A DANGEROUS SITUATION

I was asked by a good and loyal brother if a certain preacher of my acquaintance would attack a certain college if he were called to hold a meeting in a certain city where the college is located. I expressed the conviction that, knowing him as I did, if he saw any tendencies or conditions in the college which needed correction because of an adverse effect they might have on the church, he would probably say so in no uncertain terms. And why not? What had “our colleges” been feeding on to make it improper to criticize them when they need it? The present college sensitiveness to criticism presents a dangerous situation. Any brother, preacher or not, has a right to criticize either me or a college if he honestly thinks we need it. Churches need criticism and quite often they get it and nobody gets unduly excited. Are preachers enemies of the churches when abuses are pointed out and corrective measures suggested? Nobody so considers it, even college presidents! Let some preacher, whose loyalty to the truth has never been questioned, criticize worldliness, heresy or dangerous tendencies in some college and he is immediately published as an enemy of the school. Paul protested that he was not an enemy of the Galatians because he told them the truth. According to my squint on matters, the worst enemy a school can have is an administration which fusses up and gets huffy when somebody criticizes some of its activities. When a school or a church or even a Christian gets too big and important to be corrected when it needs it, it will probably get it whether it wants it or not. We are an independent people and somebody of character and independence of mind will say what ought to be said. The schools are not more important than the churches — yet. If they ever become so I’m in favor of performing a major operation on them. The school has its place and had better keep it. Some disquieting tendencies exist.

KISSING AUTOGRAPHS

According to press reports the Baptist World Alliance, holding a session in Atlanta, started “a vast revival” in downtown Atlanta at lunch time. “Traffic was halted for blocks” and wild scenes of religious enthusiasm amazed even “hardened traffic policemen.” Feeling must have been running pretty high when “Old women kissed the autograph of Dr. Oscar Johnson, St. Louis pastor who asked his listeners to ‘set sail under the cross of Jesus in the navy of the Lord.” We think that is carrying human adoration a little too far. The ignorant people of Lystra though Paul and Barnabas were “gods come down to us in the likeness of men”, and tried to offer sacrifices to them. This distressed the apostles who insisted that “we also are men of like passions with you” and urged them to turn away “from these vain things to a living God.” Kissing the autographs of Baptist preachers to show reverence toward God is an idolatrous practice that should be discouraged. When the devout Cornelius fell down at the feet of Simon Peter to worship him, the apostle commanded him to “Stand up, I also am a man.” Preachers are all just men, except the ones who are women, and great prudence should be exercised in kissing them, and it is my conviction that kissing their autographs is too tame and senseless to be even considered. Personally, I have never seen a Baptist preacher whose physiognomy or signature tempted me to exercise osculatory powers. This may be interpreted by some as evidence that I am not one of the elect-ah. Be it so but leave me out of this kissing business.

Baptist preachers can be depended on to play up the Atlanta excitement as a renewal of “Pentecostal power” and lead us to infer that the Holy Spirit moved “fifteen thousand stenographers, clerks” and old women to block traffic and autographs. I don’t think the Holy Spirit had anything to do with it. I’m reasonably certain that Dr. Oscar Johnson, nor any other Baptist preacher, exhorted the excited multitudes to repent and be baptized for remission of sins like Peter did on Pentecost. The tragedy of it all is that a large number of people in Atlanta including stenographers, clerks and old women will take their wild spasms of emotion as evidence of pardon, instead of obeying the gospel and relying on the promise of God. Some of them may even yoke up with some denominational church the New Testament says nothing about under the delusion that they are joining “the navy of the Lord.” You can read about “the navy of the Lord” in the same verse that mentions the Baptist Church, or “a Baptist church” as the editor of the Baptist and Reflector likes to say it.

Dr. Johnson is quoted as saying: “It matters not who you are or where you come from if you know Jesus.” A very nice general statement but not specific enough for stenographers, clerks and old women. That you may know more about Jesus I herewith introduce you to a question he asked: “And why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?” He had something to say about salvation. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” Baptist preachers are rather naughty about using their sectarian scissors of “interpolation” in clipping this

(Con’t, on p. 4)
SOME SPOILED FRUIT

A CLEVER EDITORIAL

In a full page, editorial in the Christian Leader, my friend E. W. McMillan, contributes his bit to the labored effort to malice the late and current activities of Clinton Davidson palatable to the brotherhood. I cannot, of course quote from the editorial as it is copyrighted and I could not do so without submitting my manuscript and use of the quotations to the editor of the Christian Leader for his approval. Even if he approved it, it might die in a committee somewhere or be vetoed by General Clinton, so I'll say my little piece without benefit of quotations. I really don't know whether to be cocky or embarrassed over the fact that the Christian Leader, whose editor used to like me immensely and maybe still does, although he hasn't said so lately, is more afraid of me than are such sectarian organs as the Baptist and Reflector or even the Christian Standard. I have been quoting and criticizing them for years and sometimes they have fought back but so far as I know they have never considered the protection of such a copyright as the Leader uses to hold its critics at bay. As we are legally estopped from making a direct frontal attack, I'll try and find satisfaction by nibbling at their flanks. If you are not sure you know what this is all about get a September 1st issue of the Christian Leader and read the editorial "By Their Fruits." If this citation of the editorial is an infringement of any copyright, charge it up to my ignorance and be charitable. Editorial responsibility must be a lark when the sanctum sanctorum is protected by both a copyright and a committee. It must serve somewhat like a bodyguard for royalty. However, I'm partial to editors who have confidence enough in their cause and their ability, to invite critics to help themselves, and feel capable of attending to the bad actors who manhandle facts. An editor behind a copyright and a committee must feel about as daring and independent as a State Evangelist under a board. Decadence will be chronic among us if real editors disappear and figureheads take their place. An editor is supposed to be a man of convictions with both power and courage to express them. The editor of the Leader promised his readers some articles on the millennium by two outstanding editors "having divergent views on this subject." (Hang that copyright, I shouldn't have used those quotation marks). The men were invited to write the articles and submitted them, and the editor was stopped by a telegram from headquarters or headquarters or something like it. It seems that the committee decided the time was not ripe to expose premillennialism and it was decided that such a discussion would do harm. Do harm to what or whom we are left to wonder! It is interesting to think of some editors among us who have made history either a committee or a board and is free to attend to anything the cause of truth demands without any official vo- toes. And he is going places as witnessed by widespread weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth.

But I must get back to my subject. I mustn't quote him, but Brother McMillan wrote a long editorial on the fruit that is growing on two trees, Clinton Davidson and Foy Wallace. Of course he doesn't mention the editor of the Bible Banner by name but anybody who has read the anonymous attacks on him which have circulated around, and listened to the gossip which has kept "the grapevine" humming, will easily recognize the picture the gentle editor of the Leader draws. By unscrambling mixed figures, Davidson appears as a Peach of a tree pruned and sprayed and bearing fruit that ought to take a blue ribbon in a California county fair, or at least a grapevine weighted with rare and luscious clusters. Foy Wallace is a sour crab apple tree, a thistle or a bull nettle if you can think of nothing worse. I'm doing my best to get this thing before you without cracking a copyright. Don't think for a moment that friend McMillan used the exact language I am employing. Anyhow, I'm giving you the general idea. The editor of the Bible Banner is represented as choking the promoter of the Leader, as the servant in the parable who was forgiven a debt of ten thousand talents, choked the fellow-servant who couldn't pay him a few shillings. The editor of the Leader weeps so piteously over the tragedy that I would be tempted to think that the exhortation to 'weep with those that weep' applied here did I not happen to know more of the facts in the case.

We are told that Brother Davidson made full acknowledgments of his sin in sojourning among the digressives, before he ever started this new promotion scheme in journalism; that he has brought forth the fruits of repentance and is being wickedly persecuted by ungodly men. This is about as clear as I can make the picture without quoting copyrighted material. Why in the world did they keep this from us so long? Why did they stay hosed up with this information until they had come out coughing smoke to tell us about it? Seems to some of us they tried desperately to conceal a situation that should have been frankly revealed to begin with. It would have been the right thing to do and also the expedient thing to do, for somebody like Brother Rowe was sure to let the cat out of the bag sooner or later.

Frankly, some of the "fruits" that the editor of the Leader says the tree should be judged by, has neither the right taste nor the right smell. And he may like his fruit with worms in it but I don't. That compromising questionnaire, rumors of threats, "eminent legal counsel," copyright methods, sneers at and attacks on men who were fighting for the truth while he was betraying it, defense of conduct he is supposed to have repented of, these are some of the fruits the tree is being judged by. The editor of the Leader couldn't stop it even if he could prove that the editor of the Banner is a sour crab apple or a green persimmon. If I had the task of defending this Christian Leader martyr of Bible Banner wrath, I would insist that he quit talking so much-especially about himself. This modern version of the prodigal son came running home demanding two fatted calves and a seat at the head of the table. He took a scornful attitude toward all the older brethren who stayed at home and blamed them for his leaving in the first place. For one thing they didn't give him enough to eat and what he got wasn't cooked right. He made a lot of money while he was away and came back home to set the old place in order and show the homefolks the magic of some new tricks he had learned. While away from home. When a man, any brother, sins he should be rebuked. When he repents he should be for-
In his brilliant speech that rushed him to his death, Stephen charged that the Jews had “received the law as it was ordained by angels and kept it not.” Paul charged that although they had “a zeal for God” it was “not according to knowledge. For being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and seeking to establish their own, they did not subject themselves to the righteousness of God.” They formulated a theory speculative and complicated. They judged and changed the law by the demands of this theory. Jesus charged that they made the law of God void by their tradition. It caused them to reject Christ because his measurements were wrong, by their theory, and later when the gospel was preached to them their objections to it grew out of idolatrous homage to a theory. Paul rebuked them with this question: “Nay but, 0 man, who art thou that repliest against God?” All objections to the gospel and its righteous demands grow out of an egotistic veneration for human theories. All such idle chatter is silly blather because it is a presumptuous talking back at God. Nebuchadnezzar felt mighty and important when he walked upon the broad walls of Babylon and swelled with pride as he surveyed the works of his hands. God pulled him from his throne, gave him the heart of a beast and after the haughty king walked on all-fours awhile, ate grass as an ox, bathed in dew, with hair grown like eagles' feathers and nails as birds' claws, he accumulated a vast respect for God. “And at the end of the days I, Nebuchadnezzar, lifted up mine eyes unto heaven, and mine understanding returned unto me, and I blessed the Most High, and I praised and honored him that liveth forever; for his dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom from generation to generation; and all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing; and he doeth according to his own will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth; and none can 'stay his hand, or say unto him, What dost thou?“ Men who chide God today with theories subversive of his truth, should learn a lesson from this humbled monarch of the East. “Now I, Nebuchadnezzar, praise and extol and honor the King of heaven; for all his works are truth, and his ways just; and those that walk in pride he is able to abase.” There is no more debasing pride today than the pride of party and no tenacity more stubborn than that which clings to unscriptural notions in religion. False doctrine is sugar-coated with phrases, pays lip service to God, while “in fact and in act” it devours him and sets up human, traditional authority. The rank and file following blind guides stumble along traditional paths ready to mouth cut and dried objections to the gospel when it is preached to them. A case in point is a question handed me by a college graduate which reveals an amazing lack of Bible information and a state of mind requiring a thorough overhauling that it may be subject to Christ.

Do you think that members of other churches are going to hell? (No matter if these people are good Christians.) Do you think a God with good common sense will condemn a good Christian just because he doesn’t belong to the Church of Christ? This querist, whom I know to be a fine and talented character in many respects, is more interested in what “you think” than in what the Bible teaches. It is a common ailment and a very disquieting symptom. It indicates a deep-seated trouble. It sets up a theory based on what somebody thinks and if it is found that God does not endorse it, then the victim of human thought is ready to suggest that God does not have “good common sense.” It is a refined form of blasphemy. In the light of the scripture, which right do men have to judge God by a standard of “good common sense?” Such judgment would have kept Abel from offering his sacrifice, would have kept Noah from building the ark, would have kept Abraham from offering up Isaac, would have kept Naaman from dipping in the Jordan, and would have kept the Israelites from marching around Jericho. An appeal, to common sense today is a pretext that keeps many from obeying the command of God to be baptized and keeps them out of the church. This same “common sense” rule keeps in operation churches and systems in religion the New Testament knows nothing about at all. A rule that operates that way is wrong. “We walk by faith, not by sight.” Faith must be capable of obeying God, even if it apparently outrages all common sense. “O, Jehovah, I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps.” “Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and the weakness of God is stronger than men.” “Let no man deceive himself. If any man thinketh that he is wise among you in this world, let him become a fool, that he may become wise.” When a man becomes this kind of “a fool” for Christ’s sake, he will not be found cancelling out the commands of God on the ground of “good common sense.”

