrest means to distort, pervert, change, turn or twist. And when we consider the depth of many of the writings of the apostle Paul we do not wonder that those who are unlearned may change, pervert, or wrest such scriptures to their own destruction. But the process of "wresting the scriptures" is not limited to those who are unlearned—it is done also by those who are unstable. Not all of the "unstable" can be classed as the "unlearned." The unlearned may be unstable; but there are many others who are recognized as learned men who are also unstable. Neither is "wresting the scriptures" confined to the writings, especially the hard-to-be-understood writings, of the apostle Paul. But unstable teachers are guilty of perverting, or wresting, the writings of all the inspired men. Such teachers are the kind Paul described, who "corrupt (deal deceitfully with) the word of God." 2 Cor. 2:17. They are unreliable, teachers and are guilty of perverting the words of eternal truth. Let us, therefore, note some examples of such wresting of the Scriptures.

Instrumental Music In Zion

Preachers of the Christian Church, in their desperation to find some semblance of authority for their mechanical instruments of music in Christian worship, often refer to the 87th Psalm. The Psalm reads as follows:

"His foundation is in the holy mountains. The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob. Glorious things are spoken of thee, 0 city of God. Selah. I will make mention of Rahab and Babylon to them that know me: behold Philistia, and Tyre even with Ethiopia; this man was born there. And of Zion it shall be said, This and that man was born in her; and the highest himself shall establish her. The Lord shall count, when he writeth up the people, that this man was born there. Selah. As well the singers as the players on the instruments shall be there: all my springs are in thee."

The last verse of this Psalm is the one taken to support to the use of instrumental music in divine worship today. David says: "As well the singers as the players on the instruments shall be there." And then by dropping back to the preceding verses it is shown that "there" refers to Zion. So both singers and players on instruments were to be in Zion. Then with dexterity they turn to Paul's statement in Heb. 12:22, 23: "But ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first-born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect." From this passage it is emphasized that Zion is the church. But the prophecy in the 87th Psalm says "the players on the instruments shall be in Zion." So it is concluded that this is a prophecy concerning instrumental music in the church of the Lord. Thus they hope they have found scriptural authority for the use of instrumental music in the church today. But to connect these passages is nothing less than "wresting the scriptures." Let us take a look into these matters and see if such an application of the prophecy in Psalms 87 is not a plain perversion of divine truth. It is true that Paul calls Zion the church in Heb. 12. But does that mean that the word Zion, wherever found, must refer to the church? No one will dispute that it sometimes does; but does it always do so? Can that be the meaning of "Zion" in Psalms 87? If Zion there means the church, then we have a prophecy of instrumental music in the church. However, we would be faced with the fact that the prophecy was not fulfilled in the history of the church in the days of the apostles, for there is no intention that instrumental music was ever played in the church during their lives. But Zion does not always mean the church. Instead it refers to a literal place. By reading 1 Chron. 11:5,6 you will find that Jerusalem is referred to as "Zion, which is the city of David." And in Isa. 10:24 we have Jerusalem mentioned under the name of Zion. Then Isa. 147:12 the words Jerusalem and Zion are used interchangeably. These statements all show that Zion cannot always refer to the church but that the word often refers to a literal city, the city of Jerusalem. There is, therefore, a literal Zion (Jerusalem) and a spiritual Zion (the church). Now the question that confronts us is, Which Zion is mentioned in Psalms 87?

