Clinton Davidson, whom the Firm Foundation describes as having "recently acquired the Christian Leader, of Cincinnati, and, with others associated with him, is endeavoring to carry out a distinctive policy in religious journalism," has added to his other conquests the invasion of Texas.

It must be confessed that this man's triumphant progress among the disciples during the last few months forms a unique chapter in our religious history. If someone had told me that a man from New York "practically unheard of among loyal disciples during the last twenty years," could suddenly emerge from his digressive connections and without any pronounced change of sentiments step around among us as he has, I would not have named him as another Saul among the prophets. There is no parallel known to me where such a man has so quickly dazzled or dazed an unsuspecting brotherhood. From the start, the campaign has been carried on with information and money furnished by himself. He conceived a grandiloquent and revolutionary scheme of journalism endorsed by the returns of a questionnaire which nobody seems to know much about but himself. Ninety-five percent of "decent and fairminded" brethren of all ages were said to demand a new deal in journalism. Somehow or other the information spread that the amount of this man's money was exceeded only by the abundance of his piety.

After some preliminary skirmishes, he decided that Nashville and Austin were a little too tough so he moved on Cincinnati and succeeded in convincing the editor of the Leader that he had "unlimited resources" and that if the Leader did not surrender, it could not live more than a year at the most. The Leader surrendered almost unconditionally. This taste of power was quickly followed by interesting and, to some, disconcerting consequences. Rumor quickly spread that other editors must behave more circumspectly or somebody would get sued. It seems that some got scared and decided to improve their behavior, but the editor of the Bible Banner, the chief offender anyhow, and being more reckless than prudent, invited the pious dictator to come on down and bring all his "eminent legal counsel" with him and promised to entertain him in a way he might not forget. It was then decided that the best way to handle the cantankerous editor was to tell everybody anonymously and otherwise, not through the Leader of course, that he was a big liar and several other things besides, not any nicer than that. This campaign still goes on but up to date the "eminent legal counsel" hasn't popped a cap. This supersalesman who talks hours at a time about himself, has written at least one letter to a friend of the editor of the Bible Banner telling what a bad reputation the editor has in the city where he lives. Nobody knows how many other such letters he has written, demonstrating his idea of decency and fairmindedness. The church in Oklahoma City where the editor lives and holds membership is one of the largest in the country. The elders are leading business men in the city and close personal friends of the editor. He has recently held the first meeting in their fine new meeting house. Let the man from New York invade Oklahoma City with his ugly charges and see what sort of reception he gets. He has his wires crossed. They think they know exactly what is the matter with meddlesome Clinton and they would probably tell him so. I know them and they are like that. They have not been spending their time and their money during any of the last twenty years building up digressive churches, and they are not premillennial sympathizers.

In his invasion of Texas, our loquacious insurance salesman and journalist deluxe attacked two stragetic points, the Firm Foundation office and Abilene Christian College. I gather from editor Showalter's editorial that he didn't make much headway in the Firm Foundation office. I am somewhat amused at Brother Showalter's editorial which is studiously polite if mildly sarcastic. Brother Showalter is a fine man, a personal friend of mine and an elder in the church where I hold membership. Incidentally I know what he thinks of Brother Davidson and his current antics. We are informed that he spent all of his three hours in the Firm Foundation office talking about himself. I am ready to admit that he is a genius of a rare order if he can monopolize a conversation of three hours with my friend Showalter, and something of a hypnotist to boot. I'm pretty good myself and three minutes is the limit I have ever been able to monopolize a conversation with him. Usually within five minutes we are both talking at the same time and neither of us hearing what the other is saying. At that we have a good time. I recall that on one occasion he asked me to hush until he got through, but I knew better than to do it, for he never would have got through, and I didn't propose to be outdone in any such high-handed fashion. My conviction is that a man who can make a silent listener out of the editor of the Firm Foundation for three hours in the Firm Foundation office, can make a fortune selling anything. He must have what it takes. He evidently told the subdued editor that he was strong on "piety, prayer and divine providence," fasted three weeks at a time, got his education under James A. Harding and "was an admirer of M. C.

(Continued on page 9)
CONCERNING THE RIMMER DEBATE

We have had numerous inquiries concerning the debate which was to have been held at the University of Oklahoma, at Norman, Oklahoma, with Dr. Harry Rimmer, international scientist, archeologist, theologian, lecturer and debater, of world reputation. The announcement was made in the Bible Banner on the ground that Dr. Rimmer had written out his propositions with his own hand, which he agreed to debate with a representative selected by those with whom he was dealing, and agreed to notify us the exact date he could hold the discussion. Hence, the April Bible Banner carried announcements to that effect.

Later, when Brother Weldon Bennett wrote Doctor Rimmer for definite arrangements, he received the reply inserted herein, which not only speaks for itself, but also speaks for some of our Premillennial, near-digressive, semi-sectarian and "Tishbite" brethren. It reveals again, what some of us have known for quite awhile—that the assumed sweet spirit of this element now giving the church its gravest concern is actually antagonistic to a defense of the truth, and will stoop to the lowest things. America had a Benedict Arnold; Jesus had a Judas; and the church has its traitors in various garb. Sometimes he is an out and out Premillennialist; sometimes he is a neither-nor; sometimes he is a promoter of pseudo-unity and holds conferences with the digressives; sometimes he is a member of the pious brigade and is too sweet spirited to argue any question, so he just writes anonymous letters attacking character in the dark; sometimes he emerges from a twenty years recluse in a digressive wilderness and as a self-announced hermit harbinger of soft pedal preaching and noncontroversial journalism he promotes a paper with a policy that will, if adhered to, hand the church back to possession.

But of this element now giving the church its gravest concern we say that reason I have never done so.

When Christian men debate doctrine they put a weapon in the hands of the unlearned and unbelieving. For that reason I have never done so.

I have received also a number of disturbing suggestions that Brother Wallace does not have an untainted financial record. If I do return to Norman and there is a prospect of a debate with him I would want to know the certainty of this matter before I allowed our names to be coupled.

Thanking you for your communication, I am, your brother in Christ,
Harry Rimmer

When the knowledge of this letter came to Brother C. E. McGaughey and the elders of the Tenth and Francis Church, in Oklahoma City, the following letter was drafted by them and sent to Doctor Rimmer, and a copy given to me. Brethren Jesse F. Wiseman and John H. Bannister also offered me similar indorsements from the Capitol Hill and Culberson Heights Churches in Oklahoma City, as appear below.

Dr. Harry Rimmer,
Duluth, Minn.

Dear Dr. Rimmer:

When Christian men debate doctrine they put a weapon in the hands of the unlearned and unbelieving. For that reason I have never done so.

I have received also a number of disturbing suggestions that Brother Wallace does not have an untainted financial record. If I do return to Norman and there is a prospect of a debate with him I would want to know the certainty of this matter before I allowed our names to be coupled.

Thanking you for your communication, I am, your brother in Christ,
Harry Rimmer

When the knowledge of this letter came to Brother C. E. McGaughey and the elders of the Tenth and Francis Church, in Oklahoma City, the following letter was drafted by them and sent to Doctor Rimmer, and a copy given to me. Brethren Jesse F. Wiseman and John H. Bannister also offered me similar indorsements from the Capitol Hill and Culberson Heights Churches in Oklahoma City, as appear below.

Dr. Harry Rimmer,
Duluth, Minn.

Dear Dr. Rimmer:

We understand that you are considering a debate at Norman, Oklahoma, with Foy E. Wallace, Jr., but that you have been hesitant to make the final arrangements because of unfavorable reports you have received concerning the man to meet you. It is to clarify these matters that we write, hoping that it may encourage you to carry out your promise to engage in this discussion.

Brother Wallace is a member of this congregation and in full fellowship with it. The leaders here know him intimately and are in a position to testify accurately concerning his character. After years of association and dealing with him we believe him to be a true Christian gentleman. So strongly do we endorse him that we are using him at this time in a revival.

We sincerely hope that you will not allow any reports from those unfriendly toward Brother Wallace to keep you from carrying out your intention to debate the proposition you have signed. It is our wish that you give the matter the attention it deserves and that the details will soon be worked out. Knowing your ability and believing in the sincerity of your challenge, we believe that you will give this proposed debate the attention of which it is worthy.
We assure you that if the discussion materializes you will have a large audience from the group Brother Wallace will represent.

Very sincerely yours,

L. E. Diamond, A. W. Lee, Elders; C. E. McGaughey, Evangelist; Tenth and Francis Streets Church of Christ, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

To The Readers of the Bible Banner:

Mr. Rimmer, no doubt after having been warmed by some of our Bollite brethren, or their sympathizers, is made to wonder if Brother Foy E. Wallace Jr. is a representative man among the churches of Christ. The Capitol Hill church of Christ endorses him one hundred percent as an evangelist or a debater. We believe he is the logical man to defend the truth against any of the champions of error. This congregation has engaged Brother Wallace’s services in both evangelistic work and debate. If we were sponsoring another such discussion, he would be our choice of all those in our great brotherhood to represent us.

We are convinced that some of our brethren who hold the same view as Mr. Rimmer on the millennium question are the ones trying to impeach Brother Wallace’s character and block such discussions which will expose their hobby. A similar effort was made by false brethren when we were arranging the Webber-Wallace debate here. They also made efforts to assist Mr. Webber by furnishing him with material. One went so far as to be seated with Mr. Webber and his moderator during the discussion and voted in Webber’s favor at the conclusion of the service.

We earnestly hope that arrangements for a discussion between Brother Wallace and Mr. Rimmer will be completed.

Yours in Christ.

Jesse F. Wiseman, Evangelist; Carl Cheatham, W. E. Bost, Elders; Chas. N. Wilson, E. H. Messenger, D. C. Drake, Deacons.

But we do not now expect Dr. Rimmer to debate, even if he can “know the certainty of this matter before” he allows “our names to be coupled.” It will be observed that the Doctor has changed his propositions, and he would force me to turn infidel in order to debate with him. He says when “Christian men debate doctrine,” it furnishes a weapon for the “unlearned and unbelieving.” Did he not know as much when he wrote out the propositions on Premillennialism and Apostasy, and agreed to debate them? Also in his lectures at the University of Oklahoma he stated publicly that he would defend in debate anything that he taught in his lectures. It was this statement that prompted Weldon B. Bennett and John P. Lewis to rise up on the propositions, and Dr. Rimmer there and then, on the spot, wrote his propositions, with his own hand, which propositions were submitted to me by telegraph and accepted as the Doctor wrote them by return wire, without any change whatsoever. So we are of the opinion that the Doctor has other reasons for his retreat.

Dr. Rimmer allows his name to be coupled with infidels when he debates with them but is not sure he wishes his name coupled with mine! Some of my dear, sweet-spirited brethren must have given me quite a send-off with Dr. Rimmer. Wonder if the good Doctor would be good enough to let me read it. I will promise (and get some good men on my bond) to return the documents to him safely!

We cannot censure Dr. Rimmer so much in this matter, except to kindly criticise his inconsistency in the points mentioned. He has been imposed on by some unscrupulous men. In reality, we respect Dr. Rimmer’s outstanding ability as a scientist who accepts and defends the plenary, verbal inspiration of the writers of the Bible and we can go all the way with him on his proposition “that the Bible is the infallible Word of God.” I have read every book Doctor Rimmer has written, and can truly say that his knowledge of science is marvelous. We believe the Doctor knows his science, but are persuaded that he does not know his theology.

There will probably be no debate in the University of Oklahoma with Doctor Rimmer. You may thank the sweet-spirited purveyors of gossip and promoters of soft pedal preaching and journalism that are among us for this. A purge throughout the church is needed that will send these promoters of this latest digression where they belong—either to the anxious seat of repentance or to the digresses. It is a pity for the churches to be afflicted with them.

EVERYWHERE PREACHING THE WORD

This year more than ever has been one of extensive travel over a wide field of evangelistic endeavor. The gospel itinerary began in West Virginia January 1, and in February we had meetings in Florida (Lakeland, Winter Haven and Trenton) where the regular Dr. Rimmer was well received. We found loyal brethren. Special engagements were filled at Tampa, Largo, Orlando, Miami, and Jacksonville. In all of these places the brethren were outspoken in their fidelity to the ancient gospel and the plain method of preaching it. There appears to be a bright future for the churches in Florida. Thos. G. Butler has preached at Lake-land ten years and was responsible for my engagements in and around Lakeland. Bro. A. L. Colson’s interest in the definite re-emphasis on the gospel fundamentals is responsible for the Trenton meetings. Plain preaching prevailed and the brethren all over Florida manifested a marked interest. From Florida the gospel itinerary called us to South Texas, where I have preached loud and long for years-since boyhood. And they will still let me preach in such places, without asking to—they even ask me. A good meeting, though short, was held with some great people and life-long friends at Corpus Christi. Other appointments in South Texas were San Antonio, Uvalde, Goose Creek, Houston, and Port Arthur. In all these places the gospel prevailed, and the preacher was helped much and encouraged no little by the good words and deeds of the brethren.

From South Texas we went east to Texarkana, (Tex-Ark.) and Nashville, (Tenn.) and to Birmingham, Ala., the scene of the battle for the truth with one of these modern challengers, and the scene of victory. Birmingham is known for loyalty to the truth and no compromise with error or isms of any shade or dye. In an early day John T. Lewis laid the foundation and the building thereon has been steady and solid. Jack Meyer, Floyd Horton, Elliot Hill, W. C. Graves and John Cox are all doing regular work with the churches in Birmingham, and John T. Lewis is still in his prime.

Among these meetings in the West, South, and mid-south-west was one of special interest at Paragould, Arkansas. I have preached in Arkansas some, but not extensively. I know of no better congregation of its size and circumstances. Blessed with good elders and working members, and thoroughly indoctrinated under the strong preaching of B. G. Hope for nearly ten years, it is one of the best churches in Arkansas, or anywhere else.

Next I paused at home-Oklahoma City-where I did the preaching in the first sitting in the new building of the Tenth & Francis Church. My heart was thrilled times without number to be preaching where I have lived and preached over the years since 1922 and to be surrounded by family and friends in such a delightful experience.
brought to my soul immeasurable happiness and unutterable joy.

