Brother H. Leo Boles rendered a real service to the cause of truth in Indianapolis. In an able speech, he boldly and at times rather bluntly presented the real issues that must be faced and pointed the way to real and righteous unity. This was in significant contrast to the sickening blather of Don Carlos Janes and others who babbled about how much they had come to love the digressives and begged the brethren to quit arguing the question and love it out. My idea of loving the Methodists or anybody else who believes and practices unscriptural things, is to take up the New Testament, point out their errors and insist that they stick to the truth. Jesus says: "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments." I can show my love for him by keeping his commandments, and my love for others by insisting that they do so, too. Blubbering honey-talk is not calculated to convert sinners either outside or inside. Brother Boles is to be congratulated for ignoring the anemic love talk which was threatening to become chronic, and getting down to the point.

The Boles speech got a rise out of the Christian Standard. The editor of the Standard registers disappointment and chagrin and expresses some threats that may bear fruit. It seems to us that Brother Boles has started something. Some great congregational singing was evidently a notable feature of the unity meeting. The Standard crowd "out of courtesy" to the objectors, dispensed with all such "aids" as organs, pianos, horns and flutes. This was a great exhibition of their love for the brethren with tender consciences. They would like for their great love to be repaid with a recognition of their "liberty" to use instruments where the demands of "courtesy" are not as overpowering as they were in Indianapolis. Brother Boles' insistence that unity demands the surrender of the innovations that caused the divisions among us, rather piqued the Standard. It is publishing Brother Boles' speech serially and editorially saying what it thinks of it, which is commendable. It is to be hoped that the Christian Leader will make itself equally clear, instead of taking Don Carlos Janes' advice to just love it out. For fear somebody might misunderstand my position in the matter, I'm for fighting it out. The Standard seems to think Brother Boles is, too. Here are some comments I gather at random from a Standard editorial.

We do believe that it was unfortunate and unwise for Brother Boles to plunge at this stage of the conferences into a presentation of this character. It seems to us that such a polemic is not in keeping. . .

A number of those who have been in smaller conferences for several years have arrived at that type of reciprocal recognition and consequently can discuss these matters on quite a different plane from that "we-are-wholly-right-and-you-must-come-to-us" attitude of Brother Boles. We can admire Brother Boles' zeal and his courage without agreeing that his effort to evangelize the rest of us accomplished what a different sort of approach could have accomplished. . . It is not the proper approach to such a conference.

Possibly Brother Boles thinks his method saves time. As a matter of fact he has lost time, wasted some time and words, for, in a number of cases he is found beating the air and setting up straw men to knock down. He has not talked with his dissenting brethren long and quietly and patiently enough to discover just what is their viewpoint.

I entertain more than a lingering suspicion that the Standard is not worried as much over Brother Boles' method of approach as it is the fact that he approached. Judging from some howls of protest which are being heard clear to Texas, he "beat" and "knocked down" something more alive and vocal than "air" and "straw men." The Standard and its "dissident brethren" have made "their viewpoint" clear enough through the years to the most of us to make its sort of "long and quiet and patient talking" lost time and wasted words. Brother Boles' "knock down" method of approach was exactly what was needed and long past due in these Murch-Witty conferences. The Standard is making it quite clear that the digressives do not intend, nor have they at any time intended to surrender their innovations to secure unity, except on rare occasions out of courtesy when conferences are held for long, quiet and patient talking to discover viewpoints which everybody by this time ought to already know. Even then some bad boy like H. Leo Boles is likely to rise up, beat some air and knock down some straw men and bust up the tranquility of the meeting.

The deeper I go into the Standard's editorial, the more I am inclined to think the editor did not like Brother Boles' speech. Why should he say this?:

He attributes to us a refusal to adhere to Scriptural practice, whereas, if he had first taken some time for a different approach, he is a generous enough man to recognize our sincere belief that we are following Scripture.

If I correctly understand Brother Boles he thinks the editor of the Standard ought to be "a generous enough man, to" point to the "Scripture" that authorizes the use of instrumental music in worship. Since he is so sincere in his belief that he is "following Scripture" so we can have fellowship with him in following it too. We sincerely think he has corrupted the worship with his unscriptural practices, and are dead sure that a lot of long, quiet and patient talk that never approaches the issue will get us nowhere—

(Continued on page 24)
WHAT THE CHURCH MUST DO TO BE SAVED

“For the hurt of the daughter of my people am I hurt: I mourn; dismay hath taken hold on me. Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there? Why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered?” (Jer. 8: 21-22)

The prophet Jeremiah in these words pictures the condition of Israel in a lurid light. Doubtless he was regarded a pessimist: soured on society; a disgusted prophet. But the fact remains that the trouble was in Israel, not in the prophet. His burning words describe the people of God today. The church is sick. And the sad part is, as with Israel, without reason; because the physician of Gilead and the healing remedy are available. “Why then is not the health of my people recovered?” Because they would not come to the physician and they would not take his remedy.

The health and strength of the church are to be found in the truth and the defense of it: its infirmity and weakness are manifest in compromise. Of the mighty host of Old Testament saints a New Testament writer remarked, “Out of weakness they were made strong.” Though the fewest and weakest of all nations on earth, God made Israel the strongest, and through them he championed the cause of universal righteousness against empires of iniquity and defeated the most powerful nations of antiquity. Standing for the truth, the church has nothing to fear. But when we compromise with error, we become of all people the most vulnerable.

I. Elements Of Strength And Weakness

The history of Israel repeats itself in the church today. Observe what the strength of the church was a few generations ago and compare it with the present. Their plea was the Bible itself. Today we hear much of “what the church believes and teaches.” The church was brought to us in an undenominational, nondenominational, antidenominational spirit. The spirit of the early gospel crusaders was antagonistic to denominationalism. The attitude toward error was consistent—all error looked exactly alike. Bishop Purcell’s Roman Catholicism looked to Alexander Campbell about like Robert Dale Owen’s socialistic atheism—he debated and defeated them both. But Nathan L. Rice’s denominationalism did not look any better; he debated and defeated it. Nor did error within the church receive more toleration, he squelched the menacing speculative movement of Jesse B. Ferguson-in the church.

During the recent simultaneous meetings in Nashville, Brother E. W. McMillan asked: If the apostles were holding simultaneous meetings in Nashville what would be their attitude? That is easily answered. It would be the same as when the apostles did hold simultaneous meetings in Jerusalem. They turned things upside down. They would do it in “Jerusalem” (Nashville) now. And if gospel preachers would preach now what the apostles preached then as they preached it, we would “turn the world upside down” again—even if we had to spank some of the brethren when we got them upside down. But Brother McMillan did not mean that—he was pleading for a pseudo-unity spirit of peace by compromise of issues—a peace where there is no peace.

The strength of the church has ever been in the maintenance of distinctive New Testament principles. It loses its strength and is reduced to utter weakness when it loses sight of these things, raises the white flag to the foe and signs truce with error.

II. The Principles Of Peculiarity

Israel was a peculiar people—a separate people. They had a separate origin. God called Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldees that he might raise up a separate family. Get thee out, God said. Later when the posterity of Abraham settled in the land of Egypt God demanded that Pharaoh should let the people go “that they may worship me.” He required of Israel a separate nation. Today God demands a separate church—be ye separate, saith the Lord.” A separate family in Abraham; a separate nation in Israel; a separate church in Christ.

1. The Church Must Be Kept Separate

We must keep the church separate in speech. The nomenclature of the denominations can have no place among Christians such as, “our church,” “our pastor,” “Doctor Blank, LL. D.,” “our institutions,” “our organizations,” “our Young People,” and “Lord, may Brother Excellent bring us a message”. ad infinitum’s string of borrowing sectarian Ashcodic language, which is fast becoming the common vernacular of professed Christians.

We must keep the church separate in doctrine. It is not a matter of what “the church believes and teaches”—it is all and only what the Word of God teaches. It is the only divine creed. There is a crying need for Bible preaching today, instead of “canned sermons” filched from sectarian sources.

We must keep the church separate in worship. Unscriptural innovations are sinful and invalidate the worship. If it is wrong to use instrumental music in worship, it is wrong to worship where it is used. In fact, in so doing the effort would be vain—in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrine the commandments of men.

Between Christians and innovators there is no basis of union nor even negotiation. Nehemiah refused Sanballat’s unity-meeting proposal which he wanted to hold on the plains of Ono. He wanted to stop Nehemiah’s work. Diggers today are modern Samaritan Sanballats—that is all. They would love to lure us to let the sound of the hammer cease and come to the plains of Ono (which ex-
to virtually sign temporary armistice. Nehemiah knew exactly what to do with Sanballat and his wily proposition but Brother Witty and others have let Murch and the Samaritans get them in conference. No matter if a few strong speeches have been made—Nehemiah could have made a strong speech. The affiliation itself is wrong, the negotiations are wrong: it can only weaken the church and serve to bring the lines which should be the tauter drawn. All the advantage in such meetings, even if some loyal preacher "tears the rag off the bush," is gained by the digressives—and they know it. We have no time or place for pseudo-unity conferences.

2. The Church Must Be Kept Evangelistic-Not Missionary

There has been overmuch emphasis on missions and missionaries and an under-emphasis on New Testament evangelistic work. Let a gospel preacher announce this next week that he sails to Japan, China or Timbuctoo, and he is no longer a preacher—all at once he has become a missionary! The apostles did not establish missions—they preached the gospel; people obeyed it, and in doing so became Christians, and that is the church. "Once a mission always a mission." Fifty years in Japan and China, and hundreds of thousands of dollars spent, but still no churches! Why? Because the procedure is wrong, the set-up is sectarian. It was borrowed from the sectarians and has proceeded along sectarian lines. Socalled "mission work" has been in charge of human missionary agencies as unscriptural as human missionary societies. The Don Carlos Janes and the B. D. Morehead one-man missionary societies (of Louisville and Nashville) are as unscriptural as the better organized societies of the digressives-between the two the latter would be the more preferable and "expedient, because they are better organized and operated. Churches need to return to the New Testament basis of direct evangelistic work.

3. The Church Must Be Kept Militant

The spirit of pacifism (pa-cif-i-cism) is taking the fight out of the church. But the conflict between truth and error is unending. Victory does not come by truce. God's terms are unconditional surrender. A questionnaire and a conference with the digressives is not the answer. The school is the only avenue of escape. Rev. Murch and hundreds of dollars spent, but still no churches! Why? Because the procedure is wrong, the set-up is sectarian. It was borrowed from the sectarians and has proceeded along sectarian lines. Socalled "mission work" has been in charge of human missionary agencies as unscriptural as human missionary societies. The Don Carlos Janes and the B. D. Morehead one-man missionary societies (of Louisville and Nashville) are as unscriptural as the better organized societies of the digressives-between the two the latter would be the more preferable and "expedient, because they are better organized and operated. Churches need to return to the New Testament basis of direct evangelistic work.

III. Some Immediate Dangers

1. The Marked Tendency Toward Institutionalism

In summing up the immediate dangers around the church, we would name the following things:

Today any man or group of men can start any institution they may please to start, but it in a benevolent basket, label it "Your Baby," and place it on the doorstep of the church with the appeal "Please, take care of it!" That is taxation without representation. Again, I say, the delegate system of the digressives is better than that, for in that case there would be a voice in what is started. The church is about to become the unwitting and unwilling victim of institutionalism, and institutionalism is about to become a racket. Where is the scriptural precept or precedent for scouring the country for orphans, transporting them from sections far and wide to an institution that was not created by orphans in a particular community, but which a promoter created by searching for orphans. Is this editor against taking care of orphans? He is not! But he is against the institutional racket. It is the duty of the church to care for their dependents—and they should provide the means of doing so under their own supervision. If individuals wish to operate hospitals, inns, homes or schools, it is their right to do so but the church cannot operate institutions. If the church can do its benevolent work through a board of directors, why not its missionary work through a board of directors? If one is a society, why not the other? There is therefore no such thing as "our institutions," if by "our" you mean the church.

Institutionalism was the tap-root of digression. It has always been the fatal blow to congregational independence. It destroys the individuality of both the congregation and the Christian as Nazlism and Fascism destroys the individuality of their citizens in Germany and Italy. Back of institutionalism is party pride. People say: "Your church does not have any great institutions; it is not missionary and benevolent." We would say: "Yes it does!" and "yes we are!" And we come to love the institutions more than the church. Schools-for instance, and this is the test: Criticize the church, and it brings no rise from these devoted men of certain institutions; but the church will criticize their school and they will have a fit, and your name thereafter, henceforth and forever is Dennis. But, brother, the college is not the church nor can the church own and operate it. It is private and secular and belongs to the man or group of men to whom it belongs! It is an adjunct of the home, not of the church; auxiliary to the family, not to the congregation; parents and interested individuals, not churches, should sponsor and support them.

In the June Liberty magazine, Bernarr McFadden, its publisher, said: "Because of my frank and sympathetic criticism of labor, publications devoted to union interests have declared I am an enemy of unions. This statement is false, absolutely! But I believe in Americanism to the nth degree. That means, if a worker wants to join a union he should have that right; but if he desires to depend on his own efforts and does not want to join a union, he should have that privilege."

With equal force the words of this publisher can be applied to the present criticisms. Because we have criticized the course and conduct in the teaching and the practices of certain schools, we are branded as an enemy of the schools. With the same vehemence of Liberty's publisher we say: "This statement is false, absolutely!" We merely insist that the schools stay in their place, keep their hands off the church, cease trying to control preachers and form dominating influences in churches. The church must be kept independent and free.

2. Another Definite Danger In The Church Today Is Modern Judaism

There is an unaccountable sympathy for theorists and their theories on the party of some who disawow any belief of the theories as such. Why the sympathy? They condemn drastic measures against these false teachers but
employ drastic measures against those of us who oppose these false teachers. They preach gentleness toward the false teacher, and practice harshness with us.

It is an old symptom. It was in the early church. Paul rebuked it. Concerning ancient Judaizers Paul said to a church afflicted with them: “To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you.” (Gal. 2:5) The Judaizers among us today, headed by R. H. Boll of Louisville, have been exhorted for thirty years, and still we are urged to forbear, yea, organize a “brotherhood committee” to arbitrate the question! Paul said, “No, not for an hour.” And why? “That the truth of the gospel might continue with you.” Give the Premillennial Judaizers right-of-way in the church today and the truth of the gospel will perish with us. “A little leaven, leaveneth the whole lump.” Paul continued, on the same point, in the same chapter, in the same argument to the Galatians that Judaizers should not be given place for an hour. Then thirty years is considerably too long and it is high time to draw the line on these modern Izers and their Isms.

We have always had neutrals. They are all alike. When the music controversy raged, the neutrals went with the digressives as their party increased and became large enough. If and when, if ever, the Boll party should become large enough, without the credentials of a prophet, we predict that the neutrals among us will go with them, just as the neutrals in the other fight went with the innovators. That is the history of it, and they are running true to form to date.