Read verse 2 of that Psalm and you will be able to tell. Thd verse reads: "The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob." Whatever Zion referred to in this case is a Zion that has gates. Can this really be said of the church? Does the church (spiritual Zion) have gates? I know there is a means of entrance into the church, and by figure of speech it might be called a gate, but even at that there is only one way of entrance. But literal Zion (Jerusalem) had gates. It was surrounded by a wall. Roads leading to the city from different directions passed through gates in the wall. Thus it is seen that reference is to literal Zion instead of spiritual Zion. But note again the statement: "The Lord loveth the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob." Two words in this statement are of the utmost importance in understanding this Psalm—the words Zion and Jacob. On the one hand there is a literal Zion and there is a literal Jacob; and on the other hand a spiritual Zion and a spiritual Jacob or Israel. Literal Zion was Jerusalem and literal Jacob was the Jews, or fleshly Israel. Spiritual Zion means the church, and spiritual Jacob, or Israel, means Christians. Now in this statement in Psalms the words must either have their literal meaning or their spiritual meaning. If Zion is to be taken in its spiritual sense Jacob must also be. We cannot make Zion in the passage mean the church and at the same time make Jacob mean fleshly Jews. So the meaning of each word may be substituted for the word itself, and by so doing, we can determine what is the correct application of the passage. Let us suppose the words are used in their spiritual sense, that Zion means the church and Jacob means Christians, and see how the matter works out. Read it this way: "The Lord loveth the church more than all the dwellings of Christians." This must be the meaning of it if the passage has reference to the church. The text plainly states that "Jacob" has other dwelling places besides Zion, but the Lord loves Zion more than all the others. But where do Christians dwell besides in the church? Are there Christians elsewhere? Certainly this is not true—all Christians dwell in the church, they have no other dwelling place. So this passage cannot refer
to the church nor to Christians, but it does refer to literal Zion and fleshly Israel. Zion was God’s chosen city. It was there that the king ruled upon his throne; there God had established his worship; the temple was built there; and many of fleshly Israel lived there. But many of them dwelt in other cities of Judea—yet God loved Zion, or Jerusalem, more than all their other dwellings. To make this passage refer to the church is a distinct “wresting of the scriptures.” Why do men take a passage and make it mean what it evidently does not mean? The only reason is that they need some proof of their theories, and where it cannot be found, the scriptures must be twisted into some semblance of proof.

Direct Call To Preach

Another example of “wresting the scriptures” is found in the use that denominational preachers make of Heb. 5:4. The language of the inspired writer in this passage reads as follows: “And no man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.” Much has been said by preachers regarding a direct call to the ministry. It is claimed that God must call each man personally and directly who is to become a proclaimer of the gospel, that thus he must be called and qualified or he acts presumptuously if he undertakes to preach the word of the Lord. There is no disposition on my part to say that men are not called to the ministry, or even that they are not divinely called, but men are called to preach in the same way that they are called to sing, or to pray, or to do any other service for the Lord, but that call comes not directly. It comes to men through the gospel. 2 Thes. 2:13, 14. Yet we are reminded by modern preachers that Paul said: “No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.” And since God specifically and personally called Aaron to his work, it is concluded that for a man to have the honor of preaching he must have a like call. That all looks very fine on the face of it, but a little study of the passage shows the fallacy of this contention and that it is but a perversion of divine truth.

There is an “honor” mentioned in the passage that a man is not allowed to take to himself—an honor to which the person must be as definitely and specifically called as was Aaron. But is it the “honor” of preaching? If so, then a man must be directly called in order to preach the gospel. But the inspired writer had no reference to the honor of
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The What, Where And When Of Man’s Salvation

JOHN W. HEDGE

Three questions may be asked with reference to man’s salvation from sin as follows:

First, What does God require man to be in order to salvation?

One does not have to be anything politically, fraternally, or denominationally in order to be saved. Man can be saved without identification with any particular political party, lodge, or denominational church. Denominationalists teach it that way themselves. Why be a Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian? Why be more than what God requires one to be in order to be saved? One cannot be less than what God requires in order to be saved and it is exceedingly dangerous to try to be more. “If any man suffer as a Christian let him not be ashamed but let him glorify God in this name.” (1 Pet. 4:16). To be a Christian is equal to being saved. To be less than a Christian is equal to being lost. To be more than a Christian is equal to going beyond the doctrine of Christ (for he does not teach you to be more than a Christian in the doctrine) and the Bible says, “Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God.” (2 Jno. 9) Can you persuade yourself to believe that the man who “hath not God” can be saved?