C. E. McGaughey, preacher for the Tenth & Francis Church, is a faithful preacher, a diligent worker and one of the most unselfish, wholehearted brothers in Christ that it has been my pleasure and profit to know. Jesse F. Wise- man and John H. Bannister are "not a whit behind" and Oklahoma City is singularly blessed with preachers who are loyal to the core and who love each other as well as the Lord. The church in Oklahoma City enjoys peace and spiritual prosperity. May no root of bitterness arise. The steady growth of the Cause in Oklahoma City and in particular the Tenth and Francis Church is due largely to the sound sense and firm faith of A. W. Lee. His guiding hand is felt by all, and he is loved and respected by all who love the church. From Oklahoma City our itinerary called us to Canada to fill engagements of long standing. The people of Canada are not geared up as fast as in some parts of our country, but we had good meetings at Beamsville and Meaford (Ontario especially Beamsville, it being the longer meeting. I found loyal brethren, concerned for the purity of the church along all lines, and devoted to the defense of the ancient gospel. I preached in Toronto one night, where Brother James D. Bales is holding the line of battle safely and securely. Brother C. G. McPhee labors at Beamsville. He once lived and preached in Texas. He and his fine family were good to me and mine, and we learned to love them, as well as all the brethren. Meaford, Ontario, is the scene of one great battle-the Harding-Wilkinson debate. It was a great victory of some forty years or more ago. Harding was a hard debater. It has always been an enigma to me why so many of the soft-pedal brethren today sing the praises of James A. Harding, and even name their soft-pedal institutions for him, when we all know that J. A. Harding was one of the most scathing in his denunciation of false doctrine and of his opponent personally in debate. I have never read a harder debate than the Harding-Moody debate.

Harding called Moody a liar-and proved it! If Harding were living now, and should preach and debate as he did then, the very school that is named for him, and the very brethren who exalt him, would not indorse him nor let him preach. But some people are peculiar. In Toronto I met again Bro. H. Mc Kerlie, who for many years has been militant in his advocacy of the New Testament principles without compromise. Bro. Mc Kerlie will write for the Bible Banner. Returning from Canada we went through the New England States and filled some preaching appointments. We failed to reach an appointment at Portland, Maine; but preached at Bridgeport, Conn., and found a fine group of loyal brethren with a neat meeting-house (I understand, paid for). Adherence to the ancient gospel is their expressed determination. We were cordially received and wanted to stay longer. Some brethren from New York attended the meeting at Bridgeport, but I did not meet Brother Clinton Davidson. As in the case of Brother H. Leo Boles, he may not have heard of me except to casually see my name in the papers.

We passed through New York, almost without stopping-not that I was exactly afraid of anything, but being a country man in such a big town, I hardly knew where to stop or what to do when I did. So we went on to Philadelphia where we have numerous friends and preached one night. I have held two meetings in Philadelphia, where there is a true church of the Lord, and one of his truest people. Soon they are to locate an evangelist with them for full time preaching, and the right man will accomplish untold good in and around that great Metropolis. We were received in the home of the Drinkwater's upon ar- (Continued on page 23)

IS THERE CAUSE FOR SUSPICION OF HARDING COLLEGE

B. G. HOPE

Recently much has been said about Bible schools. Some have been condemned by various ones who are skeptical of their soundness. At the meeting at Ft. Smith, Arkansas, in April, in the interest of Harding College, it was stated that all the suspicion concerning any teacher teaching or sympathizing with premillennialism had originated in the minds of enemies of the school and without a reason for it. This statement was made after a number of faithful gospel preachers had said that they could not conscientiously support the school.

At the time of the meeting referred to, I was doing the preaching in a series of meetings at Lexington, Oklahoma. Brethren Boll, Wood, Phillips, Smith et. al., have held meetings there. J. D. Bland, one of the elders, is an avowed premillennialist. He seems to be proud of the fact. In discussing matters with him, he told me that Brother Armstrong taught him the first he ever knew about the two resurrections and the reign between them. A number of brethren have heard like expressions from Brother Bland. Brother E. W. Scott, a former elder at Lexington, says the following in a letter dated June 18, 1939, "Bland told me that he learned it from Armstrong. He also said that Armstrong was still one. I can refer you to several to whom Bland told the same thing." In a letter dated June 14, 1939, Brother Malcolm Bowen, the local preacher at Lexington, said, "Brother Bland said, 'I had never heard Brother Armstrong make a statement in his sermons that I could not believe whole-heartedly until one night he stated that there was a period of a thousand years between the resurrection of the righteous and unrighteous.

As we (Armstrong and Bland) were walking up the hill to my home, I told Brother Armstrong that the statement was the first he had preached in a sermon that I could not accept all that was taught. Upon reaching home, Brother Armstrong took up my Bible and underlined Phil. 3:11 and told me to study it, that it would open my eyes to a great many truths." 

After hearing Brother Bland make the statement that I have mentioned, I wrote Brother Armstrong regarding it. In response I received the following reply, April 29, 1939:

Dear Brother Hope:

I have your letter written at Lexington, Oklahoma. Twenty years ago or more-yes, it was before the world war, I preached some at Lexington, Oklahoma.

And while I never preached on the subject about which you ask in your letter, either at Lexington or anywhere else, I suggest that our memories are too treacherous for us to rely on recollections twenty years old for accuracy. But when one never preached on a certain subject, he surely knows that.

Brother Bland no doubt heard me explain sometime (either in conversation or in answer to a question), I Cor. 14:22-29. In commenting on the fact that the "then's" in the passage mean "afterward" or "later" I often say that the space of time between the resurrection of the saints and the end could be "feast hours or a thousand years, even two thousand years." This is no doubt what our Brother Bland remembers.

As we all know the first "then" has already covered two thousand years and still the "then" goes on. How much the second "then" may cover none of us can know. Yours sincerely, J. N. Armstrong.

In this letter, Brother Armstrong stated that he remembered that he never preached on the subject that I mentioned-Premillennialism. Well, a man doesn't have to preach on a definite subject to teach some things that are
closely related to another. Brother Bland did not say that he took "Premillennialism" for a subject. He says, "Our memories are too treacherous for us to rely on recollections twenty years old for accuracy." If I were to even intimate that Brother Armstrong had taught twenty years ago that man is promised salvation in this age without baptism, he would resent it, I am sure. I am sure that he remembers what he preached before the war on instrumental music. I am wondering why he can't be as accurate today about this question. Do you think Harper, Hardeman, Wallace, will forget in twenty years what they are preaching today concerning premillennialism?

Again he says that he has commented on I Cor. 14:22-29 (this reference should be I Cor. 15:22-29) saying that there is a period of time between the resurrection of the righteous and "the end."

The idea of two resurrections is a phase of the "theory." I do not know whether Brother Bland told the truth or not but he and Brother Armstrong know. But even if Brother Armstrong taught no more than what he has stated in this letter, his teaching along this line is dangerous and to accept the entire theory. A belief in any part of the theory is dangerous.

Brother Benson believed the theory in 1925; in 1936 he stated that the devil was as loose today as he had ever been; that people might be possessed with devils as in the days of Christ, that devils might be cast out in this age: in 1936 he said that Brother B. F. Rhodes said that Boll might prove to be right in the end; in 1937 he told me that he had changed his mind about some of the above things.

In the Ft. Smith meeting some old students said that Brother Armstrong failed to teach them how to meet the theory even when asked about it; another student said that Brother Armstrong stated that his position was about the same as that of Doctor Brents. Now, you can decide from the above information as to the cause of suspicion. These statements have all been made by them, yet when their soundness is questioned, many rise up and cry "Persecution."

Honest men change their minds. Brother Benson has told me that he had changed his mind, but publicly he always leaves the impression that he thinks now as he has always thought. I am ready to support the school when all matters are cleared up and the disposition is manifested by those in authority to make things safe. I am wondering what has become of the plan that was suggested at Ft. Smith. Many of us are anxious to know what is going to be done.

In the May 1939 Bulletin Harding College, there were two articles on subjects named in the heading of this article written by Brethren Benson and Sears. No doubt the purpose was to leave the impression that Harding College had always been sound regarding Premillennialism. Most of the things that were said had already been said and, as usual, many words were used to explain the position of Harding College. Personally, I have never questioned the soundness of Brother Sears except as he comes to the defense of those who sympathize with R. H. Boll. "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." was quoted by one of the writers in the bulletin. What is truth? If some facts are withheld, is a truthful impression left? It is beyond question that some things have been left out of the bulletin. Why? You may answer. Brother Benson did not tell that he believed the theory in 1925 but claims to have changed his mind; that he once said that people might be possessed with demons today as in the days of Christ; that he paves as an illustration a case in China where he said a denominational preacher cast out a devil. (I understand that Brother Benson has forgotten that he said this. Well, he did, but when a witness rebuked him for it, he weakened. The witnesses are still living and are likely to live for a long time yet.) He said that Christ might perform miracles to day, it is His business; and that the devil is as loose as he ever was.

The above facts were withheld from the Bulletin and, hence, a wrong impression is left. Again, half of his article was given to show that there would be one resurrection. He sent this out intending that people believe that they are sending their children to a school where they teach just one future resurrection. He did not tell that the Dean of Bible believes that there will be two future resurrections with a period of time between. I know that he knows it for Brother Armstrong has repeatedly said so. Is all the truth given in this article?

Look at some more things. Brother Benson has said in the past that Brother Rhodes said that he did not believe the "theory," but R. I. Boll might prove to be right in the end. Why did Brother Sears not include this in his article, "Facts You Want To Know?" As to the visiting brethren, who have been invited to lecture, there is no point there. Bro. Armstrong would have invited Boll if it had been left wholly to him. He would put all on the same plane and wishes that the rest of us would say nothing about those brethren who are dividing churches by preaching this theory. As to Brother Brewer, no one classes him with the number who have fought against Premillennialism. According to reports, he has refused to debate the issue. It would have been better for the college if his name had been left out in this connection. Why did one of these brethren not tell about some of the student preachers saying that Brother Armstrong failed to teach them how to meet the theory even when asked? They did tell about Brethren DeHoff and Tyler making such good speeches against Premillennialism. I wonder if Brother Armstrong helped them prepare these speeches? Did they sound like Brother Rhodes had anything to do with it? He can show them how weak some of Brother Wallace's arguments are but he is not on record showing the boys what strong arguments he can make that cannot be torn down. Why not tell it all?

Why did Brother Benson not tell that he asked Brother... Rhodes even before the meeting not to say anything about the speeches in his final speech?

The bulletin is misleading in that it fails to present the whole truth. This would have never happened if those from Harding College had lived up to the agreement when we were all in Ft. Smith. More will be said along this line later.

[In the July issue of the Bible Banner, the following statement in my article appeared on page 7: "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 copy was there before both Harper and approved by me. The letter and statement were 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 one which gave a different impression altogether."

Brother Benson thinks this statement leaves the impression that he did not send the original letter and that he sent a copy of the first one he wrote. I am glad to make it clear that he sent the original one and also sent me a copy of the last one, but this does not change the meaning of what I said that the original letter and statement were an agreement between us, and for him to include a two or three page document on the same subject to which I had not agreed, and would not agree, was unfair from every standpoint. This is the only correction in the article that he suggested might be made.—B. G. H.]
A Symposium Of Brother Errett’s Three Articles

JOHN T. LEWIS

The three articles referred to are Brother Edwin R. Errett’s reply to Brother H. Leo Boles’ “address” delivered at the “unity conference,” Indianapolis, Ind., May 3, 1939. As such this article is not a reply—that is Brother Boles’ or the Gospel Advocate’s business. This article is a reply to Brother Errett’s “stock in store” arguments used by all digressive preachers to justify their innovations in the work and worship of the church. Since Brother Errett was good enough not to copyright his articles, I am sure he will not object to his arguments(?) appearing in the Bible Banner which occupies just an insignificant place on the “lunatic fringe” of Brother James DeForest Murch’s chart which appeared in the Christian Standard of March 18, 1939. Brother Errett was so elated over the position that Brother Murch gave the Christian Standard on his chart, he was constrained to exclaim: “It gives us no little satisfaction to recognize that the Christian Standard occupies a strategic position that may make it possible for it to render a healing service.” Without admitting that Brother Murch’s chart was drawn by inspiration, I will open Brother Errett’s Alabaster Box of Healing Ointment and pour it over the pages of the Bible Banner; but I feel sure that his arguments (?) or methods of healing will be about as luminiferous to the readers of the Bible Banner as flashes of lightning bugs on a moon light night.

The following is the first whiff of aroma that comes from Brother Errett’s alabaster box of “healing service.”

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. If the purpose is either to major on debate in order to pull every one to one side or another, this sort of message is quite appropriate, but if we want to endeavor to find a path of reciprocal understanding and recognition, and especially if we want to restudy our own position in the light of our history and of scripture, it seems to us that such a polemic is not in keeping.

Thus Brother Errett unmasked the objectives and intended results of the fathers of these “unity meetings.” It has never been their purpose “to pull every one to one side or another,” but “to find a path of reciprocal understanding and recognition.” This is not a revelation to us who live out on Brother Murch’s “lunatic fringe,” we have never had any doubt as to either the purpose or results of these love-feast meetings. However it may help those brethren who have been sitting on the side lines and watching the antics of Murch’s and Witty’s main show men, and wondering if good would not come from such brotherly acts. Since Brother Errett has told you plainly in the King’s English the purpose of those grandiose meetings—“to find a path of reciprocal understanding and recognition,” I will tell you their ultimate end, by telling you a story. A blacksmith was trying to make an ax, but he never could get the metal tempered right, so finally deciding his efforts were futile, he got the iron red hot and soured it into a tub of water and made a fizz. Brother Boles has supplied the water, and while Brethren Murch and Witty are making up their minds to take the final plunge, I will give Brother Errett a lesson in the restudy of our own positions in the light of our history and of scripture.