My information about the church and who will be saved comes mainly from the New Testament. It says nothing at all about “members of other churches” who are “good Christians.” All “good Christians” in New Testament times were “members” of the body of Christ, the only church we read about in the New Testament. There were no Christians outside of it. In the light of the sacred volume it is absurd to talk about God condemning good Christians just because they do not belong to the church of Christ. It is tantamount to saying that God can condemn a good member of the church because he is NOT a member of the church. The church is the family of God and includes all the people of God. The sectarian idea of this “other churches” business made up of only a part of the people of God is all wrong or else even the apostles as well as God were lacking in this highly valued commodity of “good common sense.” So-called fundamentalists first began to rule out part of the divine scheme on the ground of “good common sense” and the modernists are finishing the job for them. Between these schools of common sense doctors, faith and scripture do not stand much show. The commands of God have been so much doctored by common sense that multitudes worship commodity “of good common sense” and pay very little attention to anything the Bible says.

It is a terrible thing to think of anybody “going to hell.” A theory of common sense says that nobody will. How do we know that anybody will? The Bible says so. What does it say about it? Those who obey the gospel will be saved, those who reject it are in the way of “going to hell.” Man’s thinking cannot change what God says and talking about what “good Christians” people are who refuse to obey the gospel is plainly dodging the issue. God does not consider anybody a good Christian who prefers a sectarian setup to the church that Christ built.

Of all the useless vain habits in religion, talking back at God is probably the worst. “Nay but, 0 man, what art thou that repliest against God?”
HOW “THEY” FIGHT

GEORGE W. DEHOFF

Here are the latest methods of attempting to destroy the influence of any person who differs with you on a question of judgment or who calls to your attention some doctrinal weakness on your part.

1. Impugn his motives. If he is young, tell folks he is trying to attract attention and gain publicity. If he is older and well known, tell folks he is trying “to ride back into the limelight.” Above all, never concede that his motives may be good. Of course, you cannot look into his heart but some of your friends will take it for granted that you can.

2. Write and circulate anonymous lies. This is a most effective method for any snake in the grass to try as he can operate in the dark instead of the light and doesn’t have to stand behind what he says. Some now say it is sort of like a boomerang though.

3. Tell folks he is ignorant. If only they get the idea that you are broad and liberal and tolerant and your opponent is narrow and bigoted then you can strut with dignity and outward calm for many weak in the faith will be deceived. If your severest critic doesn’t have a college degree then be sure to tell it. This will go over big with those who think more of degrees than they do the Lord.

4. Whisper that his character is bad. If he has the goods on your teaching of error and you are not inclined to correct it, just tell that he has broken the seventh commandment. Of course the Savior said, “Go thy way and sin no more” but you are not following the Savior anyway. Be careful in using this method to whisper and never face the man you’re telling lies on. He might mash your nose!

5. Tell that he is under the thumb of someone else. Never give him credit for trying to follow the Lord. This method will work on those who admire original thinkers and are tired of “the old style preaching.”

6. Tell that he doesn’t believe in prayer. This will kill him with the half-sectarian members who think prayer is a substitute for obedience.

7. Tell that he is not spiritual. This can mean anything or nothing. It may mean he doesn’t shed tears often in the pulpit (perhaps he enters his own closet for private prayer) or maybe he once told a joke in the pulpit. It may simply mean you don’t like him. Of course, never let folks know how many sermons he preaches nor how many sacrifices he makes for the church or some might think this had a connection with spirituality.

8. Tell that you are ignoring him. The fact that you mention it shows you’re not but many folks just love ignor-ante. You can claim to be way up in the clouds and not noticing those who would point out your error and help you overcome it.

9. Tell that he doesn’t believe in Divine Providence. It may be that he preaches “All things works together for good to them that love the Lord” and that he believes God watches over us always with tender care but if he doesn’t happen to agree with you on some particular point of your idea of the providence of God just tell that he doesn’t believe it at all and someone will believe it (there’s one born every minute anyway).

10. Tell that he is a critic and that you don’t believe in criticism (unless you do it). Sweetly admit that you believe in positive preaching. Of course, you want to make a living off the labors of the pioneers who demolished error but you can just coast and bathe the people in sweetness; Keep them away from Christ’s sermon in Matthew 23. Tell them Christ was a lamb (but forget the lion part of it).

This will work fine on all members who are ashamed of the words of Christ.

11. Tell folks that he causes trouble by opposing error. Of course, weeds must be chopped up, sprouts must be cut, etc.-but tell folks to leave error alone and it will die. Ahab accused Elijah of troubling Israel, Christ came to send a sword but if you’ll just tell that your critic is causing trouble—even with the truth—and that he lacks “tact,” you’ll have delivered a solar plexus blow so far as some of your hearers are concerned.

12. Tell that he is pre-millennial. Turn the tables. Beat him to the draw. Lately it’s getting to be the fashion to say this about anyone you don’t like, even if he’s fighting the doctrine. Of course, most premillennialists are ashamed to admit it so this gives you an added advantage.

13. Tell that his financial affairs are shaky. If he went broke during the depression be sure to tell that but never mention the depression-lay it on his extravagance. This method will serve to cover up your own shady financial dealing by putting the attention on the other fellow.

14. Finally, tell that he is cutting his own throat. Many just love throat cutting. It maybe that he will still be able to holler after your sounding board is defunct again but lay it on now and you can hold by hook or crook onto some devotees.

These plans are best executed by using them from house to house. That way you can feel a man out and having found out where he stands, pretend to stand with him. Then, too, if you do it in public someone might another and expose you. Besides you don’t believe in argument.

I do not know just how these methods will work out but I do know that they are now being used. I’ve had them tried on me. Perhaps others will be more gullible but I doubt it. Let servants of the devil peddle their gossip but let us give attention to preaching the Word.

SIGHTING-IN SHOTS

(Con’t. from p. 1)

saying of Jesus right out of the New Testament. It is the quickest and most convenient way yet devised to get rid of a pointed saying of Jesus. Had some loyal friend of Jesus in Atlanta risen up to inform the excited multitude that Paul says we are “baptized into Christ,” he would probably have been sung or shouted down and missed having his autograph kissed.

* * *

QUICK-METHOD SCHEMES

All sorts of schemes have been and are being devised to “build up the church.” Even more or less loyal disciples cudgel their brains for some quick method of getting results. Paul and other inspired men wrote some interesting records designed to get the sort of results that please God. These records were circulated among the churches and read with a view to building them up. They were written to be understood and doubtless were. If you are one of those church builders who has tried all the schemes you can think of to build up the church, suppose you try teaching the brethren what Paul and others said to the churches of their day and see how it works. Results may be slower but they may turn out to be more substantial and permanent. “Results” that are obtained in any other way than teaching the word of God are most likely to catch on fire like “wood, hay and stubble” and when the fire is applied to them. They often pass for “gold, silver and precious stones” in statistics, and a lot of “constructive-minded” people are dazzled by the glitter of counterfeits. Better stick to the Book.
"TRAINED MINDS" AND "COLLEGE DEGREES"

O. C. LAMBERT

In a recent Bulletin entitled "Harding College On Premillennialism" there is an article "Facts You Want To Know!" By L. C. Sears. He says, among other things, "the practical mind is naturally opposed to visionary speculations. It asks for facts and definite evidence before arriving at conclusions. It is the type of mind likely to be developed by long years of rigid mental discipline". As men receive in colleges and universities, where the logical analysis of facts is a part of the daily routine." and again, "They are consistently conservative. For this reason there is far less likelihood of finding 'premillennial' tendencies and speculation among college men than among any other group in the brotherhood." Again he says: "These positive clear-cut statements from teachers and students indicate the perfect safety of the Bible teaching at Harding College, and against such safety no fault can be found."

But it cannot be denied that it has been taught in Harding College and that some of these "trained minds" have gone astray and that some of their students testify that it has been taught there. What are we to make of the extravagant statement concerning the "perfect safety" of their teaching? If their teaching is perfectly safe and no one can find any fault with it, this, I think, is about equivalent, to a claim of infallibility.

Why this "perfect safety" of teaching? It seems to be based on the assumption that one with a college degree is therefore a safe teacher. I would like to have Dean Sears apply this reasoning when urging the superiority of these schools run by the brethren over other higher institutions of learning. No doubt he would have the brethren to believe that Harding College is a safer institution than Chicago University. But this could not be for they too have college degrees. In fact he got his degree there. He evidently thought they knew more than he or he would never have gone there to study. If a degree man is a safer teacher than one without a degree, then it seems to me that the higher the degree the safer the teacher! But since the faculty of Chicago University have higher standing than the faculty of Harding, it is bound to be a safer institution. Chicago University teaches Evolution and other forms of infidelity and sneers at the Bible. If there is anything in his claim that the ideas of the faculty of Harding College are more to be relied upon than that of Christians generally, because of "long years of mental discipline" this sort of logic would make make infidels of the last one of us.

If what is called mental training fitted a person to draw safe and near infallible conclusions on all things then a man who had had "long years of rigid mental discipline" in financial circles would be a safe man to give you medicine when you are sick. But as for me, I had about as soon risk the blacksmith who had never been to college to give me medicine as the banker. I am right sure that his "rigid mental discipline" would not be worth much out of the line in which he studied. I much prefer the advice of gospel preachers who have been meeting religious errors for years than of one who has had "long years of rigid mental discipline" in sociology, political science and the like in an infidel university. The truth is that you may be the world's greatest scientist and be as ignorant as a negro in darkest Africa when it comes to religion.

The president of Chicago University recently startled the educational world by admitting that the results obtained by our elaborate educational system are far from gratifying. That it is not characterized by scientific arrangement or business-like efficiency. That the emphasis is on the trivial such as foot-ball and eyebrow plucking! That more emphasis is being placed by these "highly trained minds" in charge on the spme than on the brain. That tontine more than $1,000,000,000 spent every year now, mere are begm produced no more great scientists, jurists, musicians, or great writers, than when no such huge sums were spent. The only conclusion that can be drawn is that these great sums are being wasted. He called attention to the fact that now the emphasis is on a degree instead of erudition. The title to his first article was "They Are No Brighter." If there was as much difference in the college man and what is sometimes called the self-made man as is suggested, then the colleges would turn out better poets than Keats, men who could write better English than Washington Irving, greater scientists than Edison, better economists and financiers than Carnegie or Henry Ford.

J. P. McEvoy, one of the highest paid writers today said recently, commenting on 'the work of English departments in schools and colleges, that they were great on punctuation marks but poor on what goes between them! Very few Ph. D. men are excelling in any line. Josh Billings said that it would be a mistake not to know so much as to know too much "that ain't so."

Nearly all of the men who have preached the gospel and vanquished sectarianism for the last century were men who educated themselves. I doubt if any of them could have qualified to teach in the "Christian Colleges" of today. Many young men who have spent four or more years studying the Bible in these institutions have lamented that they were so poorly prepared to cope with the problems confronting a gospel preacher. Some of these institutions have unintentionally made the impression on the church that there was something lacking and they have been having special courses to indoctrinate their pupils, and in nearly every instance this man who is called upon to do this special work is not a college graduate! Too, many of the men in sectarian ranks who were overcome in debate by these "cornfield" preachers for the last hundred years were college graduates. The power is in the truth and colleges certainly do not have a monopoly on it.

If the illusion that colleges are oracles and that we cannot safely draw our conclusions in religious matters until we have consulted the colleges prevails, the Church of Christ will simply be another denomination and the preachers will be little clergymen taking orders from the colleges.

I am not against learning but I simply make a distinction between learning and college degrees.
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"God's Woman" — Custom — Teaching — Praying, Etc.

(The Bible Banner has offered Brother Nichol all the space he desires to reply to these articles. He and Brother Lewis are the most able men to discuss this issue. Bro. Lewis is willing, and we would like to read Bro. Nichol's reply to his strictures—Editor)

The above is the heading of Brother C. R. Nichol's new book. The question is frequently asked why preachers of the Gospel preach so much on baptism, the answer is because denominational preachers have challenged the New Testament teaching on the subject. My reason for writing again on "long hair" is because the teaching of both the Old Testament and the New Testament on the subject has been put on the ground of custom by Brother C. R. Nichol in his book, God's Woman, and until he modifies his book on this subject, or takes it off the market it will be necessary to combat the theories he sets forth in his book on this subject.

"Divine Legislation"

On page 42, Brother Nichol says: "Divine legislation is not the outgrowth of an experiment to determine what is best. Jehovah is infinite. He knew what was needed for man's good, and gave the exact law needed. It was a sad day for man when he thought he could invade the realm of divine legislation and change the rights and ceremonies of God's enactments" (Dan. 7:25 II Thess. 2:4).

In Judges 16:5, Judges 13:5, and Judges 15:12, six thousand years mark the blotched history of rebellious men in his efforts to repeal the law of Jehovah, or change it to suit his notions. Heart rending results of man's presumptuous sin, in trying to alter God's law, should so deter him that never again would he presume to attempt to change divine legislation. Custom cannot change the law of Jehovah, even though he who attempts to do so may be arrayed in the purloined livery of heaven!

The above paragraph is worth the price of Brother Nichol's book God's Woman—and if he had not "purloined" customs out of the above setting, and dragged it across the path of New Testament teaching on the subject of "long hair," I would not be writing this article.