Second, where has man’s salvation been placed according to God’s arrangement? I read, “I will place salvation in Zion for Israel my glory.” (Isa. 46:13). Here we have the place of salvation in prophecy. Heb. 2:18-23 is the fulfillment of this prophecy. “But ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn.” Just as sure as God has placed salvation “in Zion,” and just as sure as “Zion” is the church of Christ, just that sure must man become a member of the church of Christ in order to salvation.

The Lord added to the church (Zion) daily “such as should be saved.” (Acts 2:47) Again we read, “And he is the saviour of the body.” (Eph. 5:23) The position that one can be saved out of the church the saved body-is equal to saying that salvation is not where God said He would “place” it, and moreover it is equal to saying that Christ is not only the “saviour” of the “body,” but of something else as well. Now, let the advocates of this position tell us what other body of people in addition to the church “body” will be saved. We are told that the church, “which is the body of Christ,” (Col. 1:24) was “purchased” with the blood of Christ. (Acts 20:28) What other body has been purchased by the blood of Christ? If it cannot be shown that some other body in addition to the church has been purchased by the blood of Christ, then it cannot be proved that man can be saved in some other body. Or, if it can be proved that he can be saved in a body not purchased by the blood of Christ, then it is thereby proved that man can be saved without the blood of Christ, the purchase price paid for the church. It is nothing short of a plain denial of the word of God to say that responsible people can be saved outside of the New Testament church. Jesus said, “Seek and ye shall find.” The man who “seeks” salvation outside of “Zion”—the body of Christ—is seeking for “the water of life” on dry territory.

Third, when must man avail himself of the opportunity of being saved? We answer this question with following quotations: “Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.” (2 Cor. 6:2) “Today if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.” (Heb. 3:7) The will of God is plain with reference to the time of man’s salvation. Despite this plainly taught fact some men persist in teaching others of a “second day of grace” when the Lord comes and I’m sure you will not argue with me over that. We read of a “closed door,” a “harvest that is passed,” and a “separation” between the “sheep, and the goats” in connection with Christ’s second coming in the Bible. Compare these figures of speech with the doctrine of a “second day of grace” when the Lord comes and I’m sure you will be convinced of the error of such doctrine. Closing I will say that certainly man must be what? In character only a Christian. In location, Where? A “member of the body of Christ.” He must avail himself of the opportunity. When? Now— for “Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, today is the day of salvation.”
IN-CULLINGS-COMMENTS
AND CORRESPONDENCE

Kentucky Currents
E. G. CREACY
Seems Baffled

The managing editor of the new paper—the “copyright” paper—seems considerably baffled. He is having a hard time explaining so many things. The official set-up, the editorial veto board, the Davidson connection, and various other connections impose a laborious task upon him. It is really amusing. This new movement is a religious farce. I do not mean to aid it, nor by silence sanction it, nor by neutrality encourage it. Of course, some well meaning brethren will be more or less misled by this new movement. This, as I see it, is the most unfortunate thing about it.

Only A Hint

“There is a need for such a paper,” is the expressed sentiment I hear everywhere where I go on the part of informed brethren. The Bible Banner is certainly filling a niche in the walls of spiritual Zion, not occupied by any other paper. But the Bible Banner can do good only to the extent it is read. Every lover of truth and the principles for which it stands, should rally to its support. Preachers who are in sympathy with these divine principles should secure a good list of subscriptions. Merely making announcements will not do—this is good, but it is not sufficient. Tell them you are taking the subscriptions, and then see them personally. Yes, it will work—try it. It is a service that should be rendered, in the interest of truth and the cause of Christ.