I will call F. M. Green as the teacher for our first lesson. More than fifty years ago when the Gospel Advocate, with David Lipscomb at the helm, was making a desperate fight to scuttle missionary societies and other inventions and devices of men that were dividing a once united and happy brotherhood, F. M. Green wrote:

It is not a seriously difficult matter to file objections to missionary societies or any other good thing. Individuals of very moderate ability are abundantly competent to this task, and objections have been-made-to the General Christian Missionary Convention. Perhaps it would not be possible to select from the many objections urged—against it with more or less force, any more inane than that the society is likely to develop into a great ecclesiastical despotism. And yet just such a charge is made against it as lately as the year 1883. Churches are warned against it as something likely to rob them of their liberty in Christ: and if they are not thoroughly awake to the danger, they would be more ridiculous and idiotic than such a charge could be more ridiculous and idiotic than such a charge is made against it as lately as the year 1883. Churches are warned against it as something likely to rob them of their liberty in Christ: and if they are not thoroughly awake to the danger, they would be more ridiculous and idiotic than such a charge could be more ridiculous and idiotic than such a charge.

The history of missionary societies does not furnish an example of one that has ever developed even in the smallest degree into a despot over the churches. (Historical Sketches of a Missionary Societies among the Disciples of Christ-F. M. Green-1884, p. 182.)

F. M. Green was associate editor of the Christian Standard, and also corresponding secretary of the “General Society” from 1877-1882. About that time J. B. Briney, another stalwart of the Christian Standard, was cartooning David Lipscomb as an old woman in a mother hubbard dress and bonnet with a broom trying to sweep back the tide of the ocean.

Our next teacher will be Edwin R. Errett, the present editor of the Christian Standard, and our first lesson from him will be an extract from a tract he wrote about the U. C. M. S. in 1924.

I was not bitterly opposed to the United Society at its inception. Having, however, seen its workings, I detest it, I hate it. I would rather see every dollar of its vested interest lost than to have it continue as the one big agency of our people, for there are many things more valuable than money. As good Brother Mark Collins says, “I want to see the United Society smashed,” for the sake of our brotherhood and our plea.

Brother Errett is somewhat of a Carrie Nation when he gets on the warpath; but I like his way of doing things when he is on the right side. In our next lesson we will read a letter he wrote to the society.

Dec. 21, 1925, United Christian Missionary Society, 423 De Baliviare Ave., St. Louis, Mo., Brethren:—I enclose a statement in correction of a combusted falsehood appearing in the United Society News, issue of December 15. Will you please publish it in one of the two succeeding issues of the United Society News! If I do not have within ten days your assurance that it will be so published, I shall take further steps to secure justice.

My endorsement of Brother Collins’ remark is supported by these two very strong arguments.

1. That the intent, spirit and effect of the United Christian Missionary Society is the creation of an ecclesiasticism.

2. That the United Society is being used to divide the brotherhood by substitution as a test of loyalty and fellowship, or the society in place of the enthroned, divine Lord. (Italics mine. J. T. L.)

Sincerely yours, Edwin R. Errett.

I want to quote again from F. M. Green’s dissertation. “Perhaps it would not be possible to select from the many objections urged against it with more or less force, any more inane than, that the society is likely to develop into a great ecclesiastical despotism... nothing could be more ridiculous, and idiotic than such a charge.” Now read again Brother Errett’s first indictment against the society. “That the intent, spirit and effect of the United
Christian Missionary Society is the creation of an eclecticism. "Ridiculous and idiotic," eh? Brother Errett used sledge hammer blows when he was trying "to smash" the United Christian Missionary Society—he is a big game hunter. David Lipscomb used a broom and tried not only to stay the devastation wrought by the United Christian Missionary Society; but to sweep all the little societies, and multiplied musical instruments, that Brother Errett fathers, out of the work and worship of the church. That is positively the only scriptural ground for Christian union. I am glad that Brother Errett suggested that we "restudy our own positions in the light of our history and of scripture." In behalf of the brethren on the "lunatic fringe" I want to thank Brother Errett for giving us these historical lessons he has spoken the only language we can understand. Of course we would not find prophetic prophecies in one of brethren Murch’s and Witty’s unity meetings, they would be "tongues" there. As a token of my appreciation of Brother Errett’s manner of teaching these lessons, I will let him close this historical story of "our own positions in the light of our history," with the following classic.

Many of the officials of the United Society were my friends. Can I be blamed for hating an institution—not the men—that has become a friendship—destroying Juggernaut in what was a happy brotherhood? I do not believe you should be blamed for your fight against the United Christian Missionary Society, neither should you blame us brethren who are out on the "lunatic fringe" for abominateing the societies, ladies’ aids, fiddles, horns, orchestras, and other instruments of music, which you father, and defend in the work and worship of the church. They are the things which make it impossible for us to walk in your "path of reciprocal understanding and recognition," therefore if not "friendship destroying," they are brotherhood destroying juggernauts.

In the Christian Standard of June 3, 1939 you say: "It is essential, first of all, that we come to recognize one another as brethren, brethren who are sincere, brethren all of whom really believe for reasons good to themselves their position in the light of our history," therefore if not "friendship destroying," they are brotherhood destroying juggernauts.

To prove a New Testament principle should be able to cite New Testament passages, making it absolutely certain that the Old Testament quotation applies. Otherwise we have only an opinion—and that of legalistic character.

You are absolutely right about this, Brother Errett, and I am also "absolutely certain" that you know how to use the Old Testament when you are trying to teach the truth. But you are wrong and unkind, when you accuse "these conservative brethren" of not knowing as much. To show you that the brethren out on the "lunatic fringe" understand these principles set forth by you, and that we know when they are ignored by preachers and writers for the evident purpose of confusing and misleading the untaught, I quote the following from you.

First of all there is the fact that it is necessary for the anti-instrument brethren to base their argument entirely upon silence. Nowhere is there a word of condemnation of the instrument. It was used in Old Testament worship and praised in Psalms, which we are, in the New Testament, exhorted to sing. Furthermore, instruments are to be used in heaven's worship. In the light of the fact that the instruments were used in Old Testament worship and in other worship from which early Christians came, it would seem that some definite statement would be needed to make it clear that Christians were not to use the instrument. The Jerusalem conference had an opportunity to put this, as well as other restrictions, upon the church.

Brother Errett, which one of the above paragraphs would you use if you were arguing with a Methodist preacher, or a Catholic priest, trying to show them that infant membership, and burning incense belong to the old covenant, and were left out of the New Testament church by the silence of the New Testament? You know that the Jerusalem conference did not restrict either one of these false doctrines. And you ought to know that the "Jerusalem conference" was not called to consider either instrumental music, baby membership, or burning incense in the church. The Jerusalem conference met, discussed, and settled this issue before them. The Murch-Witty unity meetings are more like old time Methodist's love feasts, they meet, love each other, and everybody; but discuss, and settle nothing. If a brother tries to discuss the issues in one of the Murch-Witty unity meetings, you think he is wasting his time, and I do too. So please don't put the "Murch-Witty unity meetings" in a class with the Jerusalem conference. You just show where one New Testament church used instrumental music in the worship, and you will have your Old Testament and New Testament links hooked together, but you can never do it by comparing the Murch-Witty unity meeting to the "Jerusalem conference."

I have space enough for one or two more flashes from your Jack-O’Lantern. You say:

To us the most dangerous feature of such an argument as Brother Boles’ is precisely this tendency to separate life and worship. We are told that at a certain time and place we are at worship. But that is Judaism.

Certainly anybody who would follow your Jack-O’Lantern here would “find himself in a quagmire at last.” Maybe I can help you here, Brother Errett. Did you ever read the 20th chapter of Acts where the brethren at Troas met in “the third story” of a building, “upon the first day of the week to break bread?” Was not “the third story” a place, and was not “upon the first day of the week” a certain time, and was not breaking bread worship? This is Judaism, is it?
METHODS AND MANNERS

Cecil B. Douthitt

Since the method of approach and manner of procedure are being ridiculed and praised-condemned and approved—it may be well to point out and give examples of some of those methods and manners that are so manifestly wrong as to deserve the righteous contempt and active opposition of every person who loves truth, justice and fair play.

When a man takes it upon himself to condemn the methods of men whose soundness in the faith cannot be questioned, he ought to be certain that the methods he criticizes do not have the endorsement of inspiration. I am afraid to oppose the method of a sound teacher when he meets error face to face and exposes it “before them all” (Gal. 2: 11-14) ; when he publicly calls an opponent of truth an “enemy of all righteousness” and a perverter of “the right ways of the Lord” (Acts 13: 10); when he refers to avowed enemies of the gospel as “stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears” (Acts 7: 51), because I am afraid to oppose a method that was employed by Paul and Stephen. I am not afraid to condemn the manners of a man who calls brethren by uncomplimentary names which misrepresent them. Inspired men did not use that method. But if I believe a man to be a “hypocrite” or a “whited sepulcher,” I am afraid to condemn the method of the brother who calls him that, lest I be found condemning the method of our Lord. (Matt. 23: 27)

In this article attention is called to some methods and manners that are contrary to the spirit of Christ, that flagrantly violate fundamental principles of the gospel, and that were never employed by any inspired teacher under any circumstances.

A Violation Of The “Golden Rule”

The Golden Rule teaches that we should do unto others as we would have others do unto us. We should be willing to grant the same privileges to others that we expect to be granted. We should be as generous unto others as we want others to be unto us. We should not do unto others what we will not let others do unto us.

Brother Clinton Davidson and the Christian Leader continuously violate this divine rule. The Leader has been placed under a policy about as contrary to the “Golden Rule” as any human policy could be. The Leader has asked and received permission to quote as it chooses from the copyrighted works of others. This it refuses to grant unto others. It will not allow anyone to quote from it, unless the entire article is printed. That is not the way its writers treat the copyrighted articles of others.

My copy of Klingman’s “Church History For Busy People” says it is a copyrighted book. In the Leader of May 15, Brother Davidson has an article based on Klingman’s copyrighted history. He used the material from that book just as freely as he wanted to use it. The policy under which he has placed the Leader requires that he print the whole of Klingman’s history, if he would be true to the Golden Rule. This he did not do. When he wrote that article for the Leader he did not do unto others what he would have others do unto him; he did unto Klingman what he will not let any one do unto him.

Thomas Nelson & Sons, the firm that owns the copyright of the American Standard version of the Bible, has granted permission to Brother Davidson and the Leader to quote - as they choose from that copyrighted edition of the Bible. Will the Leader or its directors or Brother Davidson give the Bible Banner the same privilege that they asked and received from Thomas Nelson & Sons? Will they let the Banner quote the Leader as the Leader quotes a copyrighted version of the Bible? I do not see how they can refuse this request and conscientiously continue to quote from the American Standard Version without printing the entire Bible every time they print one verse.

The Nelson firm evidently has more confidence in Brother Davidson than Brother Davidson has in any of his own brethren. He is afraid some of his brethren will take one of his statements out of its setting and misrepresent what he writes, or he is afraid somebody will reply to what he writes. If Thomas Nelson & Sons did not have any more confidence in the public than Brother Davidson has, we could not get very much benefit out of the American Standard Edition. If Nelson sells out to him, like Brother Rowe did, then we will have to quit using the American Standard and go back to the King James. If Brother Davidson owned the copyright to that version, he might be afraid someone would take a verse of scripture out of its connection and misrepresent the Lord.

Any writer who wishes to do so may oppose Brother Davidson’s copyright method without any fear whatsoever of condemning a scriptural method of procedure; no inspired writer ever used any method that so flagrantly violated the “Golden Rule.”

Itching Ears

That method of putting the ear to the ground by means of surveys, questionnaires and letters to prominent business men in order to learn what uninspired men think and what the people want, and then trying to conform to the wishes and opinions of men, is not becoming in a man who claims to be guided by the scriptures. Brother Davidson did not send out that questionnaire to learn what the people need; he sent it out to learn what the people want. If he had wanted to know what they need, he would have searched the New Testament, not the returns of a straw vote. If he had spent the time, effort, and money in a study of the New Testament to learn what the people need, instead of spending it on a questionnaire to learn what they want, he would have found a hearty response and active co-operation on the part of hundreds who are not in sympathy at all with either an individual or a corporation that caters to the wishes of the public with no apparent thought of its needs. A man’s effort should be consistent with his prayers. If it is right for a man to work so hard to please the people with a religious journal, it is also right for him to pray that preachers may strive to please the people with their sermons. A straw ballot by either preachers or writers is neither scriptural nor dependable. I am opposed to that method of determining what shall be preached or written. Inspired preachers and writers did not use it.

If all teachers since the days of John the baptist had adopted Brother Davidson’s methods and manners of deciding what and how to teach, neither the church nor the New Testament would be in existence today. Jesus did not send out a questionnaire to his disciples and give them the kind of kingdom they wanted and expected when he made his triumphal entry into Jerusalem; therefore a spiritual kingdom exists today instead of a material one. If Jesus had made a survey of the wishes of the people and had given them what they wanted and demanded, they would have received loaves and fishes, and we would not have that discourse on the Bread of Life, found in the sixth chapter of John. The first Corinthian letter would have been a very sweet epistle if Paul had let the desires of the people shape his policy of religious journalism, but
THE INVASION OF TEXAS.

(Continued from page 1)

Kurfees.” This probably accounts for the fact that “he has been practically unheard of among loyal disciples during the last twenty years.” The next thing you know, Don Carlos Janes will be telling Price Billingsley that he is a great admirer of the editor of the Bible Banner. It is about time for us all to sing: “The World’s Turned Upside Down.” Possibly Brother Davidson inadvertently said to Brother Showalter: “You may sign right here,” but of course Brother Showalter was too polite to say anything about that in his editorial. At any rate, I’m dead certain that Davidson didn’t learn as much about Showalter as Showalter did about him. That is a pity, too, for Showalter is worth knowing.

According to President James F. Cox, Davidson captured Abilene lock stock and barrel, church, school, city, clubs and all. He succeeded in selling himself as about all there is left of “humility,” “piety,” “optimism,” “sincerity, loyalty to the truth, clean humble Christian life and his great faith in God.” If I seem skeptical, remember that I can recall that they used to talk about David L. Cooper and Peter Plotkin the same way out there. Cooper went the Lord knows where, and was still going the last time I heard of him, and Peter Plotkin joined the Baptists. President Cox is a mighty good man and I like him hugely-sometimes but then when a man from afar flushed with business success and gift of gab sufficient to monopolize a three hour conversation with the editor of the Firm Foundation, comes to town, he is calculated to make “a deep impression upon” a college president.