On page 57, Brother Nichol writes: "Again, and again, through the centuries there have been heated discussions over what is the proper length of woman's hair. This gives emphasis to the fact that with some custom becomes a law."

I will answer this short paragraph by writing one myself. "Again, and again, through the centuries there have been heated discussions over what is the proper" mode of baptism. "This gives emphasis to the fact that with some" the custom of sprinkling and pouring for baptism "becomes a law." On page 59, we read:

"Hair For A Covering. Of woman Paul said: 'Her hair is given for a covering.' This cannot mean that her hair was given her by custom as a covering, nor can it mean that her hair was made a sign of subjection by custom. (Then why argue that custom has anything to do with man's hair? J. T. L.) To say that God gave woman long hair, and man short hair, is saying too much; for the hair of both is short at birth, and the hair of each grows. This statement is Solomonic. (J. T. L.)

"Man With Long Hair. Paul inquired: 'Dost not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair it is a shame unto him?' (I Cor. 11:14) That the word 'natural' in this passage is used to denominate that which had by long practice fastened itself on the people as a custom, is shown by verse sixteen. (Brother Nichol is crossing his wires here, but no such mistake made in verse sixteen. Read again the first part of this quotation for the correct answer. J. T. L.) There was a time when long hair was not a "shame" unto a man. This is shown by the fact that Absalom and Samson both had long hair, but it was not a 'shame' to them. The custom of their day was not the same as the custom in Corinth when Paul wrote to the church there.

Let us forget Absalom, Samson, and "custom" for a moment, and see what the teaching of the Old Testament was on man's hair, and what the teaching of the New Testament is on the same subject. In Ezekiel 44:20, we read: "Neither shall they shave their heads, nor suffer their locks to grow long; they shall only cut off the hair of their heads." Brother Nichol, was Ezekiel binding the "custom" of his day upon God's priests, or was it God's law? We are God's priests under the New Covenant, so let Paul speak to us. "Dost not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him?" (I Cor. 11:14) Paul was here telling us that nature and revelation speak the same language on this subject.

Back to Absalom and Samson. Brother Nichol was very unfortunate when he selected Samson and Absalom to show, "there was a time when long hair was not a "shame" unto a man," but that was the best he could do. Samson was a "Nazarite unto God from the womb to the day of his death." (Read Judges 13:5-7) The law of the Nazarites was, "He shall let the locks of the hair of his head grow long." (Num. 6:5) Samson was one of the great men of the Old Testament. He was the world's strongest man physically, and judged Israel twenty years; but the beginning of his end is told in Judges 16:17. "And he told her all his heart, and said unto her. There hath not come a razor upon my head; for I have been a Nazarite unto God from my mother's womb; if I be shaven, then my strength will go from me, and I shall become weak, and be like any other man." Sometimes I wonder if the wishes, the persuasions, and acts of women don't have something to do with gospel preachers apologizing for, or trying to justify their practices. After God's Nazarite law—not custom—was violated Samson became one of the most pathetic, and pitiful, of all Old Testament law violators. Read of the birth, the rise, and greatness of Samson, his fall, his shame, and his death, in Judges, Chapters 13-16. The example of Samson, therefore, does not teach us, as Brother Nichol says: "There was a time when long hair was not a 'shame' unto a man;" but rather it teaches us the danger of listening to the persuasion of women when God's law is involved.

Absalom, Brother Nichol's other example was not a Nazarite; but he let his hair grow long, he cut it only once a year, and you can read of his end in 2 Samuel 18:9-15. Possibly his long hair had something to do with his head being caught in the "thick boughs of a great oak." Surely Brother Nichol's pen was running faster than his thinking when he took off after Absalom and Samson to show that "it was not a shame for man to wear long hair in their day."

On page 69, Brother Nichol says: "Not infrequently custom changes within the lifetime of one individual. Man of middle life can recall when it would have caused adverse criticism for a mature woman to have appeared in public in our country with her hair bobbed. Today a mature woman with bobbed hair seldom causes a comment—she does not attract attention because of cropped hair."

Yes, and those same "middle life" people can remember "when it would have caused adverse criticism" for a young man, or a young lady, "to have appeared in public in our country with a" divorced person. But today it is
hard to find a congregation that hasn’t young people in it, who have been married, divorced, and remarried, and some or them several times. I wonder if Brother Nichol wants to argue that these people are only custom makers, and not law breakers?

On page 75, we read:

“For a woman to appear in a public place without her veil, was the bane of a harlot in that day. The veil came to have a double significance, in that it was a symbol of ‘submission’ to man; and too, it showed her not advertising her self as an abandoned woman. For a man to lift the veil of a woman that he might see her race was a gross insult. (This is a bit of information that I do not have, J. T. L.) For a husband to deprive his wife of her veil was equal to divorce. (borne more information, J. T. L.) Israel became so corrupt that Jehovah declared he would divest her of the veil, Vashti, the Queen, refused to obey the command of her husband, King Asanuerus, to appear in his presence with her race unveiled that her beauty might be seen by the men assembled with him. For her to have appeared as commanded would have been an immodest act in that day—it would have been an act a virtuous woman did not commit in that time in her country.”

Brother Nichol presents Vashti as a mere slave to a race unveiled that her beauty might be seen by the men assembled with him. Was it a sin against the custom of the people? No, it was the custom of the people in that day, in that country, to show their recognition of sex relationship by wearing a covering on their heads when in public. Why did Paul command the women to show this recognition only when they were in the work-snap? But we read on:

“Wearing the veil became a custom. Customs change, and if women today can show their recognition of the headship of man in some other way than that of wearing the veil, they meet every demand of the Lord by whatever means they may show their subjection; provided, of course, it is not some method which is sinful in itself, or reflects on women by reason of some custom.”

Now Brother Nichol, when women with bobbed hair, and heads uncovered, come into the places of public worship, will you please tell us what is the sign of “their recognition of the headship of man?” Some good women might appreciate this information from you. This information is very necessary, since you claim “custom” has abrogated Paul’s edict of the head covering. I know you claim that Paul was only binding a “custom” on the women in Corinth, if so, Paul named the custom (?). Therefore, I think you should tell the “Sisters” just what custom of “their day, in this country,” has abrogated Paul’s custom, “in his day,” in Corinth. And also tell them just what sign they may use “in their day, in their country,” to “show their recognition of the headship of man.”

“In the days of Paul for a woman to appear in public in Corinth with head uncovered, hair cut short, or face exposed was for her to declare herself a harlot. . . There was nothing wrong, within itself, in appearing in public with faces exposed, and hair cut short; but I have never read anything that Paul said about women “appearing in public with faces exposed,” neither have you. You have, therefore, inadvertently put the “face” of woman in Paul’s argument where it does not belong. I will now quote an italicized statement you made on page 149. “I insist that you do not read into the passage that which is not there.” Your book would have been fine, if you had followed the above insistence.

Finally, if it has become the customs of “our day” for women to appear in public worship with “heads uncovered, and hair cut short, doesn’t it follow from what you say on page 120, that those women who appear in public worship with long hair, and heads covered, “sin against the custom of the people?” And if so, what are they “advertising”? There is a grave danger of good people becoming entangled in this web you have spun out of the theories of what you call “the custom of their day, in their country.” Dangerous because the line of demarcation between “custom” and law has been blurred in their minds.

Women Teaching in Public

Having straightened out the kinks in Brother Nichol’s hair “customs,” we will now look into the position he has taken on the above question. If I understand him, he has taken the digressive and sectarian position on the subject of women teaching and leading the prayer in public meetings. If I am wrong in this, he is, of age, and I am sure the columns of the Bible Banner will be open to him—he will correct me.

In God’s Woman, page 121, Brother Nichol says:

“Some have insisted that though the Christian woman at Corinth did pray and prophesy, they confined such activities to private life; that they were not allowed to ‘lead’ a prayer in public; that in public meetings, women were allowed to engage only in silent praying.”

Frankly, Brother Nichol, I am one that “have insisted,” and still insist, “that in public meetings women were allowed to engage in silent praying.” Will you be just as frank and tell us what you “insist” in this matter? We go on with the quotation.

“I can understand how a woman can pray while in an audience, and not be heard by anyone in the assembly. Hannah prayed a silent prayer—her lips were seen to move, but the people did not hear what she said (Sam. 1). (There is no difference in Brother Nichol’s, and my understanding about how a woman can pray in “the assembly,” and heard by (God, but not heard by the “audience,” J. T. L.). But Paul says some of the women in Corinth prophesied. The object of prophesying is to instruct. ‘He that prophesieth speaketh unto men, edification and exhortation and consolation... He that prophesieth edifieth the church’ (I Cor. 14:1-4). Since the purpose of prophesying was to edify, and women in the church at Corinth did not prophesy, it must follow that they not only spoke in words that could be heard, but their words not edifying. (What is Brother Nichol trying to prove here, if it is not that women should teach and edify in public meetings of the Church? J. T. L.) The past we now study has given commentator no end of trouble; and theories have been advanced in an effort to make the passage speak in harmony with some point advanced by another passage. The effect should be to learn what the passage teaches, without regard to what you may have concluded about some other pas-
sage. (Then, Brother Nichol, why didn’t you make an effort to show what the passage teaches instead of taking the denominational position yourself? Your position has not solved the trouble of “commentators.” J. T. L.) The position has been advanced that I Cor. 11:4, 5 gave women the right to pray and prophesy; but the privilege was revoked in I Cor. 14:34, 35. It seems to me that such a position would be disgusting to a man—of reverence, if he knows the truth about the knowledge of the Holy Spirit. (I am sure Brother Nichol would be right when he says: “It seems to me that such a position would be disgusting to a man of reverence,” if anybody ever took “such a position,” J. T. L.) Paul was giving utterance to words of the Holy Spirit. For the Holy Spirit did not reverse himself within a few minutes and make a statement in I Cor. 14:34, 35 contradicting what he had said in I Cor. 11:4, 5.

I am not concerned about some cranky position that Brother Nichol may attribute to “some”; but I would be glad if he would tell us in plain English, if he believes I Cor. 11:4, 5 and I Cor. 14:34, 35 give women the right to lead prayers, teach, exhort, and edify, in public meetings of the Church.

On page 123, Brother Nichol says:

The silence imposed on women in I Cor. 14:34, 35, is not on the ground of publicity. I am not advised who first advanced the idea that the silence demanded in that verse was on the ground of it being a public meeting: but the thought has been advanced in the course of the argument. For, I Cor. 14:34, 35 says: “To me it seems that if, in fact, there is not in the passage, or in any other inspired statement a prohibition against women speaking in public, on the ground that it is public.”

Brother Nichol is there “in any other inspired statement a prohibition against women speaking in public” on any ground? If so, where is the passage, and on what ground is the prohibition?

On page 124, Brother Nichol says:

Some have insisted that women were allowed to prophesy in the days of the apostles, when they were enabled to speak by the power of the Holy Spirit. But that since the days of inspiration they must be ‘silent’ in public meetings. I have heard that position advanced, but there is no truth in the position. I showed in my first article that they were enabled to speak by the power of the Holy Spirit. Be very sure you get into your heart the fact that the ‘silence’ enjoined did not interfere with women prophesying in the position. I showed in my first article that there is not in the passage, or in any other inspired statement a prohibition against women speaking in public, on the ground that it is public.

Reader, be very sure you get into your heart the fact that Brother Nichol is saying that women may “speak unto men edification, and exhortation, and consolation. He that prophesieth edifieth the church” (I Cor. 14:1-4).

Brother Nichol would add “she” to Paul’s “he” in the above. In the last paragraph, on page 124, Brother Nichol says: “The ‘silence’ enjoined in I Cor. 14:34, 35 was a meeting such as is not now had, and has not been since the days of spiritual gifts. To attempt to make the prohibition there expressed applicable today is a misapplication of God’s word.”

A number of years ago Brother Nichol was in a debate with a Baptist preacher, and he made an argument on Mark 16:15, 16. The Baptist preacher replying, said Mark 16:15, 16 was not authentic, and should not be in the Bible. While he was talking, Brother Nichol reached over, picked up the preacher’s Bible and cut the passage out, the preacher protested; but Brother Nichol said: “Sir, I am just trying to help you, you said the passage should not be in the Bible, and I have cut it out for you.” The preacher said the book cost him five dollars. Brother Nichol gave him five dollars, and kept his Bible. Brother Nichol, I am now figuratively cutting I Cor. 14:34, 35 out of your Bible, and letting you keep the book with the passage deleted.

Now will you please tell us what passage in your Bible prohibits women preaching or holding pastorships? Some time ago a woman “pastor” had an announcement in the Christian Standard. I wrote Edwin R. Errett, the editor of the Standard, and asked him some questions about the announcement. He never did reply to me. I concluded, therefore, that I Cor. 14:34, 35 was still in his Bible, and he did not know what to do with it; but maybe he can get an idea from you on this passage.