The Babbler Reports

In a current issue of The Babbler (organ of D. L. C.) we are informed that “fourteen students were personally interviewed by a Babbler reporter concerning the question of premillennialism.” The Babbler further states that these students knew little about the theory, and yet the Babbler refers to the theory as an issue confronting present-day Christians. It is strange that these students “knew so little about the theory” if it is an issue confronting present-day Christians! Are the students properly taught the truth “concerning issues confronting present-day Christians” at David Lipscomb College? Premillennialism is one of the issues. In David Lipscomb’s day, the students were taught the truth in a very definite way concerning all issues confronting Christians. I am sure all Christians wish it were that way today.

Who Is Responsible?

It is a lamentable fact, fifty or more years ago, the body of Christ was rent asunder by a movement that represented an element in the church that was not satisfied with the simplicity of the church in work and worship, as outlined in the New Testament. In some sections of the country this movement practically swept the whole church into a whirl-pool of sectarianism. As final results of this movement, we have the so-called Christian Church or Disciples of Christ denomination. The digressives have peddled the falsehood that those who opposed their unscriptural innovations caused the division.

In 1932 the Convention of the Christian Churches in Kentucky selected Dr. A. W. Fortune, of Lexington, to write a “History of the Disciples in Kentucky.” The book of more than four hundred pages was published. Though a modernist in the Christian Church, Dr. Fortune laid aside his bias and wrote as a true historian. He gave to the reading public a valuable book of authentic information. On the question of instrumental music, page 372, Dr. Fortune said: “The introduction of the organ into the worship of the church was the occasion of a bitter controversy, and was one of the main causes of the division which finally came.” It is certainly true, those who introduced instrumental music and other unscriptural innovations into the church, are responsible for the division. And those who practice these things today perpetuate that division.

Who is responsible for the confusion and division today over the fanciful theories of premillennialism in the church of Christ? Brother R. H. Boll and his followers are responsible. It is as impossible for R. H. Boll to shift the responsibility of this division from himself to another as it was for old Pilate to wash his hands of the blood of Jesus who stood before him as the victim of his treachery. And what about those who claim they do not believe and teach the Boll theories, but aid him by their so-called neutral attitude? In reality, they are not neutral!
Telegram

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.
Care W. A. Wakefield, Corpus Christi, Texas.

Harry Rimmer international scientist and Presbyterian faith is lecturing in Norman under auspices of Baptist Student Union. He affirms the Lord Jesus Christ will return to this earth in physical and bodily form to reign on the earth for one thousand years in a physical kingdom. This reign to follow the resurrection of the just commonly called the first resurrection. Also denies apostasy. Rimmer agrees to publicly discuss these while on future engagements here. Will you represent the church in said propositions. Answer Western Union immediately.

Weldon B. Bennett, Minister Church of Christ.

* * *

Weldon B. Bennett
Minister Church of Christ
Norman, Oklahoma

It is a pleasure to accept invitation to meet Dr. Harry Rimmer in debate. Let him affirm exact proposition stated in telegram and I will deny. Advise me as to arrangement of dates. Congratulations to you on your alertness and interest in the cause.

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

* * *

Mr. Weldon B. Bennett
Minister Church of Christ
Norman, Oklahoma

Dear Brother Bennett:

Upon receipt of your telegram this morning, I wired you as follows: "It is a pleasure to accept invitation to meet Dr. Harry Rimmer in debate. Let him affirm exact proposition stated in telegram and I will deny. Advise me as to arrangement of dates. Congratulations to you on your alertness and interest in the cause."

It will indeed be an unusual opportunity for good if such a discussion as indicated may be had with such an eminent man as Harry Rimmer. The only thing I fear is that something may prevent its consummation.

I am very anxious to hear from you further of the details. If it is possible to get a proposition on the restoration of Israel and on baptism in addition to the two propositions named, it will add much to the opportunity for good, as all of these questions should be discussed in proper order.

I shall await further word from you with a keen interest. Let me thank you for the confidence you have indicated in me by this invitation.