While Brother Cox is purring over Brother Davidson, regardless of his antecedents that relate to “his loyalty to the truth,” I cannot help but recall the times when the editor of the Firm Foundation and the Bible Banner felt duty bound to rebuke a little worldliness out that way. At first I didn’t take it very seriously, being somewhat worldly myself, but the way President Cox acted caught my attention. He took on about like a mother cat when a couple of pups are nosing around too close to her nursery. All of which goes to show that college presidents are a good deal like the rest of us. If you want to hear them it is extremely doubtful that the repentance mentioned in the second Corinthian letter ever would have been record-
ed. Would it be presumptuous to wonder what kind of letter John would have sent to the church at Laodicea, if he mailed them a questionnaire before he wrote the letter?

In order to find out whether the study of history is important or not, Brother Davidson wrote to Lammot duPont, Alfred P. Sloan, Daniel Willard and General Harboard (he cannot copyright the names of these men). I agree with him and them that history is a valuable study; not to be G. C. Brewer or S. H. Hall. I can’t think who else he could have in mind. The “college president” cannot be George Benson, E. H. Ijams or James F. Cox. Elimination of them leaves the matter wholly in the dark! The “editor of some religious paper” surely cannot mean R. H. Boll. I don’t know who he could be unless he is Jim Allen. The defender of the independence of the churches has Samson bested at making riddles. If I ever get with President Cox I’m going to try to find out if perchance he has the key. Possibly he was given the information con-fidentially. I have an idea of my own about “the danger today” which confronts the colleges and a few of the churches. I’m not uneasy about the rest of them. I don’t think they will pay any attention to him. If he didn’t have any more money than I have, nobody would pay any attention to him.

FOY E. WALLACE, Jr.
Publisher and Editor
Box 1804
Oklahoma City, Okla.

Associate Editors:
Cled E. Wallace__________________________Austin, Texas
John T. Lewis____________________________Birmingham, Ala.
Austin Taylor____________________________Unixa, Texas

Staff Contributors:
E. G. Creacy____________________________Horace Cave, Ky.
A. R. Keeney____________________________Detroit, Mich.
C. H. McCord____________________________Washington, D. C.
F. Y. Tant______________________________Denver, Colo.
G. K. Wallace____________________________Wichita, Kan.
Geo. R. Curtis______________________________Ark.
Geo. W. DeHoff____________________________Lepanto, Ark.
B. G. Hope_____________________________Paragould, Ark.
R. A. Turner____________________________Montgomery, Ala.
Thos. G. Butler___________________________Lakeland, Fla.
Geo. W. Porter____________________________Port Arthur, Texas
W. Curtis Porter__________________________Henderson, Texas
Jao. W. Hedges______________________________Graggton, Texas
Will M. Thompson________________________Holdenville, Okla.
C. B. Doubett____________________________Louisville, Ky.
The words are not penned to injure the followers of Judge Rutherford and Charles T. Russell. They are written that they may be helped. They have been lead astray by the teachings of a man who says that he desires to help them.

In regard to such teachers Christ says, “Let them alone; they are blind guides. And if the blind guide the blind, both shall fall into a pit.” (Matt. 15:14). Russell was a blind guide. Rutherford follows Russell. Jehovah’s Witnesses follow Rutherford and they are all thus being lead by the blind. A statement as severe as the one just made should be substantiated by proof. How may one determine whether or not Russell and Rutherford are blind guides? “And if thou say in thine heart, how shall we know the word which the Lord hath not spoken? When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken.” (Deut. 18:21-22). Jesus said, “Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly are ravenous wolves. By their fruits ye shall know them.” (Matt. 7:15). There are a lot of things I do not know about trees. However, I can tell an apple tree if it has apples on it. Most any one can identify an orange tree, if it is loaded with ripe oranges. So one is able to tell a false prophet by his fruits. The fruit borne by these men indicates they were not of God. Note some of the fruit taken from this “Watch Tower” tree. This ripe fruit indicates the kind of tree it is. Some of this fruit is a little over ripe—it is putrefied. “By this time it stinketh.” Now if you will hold your hand over the downward projection from between your eyes the extra ripe fruit will be brought forth. Russell said:

1. The kingdoms of this world would end in 1914. (Written before 1914)
2. Present governments to be overthrown in 1914.
3. That Christendom would be overthrown in 1914.
4. If these things do not come to pass Mr. Russell says that he has been proven wrong. If this does not happen, he says, “would that not prove our chronology wrong, yes surely.” These things did not happen and Mr. Russell being the judge he was a false prophet. “Yes surely,” says he, that would prove me and my teachings wrong. And that it has done. “A faithful witness will not lie.” (Pro. 14:1) Facts show that Russell lied. Therefore, he is not a faithful witness. How dare, then, do they call themselves Jehovah’s Witnesses?

If this odoriferous fruit has not already moved you to nausea we will note some of the wild guesses of Judge Rutherford.

Rutherford is reluctant to admit his connection with Russell. He likes to appear independent. He desires people to think that he is moved by the power of God instead of stealing all his thunder from Russell. The Prefatory to the book entitled, “Millions Now Living Will Never Die” is a letter addressed to the Judge from Mr. G. C. Driscoll that clearly shows his connection with Russell. Mr. Driscoll is the man who syndicated Pastor Russell. Mr. Driscoll is the man who syndicated Pastor Russell’s sermon in thousands of newspapers in many lands. Mr. Driscoll, in order to build up Rutherford before the followers of Russell, taught that Rutherford was inspired.

“It will not be necessary for anyone to consider your statements as a guess,” says Mr. Driscoll. The right hand man of Russell has now laid his hands on Rutherford and for him claimed inspiration. On page eight Judge lays claim to inspiration. “It was impossible for a human mind to look down through the corridors of the ages and foretell what the future and tells what will happen in 1925. He says a human mind cannot do that. Yet he tells what will happen. Therefore, Judge leads his followers to believe that his mind is divine. Note some of his prophecies:

1. The jubilee cycle is to begin in 1925 and the earthly phase of the kingdom shall be recognized. (Remember this was written in 1920.)
2. In 1925 Abraham will return to the earth in human perfection.
3. Isaac and Jacob will also be resurrected in 1925.
4. Millions living in 1920 will never die.
5. In 1925 people who are very old and ready for the tomb will return to the days of their youth, and live forever on the earth.

This fruit is taken from the book entitled, “Millions Now Living Will Never Die.” (Pages 89, 97, and 98). Rutherford has lived long enough to demonstrate to the world that he is a false prophet. He says, “Those who accept the ransomer shall return to the days of their youth.” Judge has not returned to the days of his youth—he is getting older every day. But those, says he, who accept Christ will return to the days of their youth. He has not returned to the days of his youth, therefore, according to his own statement he has not accepted Christ.

Mr. Driscoll said, “His words were not guesses.” Rutherford said “only God could tell what is in the future.” Since the prophecies of Rutherford did not come to pass we know that God did not have anything to do with it and therefore Judge is proven a false teacher. “When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.” (Deu. 18:22). Thus all can see that what Jehovah says is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken.

Should Rutherford Be Put To Death?

For the sake of the health of Judge Rutherford it is good that he is not living under the law of Moses. Had the Law been in vogue he would have been put to death in 1925. God said, “But the prophet that shall presume to speak a word in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak even that prophet shall die.” God would not permit such men to live under the old law. The grace of God has spared their lives under the new law. Even though God permits them to live we are warned to not listen to them. “Many false prophets have gone out into the world” and Judge Rutherford is one of them. “By their fruits ye shall know them.”

Their Doctrine Contradicts The Bible

Not only is Rutherford proven to be a false teacher by the failure of his prophecies but every distinctive principle he holds contradicts the Bible.

1. They teach that man is wholly mortal. The proof-texts they use are the ones that refer to the body. In Romans 8:11 God says our bodies are mortal. Now where is the text that says that spirit of man is mortal? The statements dealing with the spirit of man they ignore. They are concerned only with the ones dealing with the body. The Bible says the body without the spirit is dead. It does not say the spirit without the body is dead. They are soul sleepers and such passages as II Cor. 5:6; Phil. 1:21-24; II Pet. 1:13-14; and Matt. 17:1-8 form no part of their doctrine.

2. They deny the Bible doctrine about hell. They say there is no hell...
and yet do more preaching about it than anybody. Where there is no penalty there is no law. They are determined to disregard the law of God and ike Robert Ingersoll try to ease then conscience by preaching that there is no place of ever lasting torment. However all their preaching and writing cannot destroy the force of one single passage of the Word of God. “And these shall go away into eternal punishment.” The Lord says the wicked will be punished eternally. Paul says this punishment will consist of tribulation and anguish. (Rom. 2:9) Jehovah’s Witnesses say this is not so. However, I had rather believe Jehovah.

3. They deny the existence of the kingdom of God. This has ever been a stock argument of the devil. If he can persuade men to regard the kingdom as something future, certainly they will not emphasize its law of induction. When men wake up to the fact that the only kingdom God will ever have on this earth is here now, they will spend more time trying to get men into it that they might be saved, and less time arguing about a Utopia somewhere in the future. That the kingdom exists on earth today and was in existence in the days of Paul is too plain to be denied. Paul says he breathed at Colosse were in the kingdom. (Col. 1:13) How could they get into the kingdom if it did not exist? They were in the kingdom, says Paul. Therefore the kingdom was in existence. It is claimed by some, however, that John, in the book of Revelation teaches the kingdom to be future. There are many things about the book of Revelation that I do not know. But this one thing I do know—itis does not teach the kingdom to be future. John writes only eight verses, and stops, as it were to forestall any such future kingdom idea, and tells us plainly that he was already in the kingdom. ‘I John, your brother and partaker with you in the tribulation and kingdom and patience which are in Jesus.’ What does this passage in Revelation mean? I may not know what it means but I know what it does not mean. It does not mean a future kingdom, for John says he is already in the kingdom. As for me I shall take what Paul and John have to say and regard Rutherford and all his satellites as false teachers.

We therefore exhort these people to forsake Judge Rutherford and accept Jesus Christ. Throw away his books and take the Bible. No man can take both.

Paragaphs In Praise Of Practically Nothing

Marvelous are they works, 0 Unity Meeting, and that my soul knoweth right well. If I should count them, they are more in number than the sand. For I see from the hand of a reliable reporter that the Indianapolis meeting produced the following history-making results:

1. The nation's fifth-largest Christian Church played host.
2. People connected with Christian Leader, Gospel Advocate, etc., lent their presence.
3. About 196 preachers of one kind and another were in attendance.
4. The host minister would not let a trinkle out of his music box because of his respect for the letter of the New Testament—er, ah, ah-ahem: my mistake, I meant because of his courtesy for the feelings of some of the unifiers.
5. Vulgar debating was conspicuous by its absence.
6. The issue of instrumental music was introduced, but appeared a creature so weak and emaciated that she had to be helped to the platform, whereupon she fainted dead away from stage-fright when the oh-so-sweet smiles of the audience were flashed on her.
7. One Christian church preacher got a slap on the wrist by a colleague for presuming “to invade a non-organ church and work for its introduction.”
8. Walker, McMillan, Boles, Kershner, Witty, Sommer, Morris, Smith, Murch, and Errett made some bee-utiful dashes out to the end of the springboard, but all stopped short at the sight of the real issue spread below.
9. The meeting having very little to do or talk about beguiled a little time in flattering two attendants on their advanced ages.
10. Open forums sent scads of hot air to the roof of the building, and close observers saw it give upward several inches here and there.
11. Changed attitudes on the part of a number of Christian Church adherents were plain to all, but no one could say for sure in what direction.
12. E. L. Jorgenson in one hand carried the torch of premillenialism without a slip, while batonning with the other.
13. Bro. Trinkle declared it would hurt him if the Unity Movement should stop now, but he declined to say where.
14. Murch moved, Witty seconded, etc., AND etc.
15. Debate having failed to kill Catholicism, it was thought by some that overtures should be made to Pius XII asking terms of readmittance to medieval oneness.

Now as I lay taking my siesta, I dreamed a dream. And behold I appeared to be in a large downtown office building, where I had often been before and where things were perfectly familiar to me. And behold as I dreamed further, I saw the exits were no longer marked with their wonted names of streets, but instead had over them the names of old and dear friends: “Paul,” “Peter,” “James,” even that of the Lord himself, together with many others. And as I dreamed I saw myself trying these doors to see where they led, and certes they all led to familiar, well-trod territory. And I went into the building again, and this time observed a door that I had not noticed before. And behold, over it were mystical initials, all resplendent and attractive to mine eye. There was a mighty “R,” then a mighty “H,” and then a mighty “B.” And I thought I would try this strange door. I did so, but to mine amazement could not by any means tell where I was. At length mine eye did espy what appeared to be a signboard some distance away. I hurriedly made for it. I could read it, but I could not understand it. The words were not strange, but somehow they had a strange, indefinable twist to them.

“The mystery of iniquity,” it said, “which all along has been working (though under restraint) will finally break through and triumph, to be put down only when Christ comes (2 Thess. 2).” “Good heavens!” I gasped, “Is that in the future? I thought that was in the past, when the papacy developed; that with the liberation of God’s word by the Reformation, the consumption of that wickedness began, to be finally eradicated by the brightness of His coming.” I espied another guide-post further on, but I did not like the looks of the neighborhood, and there not being a policeman in sight, I scurried back into the building, wondering to what ghastly ruin those unfortunate souls who followed such direction should come.

I awoke on the instant in a cold sweat.
After repeated failures in an effort to make his audience laugh, a comedian got peeved. He told the best joke in his repertory and still not a ripple from the audience. He said, "Well, I guess you will laugh at that next year." A man from the crowd said, "No, we laughed at that one last year." Which suggests that there are many things going on these days which are nothing new under the sun. People are pretty much the same in all generations. The sins of the ancients have become the sins of this age. "As your fathers did so did ye." The sins that crucified Jesus are the sins that would destroy His kingdom today. The hatred of the denominations of the Jews for Christ is expressed by the denominational churches against the church of Christ today.