3. Still Another Danger In The Church Now Is The Pseudo-Unity Movement

On the very threshold of unconditional surrender, after hard-fought battles over the innovations, we now face the effort on the part of some to sell the church down the river by a truce with digression. The digressives have lost in the battle. They now seek victory in strategy and negotiation. But the victory truth has won in debate should now be sealed in the unconditional surrender of their innovations and errors and a complete right-about-face which will bring them back to the New Testament in all things. That would be unity in accomplishment. It would be automatic. New Testament unity comes not by resolutions, conferences, mutual admiration meetings, handshaking and backslapping. It exists in the church now which is loyal to Christ, and those who left unity can return and find it here-where they left it. There is no basis for compromise. “They went out from us because they were not of us; for if they had been of us they would have continued with us: but they went out, and they are taught against us.” (1 Jno. 2:19)

4. The Steady Inflow Of Worldliness Constitutes Another Ever-Present Danger To The Church

We are living in an intensely secular age. There is an all-absorbing pursuit after the things of the world. The pulpit and the press are all but subsidized by the secular spirit. Newspapers reek with crime; churches seethe with worldliness. The masses in the church and out of it are going to hell on the pleasure route. There are no danger signals anywhere to check the crazed victims of fun and frolic in their frenzied rush to the resorts of sin. Neon signs flicker “welcome” at places where red lanterns should swing “danger here-keep out.” The public mixed swimming resort is the nursery of promiscuous conduct. The salacious movie is the doorway through which the slime and slush of Hollywood gains entrance to our parlors. The dance is the preparatory school of prostitution. Cardplaying is the kindergarten for gambling. Liquor drinking and cigarette-smoking are first-steps in the course which blunts the moral and spiritual sense of boys and girls. The woman or girl with a cigarette in one hand and a liquor glass in the other drops to zero in the eyes of any gentleman. The church that harbors all such within its membership ceases to be a spiritual power in any community. Preachers who refrain from preaching against these evils have either yielded to the line of least resistance or have been bribed by public sentiment or else popular practice has blunted their own spiritual perceptions. Thus merrily we roll along.

IV. The Remedy

We believe the remedy for these ills in the church—the thing that will save the church, or at least salvage a remnant from a new tidal wave of digression—may be summed up in the following items:

1. The Rejection Of False Teachers

Paul said: “The factious man after the first and second admonition, reject.” (Tit. 3:10) Brother Brewer says, after thirty years of admonition that we should appoint an arbitration committee for the brotherhood! Paul said, Reject them. John said. Let them go out. The sooner the group of Bollites and Premillennialists go out, and cease to disturb the church, the better off the church will be. The only reason they have not gone out is because their party would be too small and insignificant. They are waiting and working within until they can gather strength, like the digressives, in the hope that they may draw away a large contingent with them. And they may succeed—if the new Christian Leader is a success, they will.

2. The Renovation Of The Schools

From attic to cellar the schools should be emptied, swept and garnished of premillennial teachers, sympathy and influence. This is due the brethren to whom these schools look for support. It is not enough to ascend to the housetop and should “We do not believe Premillennialism.” There are different types of Premillennial influence. First, the Premillennialist—the one who accepts the theory as a party tenet. Second, the Boll sort-those who hold and teach the Premillennial views but do not actually join a Premillennial sect. They prefer to stay in the church and disturb the brotherhood. Third, the sympathizer—those who deny the doctrine but sympathize with the personnel of the party. That looks suspicious. They are Bollites. The Premillennialist is one who believes the doctrine. The Bollite is the Boll-sympathizer. He is the chronic mourner over disfellowship. He stands at the Boll wailing wall. Fourth, all the neutrals. Their kind went with the digressives when the tide went that way. They are the soft-pedalers among us, and are by far the largest class of the ones mentioned. They are in the schools. They are in the churches. They are everywhere.

It is not hard to locate any of the foregoing types of individuals. One of the first indications in their reaction toward criticisms. They will criticize men who oppose Boll’s teaching, but resent any criticism of Boll or of his sympathizers. The infusion of this spirit into the student body of several schools is an immediate danger. These young people are potential leaders, teachers, preachers, elders. They carry this attitude back into the churches, and though they are taught against marking anybody, they are taught to mark every preacher who does not have the inculmination of their school. Therein lies the danger of college domination and control of the churches. It is more than a tendency—it is the developed thing itself.
3. The Repudiation Of Soft-Pedal Journalism

The freedom of the people lies in the freedom of the press. The populace in Germany, Italy and Russia know and read only what their dictators decree. It is the same principle in religion when a man in New York who has been with the digressives twenty years making money, undertakes to buy all the papers in the brotherhood and put them under the padlock of a copyright in order to control the religious thinking of the masses through suppression. The press must be freed, and the church spared of such domination.

Personalities in journalism which names teachers of error along with systems of error is not any violation of "courageous, dignified religious journalism." Naming the men who teach error and practice deception in religion, even in the church, "can be done in a courteous and Christian manner"—but it should be done. Just to talk and write of courageous, dignified, courteous methods of religious journalism is to deal only in broad generalities. For the New Christian Leader to deal in such platitudes is expected, but for the Gospel Advocate to recede from its former drastid policies and retreat behind the verbiage of carefully worded resolutions of editorial committees is a keen disappointment to many of us who have looked to the Gospel Advocate to take the lead in a major fight, without generalities, getting personal when necessary, and with a relentless offensive against false movements and the men who promote them. Whether some "temptation or scheme of intimidation" has "seduced" and "provoked" the Advocate to modify its policy recently we cannot say, but it is obvious that something has caused the good Gospel Advocate to seek retrenchment. The New Leader could very well use the same generalities that the Advocate's committee uses, and in fact the Leader did use them first. Our only point here is that it is no time to be saying pretty platitudes and dealing in generalities. We are in a fight for the truth and the canon-fire cannot cease until the enemies of the church stack arms.

Calling names of false teachers and their aides and sympathizers is neither undignified nor discourteous, because Paul did it and he was courteous, dignified and Educated. He said: "Demas forsook me having loved this present world." It was hard on Demas for Paul to say that publicly. He should have taken that up with Demas privately! Again, he said that Hymeneaus and Philetus had shipwrecked their faith and were overthrowing the faith of others by their theory of the resurrection and he wrote it down in the New Testament (a rather dignified book) that he had turned those brethren of his over to Satan. He clashed with Barnabas upon one occasion and withheld Peter to his face and rebuked him publicly. Neither incident ruined the church, nor marred the dignity of the New Testament. He further said that Alexander the coppersmith did him much evil and declared that the Lord would reward him for what he did. Paul did not seem to covet the kind of a reward he intimated Alexander would get. He told a perverter of the truth one time that he was full of guile and villainy, called him a son of the devil, and asked him if he ever intended to quit perverting the way of the Lord. When a paper develops better manners than the New Testament and a preacher becomes more dignified than the apostles neither is worth anything to the defense of the truth or to the cause of Christ.

4. The Renouncement Of Compromise In Preaching And Practice

A mere innovation in teaching and practice is seldom the real trouble. Rather is it the symptom of the trouble. Back of the instrumental music innovation was the change in attitude toward the authority of the New Testament in matters of worship, the majority rule and political views of church government, guided by a dominant spirit of worldliness in the church.

The same is true of Premillennialism. It is but the symptom of the real trouble. Back of this false theory is the general doctrinal softness afflicting the church. There has been a softening of the brain, and also of the spine, of preachers, elders and teachers in the church. There has been a let-up in that type of sturdy sermons of the positive and negative character of earlier days. Today our "ministers" are joining the "Ministerial Alliance," and have been the President and Secretary-Treasurer of these pastor organizations in various towns and cities. These organizations not infrequently give banquets in honor of one of our resigning and departing ministers. It simply stands to reason that when a gospel preacher does his duty in a community the ministers of sectarianism will not give a banquet in his honor. They would, on the contrary, hold a jubilee over his departure. That is one of the pronounced evidences of the doctrinal weakness developing among churches and preachers. It is said that the church at Sherman, Texas, insists that her preachers belong to the Ministerial Alliance. The preachers who have lived and labored there have done so, and several of them have held the official positions suggested.

There there is the growing practice of giving recognition to sectarian preachers and calling on them for prayer in our meetings. Bro. E. H. Jiams, president of David Lipscomb College, called on a sectarian preacher to lead the prayer in his meeting at Oneonta, Ala. Brother G. C. Brewer called on the sectarian pastors repeatedly during his meeting at Enterprise, Ala., after the song leader in charge of the services had refused to do so. Members of the church at Horse Cave, Kentucky, signed a statement, and noted it, that sectarian preachers were called on repeatedly in S. H. Hall's meeting there. Brother J. N. Armstrong sided with Ben M. Bogard on the Holy Spirit question against N. B. Hardeman, and his Harding College preacher boys are talking about how Bogard "got the best of Hardeman" on the Holy Spirit. One of them made that remark to me. That is because of Brother Armstrong's own sectarian position on the work of the Holy Spirit. They put these ideas into the young preachers who attend their schools. When things come to this point, it is not a ten
dency-it is the thing itself. It shows definitely that a general doctrinal weakness is back of certain issues which are seized upon, like instrumental music, premillennialism, and other hobby horses they always ride out on.

I have yet to find the first premillennialist or premillennial sympathizer, Bollite or Boll sympathizer, that is not weak on doctrine, the fundamentals of the gospel, yes, the first principles. I may hold you to the standard that I have set. Therein is the trouble. When they get into the schools, and they are in them from California to Tennessee, including Texas and Arkansas, it is bad. But when they take leadership in the churches it will be too bad.

4. The Rejuvenation Of The Spiritual Life Of The Church

In addition to all the above, to be saved, the church must retrieve its spiritual life. New Testament discipline must be enforced. We must wage war on worldliness as well as on error. In short, the complete return to the New Testament standard in our attitude toward error, in maintaining the peculiar features of the church of Christ, and in the rejuvenation of its spiritual life, is the only hope of salvation for the church in our secular and sectarian society. We must wage war on everything iminal to the essence of the gospel of Christ.
WITHHOLDING

Attention is called to the article in editorial space of this issue by B. G. Hope, entitled "What I Learned From Brother Benson." A similar article by George DeHoff telling us what he learned in Brother Armstrong's classes was published in the Jan.-Feb., Bible Banner. Brethren Armstrong and Benson are having considerable trouble getting their former students to have confidence in their public statements on the Premillennial issues, due to the teaching these men have done heretofore on these issues. Their effort to impress the public with their past soundness, as well as their present loyalty, is not in harmony with the record, nor consistent with these private occurrences, and they are meeting up with plenty of trouble as their old students begin to speak out.

Several months ago President Benson and the writer had a rather lively exchange by correspondence. He was questioned of his past record on the Boll question and boldly asserted that he had always stood against these theories. I thought I knew then that his statement was not true, but I did not have the documents with which to verify my recollections of his former positions, so I had to wait. But here is the evidence, in Brother Hope's testimony. Brother Hope has given Brother Benson plenty of opportunity to do the right thing about it, and would have spared him this exposure, had he done so, but as they have persisted in misrepresenting matters, Brother Hope has felt it necessary to let the actual facts be known. Misrepresentation is about to become habitual. I know several matters, some of them personal, which they have misrepresented.

The Benson plan lately has been to have special meetings on the loyalty and soundness of Harding College and its faculty. He makes his case look plausible because he has no witnesses there who can testify against him. But if the brethren will just read carefully the statements of Brother Hope, made in evident candor and truthfulness, it can be seen that some vital facts have been withheld from the brethren. When Brother Benson says he has stood against Premillennialism and Bollism in the past, he states what some of his most intelligent students say is not true. As these facts come out, what will the brethren, where he has held these banquets and special meetings to convince them of Harding's soundness, think about the matter?

The Bible Banner referred sometime ago, to an incident at Harding College in connection with a meeting of the young preachers there, in which they discussed the pre-millennial question. At the close one of the Bible teachers took the floor and scolded the boys, telling them their arguments against Premillennialism would not stand up, and leaving the general impression that he was in sympathy with the Boll side of it. When the young men let the cat out of the bag to a few outsiders, they were put on the carpet by President Benson, and all but one signed statements patching the matter up. One young man would not sign it. All of them had said, however, that even Brother Benson regretted that the teacher had taken them to task, and admitted he blundered. Here is an evident example of the difficulty young preachers have when they buck the administration of the school. The school is in a position to make it hard on them, and most young men under such circumstances will follow the line of least resistance, say little, or nothing, until their grades are made. But when they get out on their own the time will come for them to speak, as B. G. Hope and George DeHoff have done.

A point that sticks out just here like a knot on a log is, Why do the teachers mentioned point out the weakness of the arguments against Premillennialism to the boys, but do not show the weakness of the arguments made in favor of Premillennialism? And why do they not show them how to make strong arguments that will stand up. They seem to delight in telling their boys that the usual arguments against Premillennialism are weak but they neither expose the weakness of the theory nor give them arguments against it that are not weak. It looks suspicious. In fact, it is suspicious. Anyway, how could Brother Armstrong make a strong argument against Premillennialism when he believes certain phases of it? He is on record and says that 1 Cor. 15 allows for a thousand years time period after the second coming of Christ. And how could Brother Benson make a strong argument against any sort of false doctrine when he has been weak enough to believe that people may be possessed with demons today as in days of Christ, and that a denominational preacher in China cast out a devil in a man, and that such miraculous things could yet be performed? It is well to remember that Brother Benson was for years a missionary to China, and it seems that missionaries have had a general weakness along these lines.

In addition to this, according to Brother Hope, another main Bible teacher told the students that Brother Boll might prove to be right on the issues, and Brother Armstrong has recently told them that Bogard "got the best" of Hardeman on the Holy Spirit question, and made the boys believe it!

If that is the best the school can do, it ought to take down its sign, or else the brethren ought to take it down for them.

Another noticeable thing is that many who go out from the school resist strong preaching, and will make faces when strong sermons are preached. They also take exceptions to criticisms of R. H. Boll and his sympathizers. The truth is, Brother Armstrong believes much of the theory. Brother Benson has believed it, and still loves those who believe it and teach it more than he does those who oppose it.

Until the schools clear themselves of suspicion they cannot expect the confidence and support of thousands of brethren whose influence would be worth having. But action is what is needed—not banquet speeches.

RENEWAL TIME --- READY YOUR LABEL

The Bible Banner is a year old. Brother Fred Dennis, of Marietta, O., writes in that it is a "spry youngster." A year ago its birth was greeted with a great shower of subscriptions from nearly forty states. They have increased steadily. But it is now renewal time for all who have received the Bible Banner from the beginning. If all will promptly send renewals-$1.00-now, it will simplify our problem of sending out notices and save us that expense. If your label reads 6-39, it means your dollar was due in June. However, since the January-February issue was a combination number, there have been only eleven actual issues of the magazine. The publisher has decided to make the issues uniform by giving the readers the full twelve issues, notwithstanding the size of the magazine was increased and all have received more than was subscribed for. It will be noted, therefore, that this issue is number twelve and closes volume one of the Bible Banner. The next issue will be Vol. II, No. 1. Send your dollar now to The Bible Banner, P. 0. Box 1804, Oklahoma City, Okla.
SOME THINGS I LEARNED FROM BROTHER BENSON

I am using about the same method in saying some things that 
Brother DeHoff did in an issue of the Bible Banner a few months ago. I hope he doesn't have it copyrighted.