Brother Nichol, your book is a very unfortunate production coming from a man with your reputation as a Bible student and teacher. I cannot understand why those who read your manuscript did not tell you this before the book was published, unless it was because they had unlimited confidence in your ability as a Bible teacher, and did not read your manuscript closely. However, that is water already passed over the dam. But will you not make some public statement, modifying the radical statements you have made in your book? Or better still, withdraw your book from the market, and rewrite it, thus restoring, and preserving your reputation as a Bible student, and teacher, for future generations. The woman that would follow all the teaching in your book, would not be God’s Woman.

Following the custom of the day, I will say: “This is written in the Spirit of Christ.”

*BUSTIES* JUDGE R. O. KENLEY

Those who enroll in colleges with the purpose and intent of mastering the courses prescribed and who fail to do the required work and who, as a result, receive from the college a command to go home are denominated by the college body as “busties.” For some cause or other, they have not been able to meet the intellectual requirements of the school. Happily for such “busties” there are other schools throughout the country which they may enter which have milder courses and lower requirements. From these latter schools these “busties” often graduate with honor and receive their degrees.

The Church of Christ is a school with very high requirements, an institution that can be entered only by taught people, and one in which people, after they enter, can remain only by continuous study, growth and loyal respect for the teaching and commandments of the New Testament. The Church of Christ is the only religious institution in the world with such high and exacted requirements. The commandments, requirements and restraints of the Church become boresome and burdensome to some people, and they reach the conclusion that the course is too hard and restricted; therefore many of those who have enlisted in this institution for life voluntarily become “busties” and go to some institution—usually the Christian or “digressive” church—where the course and restrictions are not so hard, and from which they can receive their degrees in shorter time.

This has heretofore been the practice: but at this time the “busties” are attempting to take over the Church of Christ and substitute a milder course for the course prescribed by the Gospel, thereby lowering the standard requirements of this great institution. These “busties” do not like to go to the Christian Church at the present time.
due to the fact that it is not growing but is losing many of its members daily and, in addition, some of its most prominent preachers, who have become disgusted with the easy course offered, and who, for safety, have embraced the Gospel as taught and administered by and through the Church of Christ, the time being now when nothing short of a large city will support a congregation of the Christian Church; hence the threat and danger to the Church of Christ of being swallowed up by the “busbies,” as in the fourth century when it formed a union with Constantine and his civil government.

On May 24, 1939, it was my privilege to meet and hear Brother Clinton Davidson when he made a talk in the City of Houston. He told of being born and reared in poverty, of struggling to get an education, spending two years in Harding Bible College. After leaving college, he became a located minister for a congregation of the Church of Christ in Kentucky. In 1916 a controversy arose between R. H. Boll and M. C. Kurfees, “in which Brother Kurfees acted very ugly.” He attempted to mediate between them, but to no avail. Brother Davidson said this controversy affected him as follows:

(1) He decided to quit trying to preach and go into business.

(2) He did quit trying to preach and went into business, and as an insurance man led the world in the sale of insurance and thereby amassed quite a sum of money.

(3) He refused then and since to study or learn anything about the premillennial or “R. H. Boll” question.

Recently his financing the “Leader,” a religious newspaper, was prompted by the fact that he had found so many fine young preachers who had been trained in Bible colleges, and who were disgusted and threatening to quit preaching, unless the “wrangling” in the so-called religious papers ceased. Through the “Leader,” he and the brethren cooperating with him are giving to the brotherhood a paper free from controversy—there was a time when the discussion of questions in the religious papers was proper, but almost all of these questions formerly discussed are now “moot,” having been settled many, many years ago.

After listening to Brother Davidson, I reached the conclusion that men of his school of thought were not in the “restoration movement,” nor were they with David Lipscomb, A. McGary and others at the time the “busbies” broke ranks and seceded from the true Church and formed the Christian Church. Just how any gospel question can become “moot,” I am unable to perceive. I have in my library every book that I have been able to accumulate during the past thirty years, containing the sermons of our pioneer preachers, or discussed during those many years that have become “moot” or settled. Many of them are settled in my mind and in the minds of many others, but there is always some new member or members who were not here then or did not have the advantage of those discussions.

Legal questions never become “moot,” only questions of fact. Judge Hughes of the Supreme Court of the United States in a radio address some two or three years ago made the statement:

“The Supreme Court of the United States does not make laws, but its aid is continuously needed to keep the lower Courts, lawyers and the people in a true course and within the Constitution of the United States; if it were not for the Supreme Court, every man would soon have a private interpretation as to the meaning of each and every provision of our Constitution, which course in a very few years would result in the destruction of our government."

The Supreme Court, as well as other Courts, often invites special arguments before it on the part of attorneys so that the Judges may have the benefit of such arguments, recognizing the fallability of man.

The Church of Christ does not have any pope, priest or episcopate to whom Christians may appeal to settle their views and understanding or misunderstanding as to the teaching of the Bible; therefore, to deny a Christian the right and privilege of reading and hearing the Bible discussed, either in print or in debate, is to deprive him of one of the greatest aids in this world in reaching an understanding of God’s word.

I have been a friend to so-called “Bible Colleges” for many years, but if Brother Davidson be correct in his appraisal of their product, I greatly fear their usefulness is at an end. When the law department of the University of Texas or other universities or colleges only turn out as lawyers a spineless product that is afraid to go to the Court House and “earnestly contend” for their clients’ rights under the law, then their usefulness has terminated.

“To become strong, the soul must needs fight something, overcome something. It cannot gain muscle on a bed of eider-down.”

The announced policy of Brother Davidson and those associated with him, as to the “Leader” being at all times nothing but a “sweet morsel,” reminds me very much of the story I heard Bob Burns, the humorist, relate over the radio some months back. Two Arkansas farmers had a controversy and suit as to the ownership of a sow and pigs. The case was tried before his (Bob’s) uncle, who was Justice of the Peace. After the plaintiff offered his testimony, the defendant called a witness to prove his side of the case; but his uncle, the Justice, stated that he did not want to hear any of the defendant’s testimony as he was afraid that it would get him confused.

Will Christians make the application! 600 Avondale, Houston, Texas
The injunction, “If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God,” is from an inspired writer, and therefore belongs in the must list. Unless we “speak as the oracles of God” in teaching the truth, in opposing error, in describing the church, and in warning against false teachers, it is better not to speak at all.

Certain men were inspired, even verbally (I Cor. 2:13), in New Testament days to speak the truth just as it ought to be spoken, and to write it in a permanent Book so that all uninspired teachers for all future time would know what to teach and how to teach it, what to oppose and how to oppose it. Their methods, their words and their apppellations are powerful, just, decent and dignified, and no man can improve them. To criticize or oppose the use of them today is to criticize and oppose God, for they are the methods, words and phrases of God.

In describing the church no man can use descriptive words and phrases more appropriate or more dignified than the very words that inspired men used. In opposing the error and warning the brethren against a modern Diotrephes, Elymas, Hymenaeus, or Alexander, no man can use words and phrases more powerful, more effective or more dignified than the very words used by Stephen, Paul and John. Why will influential papers and preachers pledge themselves to a policy that absolutely forbids their opposing error and warning the brethren against false teachers in the very words of inspired men? A carefully planned campaign against the use of apostolic words in the condemnation of evil and error is as sinful and dangerous as a campaign against the use of apostolic words in describing the people of God.

For many years some denomination al papers and preachers have vigorously opposed our defence of apostolic words when speaking of the church. And now some of “our” papers are making a hobby out of their opposition to the use of apostolic words in naming, describing and exposing false teachers and their theories. If any man thinks I am misrepresenting some of “our” papers, let him pick out some modern Diotrephes, Elymas, Hymenaeus, or Alexander, and write an article warning the brethren against such using the exact words of Paul and John, and then let him see what becomes of his article when he sends it to one of those papers for publication. If the denominational papers and some of “our” papers both are successful in their pledged policies and campaigns, then we cannot “speak as the oracles of God” in describing either the people of God or the enemies of righteousness, and the Bible will become a forbidden book as far as these two purposes are concerned.

Many times I have heard that inspired men knew the hearts and motives of men because of their inspiration, and therefore they could use words in exposing a “son of the devil” and an “enemy of all righteousness,” which we, being uninspired, cannot use. If that is true, then we cannot “speak as the oracles of God” on that point, and must necessarily turn to the oracles of men while exposing false teachers. But when Peter gave the commandment he did not include the supposed exemption.

I do not believe that inspired men were mind readers. I am certain they were not. Jesus is the only one of whom it is said, “He knew all men,” “for he himself knew what was in man.” He alone possessed the Spirit without measure.

On different occasions Jesus said to the apostles as well as to others, “By their fruits ye shall know them.” They were taught to determine “false prophets, who come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves” by their conduct and teaching, just as we, too, are taught to do. No inspired teacher, except Jesus himself, ever claimed to be able to read the hearts and motives of men; but Paul did say, “Who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him?” (I Cor. 2:11) Their teaching and their method of teaching were inspired, but their daily conduct was not inspired, nor did they possess an inspired ability to read human hearts and human nature.

Ananias was inspired to teach Saul of Tarsus the plan of Salvation, but his inspiration did not help him at all to understand the heart of Saul. He did not know one thing about Saul, except what he had heard, and the report had led him to misunderstand Saul’s motives. Therefore, when the Lord told him to go to Saul, Ananias said, “I have heard from many of this man, how much evil he did to thy saints at Jerusalem.” If Ananias had been a mind reader, he would have known that Saul was sincere without the Lord’s explaining to him that “he is a chosen vessel unto me.”

When Paul went to Jerusalem even the apostles were unable to read his heart and they misinterpreted his motives. “And they were all afraid of him, not believing that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how at Damascus he had preached boldly in the name of Jesus.” (Acts 9:26,27) Why was it necessary for Barnabas to tell the apostles all this? Because the only way they had of knowing a man’s heart was through information of his life and conduct, for Jesus had said to these same apostles, “By, their fruits ye shall know them.” Barnabas supplied that information.

In that “sharp contention” between Paul and Barnabas over whether or not they ought to take John Mark with them on a preaching tour, Paul based his side of the contention, not upon the claim that he was a mind reader and knew Mark’s heart, but upon the fact that Mark quit on the first journey. If Paul and Barnabas had known what was in Mark, and had not been compelled to rely upon their past experiences with him, then of course they would not have argued over whether or not Mark was a fit subject to take along with them. But neither of them could read Mark’s heart, except by the fruit manifested in his life, and uninspired men can do as much today.

The apostle John said that Diotrephes “loveth to have the preeminence” and he proved it, not by saying, “I know it because I am inspired and therefore a mind reader”; but by say-
The effects of alcoholic beverages are far-reaching in their scope and disastrous to the drinker. The scriptures are clear and explicit in condemnation of this evil and it should be considered in the light of divine truth and human reason.

Many attempts have been made to justify the use of alcohol as a beverage, but they are all contrary to the Word of God and the facts of human experience. The advertising schemes, of manufacturers and dealers are bad enough, but an appeal to the scriptures in defence of intoxicants as beverages is a dangerous undertaking. Even Paul’s advice to Timothy, “Be no longer a drinker of water, but use a little wine for thy stomach’s sake and thine often infirmities,” has been used in defence of the constant use of beverages containing alcohol. The fact that Timothy was sick and that his stomach was in such a condition that he could not drink water is often overlooked. What Paul said to him about water was just as important and necessary as what he said about wine. He who would use a “little wine” for his stomach’s sake and his often infirmities, has been used in defence of the constant use of beverages containing alcohol. The same thing as whisky or beer. It takes a dangerous stretch of the imagination to assume that Paul was prescribing cock-tails for card parties.

A little morphine to deaden pain on the advice of a doctor does not justify the dope fiend’s regular use of opium. Nor does a little alcohol in a doctor’s prescription or in a hair tonic prove that it should be used as a beverage.

It is impossible for the drinker to determine the exact cost, or to measure the extent to which he is affected financially by the constant use of alcoholic drinks. He may determine the amount actually paid as purchase price to the saloon keeper for the liquor; or when he loses his job because of drinking he may count the amount which he has lost in wages over a period of months. But when he is permitted to stay on the job, it is impossible for him to know how much greater his salary would have been, if he had practiced total abstinence. It is a well known fact that drinking has kept many from obtaining promotions in their work.

While under the influence of strong drink men have done many foolish things, the cost of which can never be fully known. Money is spent freely for unnecessary things, bad trades are made, businesses are destroyed, and games of chance are played, all of which take money from the drunkard that could not be taken, if he were sober. Also the repair of broken down health is rather expensive.

That alcohol has made beggars and bums out of many who would have been self-supporting, respectable citizens, if they had been total abstainers, is a fact too obvious for anyone to deny. The truth of Solomon’s statement has been demonstrated before our eyes: “Be not among winebibbers, Among gluttonous eaters of flesh: For the drunkard and the glutton shall come to poverty; And drowsiness will clothe a man with rags.” (Prov. 23:20, 21)

Effect On Health, Life And Limb

There is scaredly an organ of the body that is not permanently injured by a prolonged use of alcohol. Irreparable damage is done to the tender membranes of the stomach and intestines. The heart and the whole circulatory system are dangerously impaired. These are not extravagant statements of an anti-saloon worker or woman’s organization for temperance; they are facts which appear in the records of medical science and it is not wise for the drinker to ignore them.