In Matthew chapter 22, we see three groups of the Jews—three denominations of them, trying to get rid of Jesus. They had no use for one another, but they could get together if it required it to destroy Jesus and His influence. They could have a union meeting against anything good. It is not difficult to imagine them talking of tolerance and having a sweet spirit. They probably thought Jesus should have had the spirit of the Messiah. Brother Pharisee might be heard to say, "Brother Sadducee, I think Jesus is too hard. He even calls names. He is too narrow. He is opposed to our theory that the kingdom is to be of the world." From the way He talks, Jerusalem is to be destroyed, and is not to become our capital of the Kingdom. In fact, He said, "My kingdom is not of this world." I said Jesus is narrow, and He is, for He will have nothing to do with any of our denominations. He talks like He is the only one that is right. I am a Pharisee because my parents were Pharisees. I'll be a Pharisee till I die. Isn't it wonderful that we can belong to churches of our own choice. You belong to your church, the Sadducees, and I belong to my church. The Pharisees. Of course, the Herodians are not as popular and powerful as we are, but I like them better than Jesus and His little bunch. What difference what church you belong to? We are striving to go to the same place. We are agreed on the essential things. You Sadducees do not believe in the resurrection, but that is a nonessential. We are agreed that men ought to be broadminded enough to work together. We believe in tolerance, so let's get together and kill Jesus."

The Sadducees supposed that in the Resurrection things went on as they are in the world. They supposed that what is done on earth ought to be done in heaven. But Jesus said, "Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures." He said that "In the resurrection, they neither marry nor are given in marriage." This upset one of their studied arguments against the resurrection. But they were modern, those Sadducees. We have some of them in these days. They are mighty ancient though. They suppose that what is in heaven ought to be in the church. They double the supposition by supposing instruments of music to be in heaven. If you could find where they use the instrument in the resurrection it would not follow that we should use it in the worship any more than the fact that men marry in the church would prove that they will marry in the resurrection.

God gave the people a law which was to last till the seed should come. The seed was Christ. People were to live and be saved by that law. There were to be no additions to it or subtractions from it. But they taught for doctrines the commandments of men. These traditions or doctrines of men resulted in the different denominations of the Jews. Such as Pharisees, Sadducees and Herodians. Jesus came to live on the earth at the time the Old Testament was the covenant of God. He lived up to it. He did not join any of the denominations then existing. He opposed them. They hated Him. His teaching if accepted would have brought them to an end.

The New Testament is the law of Christ. It is to last as long as men live on the earth—to the end of the world. By it men are to be saved, if saved at all. There are to be no additions to it or perversions of it. But as of the long ago men today teach for doctrines the commandments of men. These traditions and doctrines of men have resulted in many kinds of denominations. Such as Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Catholics and many many more. If Jesus were here he would be opposed to all of them. He would not be a member of any of them if He could. He could not be if He wanted to—they would not have Him. They would hate Him as they now hate His body the church. Now, as then, if men will hear Christ, all the human churches will vanish from the earth. He took much personal abuse but allowed no principle of truth to be gainsayed. The disciple is not above his teacher. We must imitate Jesus in learning to be long-suffering when men would speak evil of us for His sake, but we must be quick to convict the gainsayer of the doctrine of Christ.

Because the Jews sought to kill Him, and to withdraw from the territory over which Herod was ruler, Jesus would often go into borders beyond the Jordan, or in countries north of Galilee. On one occasion He went as far as Cesarea Philippi. The record says, "Now when Jesus came in to the parts of Cesarea Philippi, He asked His disciples, saying, Who do men say that I the Son of man am? And they said. Some say John the Baptist; some Elijah; and others Jeremiah, or one of the prophets." (Matt. 16). Did you ever hear anybody say, "We just can't see alike" or "We can't understand the Bible alike" or "One man's opinion is as good as another's"? These are stock statements of those who would close any discussion of differences among men on the subjects of religion. Can we see alike? Are we supposed to see alike? If two men see a thing, they both see alike. It is impossible for one man to see that 2 plus 2 equals five while another sees that 2 plus 2 are equal to four. In that case one of them does not see. They must see alike if both of them see. If, in religion, one man sees one way and another man sees another way, supposing that one of them sees the truth, the other just does not see the truth. Not that they see the truth differently. We use the word see to mean the understanding. If A understands the truth and B differs with him, it is not that B understands one way and A understands another—B just doesn't understand. We can't possibly differ in understanding a point. If we understand we understand alike.

Now are we supposed to see alike? Listen to these words of the apostle Paul, "Now I beseech you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ (through the name of Christ means by His authority, so Christ is the one who commands this), that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind (see alike) and in the same judgment." (I Cor. 1:10). Same mind, same judgment and speak the same thing. Can it be done? He said
to do it. "Well," says someone, "my opinion is as good as yours." Now that is right. We see alike on that. But my opinion is not worth anything in religion. Yours being just as good as mine is worth nothing either. We are not to walk by opinion but by faith. Opinion is no more than opinion. It wasn’t so. He was wrong and I was right.

The phrase, "It won’t add up," may sound a bit slangy, but even so, it is accepted as an announcement that something is wrong somewhere. Its coinage was not an accident, nor can it be said that it was deliberate. It was just the working of a disapponted conviction, speaking right out loud, when failure is admitted. It pictures to us two or more columns of figures whose totals are supposed to be equal. Failing to obtain this desired end, "It won’t add up" is coined and steps, with approval, into general circulation.

In the business affairs of life, when this condition is indicated, we set about locating the trouble so that the necessary correction may be made. In the realm of religious teaching this is not always done. Let Paul’s teaching be listed in one "column" and a new teaching in the other "column," in the following comparison.

The Paul Column

"Before the foundation of the world" (1:4) God “purposed according to his good pleasure” (1:9) “that in the dispensation of the fullness of time” (1:10) he would “adopt children by Jesus Christ” (15) from among Jews and Gentiles (2:16), redeeming, “through his blood” (1:7), reconciling “both unto God in one body” (2:16), which is the church (1:22, 23) of which Christ was made head “when he was raised from the dead” (1:19-23).

All of which, Paul affirms has been done (2:13-22). Now the sum total is: All of the above is included in “the eternal purpose” of God, and dates “from before the foundation of the world,” and was brought about, declares Paul, through the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ.

Theory Column

The theory is: God’s purpose was to establish a kingdom in the world when Christ came. The Jews rejected him as their king, and because of this rejection, God postponed the establishing of it, and instead, established a church, which was an afterthought, and a thing he had not purposed to do. That through the church, God now deals with humanity. The sum total of this column is: All of the above, though not the purpose of God, is what he did, dating from the time the Jews rejected Christ as their king. Are the totals equal? They “won’t add up.”

We check again the Paul column. The blood of Christ and his resurrection (Eph. 1:7, 19-23) are both made important parts in the make-up of God’s purpose, and imply his death, which was the result of his rejection. Hence, we place them in the Paul Column of this check. To them we add, “The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the elders, and of the chief priests, and scribes, and be killed, and after three days rise again.” (Mk. 8:31; Lu. 9:22) Again, “But first must suffer many things, and be rejected of this generation.” (Luke 17:25) Once more, “The stone which the builders refused is become the head stone of the corner.” (Ps. 118:22) Three times Jesus quotes this statement and applies it to himself. (Matt. 21:42; Mk. 12:10; Lu. 20:17) Peter and John (Acts 4:11) quote it and apply it to Christ. The total is: Christ must be rejected by the Jews, in the “generation” of his day, and be killed, and rise again. All of which must be done that God’s purpose be carried out— he planned it that way. And when he was rejected, killed, and rose again, he was made head of the corner, which is “The Lord’s doing.”

But note the Theory Column: When God sent his son into the world he expected that his son would be accepted and, accordingly, planned to set up his kingdom. But he was rejected and because of it, even though contrary to his expectation, he was rejected and killed, but God raised him from the dead, yet did not make him “head of the corner” of the kingdom. Man’s “doing” prevented it. Again the columns fail to “add up.” But the Paul column check perfectly with the former checking and with all he ever taught on this subject.

To help locate the trouble, let me ask here, Of what building was Christ “made head of the corner” when he was raised up? Was it the kingdom? If so, then the kingdom was established just as God had purposed. But the Theory Column says he could not have been made “head of the corner” of the kingdom, for the kingdom was not built. Was it the church? If so, since God had purposed “from before the foundation of the world” he would make Christ “head of the corner” of some building, and he was made “head of the corner” of the church, and God’s purpose “from the foundation of the world,” not an emergency resulting from, and dating from, the rejection of Christ by the Jews. To choose either horn of the dilemma goes the theory to death, and one must be chosen.
NOTES ON THE METROPOLIS DEBATE (No. 1)

W. CURTIS PORTER

The Metropolis debate was a discussion of premillennialism. It was held at Metropolis, Illinois, from June 7-9, 1939. G. D. Knepper of Fostoria, Ohio, advocate of the Boll theory, was one of the disputants, and the writer of these notes was the other. No effort will be made in these articles to give all the arguments made during the discussion, but I do wish to give some of the main arguments and interesting happenings of the debate.

Four propositions were discussed as follows: 1. The Scriptures teach that Christ is now reignning on David's throne in fulfillment of Luke 1: 32, 33. 2. The Scriptures teach that Israel, in the flesh, will be nationally restored to Palestine and will accept Jesus as their Messiah. 3. The Scriptures teach that the covenant of Jer. 31 had been made, and if so, to tell us who are the covenant people. I showed by Paul's reference to this prophecy in Heb. 8:6-13 and Heb. 10:15-20 that the covenant had already been established in his day. Since this covenant was to be made with the house of Israel and the house of Judah I wanted to know if it included only fleshly Jews. Or is it not true that the church, composed of both Jews and Gentiles, makes up the “house of Judah”? I insisted that Knepper tell us if this covenant includes him, since he is not a fleshly Jew; and if it does not, then upon what plan does he now claim the remission of his sins. But few of these demands were ever met. He evaded the matter as long as possible, but being constantly harassed with the argument, he finally said it was made “with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah.” But he would never say whether it included him and other Gentiles. He evidently felt the force of this and was never able to make much progress with his argument about Christ reigning over “the house of Jacob.” It was apparent to the audience that if the prophecy of Jer. 31: 31-34 could not be limited to fleshly Israel, neither could that in Luke 1:32, 33 be so limited.

In So Many Words

In defining the terms of my first proposition I said: “By the word ‘teach’ I mean that the Bible says so in so many words, or that such words are used as to convey the idea.” Bro. Knepper in his first speech rejected this. He said that was the trouble with us who oppose premillennialism; that we were always drawing conclusions from what the Bible says, that we must get a number of statements together and then try to get some idea conveyed by them. He insisted that it must be in so many words or he would not take it. This proved to be a very unfortunate maneuver for him, for when I took the floor again I asked him to tell us if he believed the church was established on the first Pentecost after the Lord's resurrection. After trying to hedge here and there for fear he might get into something, he finally said from his seat that he believed it was established then. I proceeded to ask him if the Bible said so in so many words, or must we take a number of passages together and let them convey the idea to us? To reject my definition of terms was to cut him loose from a number of things he believes that the Bible does not say “in so many words.” He seemed glad to let this matter rest thereafter.

What Premillennialism Does For A Man

At one time during the discussion Knepper asked: “What does premillennialism do for a man?” And he said in answer that it made him more devoted, godly and pious. I informed him of what it had done for some men. It made Bro. Wood, his son Vernon, Frank Miller and others with and help J. Frank Norris, Fundamentalist Baptist, in his debate with Foy E. Wallace, Jr., at Fort Worth, Texas, even when they were discussing baptism and the apostasy questions. It did the same for them in the debate between W. L. Oliphant and John R. Rice, Baptist, at Dallas, Texas. This certainly gives us some idea of what Premillennialism will do for a man. It has a softening effect upon the man that embraces it. My observation has been that when a preacher of the Church of Christ embraces the theory he at once becomes soft on the fundamental principles of the gospel, he develops a denominational complex that makes him want to fellowship everybody and everything. It had that effect on G. D. Knepper. A number of people told me that they heard him through a two weeks’ meeting and not a single time did he tell sinners what to do to be saved; that he did not preach a thing during the full two weeks that any Methodist preacher in town could not have indorsed. Yes, the soul of premillennialism will do for a man. And this result to Knepper became evident during the discussion. For he began a tirade against the people of God, declaring the people of the Church of Christ are, the most conceited people on the face of the earth, that we are always claiming to be right and condemning the denominations. He said that the important thing is how we live and not what we teach, and he made some reference to people whom he knew, who perhaps had not been baptized, but impressed people with their living. He held this up in such a way as to leave the impression on the audience that one might be a Christian without baptism. During his course of criticism he constantly made reference to “the so-called Church of Christ,” “the self-styled Church of Christ,” and he actually said: “How do we know that we are the Church of Christ and that denominations are wrong?” This is what premillennialism does for a man. And when I had finished my reply to such softness Knepper tried to back out of some of it, saying he did not intend to say that...
denominations are right or that a man can be saved without baptism. But if he did not intend to make room for denominationalism why the question: "How do we know that we are the Church of Christ and that denominations are wrong?" He made no effort to clear up this question, but he was forcefully told that if he did not know that we are "the Church of Christ and that denominationalism is wrong" it is time he ceased his devoted study of the speculative theories of premillennialism and began to study the first principles of the gospel of Christ—things that are fundamental. He appealed to the statement of Jesus "By their fruits ye shall know them," and added that it was not by their teaching. He also told us that Jesus went about doing good, not attacking others. Concerning these matters I showed that John put some importance to teaching as well as to fruits, when he told brethren not to receive false teachers into their house nor bid them God speed. 2 John 9. And the man who says that Jesus did not go about attacking others knows little about the history of the Christ. The most scathing denunciation of religious leaders ever read is that which fell from the lips of Jesus in the 23rd chapter. In this connection Knepper referred to the articles in our religious papers, saying they were the same sickening and nauseating articles on first principles for the last twenty years. But a man's attitude toward the truth will determine whether such articles that tell men the way of salvation are sickening and nauseating to him. Such statements simply reveal to us what premillennialism will do for a man.

Men Must Be Marked

A number of times Bro. Knepper said we had come to the place where a man could not teach what he conceived to be the truth without being marked by the "Big Boys" who oppose premillennialism. And since he is teaching premillennialism he is therefore among those who are marked. But he said he wasn't concerned about this marking business. I called his attention to the fact that Paul said in Rom. 16:17: "Mark them which cause division and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." So we have definite charge from the apostle Paul to mark certain men, but Knepper says he is not concerned about the charge. In response he said that he was not concerned about being marked, but he was concerned about who did the marking. And he asked who would decide when a man was marked? (Continued on page 23)

When the great apostle to the Gentiles wrote these lines to the church at Philippi, which he founded himself, there seemed to be no trouble in that congregation. He says: "To write some things unto you (the things which he had preached), to me, it is not irksome, but for you it is safe." He knew the Jews were overlooking the spiritual promise of a blessing in Abraham's seed. They could comprehend only the fleshly covenant. (Gen. 15:7)

In Genesis 12:1-4 the spiritual promise was made to Abraham in which there were no fleshly promises included. Describing his attitude Paul said, in verses 3 and 4. "Though I might have confidence in the flesh, if any other man thinketh he hath whereof to trust in the flesh, I more," and he gives the reason for that statement. "But what things were gain to me, I counted but loss for Christ." (vs. 5-7) Further he says: "I count them but refuse that I might win Christ and be found in him, not having mine own righteousness, which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ."

To look for a fulfillment of the promises of God to fleshly Israel through Christ as being yet future is to disregard Paul's reasoning in these statements, and to say that God's promises to Abraham of his fleshly descendants, inheritance in the land of Canaan, and temporal rule in Jerusalem, of the seed of David, were to be fulfilled in Christ, is to read these covenants to no profit. There were no promises to fleshly Israel of the land of Canaan, or any other temporal inheritance or blessing accruing to that nation, to be secured in Christ. Everything contemplated of blessings through Christ were "heavenly callings" (v. 14), and were spiritual in contradistinction to the fleshly.

I presume now that, as in Paul's day, we have brethren who try to mix up the fleshly covenant (Gen. 15) which God made with Abraham, with the spiritual promise (Gen. 12:1-4) which he made to him when he first appeared to him. To this promise the law was added 430 years after, and Paul said to the Galatians that the law could not disannul, or make the promise of no avail. (Gal. 3:17)

Premillennialists and Pedo-baptists are about alike in their study of the Abrahamic covenants. They mix up the fleshly covenant of circumcision with the spiritual promise of a blessing to all nations through the seed of Abraham. This promise was made some twenty five years before God made the fleshly covenant of circumcision with Abraham. But the Pedo's try to connect the two to get baby baptism, and the Premillennialists try to connect the two to get the Jews back to Canaan. They should read 1 Cor. 3 and see that in the reading of the old covenant the Jew's heart was so veiled that he could look into the end of that which was abolished. "But unto that day," says Paul, "the veil is upon their hearts," until they "turn to the Lord."

The Lord began to speak at Pentecost through the apostles as they were endowed to speak by the Spirit. Christ was at the right hand of God, exalted in heaven, made Lord and Christ, the Anointed Ruler. The things now before the nations—all nations were included in the promise to Abraham. "In thee and thy seed shall all nations be blessed." This was redemption, remission of sins, all spiritual blessing in Christ. There was no more temporal inheritance; no more the things of the earth, but the things above, where Christ "sitteth at the right hand of God."

In Acts 13:32, 33, Paul declared that the "promise which God made to the fathers he hath fulfilled the same unto us their children in raising up Christ from the dead," and through Christ "is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins" (v. 38), not an inheritance in Canaan. Peter declared him to be both Lord and Christ. Paul says, "as ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk in him." (Col. 2:6) He was never received as Christ Jesus the Lord until thus presented, and on the day of Pentecost for the first time in all the annals of time, he was presented to mankind the Anointed Ruler and Saviour. Denominations teach that he was man's Saviour and Ruler before the announcement by Peter on Pentecost and the Premillennialists would have become such when he returns to the earth. But when he returns, he is not to rule, but to relinquish his rule to God. (1 Cor. 15:24) As Paul admonished the Philippians to forget their fleshly ideas of an inheritance in Canaan, and reach toward a heavenly goal. I wish to call my premillennial brethren to consider his plain statements, and do likewise by accepting the truth on the question.
IN-CULLINGS-COMMENTS
AND CORRESPONDENCE

THAT BROTHERHOOD SURVEY - - WHO ARE THE NINETY-FIVE PERCENT?

The avalanche of reports that have come to the Bible Banner (and still they come) from gospel preachers all over the U. S. A. and Canada is conclusive proof that the great Clinton Copyright Davidson Questionnaire and Survey, of which the New Christian (Digressive) Leader was born, is a farce. It is a bold attempt at treachery. The scheming designs of the digressives fifty years ago in their undercover ways and underhanded means of getting control of churches in Tennessee and Texas are amateurish in comparison with this modern plan of Davidson's to take over the churches of Christ. Bollism has been whipped. Davidsonism must be, and will be whipped. He has attacked the wrong body, and tackled the wrong men. We will not bow to his mandates; and his methods of intimidation are contemptible. The only thing that subjects the church to the danger of this artful schemer who has arisen among us is that some good men have been won over to his nefarious movement. The President of Abilene Christian College sponsored Clinton Davidson in Texas, imposed him on his student body and pushed him into the limelight in Texas, thereby making an issue of him in the church and in the school in Texas.

President Cox and Abilene Christian College, by this act, become definite links in the Christian Leader-Davidson Movement. So have David Lipscomb College in Tennessee, and Harding College in Arkansas. It is evidence of the sell-out that is being made by the Presidents of these Colleges to these influences.

His next appearance will likely be on the Pacific Coast. He moves upon the Schools; his plan is to "sell himself" to the "brotherhood" and sell the Church to liberalism. Thus his net spreads, and unsuspecting brethren are caught within it.

The Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation are side-stepping a responsibility. They know the Davidson movement is wrong. Yet they hesitate to expose and condemn it by name and mention. If these two powerful papers had taken the initiative in retard ing this movement, it never could have gotten the running start that it has. From the very beginning the Gospel Advocate knew the designs of Davidson, for the publisher of the Gospel Advocate talked with the publisher of The Bible Banner repeatedly and was not mild in his condemnation of the schemes of this man. Why does not the Advocate apprise its readers of the dangers of this movement, which its publisher knows to be insidious?

The Firm Foundation is well nigh an oracle with thousands of people. When its editor speaks like he knows and means what he says, his words carry more weight than any other man in the West. We believe he will eventually mobilize—but why wait? Some of us are in battle, and need reinforcements. If we cannot get them we may go down in defeat but we will not surrender nor retreat.

But who are the ninety-five percent—tells us, Brother Clinton Copyright; tell us, Brother E. W. McMillan—WHO ARE THE NINETY-FIVE PERCENT? Some of us do not believe any such percent has ever been tabulated.

Since it is so evident that the great majority of gospel preachers repudiate the Davidson schemes—It really would seem that certain college presidents and faculty members of certain schools are the ones in doubt. Therefore—Suppose we poll the schools? Just to see how many presidents and teachers and board members received and answered the Questionnaire—and how. It would be easy for any one connected with the schools to obtain such information and send a group report.

When the whole truth is known this whole thing will be seen as a Clinton Davidson boast, the blatant braggadocio of a man intoxicated with a degree of business success. Why be taken in by the propaganda of a New York promoter who talks more about himself and his money than anything else? Several successful business men have remarked to me that they do not believe he has any money, or he would not be talking about it. His whole movement is a gigantic bluff, which needs to be called. If the Firm Foundation will give the Apostolic Times (Brother Jim Allen's paper in Nashville) and the Bible Banner a hand, we will put this movement right where it belongs back in some dark corner of New York where it originated, or in the backyard of Davidson's New Jersey estate.

As for the question—"WHO KILLED COCK ROBIN?"—we proceed with taking testimony, and soon we may be able to rest the case.

WONDER WHO THIS "EX-PRESIDENT" COULD BE?

I am late in my report but I did not "kill Cock Robin," but I did know one who is particeps criminus. I got the famous Questionnaire and prepared an answer condemning such tactics, but on receipt of a letter from the "lost man" urging me to especially reply to questions on pages 24 and 25, I discovered that the thing was copied righted, and as I had quoted freely from it I had to tear my answer up—so I did not kill Cock Robin.

In the letter requesting me to reply to the questionnaire I was informed that my name had been given him (Davidson) by an ex-president of one of our colleges who breaks down and admits under his own signature that he does not know how long Christ will be on earth at his second coming.
My dear boy, I did not assist in killing Cock Robin; but you are slowly but surely exposing the tactics now employed by this "compromising" element within our ranks. Lovingly yours—Dr. C. B. Billingsly, Fort Smith, Ark.

Newt Moody Breaks Silence

Well, I am late with my card. I did sign the questionnaire, and as a result Mr. Davidson wrote me a very nice letter; in fact more than one. Perhaps, if I had talked his language he would have sent me a plane to "come up to see him sometime." If Mr. Davidson did not learn more about how to run a paper while he was running with the goats twenty years than he has learned about the church, he could have remained with the goats without causing the truth to suffer. Mr. Davidson said that I was so "sincere" in my answer he thought he would write me. I suppose he wrote all he thought sincere. But he wrote me a second time (a personal letter). The reason was this: While out in the woods with the goats he had picked up some expressions that I was afraid of when used by a man who intended to reform all of our ideas of what a good paper should be. He used such expressions as "your church" and "Sunday School Superintendent," etc.—just cursing a little. Mr. Davidson said that I was the only one who had criticised his letter, so I was distinctive in that. Then Brother Boles and I were the only ones to answer the questionnaire, and Davidson did not write Brother Boles, but did write me, so I am distinctive in that. Now, shall I be ashamed or puffed up?

Brother Wallace, when people find out the truth about the Davidson movement, that it has been started by those who have never been "of us," and that a most bitter spirit is back of the questionnaire, as I found in Davidson's letters to me, they will have nothing more to do with it.—L. N. Moody, Vernon, Texas.

Digressive Tactics

I have been reading with interest the answers by many of the preaching brethren as to who killed cock robin. I've been wondering who that 95% could be. Nobody that I know of can fool the old boy; maybe? 

I am wondering, (not accusing) just wondering if the Christian church preachers didn't each receive the first piece of mail sent out and many of them answered it. If so, that would account for the 95%. I do not believe that the younger element in the church of Christ wants soft, pussyingfooting articles in the papers, anymore than they want such kind of preaching. I guess, being 35 years of age, I would be included in this element, but please count me out of the 95%.

You are putting out a wonderful paper. It is just what is needed at the present time. You have more brethren with you than you may realize. Up here we are few in number, but the church here is certainly in sympathy with your defense of the Truth. May the Lord raise up many more like you. Aaron A. Stone, Brentwood, Md.

The Tragedy Of This Generation

I believe the Christian Leader movement is the most disastrous and unfortunate tragedy that has hit the church in this generation. It is an "Octopus" of compromise and condemnation that is bred by a lack of love for the truth and is fastening itself upon the churches and preachers over the country to stifle the power and effect of God's Word against error. The only medium of opposing it outside of individual effort is the "Bible Banner." May God bless you in your efforts through it as well as otherwise.

I picked up a copy of the Leader somewhere not so long ago with beautiful pink flowers all over the front of it and nothing but the odor on the inside and told somebody that it reminded me of "Ferdinand, the Bull" who loved to sit under the cork tree and smell the flowers all day long and wouldn't fight at all. I didn't participate in the "first primary" (Christian (?) Leader poll) but here is my vote in the run-off and it looks like the ballot box must have been stuffed in the primary or else all of the voters have deserted the cause and are ashamed to admit they voted for it. I didn't answer the questionnaire and if I had, I would be sure of one thing, they wouldn't publish the answer but would copyright it to keep folks from reading it. If there is a man connected with the paper editorially who can be trusted with the truth on every issue, I do not know him.—Roy E. Cogdill, Dallas, Texas.
Saw The Shadow

Yes, I received each of the sheets mentioned as soon as they came in. I saw the "shadow" behind the mask, and soon put each where it belonged. 'How about this prayer? "Lord help us in all that is good and defeat us in all that is evil." I like the Banner fine. Keep it coming.-Geo. W. Taylor, Tex.

Approach by Preaching

I received the questionnaire and the circulars. I did not answer. The best method of approach in preaching the gospel is to preach it. Let us be quite forever of hunting some unique unity program. Its solution is found in 1 Cor. 1:10. Pray let us gospel preachers learn a lesson from the Methodists. They are bereft of a message because they lost the Bible. I rejoice at your boldness in defense of the Truth. Let's not forget our marching orders.-Matt. 28:19-20; 2 Tim. 4:14; Acts 5:42.—Ben West, Georgetown, Tex.

Waste of Stamps and Stationery

Anent the question of who killed Cock Robin-I couldn't say except that I had no part in it. I am one of the younger elements who was left out of the party. Perhaps the boys knew that I never was much good at shooting that kind of bird away. I got my dander up when I saw the copyright tactics that we are now familiar with and sat me down to write a letter but decided it would be a waste of good time, stationery and stamps. I would have been in the 5% and not because I love to dissent.—Lyle Bonner, Kellarville, Tex.

Who Will Acknowledge?

I have been intending to write you for quite a while regarding "the killing of Cock Robin." I did not aid or abet in the deed. I received two copies of those questionnaires but did not answer either of them and have not found any preachers who will acknowledge, doing so.—Granville W. Tyler, Russellville, Ala.

Smells Digestive

In my estimation the Bible Banner is the paper of the hour to turn the tide and keep the church free of false teachers and innovations. I did not receive the Davidson questionnaire. If I had, just the title "Rev." would have gone.—A. J. Kerr, Lancaster, Ky.
Correspondence Courses In Ethics!
I did not answer the question sent me for two reasons:
1. It did not read like a letter from one brother in Christ to another, but like a correspondent school.
2. I, at that time, along with one-half million other Christians, wished I had never heard of Clinton Davison, "the forgotten man."—Jas. P. Miller, Akron, Ohio.

None Around Nation's Capital
I did not sign the "brotherhood questionnaire," and I think I can say as much for two gospel preachers in the D. C. area-Ralph W. Lewis and Aaron A. Stone. I am now in Dayton, Ohio, and the leaders here are wholehearted in your fight against all that is wrong.—Hugo McCord, Washington, D. C.

Save Us From Sectarianism
For one year I have read carefully the articles (in Bible Banner) and I assure you it is a God-send to rescue precious souls from sectarianism in and out of the church of Christ. May our heavenly Father give you health, time and wisdom to continue your fight for the truth, is my sincere prayer.—W. F. Cox, Beamsville, Ont., Canada.

No Ballot-No Vote
I am a very Cock Robin got killed; for I did not give my vote against him. I received no questionnaire and would not have voted to soft pedal gospel preaching if I had received one.—Herbert E. Winkler, Nashville, Tenn.

Hands Across The Mississippi
I certainly appreciate the fight you are making through the columns of the Bible Banner, and wish for it a wider circulation. We want you to know that we are behind you with all the influence of The Evangelist. Our paid single subscriptions and bundles will reach the 6,000 mark in the July issue.—Chester Estes, Corinth, Miss.

A Second Restoration?
You have an able, fearless staff of writers, from editor-in-chief all down the line, who are championing a second restoration movement; a back-to-the-Bible campaign that should be supported by every loyal disciple of Christ; every lover of truth. We hope and trust that your paper will have a large circulation among the brethren; and prove a tremendous factor in destroying the many isms, factions, heresies, etc. extant today, by adhering to the policy so characteristic of it from the very first issue published up to and including the last-viz. exposing error in every form and "speaking the truth in love."—P. C. Crews (Star Printing Co.) Colorado Springs, Colo.

Hold It High
Hold the Banner high. I have to debate with myself which article to read first, Cled's or the Editorials.—0. E. Donahoe, Killeen, Texas.

We especially appreciate this good word from Brother Donahoe, a deacon in the church at Killeen. We have many such expressions from rank and file which we would love to publish, and will give space to some of them to let readers know that many who are not preachers are speaking their sentiments.—Editor.

Cranks-Faction-Radio
I got the Clinton Davidson questionnaires, but thinking they were from some crank, I threw them into the wastebasket, so I did not help "kill cock robin.

The Trumbull church, near Ennis, Texas, has been rescued from the Premillenialists. A group (About 20) led by Earl Smith, Ft. Worth, Texas, went to the schoolhouse and started meeting. The church, then at once withdrew from the said Earl Smith. Dr. Eugene Wood of Dallas has been preaching for the group headed by the withdrawn from leader. R. H. Boll is conducting a meeting for that faction now. Will the Premillenialists divide the church? Yes they will divide the church. I know, for I preached at Trumbull, following a meeting conducted by Frank Mullins. Mullins preached premillennialism every sermon. I preached against it every night. They could not take it, so withdrew to the schoolhouse.

Dr. Eugene Wood, Dallas, Texas started a "Bible Class" last winter right under the shadow of the Trinity Heights church of Christ. I went, but was met by the Doctor, escorted to the front porch and invited to leave. After some argument, I stayed. I was not permitted to ask any oral questions, so I prepared some written questions for the next meeting. The class is not operating now.

I find the Premillennialists very mean. Blansett can say the ugliest things, yet claim to be so "kind" and so "pious." Dr. Wood, says: "You make me mad." Jim Meggs, Blansett's radio announcer won't even speak to me. Their sympathizers are rather "hissy."

I phoned J. E. Blansett, Dr. Eugene Wood and R. H. Boll to hear Athens Clay Pullias, preach on the subject: Premillennialism, Sunday June 11th at 3:00 p. m. They did not come. The house was packed.—J. L. Jines, Dallas, Tex.

Scarce In Central Texas
Haven't found a preacher, teacher, elder or deacon in Central Texas, who said they had answered Davidson's questionnaire. I threw mine in the wastebasket. As for me it will take all my time trying to teach what the Lord wants taught. There may be today prophets for which Ahab sought who will prophesy and speak unto us smooth things. —Edgar Furr, Goldthwaite, Texas.

Wastebasket Stuff
I have noted with interest your department of reports from preachers on "Who Killed Cock Robin." I didn't. Neither furnished I ammunition for the one who did. When I received the questionnaire, I was hastily arranging to depart for a meeting. I considered it unworthy of my attention and consigned it to the waste basket along with some M. U. Johnson stuff. I have yet to contact a preacher or anyone else who answered it.—Allen E. Johnson, Artesia, N. M.

Counted Out
I did not receive the questionnaire from Davidson. I suppose he did not consider me a part of the brotherhood when he sent them out and after my article in your paper in the spring and a visit I had with him recently in San Antonio I am sure he does not count me in it now.—Eugene S. Smith, Del Rio, Tex.

We Need More Elighs
F. E. EXUM
(Miami, Fla.)

In some respects the condition of the Church of Christ as a whole does not appear to be good. There is a creeping in of speculative and unsound doctrine that is positively unhealthy. But on the other hand, I am glad to say that the church has some valiant Elighs who are battling everyday for truth and sound doctrine. Mighty efforts have been made by N. B. Hardeman and Foy E. Wallace. As a visitor to Nashville recently I was glad to hear the very favorable comment regarding the work of these two preachers, made by brethren who are known to be sound. The church would be in a bad state without such champions of the truth. The church needs more men who will not compromise the truth and "pussyfoot" around the denominations. How in the world could one of our big pastors condemn the false teachings of the denominations if he fraternizes with their D. D.'s in a common organization such as the Ministerial Association. Would Jeremiah have joined the Young Prophets Association?
WHO WILL BELL THE CAT?

JAMES P. MILLER
(Akron, Ohio)

Let's bell the cat! You have heard those words before and remember them from kindergarten days. They are from Joseph Jacob's interpretation of Aesop's fables and the story of the little mice who had a counsel to determine what they were going to do about their enemy, the family cat. The remarkable plan of tying a bell around the old cat's neck so that they could hear her coming, and run, was adopted. But, alas! no mouse could be found who would take the job. True, they were all for it and knew exactly what should be done, but no one would be so bold. Poor little mice; they were afraid.

What a parallel in the church today. There is a big old cat whose duty is to keep watch about the household. He preaches what he knows to be true and prints the facts regardless of friend or foe. He is willing to defend the Bible wherever it is attacked, and signs his name to all he writes. His paper stands for truth. Error within or without is the object of his spring, and he cannot only jump, but when he lands he makes the fur fly. The little mice shudder at these tactics and call the cat all sorts of things, and will write, talk, and squeal to cripple his reputation and usefulness. They try to blacken his name; they accuse him of not having the spirit of Christ! But the old cat goes steadily on with his watchfulness.

On The Nature Of Mice

These mice, like all the rest, work better under cover. They are afraid of light and of being known; so they slip around as quietly as you please until they are in the dark and feel free to squeal. When the cat's back is turned or he is away, they raise their voices loud and long. Sometimes they have something to say, and other times they just squeal. Like Hitler with the Jews, when they are short of something to squeal about, they give it to the family cat. Some even want his hide hung up to dry: but that is like the bell, who will hang his hide? They will have to face him to do that. They have a "suckers' list" and all that sort of thing, and keep the mail man's back bending, all the time delivering their propaganda, signed and otherwise. This would not be so bad if everybody knew them, for the mice they are, but the strangest thing happens with the coming of the dawn. In the daytime they dress up with extreme care until you wouldn't even know that they were mice at all. And behave? Why, they act so well that they make a reputation for themselves in piety. With the nature of true mice this furnishes them a hole in which they jump without a single squeal at the first approach of the mean old cat. And so the counsels, and conferences, and conclaves; the schemes, the ploys, and the propaganda go on and on to prove that "the best plans of mice and men will sometimes come to naught."

The Family Cat

The cat is not nearly as bad as the propaganda of the mice would make him. He is really a pretty nice fellow. He even laughs, now and then, and has no trouble making friends. In fact, you have to know him to like him most. The fact that he does his duty should not make him the enemy of right-thinking people. His work is a most necessary one. Someone has to keep a weather eye peeled for trouble. Why, if we had no cats the mice would have such a time that a jitterbug session would be a mild comparison. Not only would they play, but they would eat all the wholesome food of the household and leave nothing but the dried scraps of speculation that could not give life. It would be a tragedy for the children to have nothing of the pantry but the old hulls of theory and the dried scraps of hobbies without number. They must have milk, and meat, and to live. When we consider the cat in this light, he is not so bad but he does only his duty as he sees it.

The Cheese

Now, this is the milk in the coconut, for even mice don't risk their lives just to play. The cheese these mice are after they consider worthy of the risk. If they did not they would retreat into their hole of piety and have a life of ease. To simply state it, they desire, as all men have in the past who taught and gave growth to error, to preach themselves; to be allowed to disregard God's word and all it gives to dying man; to take a privilege Paul denied himself and even the angels in heaven (Gal. 1:8 and 9) and by hobbies, theories, and speculations (either their own or stolen from denominationalism) destroy the faith and the purity of God's people; To exchange the plea to "speak where the bible speaks," for a false modesty; to cease trying to please God and start bowing down to man to speak the things that man would like to hear; and, if he has money, sit before him in sack cloth and ashes as Henry the Fourth, Emperor of Germany, sat for three days and three nights in mid-winter before old Pope Gregory the Seventh at Canossa in Tuscany; throw honesty, self respect, and the word of God into the world of yesterday as old-fashioned, out-of-date, and behind-the-times, and stand in a new era of liberalism, progressive-ness, modernism, and tact that they now as proponents of error have before them.

More Comebacks

J. CLYDE SHACKLETT

Some few years back there was a news story in the Gospel Advocate about "The Man Who Came Back." It concerned a trip which Hoy E. Wallace, Jr., made to Nashville, Tenn. Brother Wallace visited Nashville again a few weeks ago and was the speaker in a meeting conducted by Chapel Avenue Church. Eighteen other meetings were in progress at the time. He spoke to overflowing crowds. Nineteen were baptized and one re-stored.

It was more than a local meeting. Nashville had a meeting. He lectured each of the three Sunday afternoons, twice at Dixie Tabernacle, and once at the War Memorial Building. The lecture the first Sunday afternoon was great and forceful, but the two that followed were possibly the plainest preaching done in Nashville in decades. Brother Wallace possibly never did plainer, more earnest preaching in his life, and the effect was good, not bad. The last crowd was the largest. All available space was taken, many stood, and many turned away because there were no seats left. The service lasted more than two and one half hours, the sermon almost two hours, yet many women as well as men stood throughout.

Brother Wallace injected some humor in his sermons. He manifested a fine spirit, considering the nature of the discussions. He called names of preachers and churches. He covered the case. The Hardeman Meeting last year had paved the way, and these lectures carried the good work forward. In a very vital sense, and of a higher order, Brother Wallace was again "The Man Who Came Back." The reception of his plain preaching, and the interest attending his preaching, exceeded the expectations of his friends. In fact, it provided the best evidence thus far manifested that Nashville might come back! Sackcloth and ashes are not in evidence as much as was probably the case when Jonah had preached at Nineveh, but Nashville is headed in the right direction—toward repentance—and great good was accomplished for the cause of simple New Testament Christianity.
A Good Woman Has Gone

Dear Brother Wallace:

Sister A. G. Williams passed into the beyond Wednesday, June 21, at 1:15 P. M. She died suddenly. After eating the noon-day meal, Brother Williams went out on the porch to read the paper. When she did not follow, as was her custom, he went back to see about her. He found her across the bed. He called her, but the spirit had already gone, returned to God who gave it.

Sister Williams had been a faithful Christian thirty five years. She was baptized by Brother C. R. Nichol in 1904. She lived to see all of her children, four boys and one girl, obey the gospel, except the baby boy who is not yet old enough. She was buried in the Winfield (Ala.) cemetery on the brow of the hill overlooking Brother Williams' home. Brother N. B. Harde- man spoke words of comfort to the family. Brother John T. Lewis led in prayer. Brother Gus Nichols directed the song service and Brother W. A. Black offered the benediction at the grave.

As evidence of the high esteem for Brother and Sister Williams in this community, every business house closed for the service. The church house would not hold all who came to pay their last respects. Many heard the service over Brother Chester Estes' loud speaker. (Brother Estes reads the scripture for the service). The whole front of the auditorium was filled with beautiful flowers.

Brother Williams has truly lost a helper and companion; the children a real Christian mother; the church a faithful sister; and I, a friend. Our hearts go out in sympathy to Brother A. G. and the family.

Brother Foy, I knew you wanted to know of this, since it had to come. So I have taken time out from work to write you. In Christian love, Solon Whitehead.

[All of us, including many gospel preachers, join Brother Solon in these words of love and condolence. Brother Cled and I have both shared the Christian hospitality and companionship of the Williams' home. We have no better personal friends over the country generally than A. G. Williams. He is an elder in the church at Winfield, where we have both held numerous meetings, and each time stayed in his home. We reach out our hand to you, Brother Williams, with a strong, though sorrow-muffled, "God bless you," accompanied with a fervent prayer that God may be your strength. -F. E. W. Jr.]

What Went Ye Out To See

B. G. Hope

(Paragould, Ark. )

In Matthew 11:7-9 Jesus asked the multitude concerning John, “What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken with the wind? But what went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? Behold, they that wear soft clothing are in kings’ houses. But what went ye out for to see? A prophet? yea, I say unto you, and more than a prophet.” When Jesus asked the above questions, he rekindled an admiration of the people for John. If any had gone out to see in John one who could be swayed by public opinion, they were disappointed. If others had expected one that indulged in all the fleshly appetites, Christian life corrected that opinion. It seems to be characteristic of enemies to build up an ‘imaginative character and make the traits fit the one whom they despise.

It seems to me that the above might be made applicable to Brother Foy E. Wallace, Jr., who has just closed a meeting here in Paragould. As the time drew near for him to begin the meeting, there were many rumors concerning his type of preaching and his characteristics as a man. The Tishbites did a good job advertising the meeting, but many came to see what manner of man he was. If we were to propound the heading of this article to those who attended the meeting, some would say that they came to see one who had horns and was equal to the devil himself; others would say that they came to see one who was crouched like a wild beast ready to spring on any one who might oppose him along any line; and still other might say that they came to hear one who could preach, but was clothed in “soft raiment,” and cared nothing about speaking to any one. In fact, he was pictured as one who would not carry on a conversation with common people. The local preacher might have been a little scared himself and when he met the train, he stood off and gazed at the “curio” who had come to hold the meeting. But by the time the very first service was over, the above conceptions were eliminated. No longer did we fear that we might be hooked; no longer did we expect him to leap on us if we differed with him on some matter; and we decided that he was nearly human, and at the very first service we went to him and he talked to us. The church found that he was very sociable, and instead of running out the back door at the close of each service, he would actually come down the aisle and out the front door and speak to people. He never did grit his teeth at any one, not even the preacher. So after a thorough examination of this monster who came to do the preaching in the meeting, the congregation found him to be just a faithful gospel preacher. He, without being swayed by public opinion, preached the truth, but he also possesses the courage to prove and rebuke all error and those who teach it. Then, his love for the souls of men prompted him to beg and exhorted men to obey the gospel. When we were permitted to get a conception of the man as he is, we found that the Tishbite crowd had badly misrepresented him and we can understand now why they did not sign their names. Well, Brother Wallace is invited back to hold a meeting in 1941. He will return the third Sunday in July.