I have had a number of conversations with Brother Benson and have also carried on a correspondence with him concerning Premillennialism. The following are some of the things that I have learned:

1. I learned that Brother Benson believed the “theory” as taught by R. H. Boll in 1925. He stated in an ancient history class that he believed it. Brother Benson ridiculed the idea of not taking the thousand years as mentioned in Revelation literally. He also criticised those who opposed the theory.

2. In the summer of 1936, I learned that he had changed his mind about it. I said to some friends of Harding College that Brother Benson believed the theory and as a result of that statement, I received a letter from him asking why I had made such a statement. I answered by giving him the above information and in reply, he said that at that time he was under the influence of Earl Smith. I do not know how long he held the views but he said that it was but for a short time.

3. I learned that the devil was as loose today as he has ever been and will not be bound until the time spoken of in Revelation 20. He said that he did not know when that time would be but it could take place before Christ comes. He was sure that there had not been a time in the past when it was true.

4. I learned that people may be possessed with demons today just as they were in the days of Christ.

5. I learned that miracles might be performed today. As proof he mentioned a case in China where a denominational preacher claimed to have cast out a devil. According to Brother Benson, it is up to the Lord as to whether he will perform miracles today or not. I suppose, then, it is up to the Lord as to whether he will save some without baptism. I would just as soon say that the Lord might save without baptism as to say that he may perform miracles today. It is not taught that he will do either.

6. I learned that Brother B. F. Rhodes said that Boll might prove to be right in the end but he could not say that he believed it. At this point, I asked Brother Benson how this statement could be made to harmonize with the one that appeared in the Gospel Advocate in the fall of 1936 which stated that the Bible teachers would teach the students how to expose the theory. I could not understand how a man could teach preachers how to meet a thing and at the same time say that it might prove to be right in the end. What would you think of a preacher who would say that he could not say that he believed that a man was saved by faith only but the sectarian might prove to be right in the end? Would loyal churches desire the services of that sort of a preacher?

Witnesses either heard Brother Benson say the above mentioned things or read them in letters that he wrote me. However, I do not have the correspondence now. He came to me later and said that he had changed his mind about the matters that we had been discussing and asked that I give him his letters. He left the impression that he was going to get all things straightened up as rapidly as he could. He expressed his opinion that some of the members of the faculty were being influenced by friendship. He said that he regretted that friendship to R. H. Boll would influence the disposition of some toward the theory. According to Brother Harper, Brother Benson later denied that he had ever believed any part of the theory. I took a witness from here and he signed an agreement with me that he did say those things and that I had not misrepresented him in the matter. A letter was then written to Brother Harper and approved by me. The letter and statement were then put in an envelope and sealed with the understanding that he mail it the next day. After I left, he opened the letter and included another which gave a different impression altogether.

I have withheld publishing the above information hoping that conditions might be improved. I had hoped until recently that there might be pleasing results from a recent meeting in Fort Smith, but it seems that the good that might come is being blocked by two or three who are not teachers, and not in the school. According to some of the students, Brother Benson (president), Brother Sears (the dean), Brother Sherrill (the preacher at Searcy), and Brother Herbert Dawson (a board member), reported that they won a great victory in the Fort Smith meeting against those who were criticising their policies. It was reported that they gave us “a whipping.” Thus they boast of victory over all opposition to their students, but keep them ignorant of the facts and do not tell them what actually occurred in the Fort Smith meeting.

Some of them have gone so far as to say that all who opposed Boll and his theory were dishonest. They questioned the motives of all of us there. That does not seem to be as sweet a spirit as they usually appear to manifest. The impression is being left that all the suspicion has originated outside of the school. When the president has admitted that he has believed it in the past, when the ex-president “teaches that here will be a period of time between two resurrections, when at least one other Bible teacher says that Boll may prove to be right, it seems to me that it is beyond mere suspicion and gets into the realm of facts, and the facts are within the school. If Brother Benson wants the support of faithful Christians, he ought to make a clean sweep of it, admit that he once believed and taught it but has changed his mind, and not keep masses of people in doubt about it. He told me once that he did not want Brother Harper to know that he had changed his mind. It will be better for him and the college if he will fix all matters as they should be.

I agreed at Ft. Smith to aid in raising money to help support the right Bible teacher there, one about whom there has never been any doubt concerning these theories. I wrote Brother Benson a short time ago and asked what had been done. He did not reply to that part of the letter. I was hoping that some definite step had been taken regarding the matter. In response to a recommendation, he did thank me but said that the institution reserved the right to select the teachers. He did not give me any information about any action that had been taken. I mentioned the most of the things which are mentioned above in the Ft. Smith meeting. He did not deny any of the things that are included in this article. I am sure that he will remember them all for we discussed them in the presence of witnesses until after midnight in the fall of 1936. These things can be straightened up in such a way that all of us can support the school, but for Brother Benson to deny that he has ever held to any phase of the theory is not the way to gain the confidence of the people. I am assuring all against that I will support the school when the conditions are met that were agreed on by all the teachers from Harding who were present at Ft. Smith and by the majority of the others there.

In another article other and further matters of similar nature bearing on the Searcy situation will be discussed.
One of the most surprising circular letters, since the campaign of circularizing started with the sale of the Christian Leader "down the river," came to me with Brother F. L. Rowe's name printed at the bottom, under date of April 8, 1939. As his apology for sending out the letter, Brother Rowe states that the "publisher of a religious paper" and several writers have "misinterpreted" some of his statements made "in a December 1938 issue of the Christian Leader." He attributes the misinterpretation to the jealousy of a "jealous publisher," and to the desire of that publisher "to injure the Christian Leader." He charges that publisher and "several writers" with misinterpreting three statements of his. He says:

"I refer to my statement of several months ago."
1. "That the Christian Leader was being transferred to Brother Clinton Davidson."
2. "That I had known him in Louisville many years ago."
3. "But that he had been 'lost to us' for about 20 years."

The charge of misinterpretation of these three statements came as three surprises to me, all in one circular letter. Let us notice these statements one at a time.

1. "That the Christian Leader was being transferred to Brother Clinton Davidson."

The exact statement that he made "in a December 1938 issue of the Christian Leader" is as follows: "Although the sale was made to Brother Davidson, a non-profit corporation (The Christian Leader Publishing Co.) is being formed and the ownership of the paper will be transferred to it." I am not a "jealous publisher," nor a jealous anything else, but when I read that statement I sincerely thought that "the sale was made to Bro. Davidson" and that Davidson would be the owner till and when and if that "non-profit corporation" was formed. In view of that statement and in view of Brother Davidson's activity in New Jersey, in Cincinnati, and in Nashville, how could Brother Rowe expect anyone to think otherwise? He explains in his circular letter that he only "entered into a contract with Brother Davidson to turn over the Christian Leader to him or his assigns"-Davidson's assigns. So according to his letter he did not turn over the paper to Davidson, but he turned it over to Davidson's "assigns." Then in his desire to separate Brother Davidson from all control and ownership of the paper he adds: "Brother Davidson is not an officer, director, manager or editor." If Brother Davidson is so faithful and loyal and benevolent, and has never been "lost to the Lord," as Brother Rowe now claims, I cannot understand how it could be so misleading and injurious to the Christian Leader for the readers to think that Davidson controls the paper, rather than "his assigns."

Why is Brother Rowe so anxious to separate Brother Davidson from all management of the Christian Leader? Can he separate him from it? Who furnished the money that bought it? Who selected the members of that "non-profit corporation?" Who shaped the policy of the Leader? Who adopted that copyright policy? Who gave Brother Rowe such everlasting assurance that R. H. Boll would never be an editor of the Leader? Who is "the man with the money?"

2. "That I had know him (Bro. Davidson) in Louisville many years ago."

I am unable to find where Brother Rowe ever made that statement, or where any writer or "publisher of a religious paper" ever attributed that statement to him. I find in the Leader of Dec. 6, 1938, where he said, "I learned that he had left Louisville nearly twenty years ago and been 'lost' to us:"

3. "That he had been 'lost to us' for about 20 years."

In his circular letter he says that he did not mean that Brother Davidson had been "lost to the Lord, nor to the Lord's work." but that he had been lost to "Editors, Evangelists, Preachers and other church workers, who are on the firing line in public service." But I cannot harmonize that explanation with what he said in the Leader last December, which follows:

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

Think of it: "lost to us"-"give his attention again to spiritual things." Brother Rowe says, "My friends understood my language." If he is willing to count me as one of his friends, which I hope he does, I will assure him that when I read his piece about Davidson in the Leader last December, I sincerely thought he meant Davidson had been lost to the Lord and to the Lord's work. Where was he during the twenty years he was "lost to us?" What congregation was he a member of? Where did he worship during his twenty years of obscurity? Was he worshiping with a digressive church and superintending its Sunday school?

Brother Rowe says that during that twenty years that Brother Davidson was "lost to us" he gave more than $20,000 "for the preaching of the gospel." If he will write another circular letter and tell us how much of that twenty years Brother Davidson spent in worshiping with the Christian Church and how much of that $20,000 was given to the digressives and to premillennial churches and preachers (especially in Lexington, Ky.), then his readers can decide for themselves whether Brother Davidson was lost to "us" or to the Lord.

I sincerely regret the attitude manifested in Brother Rowe's circular letter. I had thought and hoped he might acknowledge his mistake in transferring the Leader to a copyrighted soft-soaping policy and publicly renounce the whole set-up. My thoughts and hopes were inspired by a letter from Brother Rowe to E. C. Detherage of Lexington, Ky., on Feb. 20, 1939, in which he said:

"The change in the Leader has not been at all to my expectation. Things that were fully discussed, I thought understood, have not been carried out. I had no idea it was to be a magazine instead of a newspaper as it had formerly been. There is a great deal of dissatisfaction because of this and because the new writers have been shoved to the front. I am sure their purposes are all good, but both the man with the money and the editor are new, although I have tried my best to tell them everything that..."
THE MODERNIZED CHRISTIAN LEADER

C. H. McCORD

In my judgment, the new Christian Leader has not shown itself a militant exponent of truth and a blaster of error. Bro. McMillan has succored premillenialists, and the policy of his paper puts a ban on condemning them in the Bible way. I have written him in part as follows:

1 cannot understand a policy that will forbid controversies and personalities. I know some controversies are strivings to no profit; I know argumentum ad hominem is not only illogical but debasing and sinful. But if I, in running from those errors, run to the opposite extreme and forbid controversy and all unpleasant personalities, have I not run too far? I do not say names of errorists must always be called; sometimes to call them is to advertise them or to engender sympathy. But if I bind myself never to engage, how can I do my duty in light of II Timothy 2:17, Romans 16:17, II John 9, etc.?

There are many brethren afraid of the modernized policy of the new Leader.

The editor of the new Leader has very kindly invited me to write for the paper. But the way he plays hands with premillenialists forbids my endorsement of the paper.

If he will let me say what I believe to be the truth, I shall be glad to do so. Accordingly, I recently sent him an article about Bro. Boll; I doubt though that it will ever be printed. And I told him if he would publish it, I should most happily write other articles on other subjects. That one subject is not the only one needing attention today. But I cannot be conscientious and contribute those "other articles on other subjects" when the editor includes reports from avowed premillenialists.

I wish the new Leader were de-modernized.

Talking With The President

The president of the board of directors of the new Christian Leader, an outstanding and brilliant young man, brought up at the feet of John T. Lewis, sound in the faith even with a high education acquired in New York City, recently let me stay in his home on my Manhattan preaching appointment. I was pleasantly surprised to find him venement in his objections to Bollism. I told him my frank conviction that the new Leader is not sound on that issue, and I told him if he held to his beliefs the way he was talking he would not long stay connected with the Leader. He denied it was anything but sound, but said if it is not sound in its opposition to Bollism, he would quit the Leader. He wondered why I could not conscientiously write for the Leader.

I will write for the Leader if they will let me say what I think is the truth. In reply to Bro. McMillan's invitation to write for the Leader I told him I'd like to write for it, and that I did not believe Bollism to be the only issue today. But that any paper soft on Bollism or any other issue is not to be relied on; to test the matter therefore I sent him an article about Bro. Boll, written, I believe, in the Christian spirit; I told him if he would publish it I'd be glad to write other articles on other subjects. To that he has not replied one word, nor has the article been published. Wallace, on the other hand, will let that be printed. He wondered why I could not conscientiously write for the Leader.

I am signing my name to this. But we may look for another unsigned anonymous bulletin to appear any time now, and no matter where it is mailed it will trace back to the New Yorker's headquarters in Jersey City. - F. E. W. Jr.

THE MAN WITH A PROGRAM

The sponsors of the New Christian Leader have persisted in withholding the facts about its chief promoter-Clinton Davidson, financial wizard, religious-wiseacre, and journalistic highbrow. Hugo McCord, both brilliant and valiant as a gospel preacher, holds damaging testimony against Davidson's religious career, obtained from personal interviews and correspondence. Davidson evidently knows this, for in a letter to Hugo, copy of which we have, Davidson advised him to lay off or else-intimating that Hugo might be treated to some undesirable publicity. Brother Hugo very promptly invited the New Yorker to "Piggly Wiggly"—just help himself! He has threatened others and now he threatens Hugo McCord, than whom there is none brighter nor better in the kingdom.

The thing concerning which Brother Hugo has evidence is that Clinton Davidson left the church and went to a digressive modernistic Christian Church in New York because he did not like the "Church of Christ," and he did not like it because it did not have a program.

Wells, who was hibernating twenty years in this fashionable Christian Church, he was making big money in the insurance business, anybody that can see through a ladder can see the "program" he was interested in most—he was a business man!

Davidson is a promoter. That is his game. He came back to the church to promote a movement, and but for that movement he would be in the New York Christian Church today. He does not think he did wrong working and worshipping with the Christian Church. He has no repentance, and makes no confession. It is since coming back and starting his promotion scheme that he has told why he left the church because he did not like it and that it had no program. So he comes back to it with a program, and some brethren are gullible enough to swallow his bait, hook line and sinker! There are groups of brethren who will fall for his propaganda, but I do not believe the loyal brethren in Texas, Oklahoma and Arkansas will do so as a whole. But remember this Davidson is the man. Abilene Christian College honored to make the Commencement address to our Christian boys and girls. Is it playing fair with the brethren of the West for the College to sponsor this New York digressive, and under the auspices of the school foist his schmee upon our young generation of Christians?