A tone and a half of steel swiftly moving over our public highways is dangerous always; but when that ton and a half of steel is in the hands of a drunken driver it becomes a deadly menace to the life and limb of all the men, women and children who must use our public thoroughfares. Hundreds now in their graves would be alive today, if it had not been for drunken drivers and drunken pedestrians. Thousands are permanently disabled and millions are crippled and must go through life with these handicaps because some exercised their “legal rights” to drink alcoholic beverages. All these statements may be verified by an examination of the records in the traffic division of the police department at any city hall.

In times of danger from an impending disaster the sale and consumption of intoxicating drinks are usually prohibited. The safety of the people requires it. During the flood of 1937 when Louisville, Ky. was placed under martial law, one of the first steps taken to bring the situation under control and save the lives of the people was to prohibit the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages. In view of the numerous accidents that occur every day in the mad rush of this commercial age, bringing death and destruction to hundreds, it should be evident that prohibition is always impending and that danger hangs constantly over the head of virtually every man, women and child in the nation. If intoxicants jeopardize the safety of the people in times of impending disaster, they jeopardize their safety all the time, for disaster, is always impending.

Daniel knew that the wine proffered by the king would be harmful to his body, and he purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with it. He proved the wisdom of his course to the prince of the eunuchs. (See Dan. 1:1-16)

Effect On The Mind

Tests of science show that alcohol slows down and befuddles the whole mental machinery. While under the influence of liquor a person’s legs, tongue, eyes and ears are not able to function normally because of the way in which it has affected the mind and nervous system. Things are said and done that the drunkard is ashamed of when he soberes up.

The mind does not recover from the effects of intoxication as rapidly as the drunkard might think. The mind and nervous system may be permanently impaired, and in many cases insanity is the result. A check-up of the life records of some of the insane will show that alcohol can, and often does, drive people to hopeless insanity.
The Mormon Doctrine of Universal Apostasy

JAMES D. BALES

The Mormons teach that the apostasy was so universal that at “some time subsequent to the days of the Savior in his Ministry on earth the gospel was taken from the world.” James E. Talmage has said that “If the alleged apostasy of the primitive church was not a reality, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints is not the divine institution its name proclaims.” (Preface. The Great Apostasy)

Based upon this assumption we find their doctrine of the “restoration of the gospel.” Cowley on p. 7 of Cowley’s Talks on Doctrine explains their usage of the term “restoration of the gospel.”

“By the ‘restoration of the gospel’ we mean the re-establishment upon the earth of the Church of Christ, the gospel in all its pristine beauty, power and fulness; the church with apostles and prophets, and all the officers which the Savior placed therein, to be directed in their administrations by the spirit of revelation from God, the Saints to enjoy, as in ancient times, the remarkable gifts and blessings of the Holy Ghost.”

Since, they would reason, the gospel had been taken from the earth it had to have a recommitment from heaven. Through whom did this recommitment come? Again Cowley speaks:

“The dispensation of the fulness of time has been ushered in. The Father and the Son and other heavenly messengers have visited the earth and restored authority to act in the name of Jesus as in days of old. This authority has been transmitted from the Prophet Joseph Smith as designated by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and by the laying on of hands. In this manner the authority of the Holy Priesthood will be perpetuated without interruption until the ‘kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdom of our God and His Christ,’ p. 82.

Does the Bible teach that there was to be such an universal apostasy? If not then the scheme which has been reared on this ground comes crashing to the ground. Let us turn to some Scriptures which the LDS have used in an attempt to justify their conception of the apostasy. However, first perhaps it would be well to explain what we mean by the church.

The church is not composed of the officers in the church. Neither is the existence of officers entirely necessary for the existence of the church—in other words congregations may exist for a time without officers.

The church is perpetuated without interruption by any means; for that day will not come except there came a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.” But this does not say that the church shall universally, completely, and entirely fall away from the faith. Paul told Timothy, “For the time will come when they will not endure the sound doctrine; but after their own lusts will heap to themselves teachers, having itching ears; and they shall turn away their ears from the truth, and shall be turned unto fables.” (2 Tim. 4:3-4)

Yes, evil men and impostors should
wax worse and worse but not a word is said about complete destruction of the church.

Jesus warned his disciples. “Take heed that no man lead you astray. For many shall come in my name, saying, I am the Christ; and shall lead many astray.” (Matt. 24:4-5) “And then shall many stumble, and shall deliver up one another, and shall hate one another. And many false prophets shall arise, and shall lead many astray. And because iniquity shall be multiplied, the love of the many shall wax cold. But he that endures to the end, the same shall be saved.” (Matt. 24:13)

“For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect.” (Matt. 24:24.) But does not the fact that “many” shall fall away indicate that “some” shall not fall? The last passage does not say that all the elect shall be lead astray and that the church should be destroyed.

Bishop Newton translates 1 Tim. 4:1-3 thus:

“But the spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall apostatize from the faith, giving heed to erroneous spirits and doctrines concerning demons, through the hypocrisy of liars, having their conscience seared with a hot iron. Forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be accorded with thanksgiving by the believers and them who know the truth.” p. 417 Dissertations on the Prophecies. By Thomas Newton. Revised 1838 by W. S. Dobson.

This implies a general apostasy for the same in this passage we may understand it to mean many for in the Bible “many” often indicates a multitude. “In John 6:60,64,66, we find that the “some” are the many.” In Rom. 11:17 a “settle” to the end, the main body of the people. In 1 Cor. 10:7 the “some” is “The people,” in verse 8 the “some” is the “many thousands,” in verse 9 the “some” is the ‘much people” (Numbers. 21:6), and in verse 10 “some” includes “all the congregation” except Joshua and Caleb (Numbers. 14:1-2) and Moses and Aaron against whom the assembly murmured. However, we do find that by “all the congregation” was meant those who were from twenty years old and upward. They had said that their little ones would be a prey (Num. 14:3) but God said that they “shall know the land which ye have rejected.” (Numbers. 14:31) Thus God had more people than Joshua and Caleb who entered the promised land.

Thus we see that “some” often stands for the “many” but not for the “all.” The apostasy which the apostle spoke of was to include more than a few, for if it had only included a few it would not have been worthy of mention as that would not have been a peculiarity limited to the latter times. However, though the “some” is the “many” it is not the “all.” It was Talmage who affirmed, not the Spirit who taught, the following: “We affirm that with the passing of the so-called apostolic age the church gradually drifted into a condition of apostasy, whereby succession in priesthood was broken; and that the Church, as an earthly organization operating under divine direction and having authority to officiate insipritual ordinances, ceased to exist. If therefore the Church of Christ is to be found upon upon the earth to-day it must have been re-established by divine authority; and the holy priesthood must have been restored to the world from which it was lost by the apostasy of the Primitive Church.” (P. 26 The Great Apostasy)

Jude said, “But ye beloved, remember ye the words which have been spoken before by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; that they said to you in the last time there shall be mockers, walking after their own ungodly lusts.” (Jude 17-18) But Jude did not intimate the Mormon doctrine of Apostasy for he said: “I was constrained to write unto you exhorting you to contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints.” (Jude 3) He did not say that it was delivered to a certain priesthood in the church; rather it was to the priesthood which is the church composed of the saints. For as Peter said: “Ye (the church) are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God’s own possession.” (1 Pet. 2:9). The faith was delivered once for all; the faith was not taken from the earth by an apostasy and given again through Smith. Jesus said in his Great Commission to the twelve to teach them—the disciples the saints, those to whom the faith was to be committed—to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you.” (Matt. 28:20) Paul in complete harmony with this later said to Timothy, “And the things which thou hast heard from me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.” (2 Tim. 2:2)

These Scriptures are enough to reveal that though the apostasy was to be widespread that it was not to banish the faith from the earth. In other articles we shall see that the Scriptures teach that the church-faithful saints was to continue until the return of the Lord. We shall also see that there never has been a time since creation during which God did not have a people upon this earth; there never has been a generation in which all men have been cut off from God; not to speak of such being the condition for twelve centuries.

Soft-Soaping

“I do not know the origin of the word, but I often watched my mother make soap. I asked her once why a kettle of soap was soft. “I got too much lye in it,” she replied. Even so I have often found that soft-soaping preacher uses too much lye in his preaching. For this, they must account in the judgment.”—C. C. Bishop, in the Baptist Message.

For once a Baptist preacher is right. Not all the soft-soapers are in the church of Christ, but others are troubled with that “an-i-mule.” I have wondered why no one ever thought much of a soft-soaper, but I know now—he uses too much “lye” in his preaching, and you could change the “y” to “i.”

Of course Mr. Bishop is wrong about having to give an account at the judgment, for one can die with “lye” in his mouth and go on to heaven, according to his doctrine. If one, after he is born again, cannot act so as to be lost in hell, even though he should die in the act of murder or adultery, surely he would not have to give an account at the judgment for having a little “lye” in his mouth.

Chester Estes, Corinth, Miss.

IS YOUR SUBSCRIPTION DUE?

The label on your Bible Banner shows the date your subscription expires. We have given all unpaid subscribers a three months extension or period of grace. But the Bible Banner must go on a cash basis. Won’t you look at your label, and if it shows your date expired, renew now. If error has been made send us a card and it will be promptly corrected.

THE BIBLE BANNER

Box 1804
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
SOME RELICS OF ROME

E. C. CREACY

A relic is a souvenir or a keepsake. The peculiar doctrines or tenets of Protestant churches are relics of Catholicism. The Protestant world cannot consistently oppose Rome. "The kettle was the result. Hence, the "Catholic Church." says, "The use of organs in Christian worship is manifestly a relic of Rome. God permitted its use in a former dispensation, but under the constitution of Christ there is neither precept nor example of its use. But we are told that its use is not expressly forbidden, and is therefore allowable. But infant sprinkling is not expressly forbidden! Is it therefore allowable? But infant sprinkling is excluded. By what law? By the law of exclusion. God told us to baptize before playing, and therefore they are excluded. God told us (under Christ) to sing (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16), but playing is not singing; therefore, playing is excluded. The truth is, instrumental music was not used in the worship in primitive times; and that it was first used by the church of Rome. Phillip Schaff, the distinguished president of the American Company of the New Testament Revisers, and one of the greatest scholars of the nineteenth century, in his "History of the Christian Church," says, "The use of organs in churches is ascribed to Pope Vitalian (657-672)."
THE APPLICATION OF PRINCIPLES

P. W. STONESTREET

On the ground that the use of mechanical instruments of music in the worship of God under Christ is not an indifferent act, it has been suggested that Paul's meat-eating principle intended to govern indifferent things, does not apply to such practice. If the discussion had stopped short of the claim that such practice is an indifferent thing, the suggestion would be acceptable, for assuredly adding a kind of music not divinely authorized is not an indifferent act; but, according to the many Biblical warnings against the assumption of prerogatives that do not belong to man, it is a matter of serious moment.

But upon the hypothesis that the practice is an indifferent act, then, so far as those defending the practice on that claim are concerned, the principle hypothetically applies to their course. Since the practice with them is admittedly not a matter of conscience, and since they are free under their own conscience to worship “with or without” mechanical instruments, they are by their own claim logically obligated to worship “without” such instruments “for conscience sake.” “Conscience, I say, not thine own, but the other’s.” (1 Cor. 10:29)

Hence, those who use such instruments of music in the worship of God, under such circumstances, violate two divine principles-first, the law of inclusion and exclusion, ignoring the fact that the Scriptures in specifying singing exclude playing just as they exclude dancing as a part of the worship, because singing can be engaged in without either playing or dancing. Had the Scriptures used the broader term music, then both vocal and instrumental would have been implied, but that word is not used with reference to Christian worship; second, the law intended to govern Christian liberty. The only way to escape responsibility for violating the latter principle is to actually believe as the late 0. E. Payne claimed that playing such instruments is enjoined in obeying God. Perhaps none on earth claims that now.

All should profit by the experience of Nadab and Abihu, “for whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.” (Romans 15:4) How worshippers can even imagine that they have “comfort of the Scriptures” when violating the very principle that caused others to die, as set forth in the Scriptures, is one of the greatest of mysteries. Nadab and Abihu “offered strange fire before Jehovah, which he had not commanded them.” (Lev. 10:1) Of course a kind of music not commanded of Christians is strange for the same reason as worship to God. This is the reason why some of us cannot conscientiously worship God “with” mechanical instruments, and we are not in the least apologizing for it. We are only surprised that all intelligent people do not see and obey the divine principle. So there is the highest authority in heaven and on earth for conscientious objections to instrumental music in the worship; and all who are free under conscience to worship “with or without” will have to answer for not worshipping “without” such instruments at the judgment bar of God.

For the same reason and in the same way, the principle intended to govern Christian liberty applies to teachers of speculative theories, whether they pertain to premillennialism or some other ism, when such teaching is claimed to be non-essential to salvation or indifferent. Instead of such a claim modifying the offense, it adds insult to injury by violating the principle under consideration. These observations are not intended for any one who teaches such theories under compulsion of conscience, if indeed there are such teachers: other observations would be applicable to them. If all who teach such theories will identify themselves with respect to being bound or free under conscience to so teach, it would contribute to clarifying the issue. Since all who have been heard from can conscientiously teach “with or without” speculation, then, under this principle, they are obligated to teach “without” it for conscience sake.