The meeting was well attended by all classes. The business men of town were impressed with his lessons. Visitors came from a distance and the church appreciated the interest and cooperation manifest. Those who were present commented on the kind way in which Brother Wallace presented the truth and exposed error. He held the young people spell bound. Not one time did he ever show an ugly spirit. He certainly is the master of any situation and his pleasantness is effective. His humility was an outstanding characteristic during the entire meeting.

When he exposed error, he did it humbly and as a result, the doctrines of men fell crashing at his feet. Brother Denton M. Neal, of Blytheville, Arkansas; was in charge of the song service. To say that he did it well is to mildly express it. All were impressed with his work. He is also invited back in 1941 to work with Brother Wallace. He not only did his work in the meetings well, but he met with the young people each morning and taught some of the rudiments of music. The church appreciates his work.

We were glad to have Brethren Wallace and Neal in this community. We understand that Brother Wallace will be in Jonesboro next year. We will all be looking forward to hearing him there. Give us more men like Wallace and Neal. We assure Brother Wallace that we are for him in his fight against all forms of error and will go with him until the end of it all.

I received two copies of the Davidson Questionnaire, but I did not answer it. They were immediately thrown in the wastepaper basket.—Perry B. Cotham, Shawnee, Okla.
HIGH PRESSURE JIMMIE WRITES A LETTER

Rolfe Wagner, Minister
Sheridan, Wyo.

Dear Brother Wagner:

I have just read your article in the last issue of the Bible Banner and I am greatly surprised that a man of your learning and standing would enter the slanderous crowd as you have done.

Brother Wagner, you must be a truthful man and if you are I want you to write and tell me what there was in the questionnaire that had the “stench of compromise”? You received a letter or a postal explaining why the mistake of “Rev.” was made. Why not be square in your dealings with a man whom you have never met and know nothing but what you have read in the Bible Banner. Is that the way the Bible tells us to judge a brother? They ask about “the questionnaire.” You and that group think about it—a thousand others, who have seethed through the mails to hundreds of people in the church. Jimmie wrote me “in the spirit of Christ” love11 are high pressure salesman and they are trying to high pressure the whole brotherhood. The letter that love11 wrote Rolfe Wagner is just a sample of what these men of this new movement call “the spirit of Christ.” This letter is just one of many that have seethed through the mails to hundreds of people in the church. Jimmie wrote me “in the spirit of Christ” some months ago that I was on the way to hell. And if he and Davidson were the judge I would probably be there already. Brother Wagner is right in pointing out the real spirit of hatred and bitterness back of the Lovell Davidson movement. They may smile and smile (pious-like) when they talk and talk (salesmanlike) but they cannot hide their spite. Thinking people see through their words and actions, and actions often speak louder than words.

Their methods of intimidation are repulsive, Clinton Davidson has threatened some of us with “eminent legal counsel,” and others of us with public exposure. He recently threatened Hugo McCord, if he did not desist writing as he does, and now Love11 are high pressure salesman and they are trying to high pressure the whole brotherhood. The letter that love11 wrote Rolfe Wagner is just a sample of what these men of this new movement call “the spirit of Christ.” This letter is just one of many that have seethed through the mails to hundreds of people in the church. Jimmie wrote me “in the spirit of Christ” some months ago that I was on the way to hell. And if he and Davidson were the judge I would probably be there already. Brother Wagner is right in pointing out the real spirit of hatred and bitterness back of the Lovell Davidson movement. They may smile and smile (pious-like) when they talk and talk (salesmanlike) but they cannot hide their spite. Thinking people see through their words and actions, and actions often speak louder than words.

Their methods of intimidation are repulsive, Clinton Davidson has threatened some of us with “eminent legal counsel,” and others of us with public exposure. He recently threatened Hugo McCord, if he did not desist writing as he does, and now
ell threatens to starve Rolfe Wagner out of the fight. These men should be stopped. We believe they will be when the brethren are aroused to what is going on.

Salesman Jimmie assumes that we must not form opinions and pass judgment on a man we have never met. According to that the whole "brotherhood" would have to meet Davidson and Lovell personally before reaching a decision as to the character of their movement and dealings. If this be true, they should have gone to see everybody instead of sending out questionnaires. Also, they should practice what they preach. For instance, I have never met Davidson, and am told that I should not condemn a man whom I have never met. But Davidson has never met me—yet he condemns me publicly and privately, and there is mighty strong evidence that he has furnished the means to circulate some malicious propaganda through the United States mails. But we should not say anything against Davidson, because we have never met him! Sauce for the goose ought to be salad dressing for the gander! But of course, salesmen like Jimmie and Davidson are affirmative in their thinking and preaching and never see their inconsistencies.

As for Brother Wagner and his Wyoming work, where Jimmie Love11 leaves him, other and more faithful brethren will step up beside him; where one compromiser deserts him, a dozen more loyal should rally to his work. This one thing should serve to direct the attention of those who are interested in real missionary work to this field, where a true gospel preacher is actually doing the work of an evangelist and doing it in the gospel way, refusing to be domineered and intimidated by these boasted promoters of a new movement who are trying to run the church and bluff the preachers. Such methods come from New York, where Davidson learned them in his business, but there is not an ounce of the New Testament method or of the spirit of Christ in the whole movement. The "brotherhood" is finding it out. Our estimate of Rolfe Wagner has been raised several notches, and it was not low at the start. As for being "a truthful man," Brother Cled could give us one of Jimmie's personal confessions on that point.—F. E. W. Jr.

METROPOLIS DEBATE
(Continued from page 15)

preaching something contrary to the doctrine taught by the apostles and was therefore a person that ought to be marked. In reply I said to him: "Bro. Knepper, you will admit that Paul said certain teachers should be marked and avoided. And that charge is to be obeyed. Do you ever do what Paul charged Christians here to do? And if you do, I should like to know who decides for you when a man ought to be marked. In fact I would like to know just what a man would have to teach in order to be marked by you. Just what doctrine would he have to proclaim before you would be willing to mark him? Do you mark denominational preachers? And if so, who decides for you? I seriously doubt that you would draw the line even on denominational preachers. I doubt that you would mark them. And I doubt it because of what you have said in belittling the Church of Christ and boosting denominationalism." (To be continued)

On Leave Of Absence
Mr. Baisell Baxter, President,
George Pepperdine College,
Los Angeles, California
Dear Mr. Baxter:

For your information, the following is a resolution passed by the Board of Trustees at its meeting on March 8, 1939:

WHEREAS, Mr. Baxter has found it necessary because of ill health to ask for a leave of absence for one year; and

WHEREAS, he has asked to be relieved of the duties and the responsibilities as president of the College; now therefore be it

RESOLVED: that Mr. Baxter be granted a leave of absence with pay from July 1, 1939 to June 30, 1940; and that his resignation as President be accepted to become effective June 30, 1939.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED: that this Board express its deep appreciation for President Baxter's efficient service and Christian influence in organizing this College and that this resolution be passed with the sincere hope that his health will be recovered and that he may again be able to render valuable service to this institution.

I assure you that the sentiments expressed in the resolution are shared personally by me in your behalf. Sincerely yours,
A. J. Dumm,
Secretary-Treasurer
Board of Trustees.

I received the questionnaire but did not reply to it. I also received the anonymous letters. I am with you. God bless you in the fight for truth and right.—Chas. Holder, Bridgeport, Ala.

EVERYWHERE PREACHING
(Continued from page 4)
rival, stayed over night with our friends, the Petty’s, and had a reunion with the Rampy’s of Harrisburg, Pa. (He, like the writer, is just a Texas country boy who went to town.) All these, and others, are great people. We love them, feel bereft when we part from them, and often long to see them. There will come a time and a place where there will be a meeting that knows no parting—if we map only reach it.

Our course took us to Washington, D. C. where we stayed most of one day and a part of one night. The brethren had arranged for me to preach—and to my most pleasant surprise a full house greeted me on Friday night, even on short notice and brief announcement. I didn’t even know there were that many Christians in the District of Columbia. The service was full of interest, warmth and enthusiasm. It was through Brother J. H. Sturgeon, whom I had met at Texarkana, Texas, upon the occasion of his mother’s funeral that this particular engagement was made, and in him I have found a new personal friend. The work in Washington is showing the good effects of the wholesome influence and preaching of Hugo McCord. Brother McCord was away in meetings, but he was there in influence and mention. The members of the congregation had nothing but praise for him and his wife in their labors there. Would we had many like him.

Having filled all these engagements we turned westward, wending our way across ranges of mountains to the Ozarks of Arkansas, to the Eureka Springs (Ark.) Encampment. Here we are in a really great meeting, attended by Christian friends from “all over” everywhere. There is no church of the New Testament order planted in this beautiful Ozark resort. But we hope to include one in the report of this meeting. It is being made possible by a man of God B. M. Strother, of McAlester, Oklahoma, who alone guaranteed the financial end of the meeting, but it is being attended and supported otherwise by many individuals from many places. If Bro. Strother can do a thing like this single handed, what could congregations do? Imagine the results in the U. S. A. if the churches would do it. Give us more B. M. Strothers and his kind. We have several scattered over the country, but not enough.

At home again I feel that I have really been “everywhere preaching the word.”—F. E. W. Jr.
COMMON SENSE

Common sense, sometimes vulgarly called "gray horse sense"—is a rather uncommon variety. There are comparatively few people that have it. It is defined as "good, sound, ordinary sense." It is the ability to see things in their true light, to appraise things at their proper value. It would prevent its possessor from being deceived, imposed upon or led astray. It would keep one from making a fool or an ass of himself. The common sense view is opposed to the impractical, visionary and fanciful. It is the ability and disposition to winnow the wheat from the chaff, to distinguish between truth and error, to "prove all things and hold fast that which is good." It is necessary to itself of present, fleeting pleasures in order to enjoy permanent good in the future. It is practical, useful, efficient. In the affairs of life an ounce of common sense is worth a pound of fanciful theories.

Many an old horned-hand farmer has more common sense in a minute than some intellectual high-brow does all day. The story is told that some chemists were trying to discover a compound that would dissolve anything with which it was brought into contact. They had built a laboratory outside the city on a quiet, country road where they could work undisturbed. One cold, winter day an old farmer passing by stopped in to warm. They told him what they were trying to do and that they were right on the verge of success. Said the old farmer, "What are you going to keep the dern stuff in?" It was like exploding a bomb in their midst. The idea had never occurred to them.

It is generally believed, and not without reason, that college professors have, upon an average, less common sense than any other class unless it be preachers. There are many Ph. D's and D. D.'s whose heads are filled with fanciful, intellectual theories that have so little common, practical sense that they need a guardian. Good, sound gospel preachers have been ruined by attending some big university and getting a master's or doctor's degree. T. Q. Martin said that if colleges were placed under the pure food and drug act and compelled to label their products true to facts that there would be more J. A.'s turned out than M. A.'s.

Freed-Hardeman College is governed, guided and directed by common sense. While there is plenty of book learning and degrees among the members of the faculty, none of them are pedantic. They didn't acquire their scholarship at the expense of common sense. There is no intellectual aloofness nor air of superiority about them. They can get right down on a level with Spence, the colored janitor, and learn both wit and wisdom from him. There is no gulf between teacher and pupil. They appreciate and respect character and ability in white or black, educated or not. While they appreciate true scholarship, they realize that many of the world's greatest characters never saw inside of a college. And especially do they know that many of the greatest gospel preachers never attended college a day in their lives.

Not long since a former student speaking at "chapel exercises" said he would rather have the "common sense" views of life that were instilled into him by Freed-Hardeman College than to have a whole string of college degrees. Soon afterwards another "old student" writing back to the school expressed the same thought. A few days later another mature and thoughtful student spoke to the same effect.

If a choice had to be made between "book learning" and "common sense" we would prefer the latter. However, we believe in both and do our best to instill into our pupils as much as possible of both of them.

L. L. Brigance.

FREED-HARDEMAN COLLEGE

1884 — HENDERSON, TENNESSEE — 1939


COLLEGIATE. The first two years of standard college courses are taught by specialists who devote themselves exclusively to their particular lines of work.

SCHOOL OF BUSINESS. The head of this unit of the school holds a bachelor's degree in Commerce from Bowling Green Business University of Kentucky and also a master's from the University of Kentucky. He has had years of experience in this work.

BIBLE DEPARTMENT. The Bible faculty consists of N. B. HARDeman, L. L. BRIGANCE, C. P. ROLAND and W. CLAUDE HALL—able, sound, seasoned men with long and wide experience in teaching and preaching the word. The work here is safe, sound, positive, aggressive. No uncertain sound goes forth.

The above constitute the principal departments maintained by the school and offer a wide range of subjects for study and many of different lines of development and training for young people.

The Bible is the most important text-book. Like the genial warmth of the sun its influence permeates the entire student-body, molding, shaping, guiding and directing their lives.

Freed-Hardeman College is justly proud of a generous endowment that enables it to render a service and give assistance to its pupils that would be impossible without it.

Member of Tennessee Association of Colleges, American Association of Junior Colleges, application filed for membership in the Southern Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. Beautiful dormitories newly furnished. New, modern, cafeteria. Write For Latest Catalog.

DEPARTMENT OF MUSIC. All kinds—Piano, Voice, Vocal, Orchestral are taught by natural musicians who love music for its own sake. They have had exceptionally fine training and have devoted their lives to this work.

TEACHER TRAINING. Special courses for teachers are offered throughout the year and particularly in the Spring, Summer and Fall. This work is accepted by the State Department of Education for renewal of certificates and also carries the usual college credit.

HOME ECONOMICS. This department is well supplied with modern equipment and the teacher has had exceptionally fine training. She holds both bachelor's and master's degrees, the latter from the University of Tennessee where she majored in Home Ec. The work in this department is accepted without question by the State university.