I am signing my name to this. But we may look for another unsigned anonymous bulletin to appear any time now, and no matter where it is mailed it will trace back to the New Yorker's headquarters in Jersey City. - F. E. W. Jr.
We will continue our review of Chapter six of R. H. Boll's book—"The Kingdom of God." The above is a subheading in that chapter. Remember Brother Boll says the preaching of John the Baptist, and all the preaching of Jesus Christ up to chapter 12 of Matthew were the announcement, and preparation of the earthly Kingdom of Israel. The Kingdom Christ had to postpone. I am sure the readers would like to know what this postponed Kingdom will be when it is established, so I will let Boll tell them, he knows, because he has no theories, nothing but the truth. In Word and Work 1917, pages 387, 388, he says "Israel is back in their land just before the Lord's glorious coming; the temple is rebuilt, its services resumed. The last great world power, Rome, in her final shape, flourishes. The man in supreme rule exults himself above all that is called God. He sits in the temple (either in person or his image installed there), setting himself forth as the object of worship. This is the 'abomination of desolation.' When that thing occurs, all believers in Jesus who are in and around Jerusalem are warned to flee instantly. For this was not to be unparalleled tribulation. The glorious appearing follows immediately. (Matt. 24:29) The 'lawless one,' that wicked leader, meets his doom at the hands of Jesus at his coming." This is a vivid description, and the naked truth about what the postponed kingdom will be when the Jews get ready for it, according to R. H. Boll. "The temple rebuilt, its services resumed," get that. If I could write in a spirit that would be acceptable to Brother Boll and his friends, I would tell them that the "abomination of desolation" spoken of through Daniel, and referred to by Jesus Christ in Matthew 24:15, had reference to the Roman army led by Titus when Jerusalem and the temple were destroyed A.D. 70.

On page 35, Boll says: "John's preaching (Matt. 3:1-12) however brought out the notable fact that a thoroughly-going repentance must be the necessary preparation for the announced kingdom. Since the kingdom promise was national, the preparatory repentance must of course also be national; then rulers and the rank and file of the people to all of whom the kingdom was dear, must now sincerely turn and return to God." Of course John, the Baptist's mission was only to the Jewish nation; but the repentance and baptism he preached were not national, but individual. Surely Brother Boll's acumen is not so dulled by digging around his premillennial bush that he does not know this. However, if John's preaching was the "necessary preparation for the announced kingdom," since the kingdom that John announced was postponed, according to Brother Boll, and therefore John's preaching and preparation were all lost, it follows that when Jesus comes back to try again to establish his earthly kingdom and reign on David's earthly throne, (I say try again advisedly because if the Jews fooled the Lord before they may do it again) that God will either have to change his announcement and preparation of the kingdom "at hand," or he will have to send another John the Baptist. In Matthew 3:3, we read: "For this is he that was spoken of through Isaiah the prophet, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make ye ready the way of the Lord, make his paths straight." Now since the Jews would not let Jesus travel "the way," nor walk in "the paths" John prepared for Him, according to Boll's vagaries, will he tell us what prophecy in the Old Testament tells of the preparation for the future earthly kingdom of Christ, and what prophet told of the preparation for his spiritual kingdom or church? Again he says: "The sermon on the Mount was spoken to a people who were under the Law, and before the Old Dispensation had ended. (Everything that Christ did or taught were under the law, and died under the law-and in his death the law was nailed to the cross—(Jno. T. L.) While already infused with the grace of the gospel (which is freely offered in the Beatitudes) it insists upon a strict and faithful observance of the whole Law." How could they have been "already infused with the grace of the gospel" since Christ had taught nothing about the gospel, if indeed he knew anything about the gospel at that time? Surely the teaching of R. H. Boll on the kingdom question is a medley of absurdities and contradictions. He says the "righteousness" taught in the sermon on the Mount is not the righteousness spoken of in Romans 4: 22-24, 5: 17. Just another one of his hair-splitting absurdities. Again he says: "In Matt. 7: 21-23 the king is seen judging 'in that day' and excluding from entrance into the kingdom those who have not so obeyed. Again it must be evident that the kingdom spoken of here cannot be the church." Yes and it is just as evident that he was not speaking of an earthly kingdom. Jesus Christ was giving a view of the final judgment, and the conditions of the people as they shall appear there, and had no reference to the re-establishment of the earthly kingdom of Israel, with Christ on David's earthly throne reigning over an earthly kingdom in Jerusalem. This is the bosh Boll is trying to read into that scene of the final judgment, when those who have done the will of God will go into the everlasting kingdom, and those who have not done his will will go to hell. No earthly kingdom, or Jerusalem were contemplated in the closing scene of the sermon on the Mount, or in any part of that sermon, notwithstanding R. H. Boll to the contrary. He evidently thought his dissertation on the sermon on the Mount was too glaringly absurd, so he wrote a note of explanation on page 36. Read it. "To take the sermon on the Mount thus in its own evident connection and setting involves no repudiation of its teaching to the church. Such passages as 5: 17-19 and 23 and perhaps 6: 16-18 have no direct application to the church; but all of the Sermon being the Lord Jesus' word is either directly or in principle applicable to the life and walk of God's children today," Shades of Aristotle! The sermon on the Mount, although taught to set forth the principles which should govern the subjects of an earthly kingdom, with temple rebuilt and services resumed, according to R. H. Boll, "being the Lord Jesus' word is either directly or in principle applicable to the life and walk of God's children today." His conclusion here is clothed neither in logic nor reason. The only reason the principles set forth in the sermon on the Mount, are applicable to us today, is because Christ taught them in view of his spiritual kingdom or church, and contrasted the principles he was teaching with the law of Moses under which he was living, the law governing fleshly Israel. For instance, "Ye have heard that it was said, Thou shalt not commit adultery: but I say unto you, that everyone that looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart," etc. But Christ did and taught many things that are not binding on us today, because they were not incorporated in his will. In this connection I will quote from the preface of his book. "On the other hand, let a man take up the statements concerning the kingdom in the New Testament, and examine them carefully in the light of their context, and judge whether without exception the church answers to the requirements of each passage. If the kingdom here spoken of is simply the church, would it not be peculiar to say (as in Matt. 5: 3) 'theirs is the kingdom of heaven?' Is
the church theirs? Or does He refer to the church when he says that 'many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of Heaven?' (Matt. 8:11) No, Christ does not refer to the church here, neither does he refer to Boll's imaginary earthly kingdom which he says Christ came to establish, but had to postpone because the Jews were not ready for it. Christ was referring to the kingdom he will deliver up to the Father when the end comes, and when "he shall have abolished all rule and all authority and power"—the everlasting kingdom. Those who have read the New Testament and do not know this, their ignorance of Christ's teaching is as dense as the darkness that brooded over Egypt as one of the ten plagues sent upon Paraoah. I say this not to be harsh; but challenge the attention of the readers to this divisive, and perversive teaching of R. H. Boll on his kingdom theories. There is not an honest man living who could read the New Testament through, without preconceived ideas, and get the remotest idea of a future earthly kingdom with Christ as king ruling on David's earthly throne, over an earthly kingdom in Jerusalem, no more than he could get an idea from reading the New Testament that sprinkling is baptism. It is only by the perversers of the gospel that such foreign ideas are read into the New Testament.

The "Great Crisis" that Brother Boll says was reached in the 12th chapter of Matthew was only a figment of premillennialism in his mind. There was no great crisis in the life of Christ. His incarnation, his virgin birth, his life, his teaching, his betrayal, his crucifixion, his burial, his resurrection, his commission to his apostles, his ascension, his coronation, and his sending the Holy Spirit to guide the apostles into all the truth, were orderly, and a systematic unfolding of the divine scheme of redemption worked out in the mind of God before the world was. Anything else read into the life and teaching of Jesus Christ is a force. The Jews never did reject Christ as an earthly king or ruler, they rejected him only as the Son of God, the Messiah that was to come. "Again the high priest asked him, and saith unto him, Art thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed? And Jesus said, I am: and ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of Power, and coming with the clouds of heaven. And the high priest rent his clothes, and saith, what further need have we of witnesses? Ye have heard the blasphemy." (Mark 14:61-64) If I could do it in the right spirit, I would challenge Boll, and all the neutrals thrown in, to show one passage in the New Testament that teaches the Jews rejected Christ as the "Great King of David's line," the restorer of Israel's earthly kingdom, the kingdom Boll says both John and Christ announced as "at hand." While they are making up their minds to accept my challenge, you may read the following. "When therefore the people saw the signs which he did, they said, This is of a truth the prophet that should come into the world. Jesus therefore perceiving that they were about to come and take him by force, to make him king, withdrew again into the mountain himself alone." (John 6:14, 15) Brother Boll says: "Four times Matthew tells us with peculiar emphasis that Jesus 'withdrew.' And he makes quite an ado over Mathew's "withdraws," but he seemed to overlook John's "withdrew" as quoted above, it does not fit into the "great crisis."

On page 38, Brother Boll takes up the parables, he says: "Let the reader attentively consider the parables of Matt. 13 and satisfy himself on these points. But one thing must have dawned upon us: the correspondence of these secrets with the present conditions in this church age! These parables are really an announcement of the new and unexpected aspect the kingdom would assume during an anticipated age of the king's rejection and absence from the world." Brother Boll italicized the above, and evidently thought he had something. But "unexpected" and "anticipated" are contradictory terms. "Unexpected" to whom, and "anticipated" by whom? I do not believe the church is an "unexpected aspect" of anything. Paul says: "To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in 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." (Ephesians 3:10, 11) In the 1938 March issue of Word and Work, Brother Boll says: "If, after all he has promised and sworn to his people, Israel, God does not fulfill his word to them, but instead turns all into a spiritual and figurative fulfillment to a new spiritual contingent called 'the church' then we cannot know that any promise of God can be relied on, nor can we know what He means when He says anything." Brethren how do you like God's "eternal purpose" sandwiched between R. H. Boll's "unexpected aspect of the kingdom" and his "new spiritual contingent called the church?" The neutrals may say, Brother Boll wrote his "aspects" and "contingencies" in the "spirit of Christ," and I quoted him in a bad spirit, and that may make the sandwich palpable to them.

On page 39, under the sub-heading "I will build my church" Brother Boll quotes Peter's confession "Thou art the Christ the Sou of the living God." He italicized this confession and says: "It is the old Testament picture of the glorious and victorious Messiah who shall execute judgment and vengeance upon the nations and under whose feet the nations shall be brought to zero. Peter confounded all the Jewish hopes and expectations of the coming Messiah. The prophet Jesus our Lord art the prophesied Christ, this Son of the living God to whom belongs the place of universal sovereignty by right of inheritance. That was Peter's confession, and the Lord formally accepted it." According to this Peter's confession was only a picture of the glory of Christ in and over his future earthly kingdom, and had no reference to the coronation and reign of Christ over his spiritual kingdom. Therefore all of us who have confessed Jesus as "the Christ the Son of the living God," have only confessed the title of an earthly sovereign. It would be too bad to let the world know that brethren would wrangle over such minor things, according to the neutrals, so I will not try to find words to describe such blasphemy. On page 41, he says: "In the teaching that follow in Matt. 18, 19 and 20, the reference to the kingdom bears variably upon the one or the other of these features-the present spiritual aspect, as the kingdom shares the incorporeal nature of the king (1 John 3:2) in unworlly walk, humiliation, rejection, and suffering, and all the stringent spiritual requirements in order to final acceptance on the other hand; and the glory to come on the other." Therefore according to Boll "Jesus Christ" is the fictitious name or character of the king while he rules over "the present spiritual aspect" of the kingdom. I suppose the neutrals would say Brother Boll wrote about "the incorporeal nature of the king" in the spirit of the assumed name of this king. On page 43, Boll says: "At His coming He will exercise the governmental authority of the kingdom, appointing His faithful servants to rulership and executing vengeance upon the adversaries. In this latter phase, which is here seen to be deferred until the Lord's return from heaven, we recognize again the features of the Old Testament hope and promise, the very hope the disciples cherished, and which however, was not to be realized just yet." Thus according to Boll's theory the "Old Testament hope and promise" had no reference to the spiritual kingdom, the church, nor to heaven, the everlasting kingdom; but to the future earthly kingdom of Israel, with Christ as king on David's earthly throne, ruling in Jerusalem with his "faithful servants" sharing in this rule.
I have just read Brother C. R. Nichol's book—“God's Woman,” and it suggested the above heading to me. Having read some of the commendations of the book I was not prepared for some of the things he said in it. Of course, he said some good things in the book; but he put enough "wild gourds into the pot" to contaminate the whole stream of New Testament teaching on women appearing in the presence of God, and teaching in public assemblies. The book seems to be a labored effort to justify the whims and customs of some of our sisters, and so it will become the standard of authority to all preachers who want to follow the course of "least resistance." Knowing and respecting Brother Nichol as a Bible student, and teacher, as long as I have, it would be more agreeable to me to commend his book than to criticise it, but this would be to stultify my conscience. This I am sure Brother Nichol would not want me to do. I hope, therefore, Brother Nichol will be just as frank in dealing with this article as I am with his book. May be we can help each other to better understand the truth.

I will first make some general observations about the teachers, and teaching during the apostolic age, which was a miraculous age. The apostles received the baptism of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, and thereafter preached the gospel by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven. (See 1 Peter 1:12, and Gal. 1:11, 12). The lessons thus taught were confirmed by miracles, wonders, and signs, and put on record as the confirmed truth. Paul's last charge to Timothy was: "I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom; preach the word." That is, preach what had already been preached and confirmed. Therefore, the only difference between us and the people who lived in the apostolic age is, they heard the apostles preach the gospel, by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, and witnessed its confirmation by the signs that followed. We read what they taught, and accept it as confirmed truth. Therefore, we have no need of a record of Pentecost. Cornelius and his house received the baptism of the Holy Spirit to convince the Jews that the Gentiles had the right to accept the gospel. (See Acts 11:1-18, and also Acts 15:7-7) Nobody denies us the right to obey the gospel today, so there is no further need of the baptism of the Holy Spirit upon the Gentiles. Thus we receive the same benefits of the two baptisms of the Holy Spirit on record that the people received during the miraculous age of the church. The other way of teaching, before the New Testament was completed, which was common to the members, was by spiritual gifts. Thus both man and woman were prepared to teach in the miraculous age of the church. We, today, both men and women are prepared to teach only by studying God's word. Both were expected to teach in that age, both are expected to teach today. They were prepared to teach by spiritual gifts, we are prepared by studying. There was absolutely no difference in the teaching in that age and this, the difference being only in the way they were qualified, and the way we are qualified. Therefore, every limitation and restriction placed upon woman teaching in the miraculous age of the church must be binding upon woman today. God's law has been given to control the activities of man and woman in every age, and the customs of the ages cannot change that law one iota. In I Cor. 11:12-14; 40 is a continued and unbroken discussion of Paul as to how men and women should conduct themselves in public assemblies. In chapter 11:2-16, Paul tells men and women how to appear in public worship, and he gives the reason for it. It makes no difference if they worship in a cave, on a mountain, under a tree, or in a house. In verses 17-22, he condemns the mockery they were making out of the worship, and from verses 23-24 he tells them that he had received the divine system of worship which he had put in the church at Corinth from the Lord, and then he tells them how to observe the Lord's supper. He does this without mentioning any restrictions on either men or women as to teaching. In chapters 12, 13, and part of chapter 14, he discusses spiritual gifts, their purpose and end. In the last part of the 14th chapter, he gives the restriction to control the teaching of both men and women, in the public assembly.