In principle the division over teaching speculative theories is parallel to the division over instrumental music in the worship. In both cases an effort has been made, whether wittingly or unwittingly, to shift responsibility to the opposition. But responsibility for the division rests on those who drive the wedge and not on those who oppose driving it. It is easy to have the wrong slant on this important question, especially by those who have no special conviction on the matter or those whose anxiety for peace overcomes their conviction, but we should remember that even the Prince of Peace does not want it at any price. If we were similarly divided between brethren on either of the two existing divisions, it would be an occasion for speedy compromise and for charity to reign supreme; but vital principles, of which God is the author, are at stake on both questions. In purely personal matters, where God has not specifically legislated, and no principle of righteousness is contravened, such as the difference between Abraham and Lot over their herdsmen, it is man’s duty to compromise for the sake of peace, but attempting such a compromise on divine law is nothing short of rebellion against God. The most important distinction that any of us can make is between our own notions on the one hand, and God’s law on the other.

There is just one scriptural way to fellowship the two factions herein discussed; that is for them to cease to be factions by ceasing their factious course manifested in the things already pointed out; things in violation of the two principles herein discussed. Man-made fellowship is the result of man-made laws; Christian fellowship is the result of obeying the law.
Judge Rutherford — ""The Golden Age"" and ""The Challenge"

O. C. Lambert

The reader will probably remember that I went to the meeting place of "Judge" Rutherford's followers in Port Arthur, Texas, and at the request of their members went to Houston, Texas, to arrange a debate, at which time the "Judge" failed to keep an appointment for that purpose and that upon my return, I circularized their meeting, exposing him for seeking a debate with those who, he knew, would not debate and running from those who would. This circular was sent to Rutherford and immediately I received a curt letter that had been coined "The Golden Age" and a marked copy of that magazine of even date acknowledging that the only people who had accepted his challenge was the Church of Christ, and he would not debate with them! Notice that they wrote to me first! This letter and my reply appeared in this magazine some time ago. I will now give their reply.

"February 14, 1934. "O. C. Lamb- bert, 2250 Glenwood Drive, Port Ar- thur, Texas, "Dear Sir: Your letter of the tenth, addressed to Judge Ruth- erford, has been referred to us by his secretary. Evidently you labor under a misapprehension of the facts. Your leaflet with reference to the challenge to debate having been called to Judge Rutherford, we tried by someone, he referred the matter to us, with the request that we send you a copy of the Golden Age (not yellow) covering this matter. As a matter of fact, we were surprised to find our attention that a good many had either ignorantly or wilfully misinterpreted the terms of the challenge and the surrounding circumstances we thought well to republish it with some additional remarks by our editorial department, and we sent you a copy of that issue. The correspon- dence department was instructed to write you a note of transmittal, to ad- vise you why this particular number was not included in our correspondence. He evidently does not believe that I refrained to exclude him from a number of radio stations and have unnecessarily attended to so in every instance. Whether this is cowardly conduct on their part we leave to people of bal- anced minds to decide. Judge Ruther- ford has not selected himself to deb- ate but stated that Jehovah's wit- nesses would select someone to re- present them. He is willing to do so, if selected.

"Judge Rutherford does not lay claim to worldly riches and does not make it a basis for the discussion of Bible subjects, but to debate the ques- tion at issue over a nation-wide radio network with all its attendant cost, threats, and political pressure to exclude him from a number of radio stations and have unnecessarily attended to so in every instance. Whether this is cowardly conduct on their part we leave to people of bal- anced minds to decide. Judge Ruther- ford has not selected himself to deb- ate but stated that Jehovah's wit- nesses would select someone to re- present them. He is willing to do so, if selected.

"In your letter to him you attribute to Judge Rutherford statements which appeared in the Golden Age. Judge Rutherford is not the editor of that journal though a contributor to its columns. His articles and lectures are always credited to him, so there is no excuse for making him responsible for other matter which is published in the Golden Age, as you do in your letter, improperly addressed to him.

"We note that you compare yourself with Jesus and his position in Israel. We fail to note any correspondency either in position or in the spirit you manifest. Jesus' fame was spread abroad throughout the land, but we have never heard of you, nor any- one else whom we know. It is true that Jesus was charged with 'being against the government,' but we are sure he never so charged anyone else, as you do.

"Seriously, The Golden Age"

It is impossible within the limits of this article to notice the letter in its entirety and I shall endeavor to do no more at this time than to present in all of its fullness Rutherford's breath-taking exhibition of self-abasement. I must confess that the possibilities of a debate with this modern Goliath seem ed so remote that I never replied to this letter. What I now write will have to serve as a sort of open letter to him and to his followers.

Though they say there are ignoring me and the Church of Christ they wrote me the first letter and also wrote a magazine article about me and my brethren at the same time. I have observed that the muley cow ignores the one with horns.

They say he has never challenged any one except the combined clergy but that is untrue for he challenged the Pope and he also challenged others as the following quotation will show:

"The clergy and false teachers are called upon to prove their theories or else admit that they are wrong and agree to God's truth." (Government, 213)

He evidently does not believe that I am a false teacher for he says we are not included in his challenge!

Listen to him strut and crow before his people:

"The Lord's people are of the David class. 'The wicked flee when no man pursueth: but the righteous are as bold as a lion.' " (Light, 166)

"Error always seeks the dark, while truth is always enhanced by the light. Error never desires to be investigated. Light always courts a thorough and complete investigation." (Millions Now Living Will Never Die, 13)

I did not start a correspondence with him. He started it with me. They say that my letter was improperly ad dressed to him. I do not understand how that can be unless I should have left off the "Mr." before his name as they do in addressing me.

As to what connection Rutherford has with Golden Age and how signal ly I have been flattered in having "Judge" Rutherford authorize Golden Age to open a correspondence with me, I submit the following:

Rev. 8:1 reads: "And when he had opened the seventh Heal there was si lence in heaven about the space of half an hour." Rutherford says in his book, Light, page 104, that this silence was broken when the first issue of Golden Age appeared!

Further he says: "The feeding the Light, page 104, that this silence was
kindred publications (Golden Age etc. -0. C. L.) nourished, comforted and strengthened the people."

"Through the columns of the Watch Tower of March 1, 1925, the Lord revealed these truths concerning great wonders to his people." (Light, 250, 233).

This could mean nothing more or less than that these magazines are inspired-like the Bible only plainer! Think of me, simply a nobody getting a letter unsolicited from an inspired magazine at the behest of the mouth-piece of God!

He insists that his movement is simply irresistible not because of the ability of his followers but solely from the invincibility of their leader. Of his "little flock" whom he designates as "the servant class" (a very apt designation since their only function is to produce and dispose of his books and "remitt") he makes the following statement:

"It has pleased God to have an announcement made by those who are wholly and completely devoted to him and who are trusting in him regardless of all opposition (emphasis mine-O. C. L.) These are the ones whom he uses to do his great and marvelous work. They are small in number and are without reputation and influence amongst the leaders of the world." (Government, 212)

In contrast with this group who, he says are "small in number and without reputation and influence" take a squint at their inspired champion! He gauges his importance thus:

"The most important event that ever happened in Detroit, or in Michigan, or in the United States, or on the American continent, or in the world takes place this morning at 9:30 when an address will be given on 'Ruler for the People' over the greatest network of radio stations ever linked together in human history. . ." (Light, 220) The reader will not be surprised that such an august personage would fail to keep an appointment to discuss with me his challenge and refuse to debate with Church of Christ. According to this announcement, the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus, the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and The Resurrection Of Jesus Christ From The Dead pale into insignificance before "Judge" Ruth erford 'on the radio! But he has had bigger hook-ups since then. The only thing that could possibly exceed this event is his modesty!"

---

THE DEATH AND BLOOD OF JESUS REJECTED AS NONESSENTIAL

According to some Premillennialists it was God's plan and Jesus' expectation for the Jews to accept Jesus when he came to the earth the first time and for Christ then and there to establish his kingdom here on the earth and the millennium to begin.

But the Jews did not accept Christ then but rejected and killed him. God, being then defeated by the Jews, changed his plan and, instead of establishing the kingdom, gave the church as a contingency for the present. God will now wait till the second coming of Jesus to establish the kingdom of Christ or God. This will be established in Palestine with Jesus in flesh and bones on David's literal throne in the city of Jerusalem.

Though Christ will then have flesh and bones according to the theory yet they do not say that he will have blood. That will be the beginning of the millennium or the thousands years reign so much trumpeted over the land these days.

According to this plan which some premillennialists say was God's original plan, there was no place for the death and the shedding of the blood of Jesus. By this plan all typical sacrifices of all former ages and dispensations were meaningless and worthless, and were not actually typical. The death and the sufferings of Jesus would have been avoided had the Jews accepted Jesus at his first coming to the earth. But the Jews upset God's original plan according to the theory. Hence, according to that plan, we would have had a deathless and bloodless plan of salvation. But God said that without the shedding of blood there was no remission. (Heb. 9:22) This makes the death of Jesus simply a tragedy-nothing more, worth nothing to the human family.

The Bible teaches that we are justified (1 Rom. 5:9); sanctified (Heb. 10:12); made priests (Rev. 1:5); purchased (Acts 20:28); redeemed (1 Pet. 1:19); cleansed (1 Jno 1:7); delivered (Col.1:13); made nigh (Eph. 2:13); enter heaven (Heb. 10:19); receive forgiveness (Heb. 9:14); have conscience cleansed (Heb. 9:24); have our sins put away (Heb. 12:26); overcome (Rev. 12:11); and have all other blessings of grace through the death of Jesus and the shedding of his blood. But according to this premillennialist plan this would not be true. In their plan Jesus would not have been killed, the blood would not have been shed, and mankind would not have received through the death of Jesus and his cross. All the glorious and sacred conceptions of the blood and the cross would have been eliminated by this so-called original plan. The Jews outdid God, upset his plan and thereby caused the world to have another plan of salvation-one wholly without the plan or counsel or knowledge of God. The death and the blood are only contingencies, incidentals, resulting not from the love and counsel of God but rather from the Jews' upsetting God and his plan. God's love which was manifested in the death of Jesus (Col. 1:20) would not have been thus manifested. We are told that we love him because he first loved us (2 Cor. 5:14-15; 1 Jno. 5:19), but this great expression of his love would not have been manifested had the much trumpeted so-called original plan been carried out. But the Jews executed a plan that kept God from executing his "original" plan, so they say. Holy innocency, wondrously defended by the gentle friends of the cultural approach to a theory that would make void the death and the blood of Jesus, is the heritage of the souls that advocate this harmless theory. Harmless indeed it is though it destroys all that is holy and sacred concerning the death and the sufferings for our once crucified but now risen and glorified Saviour.

According to this so-called original theory we would not have the gospel that we now have (1 Cor. 15:1-5), nor the New Testament (Mat. 26:28), nor our present plan of salvation (Heb. 10:19). The grace of God manifested in the gospel (Heb. 2:9; 1 Cor. 15:1-4) for lost humanity would not have been so manifested through the gospel. But all this is a harmless and innocent theory that should excused and overlooked! Pious people who are cultured and know the proper approach to matters sacred and divine with a gentle spirit defend the teaching of this deathless theory and very severely condemn and with the unkindest gentility abuse those that are so cruel as to object to this "original" plan that has not the gospel nor the New Testament nor the plan of salvation in it. If all this is not infidelity then let someone undertake to explain infidelity so that the common people may understand it. This theory is so innocent and harmless that to raise a voice against it is almost criminal and is entirely sacrilegious and some times mean.
The Bible certainly teaches that the death of Jesus to save mankind was known, planned, foreordained, predestined and foretold, yet these meek infidels that have the spirit of Christ are defended by a body of neutralizers that would make God out a liar and a liar, the Bible, a rabish of contraditions, and wreck faith in the Bible and the Christian religion. There would not be a line of the New Testament nor one part of the gospel plan of salvation had this so-called original scheme been carried out. The theory is false. It rejects too much of the teachings of the Old Testament as to Christ and his sufferings and leaves no place at all for the gospel and the New Testament. These did occur not as a surprise to God but according to his own knowledge and counsel. Let anyone who believe that boasted false theory tell where the death and blood of Christ come in according to the theory. It would not have been at his first coming, for then he was to be received and made king in Jerusalem and begun the millennium. It would not have occurred during the millennium, the thousand years of triumphal reign. That was it would not have occurred at the close of the millennium, for that is to be the time of the resurrection of the wicked and the beast and his kingdom and the torment of the kingdom back to the Father. Where then do they find a place for the death of Jesus?