Faithfully and fraternally yours,

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

Views And Viewpoints

WILL M. THOMPSON

"Preach the Word, reprove, rebuke, and exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine, and be instant in season and out of season." This charge was given by Paul to Timothy. It is a sacred, solemn charge. Ministers of the gospel should feel keenly their responsibility to God in carrying out this charge in its completeness. We should not do any part to the exclusion of the other. Let us hew to the line.

* * *

"The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." To this commitment the faithful preacher will ever be true. When true to this commitment we will ever be found walking by faith. We will not be engaging in speculative teaching, but we will be edifying the church, and enlarging the borders of Zion.

* * *

One of my preaching brethren writes in one of the papers to tell all of us preachers how to preach, and the kind of clothes to wear, also tells us that he believes in debates, and that he calls names, even over the air, but none of the denominational preachers ever questions what he says, or words to that effect! It is wonderful that we have men like this among us. Poor old brother Campbell, Scott, Smith and others, if they had only had this brother's manner of approach, what could they have done in their day? I've been wondering why we were not having the debates we once had. Since our college preachers have appeared on the scene these false teachers have taken to tall timber-eh?

* * *

It is fine that we all do not have the same manner of approach. If all preachers were like me, what a wonderful group we would be. Different preachers appeal to different people. The more preachers we have, the more peculiarities we have. Human weakness is manifest in all. Too many of us have the idea that what "I" do is right, what the other fellow does is wrong. The wheels of Zion, if Zion has wheels, will continue to roll after the little space I occupy in the church has been vacated by my departure to higher realms. The same is true with you, brother preacher. The church has stood the test of time, and cannot be killed even by preachers and members among us. If fussing and quarreling among us would have killed the church, it would have been dead a long time ago.
Going Up To Jerusalem
THOS. G. BUTLER
(Lakeland, Fla.)
When the Hardeman meeting was announced in Jerusalem (Nashville) I was determined to go up to this religious center to enjoy and fellowship in a concerted movement to re-emphasize the “Restoration Plea.” The meeting was so significant to me that I induced the church to pay my expenses. The church at Largo, Fla., did the same for Bro. Fred Walker. These congregations were deeply interested in the effort to emphasize the principles of the “Restoration Movement,” and in things which would help their preachers to grow.

Having never been to Jerusalem (Nashville), and having heard so many glowing reports of the work and unity of the churches, excitement increased with each mile traversed. While in the city my physical comforts were adequately supplied. True Christian hospitality was extended on every hand. Unlike the certain man who fell among thieves, I came away in fine physical shape, but my spiritual being was not strengthened very much. The hopes of receiving inspiration from unity were built on false premises. I give you without bias, prejudice, or partiality some things which impressed me unfavorably while I was in Nashville.

1. Some of the leading preachers of the city were not there to give moral support to the meeting.
2. Central church would not announce the meeting, and would not have anything to do with it.
3. Other large congregations did announce the meeting, but did not give any active support.
4. Courtesy extended to denominational preachers by some was withheld from Brother Hardeman.
5. I attended chapel at the college one morning, and not one word was said about the meeting. (I could almost hear Brother Lipscomb groan.)
6. A preacher should never say anything about the sects. The slogans were: “Preach the word, and leave others alone!” “Winners never knock, and knockers never win.” (If these slogans are true, Harding, Lipscomb, Sewell, Srygley, et al., were wrong in warring against error.)
7. The good names of Wallace, Hardeman, and Boles were questioned.
You must not say anything harmful about those who support the Boll foolishness, but we can say all we care to about men who have always stood for the truth. This is exactly the way the denominations fight the church down in these parts.

8. Wallace, Hardeman, Harper, Srygley, and Lewis are doing more harm than R. H. Boll, so I heard. (Brother Cled, you were left out.)
9. Several congregations in Nashville are satisfied to pay preachers who work for a living the sum of five dollars per Sunday.
10. The envy existing between preachers is more bitter than that which existed between the Pharisees, and Sadauces. (I suppose this is the source from which Nashville derived the name, the Jerusalem of America.)

I ask you candidly and frankly, is Nashville the place for young preachers to go to get strength, enthusiasm, and inspiration? “O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets, (Wallace, Hardeman, and Boles) and stonest them which are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not.”

Going Courting
H. C. WINNETT
(Avon Park, Fla.)
The condition is indeed becoming serious in the eyes of many a young preacher. When we see from the writings and hear from word of mouth the weakening of so many men whom in the past have been considered by us as faithful, tried and true in the gospel.

As I read and re-read many statements made in the article entitled “Premillennialism” by G. C. Brewer in Feb. 2, 1939, issue of the Gospel Advocate, I am made to wonder if the soft-sold method of preaching is not creeping into the church more and more all the time. From the above mentioned article I quote, “I am now more strongly convinced than I ever was before that such ideas as that the kingdom of Daniel 2:44 was not set up on Pentecost, and that Christ is not now seated upon the throne that was foreseen and promised in ‘the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms,’ and that the present kingdom, or church, came in as an afterthought and as a substitute for the kingdom of Jewish hope, should not one time be mentioned among us as men professing to have direct Bible authority for what we teach.” Brethren, in the light of what God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit has revealed to us on the above subjects, I am unable to understand how anyone except a compromising person could make such a statement.

In Eph. 3:10, 11, the Apostle Paul says, “To the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord.” How can anyone, “not one time mention,” the theory regarding the church or kingdom being an “afterthought” or “substitute,” when Paul says that the church through which all might know, “the manifold wisdom of God” is according to the eternal purpose of God. So, if the church was not in the mind of God from the beginning, what does Paul propose to teach here?

It is apparent that many preachers are becoming very apologetic and compromising in their preaching. Courting, as it were, the favor of the premillennialists and sectarians. When preachers go courting to the extent of calling upon sectarian preachers to lead prayer and dismiss the service, to my mind they are getting ready for the marriage ceremony. Now, Bro. Brewer, is it not true that some gospel preachers have been guilty, recently, of calling upon sectarian preachers to lead prayer and dismiss services? You might be able to correct a college president on that compromising blunder.

Brethren, I love the church and the gospel of the Lord Jesus and believe it should be preached plainly, and without apology for so doing. Let all of us take our stand upon God’s word and fight, fight, fight.

Sermon Making
I am always trying to find some good thought that would make a sermon. I generally keep a small notebook in my pocket and when I see or hear something that I think would make a good sermon I jot it down and come back to it later. Lately I heard about a man who was “lost to us” for twenty years. That sounded like good sermon material. I had heard something about a person being lost once that I thought might be good to connect with it for a sermon. I finally found it in the fifteenth chapter of Luke, the story of the prodigal son. I thought I would put the two together and “wax eloquent.” First, he was “lost to us” for twenty years. The prodigal son was also lost, Lk. 15:32. Fine so far. Second, the prodigal son spent his money. Our “lost boy” forgot the Lord and made money. Will not fit so well. Third, the prodigal son ate with the hogs. Our “lost boy” ate off the fat of the land. Our “lost boy” forgot the Lord and made money. Will not fit so well. Fourth, the prodigal son came to his father and said “I have sinned.” Our “lost boy” said “I’ll show you how to run things.” Oh, who wanted to make a sermon out of that anyway?-Cleon Lyles.
“NEUTRALITY:” A COLLOQUY
A. B. KEENAN

In Louisville there once did dwell a man.
The pages of the Bible who did scan:
He gathered round him numerous lesser lights
Who, when challenged, said, “we scorn all fights!”
But on they went to split a holy church.
“Stop this at once! Our fair names you besmirch!”
“Oh, is that so! ’’ the offended ones did cry.
“Of course it is. Our cult you shan’t deny.”
So thought some “mod’rates” ranged the country round:
“Just count me neutral. On some things they’re sound.”
“Sounds? Can they be when they deny so much?”
“Just so. But keep your mind off Boll and such
And mind your own affairs. We must keep peace!”
“What, and let the pure, old Gospel cease?”
“Come now, brother, don’t you get all heated;
That’s just what’s wrong! Confusion on that point
Will soon destroy us-soon will make disjoint
Our whole peculiar plea! Now don’t you see
That to suggest Christ may not throned be
Is simply bringing into gravest doubt
Our whole peculiar plea! Now don’t you see
Or Pastor Russell, Boll or other light
What views of prophets’ word he sees
What views of nrophets’ word he sees:
“New.”
In spite of the fact that Bollite wits do lump them both together, and make their own beliefs of visions more than equal known.
Concise, exact, and clear as crystal word
On page of Peter, Paul, and John!”
“Absurd!”
Why these good folks are simply of the view
That we must take the whole word through and through.”
“Thanks: As though we’re not! We too believe in
All the Word of God.-to do so not is sin.
But we insist there must a difference be
Twixt what is plain and what we dark-er see:
That when we delve into the passage ‘dark’
We judge its meaning by the ‘light,’ not park
Our senses in some pleasant glade of White,
Or Pastor Russell, Boll, or other light
Who loves into the crystal ball to paze
And see the Jews restored.-a devious maze!”
What harm’s in that? Can’t all agree to take
What views of nrophets’ word he wants? Forsake
Our years of team work just because some feel
‘A little different? That’s a raw deal!”
The trouble is, good friend, that Word and Work
Does not conclude these views ‘opinions. Shirk
Not your duty to admit that Brother Boll insists them part of faith-none other!
If he is right, then we are wrong, you see.
For both cannot be right and not agree.”
“Why attempt to raise some lame sensations!”
‘Lame,’ you say? Take now the dispensations:

Scofield says that there are plainly seven:
Boll agrees; but do you know that this side heaven
Are only three: the patr’archs, Moses, Christ?
To leave this truth with strange ones we must tryst:
Must get in league with Norris and his ilk:
With honeyed phrase and voices soft as silk
Pack in the folks who love so much to hear
The doom of Hitler and his kindred dear.
To read the portents of the times draw nigh
When Christ on snow white horse from out the sky
To earth does come to reign a thousand years.
To sit in Zion old mid joyful tears
And wreak his vengeful will on nations round
Whilst Jews and Gentiles his decrees propound
And occupy some nearby thrones and halls
Whilst Satan’s hosts are fouled in chains and balls!
so “Neutrals,” dear, we can’t His word defraud:
It’s be with Boll, or take your stand with God!

Making Contacts
Dear Brother Wallace,
The elders of the Central Church of Christ in Los Angeles are endeavoring to contact members of other congregations throughout the United States who have and are contemplating moving into metropolitan Los Angeles. Our experience here over a period of years convinces us there are hundreds if not several thousand members of the church who have moved here from other sections of the country who are now lost to the church. They are either not going to church at all or have affiliated with the Christian Church or some denominational church.
Will you please send to us the names and addresses of members of the church whom you know have moved or are contemplating moving to Los Angeles or its vicinity? In as much as the Central congregation is located geographically in the center of the metropolitan district, we believe a great work can be done along this line. We will reciprocate and inform you of members who are moving to your city.

Fraternally yours,
The Elders
Central Church of Christ
12th and Hoover,
Los Angeles, Calif.
WE THANK GOD AND TAKE COURAGE

When the brethren from Rome came down the Appian Way to meet Paul, and by their words and presence to encourage him, “he thanked God and took courage.” The many expressions of good will and encouragement being received does in great measure the same thing for us and believing that the readers may also find encouragement in these assurances coming from the far and wide, we pass them on—Editor.

The Bible Banner came yesterday. I just have to write you this note to tell you I think it is the best yet. If you can keep it a twenty-four page paper, it is a super and superb defender of “the faith once for all delivered to the saints.” Let us work, hope and pray that our Father, the “Father of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob,” will make it possible to keep it going at this high standard. I believe he will. At any rate, we will “never give up the ship.” If it sinks we will go down with it, and go down fighting for the New Testament Church for which Christ gave his life.—John T. Lewis, Birmingham, Ala.

The current issue of the Bible Banner is a warm number; in fact it is more than warm. Super fine. Keep it coming.—C. R. Nichol, Seminole, Okla.

Your article in the November issue of The Bible Banner on “Bollism” is one of the very best you have ever put out on it. It is timely and I am glad you wrote it. Do not weaken and do not let the fire cool any. I am for you in the work you are doing. I am confident that you are getting more articles than you have space for in the paper, but I will send you another article sometime. If the Jews had accepted Jesus when he came into the world and he had begun his reien in Jerusalem then, when and where would the death of Christ come in according to Brother Boll? Write an article on Boll’s idea of the death of Jesus and the atonement.—G. A. Dunn, Dallas, Texas.

(The Bible Banner will reserve space any time for such articles as G. A. Dunn is able to write. That one on “The Death of Jesus and the Atonement” as related to the Boll idea of things will be just the right subject for your next. Brother Dunn. Let us have it.—Editor.)

The tendency among the preachers-our own is distressing. I wish that every preacher realized that unless we forget about “approach,” “diplomacy,” “method,” and buckle down to preaching the Word, we will degenerate into just another denomination. In respect to diplomacy, I have observed that the more of it used by a preacher, the less gospel he preaches. I intend to make another announcement about the Bible Banner. I hope to send you a subscription list.—J. M. Powell, Louisville Ky.

I just want you to know that I really appreciate the great work you are doing in the Bible Banner. A few of us in Arkansas have been fighting for the “Old Paths” and exposing all errors whether innovations or speculations. The paper is just what we need. Do not let up even though anonymous letters are circulated. No one but an enemy to the truth and a coward will do such things.—B. G. Hope, Paragould, Ark.

Your expose of Clinton Copyright Davidson was more than plenty good.—C. A. Norred, Fort Worth, Texas.

I am a long distance subscriber and reader of The Banner and would just like to express my humble estimation of the same. .. My impression of the Banner (and I have read every issue) is: You are contending “earnestly for the faith” and are “set for the defense of the gospel.” Many church members are so pious and sweet-spirited that they cannot stand an exposure of false doctrine. Even preachers often purposely avoid any question of controversial nature. We are not free from premillennialism in this country, and your opposition to the same has been criticised. .. We hear more criticism of those who oppose error than we do of those who teach error.—John Williams, Beamsville, Ontario, Can.

I have been dishonored by being picked as one to receive the unsigned “sheets” of propaganda against you. The opportunity I have for observation convinces me that they will not get to first base with it. My uncle and brother were here to visit me last week, and we agreed that you could and would defend yourself and man. Heave to it. If you had never done anything else for the cause, you have crystallized the truth of their being a real enemy in the public mind. Selah. Wish I could help you in the fight.—Chas. F. Hardin, Arlington, Texas.

It will be impossible for me to express my appreciation for your fight of faith in “defense of the church against all errors and innovations.” Your labors have not been in vain, and it is my prayer to God that you may be exceedingly blessed with the essential things of life. “Lift ye up a banner upon the high mountain, exalt the voice unto them.” The “journalism” move of the Leader appears to me, of a truth, to be that of premillennialists and apologists. It is my honest conviction that it would have been better for the brotherhood if Brother Rowe had sold out to the denominations. His attitude is manifested in his support of Rutherford and his divisive work in Lexington. .. Trusting that you may continue the vivacious attack on every evil thing that “doth eat as gangrene,” to the glory of God, I am with you in the fight. ..—C. W. Scott, Winchester, Ky.

The January-February issue of the Bible Banner is great. It is packed full of information that all of us need to know. As long as the brotherhood is kept informed, we have little to fear. The Bible Banner fills a real need in this field.—D. H. Hadwin, Belpre, Ohio.