With these facts before us, we are prepared to study Brother Nichol's book. On page 58, he says:

Custom decreed veil—wearing. Custom has now abrogated the edict. God did not bind the wearing of the veil on Christian women. The wearing of a head-covering, made by man, is a custom which has never been by heaven binding upon woman.

A statement like this coming from a man, who, "For years has been recognized by the religious leaders of the country as a careful student of the Bible: bold in his advocacy of its teaching, and a representative defender of the faith," is beyond my comprehension. In I Cor. 11:3, Paul says: "But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God." Paul was here giving the foundation or reason for his arguments that followed. The subordination of all men to Christ the subordination of woman to man and the subordination of Christ to God. This was heaven's order from the beginning, and will be to the end. Custom has nothing to do with these facts, nor the arguments based on them. In view of heaven's order, Paul says: "Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head." There is no custom on earth, or in hell, that can abrogate this law. In verses 5, 6, Paul says: "But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled dishonoreth her head; for it is the same thing as if she were shaven. For if a woman is not veiled, let her also be shorn: but if it is a shame to a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be veiled." If heaven is not here binding on woman, in public worship., "the wearing of a head-covering, made by man," an artificial covering, then nothing has ever been "bound by heaven" on anything or anybody. The reference to women having their heads "shorn or shaven" was incidental, Paul was taking that which had been a badge of infamy from time immemorial to show Christian women what a shame it was for them to come into the public worship with their heads uncovered. If this is not the lesson Paul was teaching in these verses, there is no lesson in them, and you may therefore tear them out of your Bible and substitute Brother Nichol's statement, because it is Nichol versus Paul in this matter. In verse 13, Paul says: "Judge ye in yourselves: is it seemly that a woman pray unto God unveiled?" This question means something to Christian women who want to know and do God's will. In Proverbs 12: 15, we read: "The way of a fool is right in his own eyes: But the wise hearkeneth unto counsel." There are two classes described here, and every Christian must put himself in one or the other.

On page 60, Brother Nichol says:

In Corinth there were some who would dictate the length of a woman's hair, and today there are some who sneer as though they were authority, and dictate the length necessary for a woman to have her hair, else she will never enter heaven.
The above statements are some of the “wild gourds” Brother Nichol “put into the pot” to make those who teach the truth on these matters appear ridiculous. He never read anything in the Bible about “there being some in Corinth who would dictate the length of a woman’s hair.”

Neither has he ever met, nor heard of gospel preachers “who speak as though they were authority, and dictate the length necessary for whom to have her hair, else she shall never enter heaven.” It is never necessary for gospel preachers to make such unfounded statements when they are trying to teach the truth. There are some Christian (♀) women who have their hair shingled, and their necks shaved like men, and others have their hair bobbed at different lengths. It is this class of shingled, and bobbed haired woman who usually come into the public assemblies with their heads uncovered. Brother Nichol, is this because they have thrown away all womanly modesty, and are doing what Paul advised when he said: “For if a woman is not veiled, let her also be shorn,” or is it because gospel preachers, like you, tell them that “custom has abrogated the edicts” of the head-covering, and long hair?

In I Cor. 11:14, 15, Paul says: “Dost not even nature itself teach you, that if a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him? But if a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given for a covering.” Here revelation and nature speak the same language. To say that Paul was only binding a custom of “long hair” upon Christian women in Corinth, because it was the “custom of prostitutes in Corinth to bob their hair, is the wildest of “wild gourds.”

Neither was Paul “dictating the length of a woman’s hair. He says: “If a woman have long hair, it is a glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering.” To say that custom was thus “dictating woman’s long hair,” as her glory, and her covering, is to rush in where angels dare not tread. If a woman wears her hair as it “is given her,” and for the purpose it was given, whether it is short or long, she cannot go wrong.

On page 64, Brother Nichol says:

Sister, to have your hair dressed in the latest mode, your dress well-fitted, clean, pressed, tailored in keeping with the latest fashion; your face painted and powdered, your lips rouged, and attractive ornaments in your hair, and at your throat, is no sin.

Yes, “Sister,” you have Bible examples for “douling up” just as Brother Nichol describes to you; but it is an old “fashion.” In 2 Kings 9:30, we read: “And when Jehu was come to Jezeel, Jezebel heard of it; and she painted her eyes, and attired her head, and looked out at the window.” When Jehovah was denouncing the Godlessness of Jerusalem, inJer. 4:30, he said: “And thou, when thou art made desolate, what wilt thou do? Though thou clothest thyself with scarlet, though thou deckest thee with ornaments of gold, though thou enlargest thine eyes with paint, in vain doest thou make thyself fair; thy lovers despise thee, they seek thy life.” In the 23rd chapter of Ezekiel the idolatries of Samaria and Jerusalem are represented by the practices of two common harlots, named “Aholah” and “Aholibah.” In verse 40, we read: “And furthermore, that ye have sent for men to come from far, unto whom a messenger was sent: and, lo, they came; for whom thou didst wash thyself, paint thine eyes, and deck thyself with ornaments.” “Sister,” you now have before you all the Bible says about women “painting,” and what Brother Nichol calls “the latest fashions,” and you also have the class of women who set the “fashion.”

In chapter 14:20-40, Paul gave the restrictions governing the teaching of men and women when “the whole church is assembled.” Brother Nichol says, on page 121 of his book: “The position has been advanced that I Cor. 11:4, 5 gave women the right to pray and prophesy; but that the privilege was revoked in I Cor. 14:34, 35.” I have never heard that “position advanced,” but who ever “advanced” it was incapacitated to comprehend an argument when he read it. In I Cor. 11:4, 5 Paul was discussing one phase of his subject, how women should appear in the public assembly or worship, in I Cor. 14:34, 35 he was discussing another phase of his subject, how women should act in the public assembly.

On page 124, Brother Nichol says:
The ‘silence’ enjoined in I Cor. 14:34, 35 was in a meeting such as is not now had, and has not been since the days of spiritual gifts. To attempt to make the prohibition there expressed applicable today is a misapplication of God’s word.

This quotation should be set up in red ink because it forever “silences” I Cor. 14:34, 35, and to keep “ignorant and unlearned” preachers from “misapplying God’s word,” these verses should be cut out of the Bible. Let us look at the facts. In the apostolic age of the church women were qualified to teach by miraculous gifts, they are qualified to teach today by studying God’s word. Paul was not enjoining their qualifications; but their teaching, the use made of their qualifications. Therefore I Cor. 14:34, 35 are just as prohibitive of women teaching in public assemblies today as when Paul wrote them. Brother Nichol himself could see this if he had not become so intoxicated on “customs” when he was trying to please the sisters by justifying their painting and hair bobbing. We will now come to the “prohibition” Paul enjoined on men. On pages 135, 136 Brother Nichol says:

If there was no interpreter present, the speaking in tongues was forbidden, and the prohibition is thus expressed: ‘Let him keep silence in the church’ (I Cor. 14:28). If the conditions under which these men were commanded to keep ‘silence in the church’ existed today, then the prohibition here laid down would be applicable. But there being on earth today no one who is able to speak in tongues, the effort to make the prohibition here demandapplicable is clearly an effort to twist the scriptures, or ignorantly make a misapplication of the passage.

Now let us see on whose door steps “an effort to twist the scriptures, or ignorantly make a misapplication of the passage,” belongs. Suppose Brother Nichol should go to Japan, as a missionary, and get up before a Japanese audience and begin to speak in a “tongue,” the English language, and there was no interpreter present, would not: “Let him keep silence in the church” (I Cor. 14:28), be applicable to him? If not, why not? A “tongue” in the Bible sense was a language the hearers did not understand. So far as the teaching is concerned, it makes no difference as to whether a man receives a “tongue” by revelation or by study, he is commanded to “keep silence in the church,” if there is “no interpreter present.” Therefore, Paul’s restriction was on the use or misuse of “tongues,” and not on their reception. Men and women were qualified to teach in the miraculous age by spiritual gifts, we are qualified to teach today by studying God’s word; but precisely the same restrictions placed upon men and women teaching in the apostolic age are binding upon men and women in their teaching today.

On page 140 Brother Nichol says:
The conditions which existed in the church at Corinth at the time this letter was written, and the conditions under which women were required to “keep silence” exist in no place on earth today.

If this is true, then women may go to preaching in the church of Christ today, as they are already doing in the digressive church, even to holding pastorates. In verse 37, Paul says: “If any man thinketh himself to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him take knowledge of the things which I write, that they are the commandment of the Lord.”

Brother Nichol says, “the custom of that day.” Paul says, (Continued on page 19)
“DIGNIFIED RELIGIOUS JOURNALISM”

CECIL B. DOUGHTY

An Embarrassed Committee

About the time Brother Goodpasture took over the editorial reins of the Advocate, a committee of twelve men was appointed to restate the policies of the paper and to bestow upon the new editor a certain amount of authority which they would expect him to exercise. I know some of these committee men as well as any man knows them. They have been in the front ranks on the firing line of gospel truth for many years. They have been actively engaged in every fight against the theories that are disturbing the churches for the last two or three decades. Though I had never seen a single line from the pen of Brother Goodpasture during all the years that he has been a regular contributor to the Advocate, in which he took an active, aggressive stand against the false theories that the others had been fighting, yet I felt certain if he would follow the policy prescribed by the committee as reported in the Advocate of March 9, that the paper "would continue to publish articles which condemn error, within or without the church," that "it would hew to the line of the policy that had characterized it for eighty years," and that "both sides of an issue" would be "discussed freely and fully." I believed Brother Goodpasture would carry out the policies of his committee and wrote him a note of congratulation upon his appointment as editor. I was too hasty with that note. He refuses to comply with the policy and wishes of his chosen committee. Some of his most persistent objectors are on his committee.

A letter from one member of the committee informs me that he called at the Advocate office and asked to see an article that had been sent in for publication and which the editor would not publish. He was not permitted to see the article, much less pass on its publication. That article was sent back to its author and that committee man never saw it until it appeared in another paper.

Brother W. C. Cooke, another member of the committee, upon learning of Brother Goodpasture's new type of "dignified religious journalism," as manifested in his refusing to publish articles that he thought ought to be published, was very much displeased with Bro. Goodpasture's interpretation of his "authority" as delegated by the committee, and frankly told him so. He wrote a letter to Bro. Goodpasture stating that: "since such a committee exists it should be consulted on such matters"; that unless the article is published "with an apology from the person or persons responsible for its rejection" that he wants his name "dropped from the committee," with a short explanation for doing so. It is certainly a strange brand of dignity that publishes a man's name as a member of an editorial committee, but refuses to allow that man to state that he is no longer on the committee and not in sympathy with the editor's interpretation of his delegated "authority." That may be "dignified," but it is not just. Does Brother Goodpasture want the Advocate's readers to think that Clarence Cooke is endorsing the new policy of the Advocate? Why does he not let Brother Cooke tell the readers of the Advocate why he wants his name dropped from the committee? Brother Goodpasture got twelve good men on his committee and if they get off, they have got to slip off so quietly that the readers will never know they are gone.

A Case Of Injustice

Several weeks ago the Advocate published an article on "Premillennialism" by Bro. G. C. Brewer. The article was a brazen disparagement of the efforts of scores of good men (some of whom are dead) who in tears pleaded with R. H. Boll to hold his speculative views in private and quit teaching them to the destruction of the peace of the churches. Brethren from different quarters sent replies to Bro. Brewer's article. I too, sent one, in which I tried to tell the readers of the Advocate that dozens of faithful brethren had done, over a period of twenty-five years, what Brewer said ought to be done now. Many of these Boll apologizers over the country claim to be under the impression that those of us in Louisville who oppose the public teaching of Boll's theories have never tried as we should to get him to quit teaching them. And-Brewer's article
was a clumsy attempt to confirm that impression. The purpose of my article was to disabuse their minds of that false notion. Also, I tried to get him to come to Louisville and speak to M. C. Kurfees and other premillennialists to stop teaching their theories. Then I asked him four or five questions regarding the attitude he thought we ought to assume toward the premillennial leaders, after they refuse to stop teaching their divisive theories. Every one of those articles was rejected by the Advocate. They were either returned, or consigned to oblivion. But Brother Brewer was permitted to come back with another article in the Advocate, build him up a straw man, answer some questions that had been put to him, or that he found some where, or that he made up for himself, and wholly ignore the questions asked in one of the articles the Advocate refused to publish.

Even if we should grant that the questions Brother Brewer answered were answered satisfactorily, what in the wide, wide world has that to do with questions which neither he nor any other Boll sympathizer has ever answered through the Advocate? These questions under consideration are vital; that much discussed matter of "fellowship" is involved in them; they relate to Christian conduct and practice. Is it a breach of "dignified religious journalism" to ask and answer questions based on fellowship, Christian conduct and practice?

Many years ago when "speculations on unfulfilled prophecies and other Biblical utterances" crept into the Louisville churches, Brother M. C. Kurfees did everything that a Christian gentleman and a gospel preacher could do to get the principal speculator to hold his opinions in private. In a booklet, "The Need Of Continued Emphasis On The Restoration Of The Ancient Order," in 1929, he wrote the following:

"A most vivid illustration of this fact is found in the division and strife that have come in some of the churches in recent years over speculations on unfulfilled prophecies and other Biblical utterances. When these speculations were first given air in Louisville, Kentucky, a few years ago, I made an earnest and vigorous effort to impress upon their principal leader that, if the said speculations were not checked, they would be certain to lead to strife and division. I assured him that, so far as I was concerned, such opinions would not interfere with our fellowship and co-operation with each other in the Lord's work, provided he would keep them to himself 'before God,' as the inspired apostle in Rom. 14:22 distinctly requires, but that I could not co-operate with an individual in teaching and upholding such opinions. We must teach the word of God, and not the opinions of men. Assuredly the division and strife that have followed the propagation of the latter in this case most truly and vividly illustrate the wisdom of the inspired advice."

When the "principal leader" in speculation persisted in his theories, and when another "leader," E. L. Jorgenson, persuaded the Highland church to withdraw from two good men for objecting to his speculations, then M. C. Kurfees refused to co-operate with said leaders, he applied Rom. 16:17 to them, he turned "away from them," and went to his grave refusing to fellowship them. I believe he was right. He could not have pursued any other course and been true to the gospel of Christ. Now we are being criticized for doing what Brother Kurfees taught us to do. And since Brother Brewer has taken it upon himself to suggest and point out the duty of the brethren in these matters, I believe I was within the bounds of right and reason and "dignity" when I asked him to show us wherein we are wrong in our attitude toward these men who have caused all this division and strife in the churches. Brother Goodpasture and the Advocate are doing us a gross injustice when he says Brother Brewer say most anything he wants to say on "Premillennialism" and its teachers, and at the same time refusing to let us ask him a few simple questions so vitally connected with Christian practice. If Brother Brewer cannot show us we are wrong in our attitude toward teachers of opinions, I believe we can stop his criticism of the men who are leading the fight in opposition to this disturbing faction, if the Advocate will give us the space it so graciously grants to him.

That editorial of June 1, came as a shock to me, for Brother Goodpasture had told me in a letter that he could not publish my reply to Brother Brewer on "Premillennialism" because "the ground has been covered, in the main, by other articles." The ground of premillennialism has been covered! How strange! But has the ground been covered? I agree with one of the members of Brother Goodpasture's committee, who wrote to him as follows: "Now, as to the ground being 'covered repeatedly'; We must realize the ground is never covered so long as men like G. C. Brewer assume a compromising 'attitude' toward this faction." Does Brother Goodpasture really think the ground has been covered? He says he is now preparing a series of articles on premillennialism. It will be refreshing to see that series. What "ground will he cover? Of course any ground that he covers on that subject will be "new-ground" to him. Will he go to the practical side of the issue and answer the questions which were put to Brother Brewer and which were published in the May number of the Bible Banner? Will he tell us whether we are wrong in our practice-the practice of taking M. C. Kurfees' advice and applying Rom. 16:17 to the teachers of premillennialism? Will he discuss the point of veracity raised by Brother John Hayes' article which also he refused to publish? Or will he dabble around with a few little pieces so soft and flaccid that even Don Carlos Janes will give him a pat on the back for them?

A Final Word

Brother Goodpasture should go easy in his use of that proverbial "blue-pencil." If any living man knows what ought to be published in a religious journal, that man is F. B. Srygley. If the "blue-pencil" is used a little too freely on Srygley's pieces, and the brethren finds it out, it will be just too bad. They like Brother Srygley's type of "dignity," and they want him to have perfect freedom of the press in his fight for truth and right. Some are already wondering why Brother Srygley's articles are not as pointed as they were a few months ago. If Brother Goodpasture has not been blue-penciling Brother Srygley's paragraphs, he ought to say so at once. If he has, it would be better to hide his pencil and remain silent.
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One of the contemporary phenomena of American life is our craze for pictures. This has been abundantly, and to the publishers at least, lucratively illustrated by the immense popularity of the picture magazines such as Life, Look, Click, Pic, etc. These publications have catered to the public taste with all sorts of bizarre, biographical historical, and sexy pictures. Some of the photographers who secure these pictures have experimented with angles, lights and shadows, close-ups and panoramic shots, and have produced effects that are often startling, and sometimes almost unbelievable.

Along with the rise to popularity of these publications has come the candid-camera fiend. He delights in catching his friends with their mouths open or their shirt-tails out. He has even invaded the boudoir and the bath to get shots of embarrassed and unconventional subjects—not infrequently emerging with a black eye along with his cherished film. At any rate the spinster who is in the habit each night of looking under her bed for a man (whether fearfully or hopefully) is much more likely to find him now than she was a few years ago.

This, together with the cinema, has made us picture-conscious. We are familiar with such terms as "dark-room," "projection booth," "over-exposure," "under-exposure," etc. The principle of photography is fairly well known even to the average high school student. With such knowledge as a background, we can perhaps get a real insight into John's statement in I John 3:2, "Beloved, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We know that, if he shall be manifested, we shall be like him, for we shall see him even as he is." Just as the film accurately and truly reproduces that which it "sees" when the exposure is made, so the Christian truly reproduces the Christ-like life when he sees Christ as he is. While this passage undoubtedly has primarily an eschatological significance, it must not be overlooked that our vision of Christ begins in this life. David Smith says, "The argument is twofold: (1) Vision of God implies likeness to Him in character and affection (cf. Matt. 5:8); (2) the vision of God transfigures even in this life (II Cor. 3:18)."

It is both interesting and profitable to see how in past ages religious folk have become like that which they conceived the Savior to be. No less true is it today that our conception of Christ will inevitably mould our attitudes and shape our policies. We become like that which we worship. And every individual must of necessity have a mental image or picture of Christ which quietly and unconsciously makes his life and fashions him "according to the pattern." Hence, the compelling need of seeing Christ "even as he is." No distorted, out of focus, eccentric grotesquery will suffice: no one-sided caricature will make us Christ-like. There must be the full and complete picture which the Bible gives.

Only in this way can we know that we are becoming like Christ instead of like some distorted and incongruous parody or caricature of him. In the middle ages there were many who pictured Christ as an ascetic, inclined toward effeminacy, and shuddering at contact with the sinful and materialistic world. The result of such a picture was the worldwide retreat into the monasteries. All over Europe, in Asia and Africa, and even in America after its discovery these monasteries were a well-known and popular phase of religious life. Seeing a Christ who avoided contact with the world, those who desired to follow him became like-minded in their withdrawal. They became as it were dead to all association with their fellow-men. Many of them put themselves under a vow of perpetual silence. They spent long hours in fasting and prayer. In every way possible they curtailed contact with the outside world. And all because of a false picture of Christ.

At another and more recent age we have had the emphasis placed on the "manliness" of Christ. In such books as Bruce Barton's "The Man Nobody knows" (i. e. nobody but Bruce Barton) Christ is pictured as a sort of "hall-fellow-well-met." He is the glorified Rotarian, not above a subtle joke now and then or a hearty slap on the back. He is a man's man, masterful, dominant in any group, capable of big things, yet not above the practical jokes played on one another by his disciples, and being "the life of the party" at social gatherings. Seeing this sort of Christ it has been interesting to watch the antics of sectarian preachers (and sometimes even gospel preachers) in their efforts to become like Him. They have attended and become members of all the civic clubs in the city; they have gone to the ball games and shouted louder than anybody there if possible. In their daily contacts with others they boom and laugh and cavort, seemingly rather anxious to impress everybody with the idea that sanctity and sound are Siamese twins that the true Christian is one who knows how to be a "regular fellow." As a result they have cheapened religion in the eyes of the world, and have not infrequently made themselves the laughing-stock of the community.

But these eccentric perversions of the real Christ are relatively harmless in comparison with the more recent and more dangerous view of him which has gained such widespread popularity. We speak of that view which presents him as a mild-mannered, inoffensive, soft-spoken, sweet-spirited, Casper Milquetoast sort of man. This is the conception one would get almost always from listening to sectarian preaching. Christ is held up before the world as a composite of Casper Milquetoast, Little Lord Fauntleroy, and Ferdinand the Bull—especially the latter for "he never learned to fight." His mercy, his love, his gentleness are so magnified and presented out of all proportion as to make the finished picture a downright perversion. The thing they present to the world is not Christ; it hardly even resembles him. With such a picture and such a conception it is little wonder that the sectarian clergy are just too divinely sweet to be positive or plain about anything—even the truth they may present. Unfortunately the condition is not confined to the denominational clergy. It has seeped into the church of the Lord. The hesitant, apologetic, half-ashamed note is becoming all too prominent in our preaching. And unless a halt is called the day may not be too distant when we will be hearing sermons weekly after the manner of a certain pastor who shielded the woods with the following amazing pyrotechnic on "Repentance": "Ah-My beloved friends—the Bible teaches that we should repent. In fact a close study of this blessed volume will reveal that there are places where it positively makes such a declaration—ah, that is, in a manner of speaking. Ah, Jesus teaches us that we should quit sinning, as it were, or we are liable to be damned to a certain extent, and go to hell in some degree at least."

The specific for this condition is obvious. We must "preach Christ." We must earnestly and prayerfully study and present the complete and accurate picture of the real nature of the Lord. No perversions, no half-truths, no one-sided caricatures must be permitted. Those who are concerned both for the present safety and the future glory of Zion must awaken to the need of the hour. They must come alive to the fact that a false and dangerous idea of the Lord (which is
in truth a deadly heresy) is abroad in the land—and is threatening the church.

A close study of the Old Testament prophets will reveal that their preaching was always God-centered. If the people were particularly inclined to dishonesty and cheating, the prophets preached on the justice of God; if impurity and immorality were outstanding, the prophets preached on the holiness of God; if the times were heavy with fear and forebodings as in times of threatening national disaster, the prophets preached on the eternity and power of God; if idolatry were becoming popular, the prophets preached on the omnipotence, unity and exalted glory of God. Thus always the particular problem to be met was solved by a preaching on the character of God.

So it must be today. Since people become like that which they worship, and since “we shall be like him for we shall see him even as he is,” we must emphasize the true nature of Christ. His kindness and gentleness must be prominent in that picture (he is the lamb of God) but so also must be his fearless and militant aggressiveness (he is the Lion of Judah). Any preaching which presents one side of him with out the other is destructive of Christianity and should not be tolerated.

More Surveys?

We have seen a survey of the brotherhood to find out what the folks want the preachers to write. Brother Whiteside now suggests a survey to find out what the people want preached. Why not a third survey of the brotherhood to find out what the people want in their anonymous letters? (If we cannot know who wants the malicious lies, slander and gossip perhaps we could know the percentage.) Then after this survey is completed, I would suggest a fourth “survey of the brethren” to find out which surveys have been impartial, and have proposed another man—a better debater—and try it over! The brethren, being charitable, agreed for the Baptists to have another chance. They selected Dr. D. N. Jackson, another Arkansas Baptist champion. The “Doctor” submitted propositions and we accepted them, but have been unable, to these years, to get a definite promise as to the time for the battle. We are sorry Dr. Jackson is so busy (?) he cannot come to the rescue of his dissatisfied brethren. We had hopes that the debate would be held, with Dr. Bogard as Chairman Moderator! At least, we thought Jackson and Bogard might “bury the hatchet” and be “buddies” again. But our hopes have vanished.

Send Your Dollar

A year ago its birth was greeted with a great shower of subscriptions from nearly forty states. They have increased steadily. But it is renewal time for all who have received the Bible Banner from the beginning. If all will promptly send renewals — $1.00 — now, it will simplify our problem of sending out notices and save us that expense.

**Kentucky Currents**

**z. c. creacy**

**No One Knows**

(1) That Christ will set foot on the earth again; (2) that Christ will establish a kingdom when he comes; (3) that the Jews will be restored to Palestine; (4) and that man will have a second chance! Why should this Russelistic garbage be dumped into the church of Christ? What kind of pulse-beat does a member of the church have who will even wink at such teaching? The church and some of “our” colleges are honey-combed with such teachers and sympathizers. Out of the church, it is Russelism: in the church, it is “Bollism.” It is folly to deny it. When some one tells you that Brother Boll’s prophetic teaching is not “Russelism,” you had better be skittish of him. When a preacher, or even an elder, says he does not know what Premillennialism is, and doest not want to know, it is proof that they are not safe teachers.

**Disappointed**

In 1936 the Baptists in the “region of” Somerset, Kentucky, imported Dr. Ben M. Board of Arkansas to defend them in debate. In spite of all their boasting before the debate that the “church of Christ” in that region would be unknown when Board administered his Baptist anesthetic, the Baptists are much dissatisfied, and have proposed another man—a better debater—and try it over! The brethren, being charitable, agreed for the Baptists to have another chance. They selected Dr. D. N. Jackson, another Arkansas Baptist champion. The “Doctor” submitted propositions and we accepted them, but have been unable, to these years, to get a definite promise as to the time for the battle. We are sorry Dr. Jackson is so busy (?) he cannot come to the rescue of his dissatisfied brethren. We had hopes that the debate would be held, with Dr. Bogard as Chairman Moderator! At least, we thought Jackson and Bogard might “bury the hatchet” and be “buddies” again. But our hopes have vanished.

**Not By Accident**

A person cannot become a member of the church of the Lord by accident. Obedience to the gospel puts one in the body of Christ, which is the church. This must be an intelligent obedience. We “obey from the heart” (Rom. 6: 17, 18). We are saved by the truth, but Christ said we must know the truth (Jno. 8: 32). Faith is a prerequisite to obedience. Faith is produced by testimony (Rom. 10: 17). Divine testimony produces the right faith. False doctrine (testimony) produces the wrong faith. It follows then, that intelligent obedience is the result of the right faith. When one is taught false doctrine and accepts it, his “faith” is wrong, and his “obedience” is invalid. Thus, when people have been “baptized” upon the wrong faith, their baptism is invalid. I do not teach people of denominational bodies to be “rebaptized,” or to be baptized again; it is a question of being baptized. I do not “take people in” the church—that is not my business—the Lord does this. Whom does the Lord add to the church? “Such as should be saved” (Acts 2: 47) are added to the church. A denomination is not a side-entrance to the church. There is only one way to become a member of the church; Intelligent obedience to the gospel is the way. I am saying that the validity of baptism necessarily depends on the administrator, but it depends on the right faith. All law is predicated on design. Baptism is for, in order to, the remission of sins.

**“The Blue Grass Region”**

Many battles were fought for the “ancient order of things” in the blue grass region of Kentucky in pioneer days. Lexington was the scene of the famous battle against the onward march of rank Calvinism—the Campbell-Rice Debate. This section of Kentucky became the “stronghold” of the church in those days. But the tide of digression broke loose and most of the congregations were swept into the whirlpool of sectarianism. In recent years another apostasy (“Bollism”) very near swallowed the remnant. Much credit is due the Fairfax church in Winchester for holding fast “the things which befit the sound doctrine.” A great battle was fought in Winchester in 1933—the Neal-Wallace Debate—which resulted in saving many brethren in that territory from further advances of the Russelistic teaching of Boll. Neal, Rutherford, and others of that sect, to say nothing of the far reaching influence it had on the “brotherhood” at large. The cause in the “blue grass” is being restored and revived, and all indications point to a bright future. There are some able and dependable preachers laboring in that field, among whom is C. W. Scott, a young man of sterling character. He preaches daily, and is truly an evangelist (not a “Pastor”) of the Timothy type.
ROBERT INGERSOLL: PRODUCT OF INFIDELITY

GEO. W. DEHOFF

Infidels delight in seeking to malign the character and blaspheme the name of those who believe the Bible is God's Word. They have published books criticizing the sainted patriarchs of the Old Testament and seizing upon the slightest mistake in their lives as if it were a common occurrence and bore the approval of God. Preachers and their families have been mercilessly slandered as "half ignoramuses and the other half well-housed hypocrites."

Christianity gladly invites a comparison of its product with that of infidelity. "By their fruits ye shall know them." No Christian should desire to do despite to any man either living or dead, but since infidels still contend that Robert G. Ingersoll was a great thinker and a benefactor of mankind, let us look into his life both public and private.

Background and Character of Ingersoll

The father of Robert G. Ingersoll was a graduate of Yale and a Congregational minister. His character was good, his attitude tolerant. His mother was a graduate of Willard Female Seminary, Troy, New York. The ability of his parents accounts for the fact that Robert, though he had not a common school education, was a fluent talker and conversationalist. The mother of Robert died when he was young. His father married again. The children mistreated their stepmother. Three times he married other women with the same result. Infidels have charged that Mr. Ingersoll was so severe with his children that he drove-Robert to infidelity. This is false. He was too lenient with Robert who, spoiled by his father's indulgence, was proflane, obscene, rude and unfeeling; irregular in attendance at school and a shiftless loaf when it came to work.

Robert G. Ingersoll attempted to study law in Greenville, Illinois, but was dismissed for bad conduct. In Marion, Illinois, he came out of a house of ill-fame reeling drunk and little boys stoned him as he crossed the street. He was an idle, drunken, worthless loafer and gambler in Marion and was indicted there for being one of a drunken mob. (Court Record of Williamson County, Marion, Illinois) In Marion, Harrisburg, Shawneetown and Peoria, Illinois his life was that of a drunkard and gambler. It was common for him to curse and swear and insult people. (St. Louis Post-Dispatch, St. Louis, Mo. October 17, 1881) He taught school in Waverly, Tennessee, and was run out of the community for misconduct.

Robert G. Ingersoll visited grog shops and places of ill-repute all over the country. The proof of this is abundant in both court records and newspapers. Yet he is the man whom Atheists have recently said was "a greater man than Abraham" but sensible people say he was a moral reprobate.

His Public Life

Ingersoll's followers berate the churches for defending slavery and claim that Ingersoll was a champion of liberty. In 1860 he ran for Congress on the Pro-Slavery Ticket with the Fugitive Slave Law and the Dred Scott Decision as his platform. He was the foulest-mouthed and most rabid pro-slavery demagogue in southern Illinois. In 1861 he spoke so freely for the seceders that he was on the side of the South. When the other side became more popular he changed over and Lincoln appointed him Colonel of an Illinois Cavalry regiment in the hope that he would influence his associates to volunteer. Infidels claim he fought slavery but never mention his early career.

In the army, Ingersoll neglected his military duties. In Hallack's advance on Corinth, a sixteen year old Confederate boy ran him into a cattle yard, captured and disarmed him single-handed. (Infidels claim he was a greater soldier than Moses who led more than two million people for forty years! !) Ingersoll resigned from the army in the face of the need of men because charges of drunkenness, etc., were being presented against him.

Ingersoll was attorney for the Peoria Whiskey Ring. He embezzled thousands of dollars of his clients money and failed as an attorney. He ran for governor and was overwhelmingly defeated. (Once on the train he yelled, "What has Christianity ever done to help the world?" An aged lady sitting across the aisle answered, "It has kept Robert G. Ingersoll from being governor of Illinois.) Ingersoll tried to be appointed Minister to Berlin under Hayes but made no respectable showing. He tried to be Republican delegate from the District of Columbia but was defeated by a Negro. His last political effort was to present a petition "to open the U. S. Mails to the circulation of vile literature and instruments of vice." (See Record of the Senate Committee on Petitions.)

Ingersoll As a Writer and Thinker

Ingersoll could not get a third grade teacher's certificate. (Madison, Ind. Star, December, 1881). His famous speech on "Temperance" was stolen from Dr. Gunn's "Family Physician." His Mistakes of Moses was plagiarized from "Evidences Against Christianity," a book by James Hirrel published in London in 1809. His lecture, "The Gods," was stolen from "The Leviathan of Hobbes" and "The Ruins of Empires," by Volney, and the Encyclopedia edited by Voltaire. His "Ghosts," was plagiarized from D. Alembert's "System of Nature." He is supposed to have written a hundred lectures but four could be selected containing all his blasphemies. The others are merely repetition. His famous Speech at a Child's Grave" and "Speech at His Brother's Grave" are almost entirely taken from English poets and changed into prose.

Ingersoll once asked "Do you think God passed by the wonderful civilization of the Greeks and Romans and chose old Abraham and his tribes?" not knowing that Abraham lived a thousand years before the Greeks and Romans. In commenting on the book of Joshua he said that if the earth were stopped it would give off as much heat as a piece of coal six billion times as big as the earth! Only a "rationalist" could explain how he arrived at this unusual figure! ! Ingersoll said that since it is colder up in the air, if the flood waters had covered the earth there would have been ice three and a half miles thick at the equator! He did not know that if the surface of the earth were enlarged the temperature would remain approximately the same. When asked how he would have improved creation he replied that he would have made goods health catching instead of disease. He did not know that in that case he would have had to create people diseased so they could "catch" health. He once asked, "Why doesn't God kill the devil?" Someone replied "It would leave too many of you fellows orphan children." Ingersoll was challenged to debate all over the country by dozens of Jews and Christians and he always refused. (Decatur, Ill. Morning Review, January 26th, 1889 and other papers.)

Yes, "by their fruits ye shall know them," and if infidelity is satisfied with Paine, Hobbs, Hume, Rosseau, Voltaire and Ingersoll, believers can certainly be satisfied with Abraham, Moses, Christ, Paul and the other apostles; with Luther, Spurgeon, Campbell and others who have tried in some measure to fight their battles.
There is a strange teaching in the land that the Jews rejected the Christ when he came and killed him, which thing was neither foreseen nor expected, and because of this the whole plan of God was changed. It was expected that the Jews would accept the Christ when he came first to the earth and that then God would set up the kingdom that Daniel (Dan. 2) and John and Jesus spoke of (Mk. 1:14-15). But since the Jews rejected the Christ instead of accepting him God did not at that time give the kingdom but did give as a "contingency," the church, instead of the kingdom as God expected to give when Jesus came to the earth the first time. So all is different from what was foreseen and expected. What a pity that God and Christ did not foresee what the Jews would do with Christ, so that they could have avoided giving the teaching that was given concerning the establishment of the kingdom! Much misunderstanding and trouble could have been avoided if God and Christ could have been wiser and written better. The divided church that is now sick might have been saved from all this fuss and fight and division.

But is it true that the suffering and death and resurrection of Jesus were not seen? Was not that very thing seen and foretold? That the Jews would not receive the Christ but would reject him and that he would be killed and his death was fully and plainly taught in the Old Testament, and hence there was no disappointment so far as what God and Christ knew would take place when Christ came the first time to this earth.

1. David saw that Christ would die, but that his soul was not left in hades nor did his flesh see corruption. (Ps. 16:8-10; Acts 2:25-28)

2. That Judas would betray Christ was known. (Ps. 41:9; Jn. 13:18)

3. The price that was to be paid for Jesus was known. (Zech. 11:12)

4. What should be finally done with that money was known. (Zech. 11:13; Mt. 27:1-10; Acts 1:16-20)

5. That no bone should be broken was known. (Ps. 34:20; Ex. 12:46; No. 9:12; John 19:26)

6. That he should be smitten was known. (Zech. 13:7; Mt. 26:31; Mk. 14:27)

7. Zechariah says that they should look upon him whom they had pierced. (Zech. 12:10) This shows that they not only knew that he should die but that he should be pierced. (Jn. 19:34-37)

8. When Paul preached the death, burial and resurrection of Jesus (1 Cor. 15:1-4), he did it according to the Scriptures. The Scriptures therefore told of these things.

9. Peter said (Acts 2:23) that Christ was killed according to the foreknowledge and determinate counsel of God.

10. Peter also said that God foreshadowed by all the prophets that the Christ would suffer death. (Acts 3:18) Then not just some of the prophets knew of these things but the words, "all the prophets," show that all knew it.


12. Paul to the Thessalonians reasoned from the Scriptures that the Christ should suffer and rise from the death. (Acts 17:2-4) But Paul could not have taught these things from the Scriptures if the Scriptures had not spoken of them.

13. When the eunuch was taught by Philip (Acts 8:26-33) from the Scriptures about the slaughter, death of Jesus he was taught from Isa. 53.

14. Paul (Acts 26:22-23) said that the prophets and Moses said that the Christ should suffer and be raised from the dead. This being so it is evident that the prophets and Moses of the Old Testament understood that the Christ should suffer and be rejected.

When one teaches today that it was not expected that the Jews would reject and kill the Christ such as one teaches heresy. When one says that all that God spoke through the prophets, Daniel, John, Jesus and others, about the establishment of the kingdom in the days of Christ while he was on earth or soon after, was wrong, and that the Jews upset the whole thing, he does not know or else does not care what the Bible teaches on that. God was not asleep nor was he ignorant of what the Jews might do with the Christ. To teach otherwise is heresy and leads to infidelity.

When God spoke as he did in the Old Testament of the death of Christ at the hands of the Jews He knew what he was talking about. And when John and Jesus and others spoke of the coming of the kingdom they knew what they were saying. When people say today that it was not expected that the Jews would reject the Christ they are wrong. When people teach that the Jews in rejecting Christ upset the whole plan of God as to the establishment of the kingdom it is the task of God to teach what is in direct contradiction to the Bible. There is no excuse for such teaching. It is heresy. God will not hold guiltless those that thereby divide the people of God, cause hatred, and retard the progress of the work of God among men on the earth. All should teach the truth, and the truth is one. There is no cause for all this wrack and strife. It should cease. God has told us (2 Jno. 1:8-10) that we should not encourage and assist false teachers and teaching. They that do it will be lost if they do not cease either to teach or encourage those that do teach such heresy. Some repenting is in order and must be done if men are to reach heaven.

"There Is Death In The Pot"

(Continued from page 13)

"the commandment of the Lord." Take your choice. In verse 38, Paul speaking of those who were neither prophets nor spiritual says: "But if any man is ignorant, let him be ignorant." That is, if you don't believe what Paul says, remain in your ignorance, and take the consequences; because there is no other method of enlightenment. On page 147, Brother Nichol commenting on 1 Timothy 2:12 says: "No one should conclude that the passage is atheistic, and that because Paul says men are to pray in every place, the teaching is that women are never to pray." No, Brother Nichol, nobody but an ignoramus would thus conclude; but surely Paul was implying that there were places where women should not pray. Will you please tell where these places are, if not in public assemblies? On page 150, Brother Nichol says: "My wife has a very fine collection of iris. She taught me how to hybridize—how to take the pollen from one flower and pollenate another flower. Did she do wrong in teaching me how to produce a hybrid?" No; but what has that got to do with women teaching or leading prayers in public assemblies? Surely you would not say: "My wife taught me how to hybridize," therefore, it is right for women to teach and lead the prayers in public assemblies.
That Brotherhood Survey and “Who Killed Cock Robin”?

As we hear from leading preachers all over the U. S. A. it becomes more and more evident that the so-called “survey” of Clinton Copyright Davidson was a sham. Who answered his questionnaire? Who did he survey? What kind of bullyragging is this that has been pushed over on the public? It is but the salesmanship scheme of an ex-digressive to promote a sinister religious movement among churches of Christ. It is the handmaiden of the Witty-Murch Movement — or are they twin-sisters?

Brother Jack Meyer opens the column this month with the suggestion that preachers of metropolitan areas be polled by one of their number and a report be made. He gives an example by doing that himself, and sends a joint report of the Birmingham preachers — none of whom answered the questionnaire. Yater Tant made a similar report for the others.

Another suggestion is that those who did receive the questionnaire, but answered it unfavorably to Davidson’s scheme, also send in their card. We have the suspicion that more unfavorable answers were sent in by those who replied to the questionnaires than has been found out. And since it has been said that Davidson alone has seen the answers to his questionnaires, who can put any trust in the claim that they were representative of the preachers, or the brethren as a whole? Evidently, they did not represent the host of preachers who are speaking their sentiments through the Bible Banner — and they are among our most able and best known men.

It is about to turn out that Clinton Copyright just dreamed about killing poor little Cock Robin with his air gun (or pop gun) but the real Cock Robin may have just flown away, and will come back again. So we hope that the old Gospel Advocate will soon get over the Davidson “ethical journalism” scare (“Whose afraid of the big bad wolf?”) and return to the field with heavy artillery for militant, aggressive, offensive warfare on error. Our address is Box 1804, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; let us hear from you.

Birmingham is glad to report that the thirteen preachers who preach regularly for the twelve churches of the district have been polled, and not a one answered the Clinton Davidson Questionnaire. I wonder of this is a sample of its coverage and response. If one brother in each city or section will take a little time and poll the preachers where he lives, then send in a collective report, much faster progress will be made in learning of more than three dozen really did answer the “brotherhood survey!”—Jack Meyer, Birmingham, Ala.

* * *

(The other preachers in Birmingham are W. C. Graves, John T. Lewis, Floyd H. Horton, Elliott Hill, John D. Cox, Ezell, Estes, and others whose names I do not recall—and Brother Meyer says not one of the whole group answered the questionnaire. Brother Copyright—who did answer your great questionnaire?—Editor)

* * *

I am fully persuaded that you are doing one of the most needed works in the brotherhood today. As to the questionnaire sent out relative to the kind of religious literature desired, those received by me soon found the wastebasket.—Thos. H. Burton, Lake City, Fla.

It gives us great pleasure to write you and let you know that we are behind you in your great fight for the Truth. We think it is time for every church and every individual Christian to take a stand for the pure and undefiled gospel. “Once delivered to the saints.” We enjoy the Bible Banner and believe it will hold the tide of digression by exposing the false doctrines, and also our weak brethren who are trying to be neutral until they see which side will win before they take a stand.

Yours in the faith,

(Signed) Elders and Deacons, Monahans Church of Christ, Monahans, Texas.

Elders: C. F. Fehl, H. A. Pickering, Chas. R. Hall.


Evangelist: A. G. Hobbs, Jr.

* * *

We know a little about the tremendous task that you have assumed: and of the bitter criticism directed at you by the enemies of the truth, which is meant to include also those who try to stand on both sides of the fence. We want you to know that we are in hearty accord with the great fight you and those associated with you are making for the unity and purity of the church for which the Saviour died. Our prayers are that the Father may bless you in physical strength and wisdom to carry on for the truth, and that the faithful brethren will uphold your hands.

(Signed) W. R. Rose, A. G. Williams, Solon Whitehead.

Elders Church of Christ, Winfield, Ala.

* * *

It was true of olden times and is still true in our time: that in every wave of departure from the course prescribed by God for man, there will arise some who will champion the Lord’s cause in a great way. The Banner (and not the Leader) appears at a very opportune time. It is operating in a very creditable manner in the much neglected field of journalism, and this field seems to be widening due to the fact that the papers that once dealt in an effective way with the controversies, isms and innovations affecting the church have toned down in a great measure.—W. H. Green, Billiant, Ala.

* * *

I received the questionnaire but did not answer it. I never did learn the method of approach and am more interested in what people need than in what they want.—W. G. Bass, Orange, Texas.
I have been reading your paper and have come to the conclusion that you are the only one in the paper business who has courage enough to tell the whole truth about the inside condition of the church.—J. L. Hines, Dallas, Texas.

As I now recall, I returned the questionnaire with the comment that Paul' writings were a very fine example for us. It seems from the last issue of the paper that a great number of the preaching brethren did not favor the New Paper. I rejoice in the firm stand taken by so many, and their expressions of support for you and your work. I have no respect for the unchristian effort being made to hurt you and do not believe that it will. I believe that both you and your work are being accepted with greater praise than ever before.—M. C. Cuthbertson, Haynesville, La.

I have read and enjoyed the eleven issues of the Bible Banner to the fullest extent, and cannot refrain from writing you and expressing my appreciation of a periodical that is filling such an important and definite place in the brotherhood. You are plugging up the gap that has too long been left open for allisms and ites and other species of bacteria, to creep in. They are receiving a genuine sterilizing through your ability and that of your loyal backers and your many friends seeking the whole truth.—James 0. Wolfgang, Indianapolis, Ind.

I have just read the May issue of Bible Banner. Each issue is superior-excellent and I long for the coming of each one. The thrill and the reassurance that it gives me to behold the valiant fight that you and your faithful associates are making for the old paths beggars expression. I believe your fight is acceptable in the sight of God, and in spite of all the diabolical schemes that have been framed to destroy you, I believe our God will sustain you. I pray that he may preserve you and permit you to lead the battle for many years yet to come.

It would be my choice to pay several times the present subscription price to see the Bible Banner supported and kept alive. I will lose no opportunity to encourage others to subscribe. David H. Bobo, Chattanooga, Tenn.

I never received any of the questionnaires sent out by Mr. Davidson. I have received some of the unsigned sheets, which were used to start fires. "Preach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine." Keep up the good fight.—V. P. Smith, Goldendale, Wash.

I received a copy or two of the questionnaire but did not answer. Not a preacher with whom I have talked about it has ever admitted that he answered one. I felt that the querist might not know much more about how to run a paper than do our present experienced editors and I am pretty well convinced that the average preacher would make a failure if he tried it. So what would his advice be worth? Who could please every one if he tried? The Lord did not. He did not try. Please the Father.—C. L. Wilkerson, Springfield, Mo.

Received my first copy of Bible Banner dated May, 1939. It is fine, and to the point. You do not have to guess who or what the writer is talking about. I believe much lasting good will come to the surface after awhile, but things have gone so far in the wrong direction, it will take time to tell.—V. M. Whitesell, Tenn.

I deeply appreciate and enjoy the Bible Banner.—J. Roy Vaughan, Miami, Fla.

As to that questionnaire from Davidson or someone else, I did not give it enough consideration to remember what I did with it, but I think I gave it all the consideration it deserved. When men ask men what to preach instead of asking God (as directions are already given in the Bible) I do not think such men are fit to preach—they are men-pleasers. May the Lord bless and help you.—G. A. Dunn, Dallas, Texas.

I want to let you and the readers of the Bible Banner know what disposition I made of the recent questionnaire. Well, here goes—it was in the wastebasket thirty seconds after it reached my hands.—J. M. Powell, Louisville, Ky.

My tardiness in communicating with you has not been due to any lack of interest on part in the battle you are waging against error and compromising tendencies in the church today. I am in hearty accord with you as are thousands of others who will not sheath the sword until the battle is won. The questionnaire sent me found its way into my wastebasket, of course. I have not talked with a gospel preacher (and I have contacted a number) who answered it. All discarded it as I did.—Guy N. Woods, Wellington, Texas.

I believe the question is, "Who killed Cock Robin?" It was not I. I did not even get a shot at him. If I had gotten a shot, I believe I would have taken it at the vulture that was waiting to prey on the remains of poor Robin. But I do not believe Cock Robin is dead. The last few issues of the Bible Banner is evidence that he is still very much alive and in good health. I did not get the questionnaire; so you add this to the reports that make up the "5 per cent." It is rather a heavy "minority report." All the preachers in this section are with you in the fight.—Denton M. Neal, Blytheville, Ark.

I received the Davidson survey. It went into the waste basket. I have met one person who answered it. Only two were received in this congregation of nine hundred members. I wrote Davidson a letter asking if he were once in the Christian Church. His secretary answered that "he is extremely busy with constructive work" and has no time for such questions. I asked McMillan the same question when he was in Fort Worth. He did not answer. Brother John Straiton said that he was in New York about a year ago when Davidson placed membership with the Manhattan church. So it seems that he has really been lost. That would not be so bad if we could be assured that he has been found.—Glen L. Wallace, Cleburne, Texas.

I received one of the Davidson questionnaires, but did not answer it. It struck me as having been written by one who could not stand plain New Testament truth from either pulpit or press. It had the appearance of having stopped over at Louisville for a "spell," or it might even have been born there. I greatly appreciate the Bible Banner and its firm stand for the truth.—Arthur W. White, Winslow, Ariz.

I received Davidson's questionnaire but did not answer it.—Wm. Britton, Foss, Okla.

I do not recall whether I got one of the Davidson questionnaire's or not. But if I did, and if I answered it, I know I told him I was four-square for plain, pointed, gospel preaching and writing.—C. D. Plum, Wheeling, W. Va.

I am another preacher who assigned the Clinton Davidson "Better Religious Journalism" survey questionnaire to the waste basket.—Geo. B. Curtis, Morrilton, Ark.
Encouraging A Fraction

In reply to Bro. Morehead's letter asking for subscriptions to World Vision, I thought I had the privilege of saying what I thought about the magazine, especially since I was sending money. I sent the money because I approve of much in the magazine and I know it does good. But I cannot understand how a man of his acquaint-ance can under-estimate the havoc wrought by the Boll schism-havoc that has, according to Bro. Batsell Baxter, crippled our work even into foreign fields. Bro. Morehead, special-ist in foreign work, should be more concerned than the rest of us about Bro. Baxter's remark. I do not know, first hand, just how far premillennial-ism has hampered foreign work, but I thought I could see the following point very clearly:

I regret so much you would lend even indirect aid to the Louisville fac-tion by advertising their song books. If all brethren would mark them plainly, ere long I believe they would quit their specializing on theories, re-struction of Jews, etc. Somuch bet-ter it would be if they would special-ize on practical matters-the salvation of all people thru obedience to his blessed gospel.

Bro. Morehead replied that it is a case of a pot calling a kettle black:

Are not most of the songs published by the Gospel Advocate Company written by brethren? Are they not paid for the song? Does this not encourage sectarianism? If not how do we encourage the Louis-ville brethren by buying their song books? I am unable to see any differ-ence.

What if the Advocate were guilty of encouraging sectarianism? Would that justify the World Vision to encourage it also? That is the kind of "logic" Bro. Clinton Davidson uses to justify his hibernation with the digressives: "The alleged loyal church in New York City had no program of action, so I left it and went to the Christian Church." It seems to me both of these brethren are using "logic" that says: Two wrongs make a thing right.

Well, of course if the Advocate pat-ronizes sectarians when it could patronize loyal brethren, it does wrong: if I buy from a Roman Catholic preacher when I could buy from a brother in the Lord, I am without excuse. And so if I buy from factionalists my song books when I can buy them from sound brethren, am I doing right? I have no axe to grind, and am not soured on anybody; nor do I uphold wrong in anybody. It just seems to this immature person that for me to advertise and buy books from Louis-ville, the equal of which I can get elsewhere, that I am going out of my way to encourage schisms.-Hugo McCord.
Another Melting Pot
L. L. BRIGANCE

A finer group of young people, perhaps, were never gathered together than the student-body of Freed-Hardeman College during 1938-39. The cosmopolitan character of this body is shown in the fact that they come from twenty-one different states and the Dominion of Canada. They were a typical cross-section of American life. They represented all parts of our great country from New York, Pennsylvania and the Virginias on the east to Arizona, New Mexico and California on the west, and from Canada and the great lakes on the north to Florida and the Gulf of Mexico on the south. Some came from the little hillside farm far away in the depths of the backwoods, while others came from such great industrial centers and metropolitan cities as Philadelphia, Detroit, Cincinnati and Cleveland. They also represented a great variety of social and economic conditions. Their very speech betrayed them. It told from what section of our country they came. There was the sharp, crisp, staccato voice of the North; and the soft, languorous drawl of the deep South. One common interest, however, drew them and held them together—their own love, or that of their parents, for the pure gospel of Christ and the New Testament church. In spite of all their differences otherwise, in the melting pot of Freed-Hardeman College, they soon ran together and became one solid unit. All sectional, social and economic differences forgotten, they soon became one big family living, working and playing together in the melting pot of Freed-Hardeman College during 1938-39.

'The Timid Soul
I dreamed that I was standing near
The throne of Christ on high,
While all humanity, in fear;
Came slowly filing by.

Two streams approaching, left and right,
Converged before the throne,
And all fell down before the light,
That came from out the throne.

And every tongue confessed him now,
The One who did atone;
And every knee to him did bow,
To Christ upon his throne.

At left were screaming, bitter cries,
At right was jubilee!
But all did seem to recognize
As just, their destiny.

Then from the ranks of doomed appeared,
Of pious mien, a man,
Who made request that he be heard,
And thus his speech began:

"A man of peace, on earth was I,
I sought in peace to dwell.
So why should peace now pass me by,
My spirit left in hell?"

Behind the throne there was a stir,
And when I bent to look,
A shining angel did appear,
And bore an open book.

The king gave order to proceed.
He read with dignity.
"A most strange case in this, indeed,"
Then to the man, said he:

"As farmer—all your crops kept clean,
And every weed did kill;
As teacher-truth you did not screen,
Let lies grow in the hill!"

"Until the church you left untaught
Was torn to shreds by strife.
Is that the peace for which you fought?
For which you gave your life?

"To save a child, your life didst dare
And fought a mad-dog fierce;
But error rampant everywhere
Your neighbor's souls did pierce.

"To build a house, you cleared the ground,
And laid foundation fair;
But built your teaching all around
The errors that were there."

"Please stop!" the poor man cried,
"Oh, cease!
Thy words are like a rod.
Tis plain I was a man of peace,
But not a man of God!"
Sighting — In Shots

(Continued from page 1)

we ought to be. About all the Standard seems willing to risk at present in proof that "we are following Scripture" is a rather feeble plea that "we" are not any worse than the rest of us. It is quite possible that some of the rest of us are not quite as good as we ought to be, measured by the scriptures, but what does that have to do with the issues that Brother Boles raised? The logical thing for the Standard to do is to make an effort to show "that we are following Scripture" and if it succeeds it will make clear the duty of the rest of us. There is a mild note of defiance in the following:

Let him understand fully that we are not in any degree afraid of his arguments, but we do not believe unity is to be reached by this method, and we desire unity very, very much.

A free and frank discussion of the issues raised by Brother Boles in his great speech, is not likely to bring about the sort of unity that the Christian Standard so "very, very much" desires. The Standard wants unity with instrumental music and the societies. Brother Boles insists that there can be no unity except without them. This makes the issue quite clear and since the Standard is "not in any degree afraid of his arguments" a full discussion of the issue is in order.

This question of unity goes a lot deeper than the Standard's attitude, or that of any participant in a unity conference in Indianapolis or anywhere else. The various branches of Methodism have attained to unity of a sort but pretty much of a sham when measured by the sort the New Testament teaches. Digression in this country has reached a stage where the Standard could not control it or cure it, should Brother Boles convert its editor and everybody connected with it. Unbelief and disloyalty are rampant even among those who pay lip service to "Our Great Restoration Movement." The Reader's Forum of the Standard carries a protest against a departure that has become quite common among the digressives which is only another symptom of the real trouble with them.

A few years ago I attended a state convention where a three-day session concluded with a Candlelight Communion Service on Thursday night. I know another state where it is a custom at the convention to have what they call a "Sacrificial Luncheon" at noon on either Saturday morning with the observance of the Lord's Supper or Thursday evening meal. I know a young preacher who directed a convention where it is a custom at the convention to have what they call a "Sacrificial Luncheon" at noon on either Saturday morning and "at midnight on Thursday when Christmas Day came on Friday," were weak and compromising on matters of doctrine. They have departed from the New Testament in matters of organization, corrupted its worship and compromised its doctrine.

This general attitude toward doctrine is exhibited in nearly every place where there is a "Christian Church" and an "alleged loyal church," as Brother Davidson would say. I recently preached a series of sermons on the Book of Acts. In this sizable town there was a Christian Church about half the size of the "alleged" loyal church I was preaching for and to. The pastor of the Christian Church came out one night, I was told, came late and left early and I did not meet him. It was generally known that when Methodist, Baptist or union meetings were conducted in the town, he was conspicuous for everything but his absence. As a rule they like most anything just a little better than they do plain, Bible preaching. Here are some facts which must be faced outside of unity conferences. What can be done about it? Nothing, except to go ahead and preach the truth as it is in Christ Jesus and hope that some honest souls will accept it. While Don Carlos Janes is loving it out with them, I think I'll just go ahead and try to preach it out. Even if he loves up more of them than I preach to, I'll possibly convert more of them than he does.

Incidents in personal experience come to mind. A cultured woman in the Christian Church told me how "narrow" she thought some of us were but broke down and confessed that she thought some of them had gone too far. I, of course, agreed with her in that confession. She told of an incident when she became interested in a poor but worthy family and tried to interest an officer of the church in them. She met with this chilly rebuke: "People like that one time and was put off with the advice that he try to preach the Word out. Even if he loves up more of them than I preach to, I'll possibly convert more of them than he does.

The story goes that a poor man wanted to join a church like that one time and was put off with the advice that he try to preach the Word out. Even if he loves up more of them than I preach to, I'll possibly convert more of them than he does.

Incidents in personal experience come to mind. A cultured woman in the Christian Church told me how "narrow" she thought some of us were but broke down and confessed that she thought some of them had gone too far. I, of course, agreed with her in that confession. She told of an incident when she became interested in a poor but worthy family and tried to interest an officer of the church in them. She met with this chilly rebuke: "People like that one time and was put off with the advice that he try to preach the Word out. Even if he loves up more of them than I preach to, I'll possibly convert more of them than he does.

The story goes that a poor man wanted to join a church like that one time and was put off with the advice that he try to preach the Word out. Even if he loves up more of them than I preach to, I'll possibly convert more of them than he does.

FREED-HARDEMAN COLLEGE

Henderson, Tenn.

A Standard Junior College Emphasizing the Moral and Spiritual Side of Life.

Work Accepted by Leading Educational Associations and Institutions.

Students from Twenty-One States and Canada.

In addition to regular college courses, Freed-Hardeman maintains departments of Bible, Commerce, Music-Piano, Voice Vocal, Orchestral, Home Economics, Teacher Training, Public Speaking, etc.

The teaching of the Bible and related subjects together with the preparation of those who desire to preach the Word especially emphasized. No hobbies of any kind.

A liberal endowment enables us to offer scholarships to young preachers, for which applications are invited.

Living conditions unsurpassed. Beautiful dormitories newly and modernly furnished. New cafeteria with service unexcelled. Our own sanitary dairy.
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