This has been called to the attention of those that hold this wild infidel theory but is passed up with scant consideration as a thing of minor concern. There are those that believe that the foundation of all that is sacred that pertains to the death of Jesus and the gospel and the New Testament is destroyed by this loudly trumpeted theory. They believe that it is not only wholly false but that it wrecks the Bible and faith. They believe that all lovers of God and the Bible should cry out against it. But there is a body of sympathizers that are defended by a body of neutralizers who would have men wearing the name of Christ and his sufferings and leaves no place at all for the gospel and the New Testament. These did occur not as a surprise to God but according to his own knowledge and counsel. Let anyone who believe that boasted false theory tell where the death and blood of Christ come in according to the theory. It would not have been at his first coming, for then he was to be received and made king in Jerusalem and begun the millennium. It would not have occurred during the millennium, the thousand years of triumphal reign. That was it would not have occurred at the close of the millennium, for that is to be the time of the resurrection of the wicked and the beast and his kingdom and the torment of the kingdom back to the Father. Where then do they find a place for the death of Jesus?

This has been called to the attention of those that hold this wild infidel theory but is passed up with scant consideration as a thing of minor concern.

There are those that believe that the foundation of all that is sacred that pertains to the death of Jesus and the gospel and the New Testament is destroyed by this loudly trumpeted theory. They believe that it is not only wholly false but that it wrecks the Bible and faith. They believe that all lovers of God and the Bible should cry out against it. But there is a body of sympathizers that would defend these evil teachers of this infidelity, and neutralize the sacred teachings of God. Certainly there is a great body of people that do not understand the importance of the whole matter. They do not wish the Bible ruined and the gospel destroyed but they are so badly taught, or rather untaught, that they are deceived as to a matter that is grave and important indeed. Hosea said: "My people are destroyed for a lack of knowledge." (4:6). Surely that must be the state of many now. May God deliver and help.

I continue at this time my report on the debate I had with Bro. G. D. Knepper, advocate of the Boll theory of premillennialism, at Metropolis, Illinois. Some of the interesting things of the discussion I am trying to present in this series of articles.

**His Start Toward Premillennialism**

Bro. Knepper stated that his first reason to question the position of those opposed to premillennialism was that children among them were afraid to pray what is called the Lord's prayer in Luke 11 and Matthew 6. He had many things to say about this prayer that he failed to sustain. He referred to Luke 11:1 to prove it was a prayer Jesus taught his disciple to pray and not one he taught his apostles to pray. And from this he concluded that men are disciples of Jesus today, they must pray this prayer, and that it is the only one you could ever know is scriptural. In reply it was shown that his argument meant that discipies today must do all things Jesus taught his disciples then. If it doesn't mean this, then it is nothing to the argument. But this proved entirely too much for Knepper, for it was shown that Jesus taught his disciples to observe and do all that the scribes and Pharisees that sat in Moses' seat taught them to do. And according to Knepper's argument we would have to conclude that if you are a disciple today, you must do all that is commanded by Moses. Knepper felt the force of this and could never be induced to reply to it. He made the claim also that we who oppose premillennialism have no right to pray "thy kingdom come." But he was asked if he takes Mat. 23:1-3 out of the Bible when he fails to teach Christians today to do and observe all that is contained in Moses. The cases are certainly parallel and could so be seen by the audience. The proper solution of the matter was offered in this way. When Jesus taught his disciples to pray "thy kingdom come" the kingdom was in the future it had not come. But since that time the kingdom has come, and we are living since it has appeared. So we cannot pray for it to come now. Just so with the Passage in Matthew 23. When Jesus taught his disciples to observe the commandments of Moses, the law of Moses had not been abolished; but since then the law has been taken away, and it would certainly not be right to demand an observance of it now. So in neither case are men rejecting the word of the Lord.

**Christians Before Seeking Lord**

During the discussion I introduced the Genuineness of its all in Acts 15:13-17 as he quoted from Amos to point out the conversion of the Gentiles. I showed by this passage, of course, that the tabernacle of David had to be rebuilt before the Gentiles could seek God, for it was rebuilt "that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord." Inasmuch as the Gentiles began to seek the Lord in the days of the apostles according to Acts 10, the tabernacle of David was already rebuilt. Furthermore, I proved by Isa. 16:5 that the tabernacle of David included his throne. So Christ had to be on David's throne before the gospel was offered to the Gentiles. And to say that the tabernacle of David has not been rebuilt, that the prophecy of Amos has not been fulfilled, is to deny the Gentiles any right to the gospel today. A theory that destroys the hope of the Gentiles in this dispensation cannot be considered a harmless theory. But in reply to this Knepper contended that the Gentiles were already "called" by the name of the Lord before the prophecy was fulfilled, for it said "Upon whom my name is called." So he endeavored to make a play on the tense of the verb. But he was shown his inconsistency here. His position made it necessary for the Gentiles to be called by the name of the Lord, then the tabernacle of David to be rebuilt, then they could seek the Lord. So that would have men wearing the name of the Lord before they ever sought him Christians therefore without seeking the Lord. But the verb was shown to be present tense even in the prophecy of Amos. Oftentimes the present tense is used in prophecy when the future is to be pointed out. Bro. Knepper also claimed that this prophecy could have no reference to the church, for Jesus said "I will build my church," but the tabernacle of David was to be "rebuilt." So "build" and "rebuilt," he insisted, could not be the same. But the sense in which there was a rebuilding was shown from the statements of Ezek. 21:26, 27 and Hos. 3:4. Israel was "many days without a king," the throne was overturned till he should come whose right it was, then Christ was placed upon that throne and the tabernacle rebuilt. It was rebuilt in the sense that a king of the family of David once more ruled upon his throne. But this is not at all in conflict with the idea that Jesus built the church. It was a new institution, not made up of fleshly Jews.
but of all nations who would accept the gospel.

Not King Of The Church

Bro. Knepper endeavored to get consolation for his future kingdom idea by stating that Christ is never called the king of the church. So he insisted that the kingdom and church are not synonymous. He was informed, however, that neither was Jesus ever called the husband of the flock or the shepherd of the bride. To use such expressions as these is to mix the figures of speech. Certainly Jesus was not called the king of the church. But he is king of the kingdom, head of the church, husband of the bride and shepherd of the flock. Yet the different expressions refer to the same institution.

Kingdom Came With Power

I made the usual argument of Mark 9:1 that some standing there would not taste of death until they had seen the kingdom come with power. I maintained that if the kingdom had not come, then some of those men then in the presence of Christ must be living somewhere today, for they were not to die till they should see the kingdom come. The power, of course, came with the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. Acts 1:8; 2:1-4. So it was there the kingdom came. But Knepper found another fulfillment of that promise. He went to Mark 9:2 and found Peter, James and John on the mount of transfiguration with the Lord and then to the statement of Peter about it in 2 Pet. 1:16-18, and he concluded that some of the men there did see him with power at the mount of transfiguration. At this point I spoke from my seat and said: “It came then at the mount of transfiguration, did it?” And Knepper, seeing the hole he was in in view of his contention that it is yet to come, became considerably bothered, and it took him a little while to get back on the track and get going again.

While David Slept

To prove that Christ is now on David’s throne I used a statement found in 2 Sam 7:12: “And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will establish this kingdom.” This prophecy clearly shows that the seed of David was to be placed on David’s throne after the death of David and before his resurrection. His days on earth were to be fulfilled and he was to be sleeping with his fathers at the time this prophecy was to be fulfilled. But if Jesus is coming back to begin a reign on the throne of David and will raise the righteous dead prior to that reign, as premillenialists claim, then David will not be dead when such is done and the prophecy fails. However, Peter applied this to Christ when he ascended to the Father. The application is found in Acts 2:29-35: “Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. For David is dead and is buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day.” Then Peter said: “But Christ also hath suffered being tempted, and hath set at nought them that live in vanities of this world. Land of promise, God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he seeing this before spake of the resurrection of Christ that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear. For David is dead and is buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day.” Thus he pointed out the very point mentioned in the prophecy that David’s days would be fulfilled and would sleep with his fathers. So Peter declared God raised up Christ to sit on David’s throne. According to premillenialists he will bring him down from heaven instead of raise him up. Then Peter says that he spoke of the resurrection of Christ, not of his second coming. This argument forever proves that Christ is now on David’s throne. Furthermore, if Christ will not take his throne till his return, then this prophecy fails and the word of God is proven false.

(To be continued)
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Society In The Church

When the activities of the Church of Christ are diverted from the worship and service of God, or the aid of one’s fellowman with a view to his spiritual betterment, such activities are sinful. Therefore, a church picnic, a church festival, a church “42” party, a church bazaar, or a church quilting party or any such thing that appeals to the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, or the pride of life, falls under God’s condemnation.

A church practicing these things may grow numerically but will die spiritually.

One cannot serve God and mammon.

All spiritual blessings are in Christ; and to be in Christ is to be in his Church. The young people are not in one division of the church and the old people in another. There is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, but all are one in Christ Jesus.

One goes to school and is developed mentally. One goes to church and is developed spiritually. In the one case he receives the blessings of God common to all mankind, in the other case he receives the blessings of God that are peculiar to his people that are chosen out of the world. Hence, I conclude that a church school falls into the same category as those above mentioned. One goes to school to appease his desire for learning. One goes to a picnic to appease his desire for food and frolic. Both are fleshly desires. But one goes to church for an entirely different purpose—to be developed spiritually.

Schools and picnics are not harmful within themselves, but when dragged into the church they become out of place and harmful to the church as do all innovations.

A church society, whether of young people or old, may be an aid in building up a sect, as was the case in Wesley’s day, but it will never build up the Church of Christ. It is of the earth earthy. It is not so much as do all innovations.

Therefore, I suggest that we seek out the old paths and walk in them.

W. G. Eubanks, 308 Chapparral St. Corpus Christi, Texas.
"Think not that I came to send peace: I came not to send peace, but a sword." (Matt. 10:35)

The corruption and deformation of the church has always begun in a faithless ministry. When the majority of our pulpits become filled with time-servers, whose whole study is personal popularity, and who never rebuke sin and censure error, except by a passing remark at long range: apoc-
tacy is not far distant. There is among our ministry an effeminate at-
titude, and household morality for God's own house who would at all
hazards maintain between Christ and anti-christs. The voices of time-ser-
ers are always heard to peal long and loud on the subject of "Peace" and
other similar subjects. But, there can be no peace between Christ and anti-
christs; truth and error; or righteous-
ness and sin.

**Peace versus Peace**

The statement of Jesus, "I came not to send peace, but a sword," on
first thought seems inimical to the announcement of the angelic host
as they sang, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace among
men." Christ came to send peace, and yet, He "came not to send peace
but a sword." He announced peace but the very announcement effects the
disruption of peace. This paradox can
be stated thusly: "Peace versus peace." Christ is come to bring true
peace, and therefore, is come to dis-
turb all false peace and excite dis-
cord which is as profitable as it is
indispensable. No sophistry can
evade this inimitable conclusion: Di-
vision is quite necessary to permit
true peace.

**Plain Preaching Vs. Compromise**

There is a rift in the brotherhood over the question of the right kind of
preaching and writing. Some are set for plain preaching, while others ad-
vocate to preach a Constructive gos-
pel, and use the proper Psychological Approach. The pleas of the latter are
but a smokescreen for their shame-
ful compromises.

The psychological method of ap-
proach was unheard of in the days of
Jesus Christ, if we are to judge by his
teaching. Christ was not put to death
for preaching the truth, as our "mod-
ers" speak of truth; but for, his dra-
tic, pointed, uncompromising, and
uprooting the shams of the people. For
example, one one occasion, he said
"Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees,
hypocrites! for ye are like unto whit-
ened sepulchres, which outwardly ap-
pear beautiful but inwardly are full of
dead men's bones, and all unclean-
ess." This presents Christ in strik-
ing contrast with the effeminate
methods and teaching of our modern
prostitutors of truth.

When Peter preached the gospel for
the first time on Pentecost, he boldly
announced facts of import ter-
rific to the hearers. In words fraught
with terrible and convicting meaning he declared: "Ye by lawless men did
crucify and slay" the Son of God.
'He purpose of gospel preaching is to
convict the world of sin and righteous-
ness. Peter's sermon obtained the de-
sired results. "They were pricked in
their hearts, and said, .. what shall we
do?"

The preaching of Stephen is worthy of
note. "Stephen, full of grace and
power, wrought great wonders and
signs among the people. And there
arose certain of the synagogue, dis-
puting with him, and when they were
not able to withstand the wis-
dom and Spirit by which he spake, ..
stirred up the people. .. And the
elders and the scribes came and seiz-
ed him and brought him into the coun-
cil, and set up witnesses against him."

When Stephen was given an opportu-
nity to speak for himself, he deliv-
ered one of the most remarkable
speeches on record. In a graphic way
he sketched the call of Abraham until
the birth and circumcision of the
twelve sons of Jacob. He next pro-
ceded to the case of Joseph. Then
he reviewed the call of Moses, the de-
leverance of the children of Israel,
their wanderings, and final rejec-
tion. Unlike our moderns who leave
the application for the hearers to
make, Stephen sprang upon his ac-
cusers the application of the facts
which he had arrayed in his discourse.
He said, "Ye stiffened and uncircum-
cised in heart and ears ye do always
resist the Holy Sprit: as your fathers
did, so did ye." "Now when they
heard these things they were cut to
the heart, and they gnashed on him
with their teeth. .. and they cast him
out of the city and stoned him." Stephen was God's preacher. His
preaching is worthy of imitation. We
need more Stephens.

The New Testament is replete with
examples of the very best preaching
and writing; and like the examples we
reviewed they all are given to plain
preaching. God is not pleased with
tolerance and compromise.

It is a regrettable thing when people
love compromise, but when they do,
division is indispensable. Many of our
brethren shudder and retreat, when
they see the division over the ques-
tion of the right kind of preaching and
writing. But, when we carefully con-
sider that Christ came to "send a
sword" we should rejoice to see it.
There can be no true peace between
truth and compromise. When peace
is made between truth and compro-
mise it is a false peace. The kind of
peace Christ came to distrust. May
there always be a division between
truth and compromise.

**Bible Banner vs. Christian Leader**

The new enlarged Christian Leader is
a digressive organ. It's policy is
found on surveys, tolerance and
compromise. It is an organ through
which a "modern Moses," Clinton
Davidson, can pan off on the brother-
hood his sectarian ideas learned dur-
ing twenty years of wandering in a
swanky digressive church.

The Bible Banner is set for the de-
fense of New Testament Christianity.
Marked division exist between the
Bible Banner and the Christian Lead-
er. This division is quite desirable.
Our Lord is well pleased with it. He
is not well pleased with a heresy-scout
like Clinton Davidson; nor with a di-
gressive organ like the Christian Lead-
er: But, since we had the two thrust
upon us, the sword of the Spirit had
to be drawn and a division made.
When this was done our Lord was well
pleased.

The Gospel Advocate and Firm
Foundation can be mighty forces in
helping the Bible Banner and Apos-
tolic Times, continue the effecting
of division, between truth and the digres-
sion staged by the Christian Leader
and Clinton Davidson. This, to date,
in the main they have failed to do.
They cannot perform their God-given
mission and ignore their imperative
responsibility. The brotherhood has a
right to expect them to rally to the de-
defense of the cause of Christ against
this digressive aggressor. Their si-
lence in the fight will be calculated
to the effect false peace between
truth and digression. If the Gospel
Advocate and Firm Foundation fail to
serve the brotherhood in this capac-
ity, then, a sword must be drawn
against them.

**Truth vs. Premillennialism**

Our whining, compromising breth-
ren cry and beg in pious tones for
peace between Premillennialists and
exponents of truth. There can be no
true peace between a damnable heresy, which has as its foundation the stench of infidelity, and the truth of the living God. Division must exist between us and the Premillennialist, else we will be a partaker of their infidelity. This fact is clearly set forth by John. Said he, "If any one cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting: for he that giveth him greeting partaketh in his evil works." Paul said, "I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing division and occasion of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them."

Gospel Preachers vs. Ministerial Alliance

The Ministerial Alliance is a growing institution. It is gaining much power politically. In many cities, if a gospel preacher should desire to pitch a tent and preach in a series of gospel meeting, he would have to appeal to the Ministerial Alliance for permission. Many city governments have turned such problems into the hands of the Ministerial Alliance. Gospel preachers have been denied the rights to preach in cities by the Ministerial Alliance. The space of time known as the dark ages was brought about by the suppression of speech and religious convictions. This suppression in the main was made by the clergy of the land. The clergy of our own land, and especially the Ministerial Alliance, will suppress the freedom of speech and religious convictions if they can gain enough political power. The Ministerial Alliance is as great an enemy of Jesus Christ as the Jews. Yet, many of our gospel (?) preachers are joining the Ministerial Alliance! There can be no true peace between a gospel preacher and the Ministerial Alliance, for, "What concord hath Christ with Belial? or, what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever? and what agreement hath a temple of God with idols."

It is colossal stupidity on the part of these brotherhood to wink at the shameful steps many of our gospel preachers have taken in this regard. Elders, does the preacher of the congregation over which you are appointed, belong to the Ministerial Alliance? Brother preacher do you belong? How many preachers can show their hand and be found free from this sin? When congregations require their preachers to become members of the Ministerial Alliance, then, in horror I am lost for epithets to express my disgust. "Think not that I came to send peace, I came not to send peace: but a sword."
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[The following letter was requested as a basis for an editorial. But Brother Lewis statement covers the ground in such a good way that it is sufficient in itself to convince all of the merits of Bro. Lewis’ work. He deserves full cooperation and fellowship of Oklahoma Churches and Christian elsewhere or anywhere. He should not lack funds for the needed work. We hope they may be provided.-F. E. W. Jr.]

Dear Brother Wallace:

You suggested that I give you some of the facts concerning my University work and you would give it an editorial write-up in the Bible Banner. I did both the University work and preached for the Church here for the first three years after I came to Oklahoma in September 1935. Beginning last September (1934) the work was divided and I have only been doing the University work. Enclosed you will find a card dated May 25, 1938 and a letter dated June 18, 1938 that explains the beginning of our ‘definite’ separation of the work. They are self explanatory.

I am also enclosing a letter head from the Dean’s Office of the School of Religion that indicates the fact that the School of Religion is separate and distinct ‘technically’ from the University proper. The Board of Regents of the University has nothing to do with the running or financing the school of Religion. There are eight names on the faculty supported by their respective religious groups and I have indicated, in ink, the title of each as listed in the University Catalogue for next year. The School of Religion is interested in religion in general. The different faculty members are interested in various phases of the general aspect of religion. The Jewish Professor is interested in the History of the Jews, the Christian Church man in Religious Education, others in the Philosophy of Religion, Old Testament and so forth. All of my classes are in the New Testament.

I have three courses in the New Testament approved by the University so that any undergraduate may take the courses and get credit toward graduation. I am teaching these three courses this summer. One course is “Introduction to the New Testament,” another is the “Life and Letters of Paul,” and the third is the “Non-Pauline Writings of the New Testament.” Beginning next September I have two sections of these last two courses, making five different classes offered in the New Testament. These classes have to be approved by the University and listed in the catalogue several months in advance. All courses in religion are elective—what means that a student isn’t compelled to take them. In my classes the New Testament is used as a text. I encourage students to use Nelson’s Teacher’s Testament with notes and helps, however, any translation of the New Testament is acceptable. During this year I have had about 80 students taking the work for credit and several that attend the classes not taking it for credit. Less than 20 were members of the Church.

In addition to class work I have access to the University Radio to comment on the Improved Uniform Sunday School lesson text. This is a weekly broadcast that we have continued for over a year and will probably continue indefinitely. I do not get all the time as others, who can and care to, are given part of these programs. I have been on twice this month (June).

There are problems connected with student life of a large University campus that need solving. Little along that line has been done so far due to the lack of facilities. If a Church of 300 members needs a “Pastor” (c?), to feed and care for a flock that size, surely a group of that many students coming to a State University Campus, with over 7,000 students, needs advice. Occasionally the young people of the Church get together in social gatherings. The University has each student to fill out a Church preference card, which is given to the various Church groups. In this way we can know the members of the Church who are in the University.

I plan to have a young preachers training class again this fall if there is a sufficient number interested in it. Last fall I began and continued for a few months a class of a few young men. We used Nelson's Pocket Encyclopedia as a basis for our study. We had some debates—I defended invalidness of the materialism on the Improved Uniform Sunday School. We should take advantage of the opportunity that this work offers to provide religious training not only for our members but also for many others not members of the Church of Christ. A fair conservative estimate would place over 80 percent of the students that have attended my classes for the four years in the list of those not members of the Church of Christ.

I have been very lengthy in giving you these details. I have already had something to say in the Gospel Advocate and Firm Foundation about this work. You may use your judgment as to how much you use, of what you say, in writing your editorial concerning this work.

Enclosed is a record of the financial contributions to this work. This does not include some that I have received for preaching. That would probably bring the support from both up to almost $100.00 a month. Each contributor gets a report sooner or later. I have only sent out two so far. I will probably send the next one out after the summer semester is over.

Sincerely yours, John P. Lewis, 136 Page, Norman, Okla.
**BANNER BOOKS**

As previously announced, the publisher of the Bible Banner recently acquired the B. C. Goodpasture stock of used religious books, which have been shipped from Atlanta, Ga., to Oklahoma City, Okla. Many old, out-of-print and rare books are in this collection, which preachers and teachers need, and which cannot be purchased elsewhere. The following items are only a sample of the many sets and single volumes on hand. A full list will be prepared and published in this space. Preserve these pages as they appear for future reference, and for a complete list.

### I. COMMENTARIES - LEXICONS - THEOLOGICAL SETS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Adam Clarke, Old and New Test. Complete, six volumes, full sheep, imported, original with author's photo and autograph, fine</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Meyer's Commentary on New Testament, eleven volumes, complete, good condition, one of the best</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Bloomfield's Critical Digest, 6 vols., fair condition</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Schaft's Commentary on New Testament, four volumes, complete, good as new. (By fifteen members of the Revision Committee; edited by Philip Schaft)</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>The Bible Commentary, eleven volumes, complete, good condition</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Benson's Commentary, Old and New Testaments, five volumes, complete, full sheep, good set</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Weiss's Commentary on New Testament, four volumes, complete, good as new</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Patrick &amp; Lowth, Old &amp; New Testaments, four volumes, complete, full sheep, old and rare, good set</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Bengel's Gnomon-Old and New Testaments, 2 vols...</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Jahn's Archeology, bound in sheep, good</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Jahn's Archeology, bound in cloth, good</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Horne's Introduction-Old and New Testaments, 4 vols., sheep, good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Horne's Introduction-Old and New Testaments, 2 vols., complete, good</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Treasury of David (Spurgeon), Commentary on Psalms, seven volumes, complete, good</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Ellcott's Commentary, Old &amp; New Testament, 8 volumes, complete, good (by C. J. Ellcott, member of Revision Committee)</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Commentaries — On nearly all Books of Bible — Barnes, Godet, Stuart, Cheyne, Pusey, Cowles, Delitzsch, $1.00 to $2.50 per volume</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### II. SERMON SETS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Volumes</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>The Pulpit Commentary, 50 volumes on entire Bible, complete set, binding discolored and soiled, but intact (new price, $125.00)</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Parker's People's Bible. 26 volumes, complete, good</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>The New Biblical Guide, 8 vols., covering whole Bible, by Urquhart, good as new</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Topical Excerpt Library — 5 vols. cloth, good, subjects: (1) Atonement</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Christianity</td>
<td>(3) Service</td>
<td>(4) Im...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. **Biblical and Theological Library**, 9 volumes, complete, Crook and Hurst Series, covering Introduction to Scriptures, Hermeneutics, Archeology, Systematic Theology, Methodology, Church History, and Evidence, of Grounds of Faith-all in one complete series, good set. (Or in single volumes $2.00 each) $15.00

Hundreds of single volumes of sermons, homiletics, biographies, and general subjects. Let us know your wants; we can probably fill the order.

(Con't on next page)
### BANNER BOOKS - (Continued)

#### III. OTHER SETS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life and Letters of Dean Stanley, 2 vols., good</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townley's Biblical Literature, 2 vols., sheep, good</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baxter's Works, 2 vols., sheep, good</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobart's Works, 3 vols., good</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Edwards' Complete Work?, 10 vols., sheep</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### IV. BIBLE DICTIONARIES, ENCYクロピEDIAS, HISTORIES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopedia of Biblical Literature, McClintock &amp; Strong, 12 vols., complete, good as new</td>
<td>17.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaff &amp; Herzogg's Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 4 vols., complete, good</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith's Bible Dictionary, 3 vols., complete, good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Bible Encyclopedia (Fallows), 3 vols., leather backstripped, fine edition, good as new</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another set, good</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another set, cloth, good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another set, 2 vols. edition, complete, leather, fair</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lippincott's Pronouncing Dictionary of Biography &amp; Mythology, 2 vols., good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watson's Dictionary of Bible, sheep</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods Dictionary of Bible, 2 vols., 1813 edition, sheep</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Lights (Little)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- 3 vol. sets, good</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biblical Lights (Little)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-- Single Vols.</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typology of the Scriptures (Fairbairn) 2 vols., good</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitto's Encyclopedia of Biblical Literature, 2 vols., leather, good</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitto's Encyclopedia of Biblical Literature, 2 vols., cloth, good</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopedia of Missions, 2 large vols., good as new</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopedia of Prose Illustrations, (Foster) 2 vols., fair</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Encyclopedia of Poetical Illustrations (Foster) 2 vols., fair</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### V. SPECIAL SETS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopedia of Music, bound in red leather, fine set, 11 vols.</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poetical Works of Longfellow, deluxe black leather, large, 2 vols., fine</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picturesque Palestine, deluxe black leather, large, 2 vols., fine</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Master Library, (Bible), 10 vols., good as new</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D'Aubigne's History of Reformation, 5 vol. sets, good</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momsen's History of Rome, 4 vols., good</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopedia Britannica, 24 vols., (complete except index vol.) 1930 edition (new price $35.00), good</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADDRESS ORDERS TO

THE BIBLE BANNER

P. O. BOX 1804

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA