It will be recalled that there was quite an anonymous uproar in the fat valley of Ephraim when the Bible Banner began publication. It is in order here to compliment Brother Deforest Murch. When he classified us out on "the lunatic fringe" he did sign his name to it. We are not yet willing to admit that we are crazier than he is, but as long as he stays in the open we will regard him as a worthy antagonist.

As I was saying, about the time the Bible Banner started publication, its editor was anonymously and circularly accused of obtaining subscriptions on false pretenses, and making false promises of financial security for the paper. He planned incorporation and so announced it. He had backing he thought substantial enough to justify the announcement. When the backing backed out too far to lean on, and plans had to be changed and the editor frankly said so, "the drunkards of Enhram" staged a joyous celebration, and used printing ink and the mails to carry their unsigned glee from coast to coast. Comparatively unperturbed, I watched the "tempest in a teapot" and the jottings in my memory record that some were mad, and some were glad and some were plainly scared. The assurances given that the Bible Banner was financially safe were plainly jeered at as a studied and deliberate piece of crookedness. No names were signed but we are not as much in the dark as to the source of such things as some think we are.

About this same time a journalistic instrument on which only the sweetest music was to be played was conceived and brought forth by a wise man of the East, a master of his art. The fact that he was fresh out of digression if out-was to be no handicap in view of the fact that a galaxy of trained artists, emotionally noble and exalted, if not transcendent, were to be assembled to make this new instrument of the master's art produce a sweet melody meet for angels' ears. Prospective subscribers were assured that it had adequate financial backing for at least five years and it was implied that it would lack no good thing until the Lord came to take it home where its sweetness would blend into the song of the angels. Its promoter had such power before the throne that he published the fact that his prayers had availed to save at least a million-dollars, not sinners-for his clients when a crooked attorney had unholy designs on their investments. Financing a new paper would be but a drop in the bucket of divine grace. A conclusion was based on a brotherhood questionnaire and survey to the effect that about ninety-five percent of the brethren would cock their ears to the music of this new brotherhood organ. An organization with an editorial committee and every other essential including a president, was perfected to protect the ears of the sensitive from a single discordant note. It was copyrighted to guard against some interloper on out on "the lunatic fringe" taking hold of its classics and debasing them into jazz. It looked as though our whole literature was to be modernized, sweetened and made as palatable as a big insurance policy with a next to nothing premium rate and double indemnity benefits. Brother Murch and the Christian Standard tasted a sample and smoked their lips with satisfaction.

How are the mighty fallen! Tell it not in Bath.
Publish it not in the streets of Ashkelon;
Lest the daughters of the Philistines rejoice,
Lest the daughters of the uncircumcised triumph.

The wise man from the East has backed up and according to "The President's Statement" he is no longer contributing the major portion." The paper is operating "with a deficit" which "is met by private contribution" and "it runs in the red." A situation has arisen which "demands greater effort and added expense." Aside from its self-righteousness, it seems to be on about the same level the Bible Banner is supposed to move on. This must be highly embarrassing to some who wanted to scandalize the Bible Banner because it had to announce a necessary change in its plans. It would be just too bad if this bright star should drop into the same hole the Bible Banner was chided for being in, and find when it hit the bottom, we had clumb out. (That's not a typographical error, it's just the humor I'm in). Our agile friend Jimmie who rides the skysways both literally and figuratively has started the West Coast Christian again and dedicated it to the enormous task of helping "clean house from the inside." He doesn't even want people who are not members of the church to read his paper and prays the rest of us to keep it from them. Funny fellow is Jimmie! A few months ago he was crying for a paper we could pass around and now he is crying for one we can't. He is a little like the children in the market places who kept on crying anyhow regardless of what they got. Jimmie didn't seem to like it a little bit because the Bible Banner spanked the fire out of a few naughty premillenialists who were acting up in a way that threatened to upset good family order, but about the time we got them pretty well quieted down, along comes Jimmie with his sleeves rolled up and a paddle in his hand an inch thick, a foot wide and a yard long. He whales into the brethren before they even have time to bend over.

(Continued on page 21)
THE ACCENT ON LOVE

Clinton Davidson, alias Copyright Clinton, has been to Los Angeles. He was there to promote his schemes and to try to transfer the Christian Leader to the Pacific Coast under the cloak of the George Pepperdine Foundation. James L. Lovell, one of Davidson's advance agents and salesmen, requested the elders of the Central Church to permit Davidson to speak. The courtesy was reluctantly extended. It was expected that he would manifest the spirit he so much extols—the spirit of love personified. But the spirit that actuates a man will out. His speech was a complete let-down. It revealed the bitterness that rankles in his breast toward the church. He criticised the other papers and their publishers, including the Gospel Advocate, the Firm Foundation and the Bible Banner, without calling their names but nevertheless making it clear to all what his references meant. His address was punctuated with thrusts, insinuations and insuendoes, and he lowered himself in the eyes of those who had held him in some degree of favor.

Davidson's subject at the Central Church was "The Accent On Love." The one thing that impressed so many was that every man he praised was a premillennialist or a premillennial sympathizer while every man he criticised was one who had been active against premillennialism. That was a real eye-opener. His actual sympathy was revealed; his hand was played; and everybody in California knows now that Davidson is a premillennialist. The Bible Banner has repeatedly said that the whole Davidson movement has been an effort to vindicate R. H. Boll, E. L. Jorgenson, J. N. Armstrong, and Homer Rutherford. His movement has been an effort to vindicate R. H. Boll, E. L. Jorgenson, J. N. Armstrong, and Homer Rutherford. His movement has been an effort to vindicate R. H. Boll, E. L. Jorgenson, J. N. Armstrong, and Homer Rutherford. His movement has been an effort to vindicate R. H. Boll, E. L. Jorgenson, J. N. Armstrong, and Homer Rutherford.

It is being said that the fight against premillennialism has been won. Even the editor of the Christian Leader, we are told, has come out against premillennialism. But the casual reader observes that he could not write against premillennialism without taking side-cracks at those who have fought the battle and focused the issues. When it happens a man so to do a thing, it takes all of the effect out of it. Anybody can see that it was a painful task for Brother McMillan to take up his pen to write even mildly against premillennialism or to condemn those who teach it or to take a definite stand on anything. The truth is, his connection with the Clinton Davidson Movement disqualifies him to fight anything for that is definitely against the policy of that movement.

In the current Christian Leader F. L. Rowe announces that Los Angeles is the objective for the next Unity Conference. It will be stoutly opposed here. It is a strange unity that drives a wedge into our own ranks when these unity meetings are forced upon communities of Christians who do not want them. These promoters among us are apparently quite willing to see division come within the church in order to have their pseudo-unity with the digressives. Of course, the digressives are willing for the wedge to be driven for driving wedges with their innovations has been their practice through the years.

The evident purpose of these meetings is to minimize the issues and to build up the idea gradually among weak members of the church that instrumental music is not a test of fellowship. James D. Murch stated in the Gospel Advocate that the Unity Meetings had at last developed a scriptural ground for instrumental music, showing very conclusively that he doesn't have a gnat's idea of surrendering their innovations but is using the Unity Meeting to justify them and to induce churches of Christ to tolerate and fellowship them, without debating the issue. And the sad thing is that Claud F. Witty and every gospel preacher who participates in these meetings are aiding Murch with his schemes and playing right into the hands of the digressives.
Unity Meetings are more favorable to the digressives than debates. The Unity Meeting is purely a speech-making tournament where a few oratorical masterpieces can be flung out over innocent audiences in an effort to break down issues in emotional appeals without submitting them to the crucial test of argument. Mr. Myers, president of the Restoration Association, asked me if I was afraid of Unity Meetings? I asked him if he was afraid of a debate? If not, sign your name to the proposition. He did not sign his name. Homer Strong was present and I asked Homer if he would debate the proposition here in California that we debated, in Arkansas. He replied that he would never under any circumstances meet me in another debate, giving as his reason that I had tricked him and am no gentleman. Chas. M. Neal says that I am no gentleman; J. Frank Norris says I am no gentleman; Glen V. Tingley says that I am no gentleman—but I wonder if I have to be a gentleman to debate with these men. Jesus Christ debated with the devil in the mountain—and I debated with his twin-brother in Fort Worth.

It has been virtually conceded that the Christian Leader-Clinton Davidson Movement has been defeated. Davidson boasted that he would procure 50,000 subscribers and thought he would get 30,000 of them in the vicinity of Nashville. My venture is that the Bible Banner has more bona fide subscribers in Nashville than the Christian Leader has. It has leaked through that the Leader's entire actual subscription list, after all the boasts of a journalistic blitzkrieg on the brotherhood, will not exceed 3,000. And where are the one hundred trained writers who are going to write for the Leader? Where is the training school?

Clinton Davidson allowed himself to be misled. He was simply misinformation. He did not know the church of Christ and gospel preachers. John Allen Hudson told him in Chicago that the Bible Banner would expose him and his movement without mercy and that the Gospel Advocate would reap the benefits of it without fighting, and would still be in Nashville when his movement had run its course. Davidson did not believe it then, but he does now. The demise of the great New Christian Leader is at hand and the inscription on its memorial stone will be:

"Here lies Clinton Davidson's copyright, The ethical journal that wouldn't fight, A paper that started out of spite, With a hundred trained writers, all too light, To save his movement from that bad plight, The truth has triumphed in his might, And Clinton's Copyright is out of sight."

(Original with the editor, but not copyrighted)

If the Pepperdine Foundation wants the Christian Leader and will wait a few weeks longer, it can get it free. Davidson is ready to give it away and is only waiting for the consent of: "the president." But whoever takes it free will not have a bargain.

It is generally known that Davidson's movement was directed against the Gospel Advocate, because he thought the Advocate was the strongest exponent of the principles the policies Davidson wanted to crush. Davidson scared the Advocate. Its publisher capitulated. It policies were modified to conform to Davidson's ideas, even to the appointment of figurehead editorial committees which have never functioned. The Advocate has been willing for others to bear the brunt of a battle that it should have waged, the benefits of which will accrue to the Advocate, while they are spared the unpopularity of making the fight.

D. Ellis Walker represented the Gospel Advocate all over the South for several months as a contact man. In one of his reports to the Advocate office, he wrote as follows:

"I do not know how you feel toward Cled Wallace and Foy E. Wallace, Jr. You should be extremely grateful because they fought your battle for you in the beginning. There is no doubt in my mind but that the Christian Leader would have made great headway had it not been for them.

"So far as I have been able to observe the Christian Leader, it has made little headway in the Deep South."

"The strongest influence in the South among churches of Christ outside of the Gospel Advocate is Foy E. Wallace, Jr.'s Bible Banner."

There are many brethren who are coming to believe that the policy of the Gospel Advocate is commercial and pecuniary. It cannot be denied that it has receded from its former level and left the defense of the truth on important issues to others and has elected to follow the course of least resistance. The Bible Banner wants it definitely understood that it has not fought the Advocate's battles for the Advocate's sake, but because the interests of the church and the Cause of Christ required it. If the Gospel Advocate benefits from the victories for the truth in battles which it refused to fight, it is my firm conviction that it will ultimately lose far more than it can gain by such an ignoble policy. Truth is too precious to bandied and bargained, and the church is too sacred to be exploited. -F. E. W., Jr.

SISTER N. B. HARDEMAN

We were all unprepared for the announcement of the unexpected response of Sister N. B. Hardeeman to the death angel's summons. The pale horse and its rider suddenly crossed the threshold of the Hardeeman home and suddenly, but gently, gathered in death's embrace this grand Christian woman and wafted her away to eternity. Unnumbered thousands of loyal friends share the sorrow of Brother Hardeeman, the family, the connections, and all the local people. Legions of students who knew her and loved her as Miss Jo have also felt a poignant grief. The editor of the Bible Banner and his entire family have been the recipients of the genial hospitality of the Hardeeman home. Sister Hardeeman always told me that she loved our family and we all loved her as we do the entire Hardeeman family. We shall miss her, too. In far-off California at this writing my unbounded sympathy is extended to them and our prayers ascend together on their behalf.

Brother Hardeeman is a man strong in intellect, in spiritual attainments and in determination. As president of the Christian Leader Publishing Co., I want to make it clear to the Leader's readers and friends just what this change means. It is significant to all who are active in the magazine's production and management, because it demands greater effort and added expense. To others, it is of small importance for the following reasons:

The Christian Leader's chosen field of endeavor is, as stated above, the vanguard of truth and the protection of the Gospel of Christ and extend his kingdom. Its policy is best expressed in Philippians 4:8, which leaves no room for exparte railings against any man, saint, sinner, or sectarian. In the honest conviction that a publication's (Continued on page 21)
For an advanced study in sublimmated egotism, I suggest that you read the following article from Brother G. C. Brewer’s about himself in the Gospel Advocate of April 25th, if you care for that sort of thing.

Plans for Future Work
G. C. Brewer

1. Our Plan.

The papers have recently given a report of our proposed connection with Harding College. This gives us a reason to write this article concerning our plans for future work.

We had decided to evangelize for about eight or nine months in the year, and to spend the winter months teaching at Harding College. Accordingly, we have filled up the year of 1940 with meetings. Beginning about May 1, these meetings are closely connected and some of them overlap. Five of these meetings are in Texas, five in Tennessee, one in Alabama, and three in Kentucky. Then the work at the college has already been outlined.

Whether we shall be able to continue these strenuous efforts for many years remain to be seen. Also whether our work at the college will be successful and satisfactory to us, and to all others concerned, remains to be seen.

We realize that this effort in the college is something of an experiment, and, therefore, our promise is made for only the one year, at this time. If that year proves to be all we hope for it to be, then we would possibly make arrangements for each succeeding year. This is the plan that was made some months ago and upon which we tendered our resignation to the Broadway Church at Lubbock, Texas.

2. Our Purpose.

The reason we made the decision outlined above is that we hoped to be able to do more good with this program than we could do preaching for one congregation. Also we have gone away and held so many meetings that we felt that it was not justice to the Lubbock Church for us to hold this position and at the same time be absent so much of the time. We were away from this work eighteen Lord’s days in 1939. Without any demand from the elders of the church, we knew that this was not best for the work and was not fair to the brethren. That was one of the reasons that prompted us to offer our resignation and to enter the evangelistic field.

Another reason was that we hoped to reach more people in the field with the gospel of Christ than we are able to reach while preaching for a local church. Furthermore, our experience in local work enables us not only to preach to the outside world during our meetings, but also to help the congregations where we go with problems, and often to show them a systematized work by which they will be able to carry on to the glory of God. Then in the college we hoped that we would be able to help train young men for the work in its many phases, in the providence of God.

Since we have had experience as an elder, local preacher, evangelist, debater, and writer, we can give the young men the advantage of our experience as well as the advantage of our study. We cherish the hope that we can help indoctrinate them so that they can meet the issues of the day and be able to solve some of the problems that come to a local preacher and so that they will be able to lead congregations to fulfill the scriptural standard for a church.

We did not reach the conclusion that we would be able to do this work without the persuasion of others. Many of our friends, among them preachers, have told us that they believe we could be of service in this field, and they had part in persuading us to undertake this effort. They may be mistaken in what we can do, and we may be mistaken in our ability to accomplish anything in this way; but, at least, this was the view and the ideal that we had in mind in making the decision.

There can be no personal advantages to us in this arrangement. We cannot be at home and hold meetings, neither can we be at home and teach in the college. This work, therefore, practically demands that we abandon our home and give up all hope of maintaining a home at all. Mrs. Brewer will be able to travel a part of the time, and she can remain with us through the whole period at the college; but she, too, will have to sacrifice home and be adrift a good part of the time.

Financially, this work means a loss to us. The meetings we will possibly average about what we have been accustomed to receive for our local work, but the college will pay only about one-third of what we now receive at Lubbock. This plan, therefore, will entail a loss of several hundred dollars each year. We have never, however, made money a consideration in our services of the Lord. We have been blessed in receiving a support for our work. But the Lord is our witness that we have given our time, our talents, our energy, and our all into the work without ever considering whether the money would be more abundant or whether money would come at all or not. This is the motive—that has prompted us in all of our moves and all of our undertakings. It is the motive that prompts us now.

3. Calls for Meetings.

As was stated above, we received many calls for meeting that we could not hold while doing local work, and our time for this year was filled up with meetings before the public knew that we had planned to give up local work and go into the field. And we have always had to decline many invitations that we desired to accept. If our plan goes through, we shall now be able to answer more calls. We have never tried to choose the places where we go for meetings. We have answered the calls as they come. Some of these come from large churches and some come from small churches and even from country places. The amount of support may be determined by the place we go, but the good we can do cannot be determined by the size of the church nor by the size of the town in which the church is located. And since it is good that we are out to accomplish, we go wherever we can without regard for what the financial reward will be. We appreciate the calls that come, and we wish we were able to answer every one of them to go to every place that needs and wants us.

4. Things That Threaten.

Since it has become known that we plan to teach some special courses in Harding College, reports have come to us and to the president of the college that there will be a fight made upon the college because of our connection.

And some of our friends claim that there will be a fight made on us because of the college. It seems, therefore, that some who favor us fight the college, and some
who fight us favor the college, or, at least, will fight the college less if we are not there.

We are little concerned about any fight that may be made upon us. Our lives are an open book, and our work has not been done in a corner. The places where we have lived and labored for the Lord are well known. The books, tracts, editorials, and contributed articles that we have written are all still in circulation. There is nothing hidden about our work and character or our view. If anyone is interested in knowing where "we" stand on any question, whether doctrinal, personal, financial, or historical, that person need not go to the trouble of searching our records; all he needs to do is to ask us. We are glad to answer any question of whatever nature that any person might want to ask. We will explain our views either publicly or privately, orally or in writing, on any issue that confronts us today. We are neither afraid nor ashamed to tell where we stand on anything political, social, or religious. If some brethren find it to their advantage to fight us, we are glad to be of service to them in that way. We, therefore, remove all restrictions and declare open season on us through the whole year.

But if the college is going to suffer because of our connection there, then that brings up something new to consider. As said above, our only motive in undertaking this work is to bless the college, not to improve ourselves. If this new connection instead of proving advantageous is going to prove injurious to the college, then our reason for going there no longer exists. If the president, the dean, or the trustees of the college think that this is going to be the result of our coming, and if the preachers and papers and other colleges can foresee that this arrangement will prove disastrous to Harding, we shall be happy to cancel our appointment there and save the good school any further criticism.

If some brethren find it to their advantage to fight us, we are glad to be of service to them in that way. We, therefore, remove all restrictions and declare open season on us through the whole year.

Since you ask for it, here goes. Since "we" are invited to an "open season on us" and choose to take a pot shot on them we are wondering just what size covey Brother Brewer are. Here is an estimate of himself unblushingly self-expressed in terms of "we" and "us. He is telling of the unmixed blessing he hopes to be to Harding College.

"Since we have had experience as an elder, local preacher, evangelist, debater, and writer, we can give the young men the advantage of our experience as well as the advantage of our study. We cherish the hope that we can help indoctrinate them so that they can meet the issues of the day and be able to solve some of the problems that come to a local preacher and so that they will be able to lead congregations to fulfill the scriptural standards for a church."

You are too modest, my dear brother. You should have omitted the suggestion of "help." "We" should be able to take care of a little job like that on the side without anybody helping "us." Seems that I have somewhere come across a little gem which should serve to reduce the size of the "we" in some of "us."

"Let another praise thee and not thine own lips." Possibly "we" couldn't wait, or feared others could not do justice to the subject and might overlook some important fact of "our" personal greatness. Thank you for "removing all restrictions" in advance that might have proved embarrassing to me in taking a shot at "us."

We entertain the hope that at least some of "the young men" may avoid a common human frailty exhibited in "we" and "us" but under the circumstances the prospect is discouraging.

A Reminder To The Readers

We kindly ask all readers to look at the label on their paper. The date on the label indicates when your subscription expires. If your date is up it will help us to little in renewing all subscriptions if you will enclose your dollar in an envelope with your name and address, marked "Renewal" and thus save us the time and expense of sending out the notices. Thank you. The Bible Banner, Box 1804, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.
Paul wrote two letters to Timothy whom he addressed as “my true child in faith.” He wrote one letter to Titus and addressed him as, “My true child after a common labor.” In these letters he warned Timothy and Titus against certain teachers, and doctrines, and admonished them to fight them. Following Paul’s example, and for the same reason, I am writing this open letter to Clarence Young, my son in the gospel.

On the inside cover of the Christian Leader, April 1, 1940, we have, “The President’s Statement,” by C. B. F. Young, Now C. B. F. Young was, is, and always will be Clarence Young to me. I have known him from childhood, I taught him the truth, I baptized him, I married him, and I have watched his rise in the educational and business world with much interest, and always with the hope that he would remain true to the “old paths.” I have not lost that hope yet; but there are some things in “The President’s Statement,” that suggest loose reasoning on Bible principles. In speaking of the Christian Leader, he says: “Its policy is best expressed in Philippians 4:8, which leaves no room for exparte railing against any man, saint, sinner, or sectarian.” Clarence, there is no policy stated in President’s Statement, “that suggest loose reasoning on Bible learned from Paul, that evidently you have forgotten since fact, many things may be done whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things.”

Let me call your attention to some things we have’ learned from Paul, that evidently you have forgotten since you left Birmingham. In Philippians 3: 17-19, Paul says: “Brethren, be ye imitators together of me, and mark them that so walk even as ye have us for an ensample. For many walk, of whom I told you often, and now tell you even weeping that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: whose end is perdition, whose god is the belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things.” Clarence, this is the rule of action Paul recommended to the Philippians. Would you call it “exparte railing”? In fact, many things may be done “exparte railing” after proper notice has been given to the opposite party; but these notices should always be given the Pauline way open and above board, and not by scurrilous, anonymous letters. We go on with Paul’s admonition to Timothy. “But know this, that in the last days grievous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of self, lovers of money, boastful, haughty, railers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affections, implacable, slanderers, without self control, fierce, no lovers of good, traitors, headstrong, puffed up, lovers of pleasure rather than lovers of God; holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof; from these also turn away. For of these are they that creep into houses, and take captive silly women laden with sins, led away by divers lusts, ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth. And even as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so do these also withstand the truth; men corrupted in mind, reprobate concerning the faith. But they shall proceed no further; for their folly shall be evident unto all men, and theirs also came to be.” (2 Tim. 3:14) Clarence, you can see from the above that you do not know what Philippians 1:8 teaches, and you are all mixed up on “exparte railing.” I am sure the characters Paul describes would come under the head of one of your designations, “man, saint, sin-ner, or sectarian.” Therefore the “policy” of the Christian Leader is a nonentity so far as New Testament principles are concerned. I believe, if I were you, I would change the policy of the Leader rather than leave the impression that I thought Paul was a ranter.

Paul, writing to Titus says: “For there are many unruly men, vain talkers, and deceivers, specially they of the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped; men who overthrow whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre’s sake. One of themselves, a prophet of their own, said, Cretans are always liars, evil beasts, idle gluttons. This testimony is true. For which cause reprobate them sharply, that they may be sound in the faith, not giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men who turn away from the truth” (Titus 1:10-14).

I will now quote from “The President’s Statement.” “In the honest conviction that a publication’s proper function is to illuminate the true way, rather than publicize faults and errors of individuals, the Leader’s columns will be kept free from perverse disputes, and from the products of jealousy and personal rancor.” The difference therefore between Paul’s way of “illuminating” and the Leader’s way, is the difference between God’s way and man’s way the distance between heaven and earth. Or would you say Paul’s writings were “the products of jealousy and personal rancor”? I think, Clarence, the trouble with the “Presidents” of the committees of some of “our” religious papers, is they do not seem to be able to discriminate between principle and personalities. That is often the cause of trouble between preachers and elders. For instance, there is nothing personal about this open letter to you, other than I want you to see personally that the policy you have announced for the Christian Leader is a slap in the face of inspiration, and not just a thrust at some present day writers or preachers. I feel sure, since you are a chemist, if you saw me rummaging around in a chemical laboratory you would frankly tell me that I had better be trying to do something that I know something about. You would, if you loved me, because I might mix things that would cause a combustion. Yet that would not be nearly so bad as mixing truth and error.

Again Paul said to Timothy: “Alexander the copper-smith, did me much evil: the Lord will render to him according to his work: of whom do thou also beware; for he greatly withstood our words.” (2 Tim. 4:14, 15) You see the Leader’s “policy” would stigmatize Paul as a Publicizer of the “faults and errors of individuals.” The policy therefore of the Christian Leader takes in all the “ists” and “isms” in the church, and would stop the mouth of every gospel preacher, and dry the ink on every pen that would dare challenge those “ists” and “isms” publicly. The only manly, decent, Christian, or scriptural way to challenge any “ism” that is destructive to the peace and harmony of the church is to do it publicly. Whispering around that you know something on a certain preacher or editor that would ruin him if you would tell it, is neither manly nor Christian.

I quote your next paragraph. “This policy is by no means tantamount to condoning sin and error, because the only way to correct error is with God’s word-not with bitter incriminations. (But Saul, who is also called Paul, filled with the Holy Spirit, fastened his eyes on him, and
said, 0 full of all guile and all villainy, thou son of the devil, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?" Of course, this bit of "bitter incrimination" would not be allowed to soil the pages of the Christian Leader; but the Lord had it put in his Book. J. T. L.) Wrong doers, in the church and out of it, must fearlessly be brought to repentance; but church discipline is a thing apart from publicity, lying within the province of the eldership." Clarence, what has "church discipline" got to do with "wrong doers out of the church?"

And what has the eldership got to do with bringing sinners to repentance outside of its own congregation? Gospel preachers are the only ones who have any authority or command from God to deal with sinners "in the church and out of it," that is, their work, or teaching is not limited to local congregations, but is world wide. Paul dealt with sinners "in the church and out of it," both with tongue and pen, and he did not put his teaching in sugar coated capsules either.

The eldership itself is not infallible. Paul said to the elders at Ephesus. "I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts 20:29, 30). Therefore the elders themselves may need correcting, and Paul tells us how it ought to be done. In 1 Timothy 5:10-21, he says: "Against an elder receive not an accusation, except at the mouth of two witnesses or three. Them that sin reprove in the sight of all, that the rest may be in fear. I charge thee in the sight of God, and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality."

Notice Paul says: "Them that sin reprove in the sight of all," and this command was given "in the sight of God and Jesus Christ, and the elect angels." Paul gave only one other command comparable to this one, and that was his last charge to Timothy. "I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ, Jesus, whom shall judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom of sight of God, and of Christ, Jesus, whom shall judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom; preach the word; be urgent in season, out of season; rebuke, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching. For the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine; but having itching ears, will, with their own lusts, and will turn away their ears from the truth, and turn aside unto fables." (2 Tim. 4:1-4)

Your policy would brand Paul, in his first charge to Timothy, as a "publicizer of the faults and errors of individuals," and suppose you would say, in his last charge, he was charging Timothy to rant. Of course, "reprove and rebuke" have been left out of the vocabulary of the Christian Leader.

I can understand the policy of the Christian Leader only on two grounds. Its makers are either ignorant of God's way of dealing with wrong doers, in the church and out of it, or they think they have a better way than God's way. In Galatians 2:11-14, we read: "But when Cephas came to Antioch, I resisted him to the face, because he stood condemned. For before that certain came from James, he ate with the Gentiles; but when they came, he drew back and separated himself, fearing that they were of the circumcision. And the rest of the Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that even Barnabas was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Cephas before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest as do the Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, how compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?"

Peter was an apostle and an elder too, and this is the way Paul dealt with him, and then published it. Clarence, do you think Paul published this to teach us that it is wrong (1) to "publicize faults and errors of individuals," when the good of the cause of Christ is involved? Peter was not embittered against Paul by this deserved rebuke. He afterward wrote: "Even as our beloved brother Paul also, according to the wisdom given to him, wrote unto you; as also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; wherein are some things hard to be understood, which the ignorant and unsteadfast writ, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction. Ye therefore, beloved, knowing these things beforehand, beware lest, being carried away with the error of the wicked, ye fall from your own steadfastness. But grow in the grace and knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. To him glory both now and forever. Amen." These are the last words that Peter wrote-they are words of warning. Of course the terms, "ignorant and unsteadfast," would not be found in high class (?) religious journalism today. If Peter had belonged to the peanut tribe, he doubtless would have dropped Paul a curt note forbidding his name to appear (Acts 15:4) in any of his epistles. Of course, Paul would have referred to Paul as "our beloved brother Paul."

I will now quote your scripture on religious discussion that may appear in the Christian Leader. "Doctrinal questions, on which there are disagreements among godly men, (There are godly men among denominational preachers J. T. L.) may be discussed in the Leader, with two provisions, namely: Both sides of the disputed question must be given equal prominence in the same issue of the magazine; and each writer must confine his writings to what he himself believes, saying nothing about what he may imagine the other brother's convictions to be. To be sure that the latter stipulation is observed, it will be preferable that each writer be allowed to read the other's manuscript before it is cast in type." Clarence, will you please give, a precept, example, or a necessary inference, from the Bible for such procedure as you have prescribed for the Christian Leader? Jesus Christ, and his apostles were controversialists of the first rank. What was their method? Jesus Christ said: "Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, This people honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men." (Matt. 15:7-9) Again He said: "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is become so, ye make him two fold more a son of hell than yourselves." (Matt. 23:15)

This is the way Jesus presented his manuscripts to, and about, false teachers, and pretenders in religion. "For such men are false apostles, deceitful workers, fashioning themselves into apostles of Christ. And no marvel; for even Satan fashioneth himself into an angel of light. It is no great thing therefore if his ministers also fashion themselves as ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works." (2 Cor. 11:13-15) This is Paul's "manuscript," but of course, if he were living today, he could not get it in the Christian Leader. Clarence, this is my "constructive criticism" of the policy of the Christian Leader. As to whether it is "favorable" or "unfavorable," will depend on who is doing the "imagining."

We kindly ask all readers to look at the label on their paper. The date on the label indicates when your subscription expires. If your date is up it will help us no little in renewing all subscriptions if you will enclose your dollar in an envelope with your name and address, marked "Renewal" and thus save us the time and expense of sending out the notices. Thank you. The Bible Banner,
“THE KINGDOM IN ACTS”


JOHN T. LEWIS

Chapter eight of R. H. Boll’s book, “The Kingdom of God,” is written under the above heading. I have showed that every promise God made to Abraham and his descendents concerning land grants, or an earthly kingdom, was absolutely fulfilled to his posterity, and forfeited by them in not keeping the conditions stipulated by God himself.

That the readers may have no doubt about these facts I will show them again, as this will be my final answer to our skeptical friend, Mr. R. H. Boll.

In Genesis 12:5-7, we read: “Abraham took Sarah his wife, and Lot his brother’s son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the souls that they had gotten in Haran; and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan; and into the land of Canaan they came. And Abram passed through the land unto the place of Shechem, unto the oak of Moreh. And the Canaanite was then in the land. And Jehovah appeared unto Abram, and said, “Unto thy seed will I give this land.” Thus the land of Canaan was vouchsafed to Abram’s seed without any conditions upon their part. Did God ever fulfill this promise? In Joshua 21:43-45, we read: “So Jehovah gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers; and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And Jehovah gave them rest round about, according to all that he sware unto their fathers: and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; Jehovah delivered all their enemies unto their hand. There failed not of any good thing which Jehovah had spoken unto the house of Israel; all came to pass.” Therefore to claim that God will have to restore the earthly kingdom of Israel, and give them the land of Canaan to fulfill his first land promise to Abram is one of the absurdities of premillennial teaching. We read again in Genesis 15: 18: “In that day Jehovah made a covenant with Abram, saying, ‘Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates.’ Therefore this second land grant God made with Abram, not only included the first, but extended to the Euphrates. In Genesis 17:5, we read: “Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for the father of a multitude of nations have I made thee.” This shows that Abraham was not only to be the father of fleshly Israel; but of other nations. This promise can only be fulfilled in spiritual Israel. Paul settles this fact in his argument in the fourth chapter of Romans 9:6. “And the saying, ‘He will inherit them that he made before him,’ is written under the above heading. I have showed that every promise God made to Abraham and his descendents concerning land grants, or an earthly kingdom, was absolutely fulfilled to his posterity, and forfeited by them in not keeping the conditions stipulated by God himself.

Earl 8:3, we read: “David smote also Hadadezer the son of Rehob, king of Zobah, as he went to recover his dominion at the River.” We also read in 2 Chronicles 9:22-26, “So Solomon exceeded all the kings of the earth in riches and wisdom. And all the kings of the earth sought the presence of Solomon, to hear his wisdom, which God had put in his heart. And they brought every man his tribute, vessels of silver, and vessels of gold, and raiment, armor and spices, horses, and mules, a tribute year by year. And he ruled over all the kings from the River even unto the land of the Philistines, and to the border of Egypt.” Without controversy, therefore, God has fulfilled his land covenants with Abraham. When David, and Solomon took possession of this country the abstract showed they had a clear title from God himself. After God had literally, absolutely, and in every sense, fulfilled this land covenant with Abraham’s descendents by giving this land to them and making them absolute rulers over it, he stipulated certain conditions upon which their perpetual possession of that country depended. In 2 Chronicles 33:8, we read: “Neither will I any more remove the foot of Israel from off the land which I have appointed for your father, if only they will observe to do all that I have commanded them, even all the law and statutes and the ordinances given by Moses.” Surely Brother Boll would not deny God the right to state these conditions after he had given the country to Israel. However, it makes no difference about what Brother Boll may think or say, God gave the conditions, and Israel violated them, according to the last of their prophets. In Malachi 3:7, we read: “From the days of your fathers ye have turned aside from mine ordinances and have not kept them.” Thus Israel themselves ended the Abrahamic land covenant. In the destruction of Jerusalem, A. D. 70, the Jewish nation, as such, ended once for all. I am sure there is not a Jew on earth today, that knows what tribe he came from. The Jewish race is with us today, and possibly always will be; but the Jewish nation is not, and will never be again. The restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel is nothing but an idle dream of a speculative mind. God made two promises to Abraham, one was an earthly kingdom made of all nations concerning land grants, or an earthly kingdom, was absolutely fulfilled to his posterity, and forfeited by them in not keeping the conditions stipulated by God himself.

Paul speaking of the spiritual kingdom says: “For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ. There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither male and female; for ye all are one in Christ Jesus. And if ye are Christ’s then are ye Abraham’s seed, heirs according to promise.” (Gal. 3:26-29) In Gal. 6:16, Paul calls the same people, “The Israel of God.” These things could never be said about any earthly kingdom. You now have before you the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth, and nothing else is the truth concerning God’s fulfillment of the Abrahamic promises. There is absolutely nothing forced about the scriptural teaching of the fulfillment of God’s promises to Abraham. And remember whatever may be said in the prophets concerning either an earthly kingdom, or spiritual kingdom, must come out of the promise God made to Abraham. If you keep these facts before you, you will never be lost in the premillennial fogs of a thousand years reign of Christ over an earthly kingdom.

We now notice Brother Boll’s arguments (?) in Acts, He says: “Let those who are put to the necessity of forcing
the language of scripture into agreement with their position, suppose and teach such things: We as simple Christians, ought to feel no obligation like that. For my part, it pleases me to accept the evident implication of the Savior’s reply, that sometime (the definite time unknown) Israel’s kingdom would be restored to them. (I can see no “implication” of the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel, in the Savior’s reply to the question asked in Acts 1:16, which pleases Brother Boll so much. J. T. L.) For so it is promised in the holy scriptures: (Where ? J. T. L.) “In that day—that is, when Jehovah shall reign over the remnant of Israel in Mount Zion forever—(If Jehovah is to reign over the remnant of Israel in Mount Zion forever, and Brother Boll says the throne of Jehovah, is not the throne of David upon which Christ is to sit in Jerusalem, and reign over an earthly kingdom for one thousand years, (Micah 4:6-8, and Jer. 33:7) are just about as clear and satisfying.” As to the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel with Christ reigning over that kingdom on David’s earthly throne, in Jerusalem, for one thousand years, (Micah 4:6-8, and Jer. 33:7) just as much as for the last twenty-five years, (J. T. L.) (The ‘former dominion’ shall come—the dominion once held and lost, now returned to, in glorious and exalted form—even ‘the kingdom of the daughter of Jerusalem.’ (Micah 4:6-8 Jer. 33:7). That is eminently clear and satisfying.”

“Thus began the establishment of the kingdom on David’s earthly throne, in Jerusalem, for one thousand years, (Micah 4:6-8, and Jer. 33:7) are just about as clear and satisfying.”

Let us examine these scriptures. In Micah 4:1, 2, we read: “But in the latter days it shall come to pass, that the mountain of Jehovah’s house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and it shall be exalted above the hills; and peoples shall flow unto it. And many nations shall go and say, ‘Come ye, let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us his ways, and we will walk in his paths. For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem.’” This prophecy is almost identical with Isaiah 2:1-3. Isaiah says it was concerning “Judah and Jerusalem,” but he says nothing about the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel. Every Bible student and commentary known to me, will tell you that these prophecies tell of the restoration of “The kingdom of the Messiah, and the conversion of the Gentile world,” which began on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ. Christ himself told of the near approach of the fulfillment of these prophecies in Luke 24:44-49. Indeed “the word of the Lord” went forth from Jerusalem “in that day.” Thus began the fulfillment of God’s promise to Abraham to make of him “the father of many nations.” Who, but a premillennialist, could believe that Micah after making such a glorious and unmistakable prophecy concerning the establishment of the spiritual kingdom, or Church of Christ, would so abruptly change from the sublime to the ridiculous, by prophesying about the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel in verses 6-8? Adam Clarke says verse 6 points out “the state of the Jews, who were to be gathered into the Christian Church.” Verse 7, says: “And the Lord shall reign over them in Mount Zion from henceforth, even forever.” In Hebrews 12:22, 23, we read, “But ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to innumerable hosts of angels, to the general assembly and church of the firstborn who are enrolled in heaven, and to God the judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect.” If therefore Hebrews 12:22, 23 does not tell of the fulfillment of Micah 4:7, there is no fulfillment of it; because there is no restoration of an earthly kingdom mentioned in either passage. In verse 8, Micah speaks of the “tower of the flock.” If the flock of God, is not the Church of God, what is it? It could not be “The earthly kingdom of Israel” restored; because that would leave out a good part of the flock—all that Jesus said he would bring in. In John 10:16, we read: “And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd.” Are not Jesus, and the church, the “tower” and “flock” of which Micah prophesied?

We will now notice Jer. 33:7. “And I will cause the captivity of Judah and the captivity of Israel to return and I will build them, as at the first.” Brother Boll asked us to compare this verse with Micah 4:6-8. I do not believe that this verse teaches what Micah 4:6-8 teaches. Jeremiah was in captivity when he made this prophecy and I cannot understand how Brother Boll can see anything in it, other than the return of the Jews from the Babylonian captivity.

“DOES CHRIST NOW SIT ON DAVID’S THRONE

Let us consider carefully and impartially Brother Boll’s explanation of Acts 2:30, 31. He quotes and italicizes these verses, and then asks the above question. I will quote the verses, and dissect Brother Boll’s arguments (?) and explanation (?) as we go along. “Being therefore a prophet and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that of the fruit of his loins he would set one upon his throne; he foreseeing this spake of the resurrection of the Christ, that neither was he left unto Hades nor did his flesh see corruption.” (Acts 2:30, 31). Brother Boll says: “It is this passage that demands our especial examination; for it is relied upon as the positive and final proof that Jesus is now sitting and reigning on David’s throne. (If these verses connected with verse 33, and 34 are not “positive and final proof that Jesus is now sitting and reigning on David’s throne,” and the reigning began on “that day,” then there is no proof to that effect, and all gospel preachers who so teach are false teachers, and we should not expect Brother Boll, and those who stand with him to stultify their conscience in fellowshipping us. J. T. L.) We shall consider it carefully and impartially to see if that is so. I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, that if such is the meaning—or whatever may be the meaning—of these words I am well-pleased to have it just as it is. (If you are “well pleased to have it just as it is,” Brother Boll, it is the Holy Spirit, through Peter, saying that God had fulfilled his covenant made with David in 2 Samuel 7:12, and spoken of in Psalms 89:3, 4, and 34-36. J. T. L.) Having no position to force or creed to defend we feel free to take all God has said and just as he said it. (In order to make his position plausible, Brother Boll has become a little reckless with the facts here. The only way to force a position, or defend a creed, is by eternally teaching them, and a little further on he will state the position he has been teaching and defending for a quarter of a century—a position that has caused all the trouble in the church over premillennialism. J. T. L.) But if upon examination we see that the passage does not say what is claimed for it, of course no human authority and no consideration of the general views of the brotherhood should weigh in the matter. (Brother Boll is here implying that “the general views of the brotherhood” have been wrong in this matter and should not be weighed. J. T. L.)

And what do we see in Peter’s statement? A declaration that Jesus is sitting upon David’s throne now? That God has actually seated Him on the throne of David? If so, that settles it for everyone. But what do we find? Simply that David, foreseeing that of his natural descendant God would set one (the great promised Son) upon his (David’s) throne-spoke of the resurrection of the Christ. But what do we find? That God would set one (the great promised Son) upon his (David’s) throne-spoke of the resurrection of the Christ. In other words, the promised Christ of David’s line was to be raised from the dead in order that He might be seated on his father David’s throne. This Son of David, this Jesus

(Continued on page 12)
WHAT THE BIBLE TEACHES ON PRAYER

CEcil B. Douthitt

Meaning Of The Word

The term “prayer,” as used in this article, means the word-expression of requests to the heavenly Father, with confession of our sins, and thankful acknowledgment of his gifts and mercies. The words “supplication,” “intercession,” and “thanksgiving” are used in the Scriptures expressing different kinds of prayers.

To represent its nature prayer is called an asking (Jno. 16:24), a pouring out of the soul (1 Sam. 1:15), a seeking and knocking (Matt. 7:7), or a striving (Rom. 15:30). One or more of the following parts may compose a prayer: adoration, petition, confession, invocation, dedication, thanksgiving, and blessing.

Prayer implies the existence of God and the dependence and responsibility of man. There is no place for it in the life of one who denies God’s existence and man’s responsibility to a Supreme Being.

Its Scriptural Providence

From the days of Seth and Enosh until the death of the apostle John, holy men of the Bible called upon the name of God in prayer. Prayers of Abraham, Jacob, Moses, Samuel, David, and many others appear on the pages of the Old Testament. The altars of the patriarchs were erected with the view of calling upon the name of Jehovah.

Jesus himself prayed often. At least two of his parables were spoken to the end that men ought to pray and not to faint. He taught his disciples how to pray. Of the five acts of worship presented in the New Testament for the church of Christ, prayer is the most frequently mentioned.

Paul gave a commandment: “Pray without ceasing; in everything give thanks,” and then added, “for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus to you-ward” (1 Thess. 5:17,18). He said also: “I desire, therefore, that the men pray in the name of Jesus Christ, our mediator, and to no one else. The many promises of God to the prayerful and the righteous are connected with every remedial agent, all who can be cured at all will be cured in this way. James does not teach that this remedy is an antidote to death and decay, for there was never a time when Christians did not sicken and die. One may believe with all the heart that God will heal the sick in answer to prayer independently of natural law and without the use of any natural means. Oil as a remedy for many ills was very common in the time of James, and probably was to the sick then what various medicines are to the sick now. If the best that science has produced is applied, and the prayers of the righteous are connected with every remedial agent, all who can be cured at all will be cured in this way. God can and does answer our prayers for daily bread by working through the laws of nature. If we expect him to rain manna from heaven as in the age of miracles, we shall be disappointed. We must use the means he has given us to produce our bread by his laws of nature and be working through these laws as in the case of Elijah, will grant our request. James teaches that prayers should be offered for the sick (Jas. 5:14,15) and promises that such prayers will be answered. The healing in answer to prayer mentioned by James is medicinal, or through the use of natural means. Oil as a remedy for many ills was very common in the time of James, and probably was to the sick then what various medicines are to the sick now. If the best that science has produced is applied, and the prayers of the righteous are connected with every remedial agent, all who can be cured at all will be cured in this way. James does not teach that this remedy is an antidote to death and decay, for there was never a time when Christians did not sicken and die. One may believe with all the heart that God will heal the sick in answer to prayer independently of natural law and without the use of any natural remedial agent, all who should remember that faith without works is just as dead in the natural world as in the spiritual realm. (Jas. 2:14-26.)

The righteous are taught to pray for sinners and there are many examples of answer of such prayers. Jesus prayed for those who crucified him (Luke 23:34), and his prayer was answered in perfect harmony with God’s spiritual law of forgiveness. The people for whom he prayed were present on the day of Pentecost when Peter preached that memorable sermon of the second chapter of Acts. They were pierced in their hearts by the words spoken by the apostle, and asked “What shall we do?” Peter told them to repent and be baptized, and they obeyed; they were forgiven and the Savior’s prayer for them was answered. Not a single spiritual law was ignored or over-rulled, and no miracle served as a substitute for their obedience to God’s law of forgiveness.

To Whom Should We Pray?

All prayers should be made to the Father through the name of Jesus Christ, our mediator, and to no one else. In what is commonly called the “Lord’s Prayer,” Jesus taught the disciples to address “our Father.” (Matt. 6:9) Blessings are promised to those who ask “of the Father.”
Thanks should be given always “to God, even the Father” (Eph. 5:20). We should “call on him as Father.” (1 Pet. 1:7) Jesus never addressed anyone in his prayers, except the Father. “Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving.” (Ps. 50:14) Paul said his supplication was “to God.” (Rom. 10:1)

Praying to angels or to Mary, the mother of Jesus, is without a single particle of scriptural authority.

For Whom Should We Pray?

Christians should pray for one another. “Finally, brethren, pray for us,” (II Thess. 3:1), said Paul. Again, “I make mention of you, always in my prayers.” (Rom. 1:9)

The Scriptures teach that “supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings, be made for all men.” (I Tim. 2:1) All the living may be beneficiaries of our prayers, but not the dead. Their destinies are sealed and their state cannot be changed.

Public Prayers

It is obvious from the fourteenth chapter of First Corinthians that prayers were made in the assembly of the church. These prayers in which all participated were led by one person and all the others silently followed the leader. At the close of the prayer all spoke the word “amen,” which means “so may it be.” To say “amen” at the close of a prayer is to sanction what has been said in the prayer. While the leader of a congregation in prayer should remember that he is praying to God and not to men, he should also not forget that others are praying after him and he should speak distinctly and use words that all can understand. Writing on this point Paul had this to say: “So also ye, unless ye utter by the tongue speech easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air.” “If then I know not the meaning of the voice, I shall be to him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh will be a barbarian unto me.” “I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also.” “Else if thou bless with the spirit, how shall he that filleth the place of the unlearned say the Amen at the giving of thanks, seeing he knoweth not what thou sayest? For thou verily givest thanks well, but the other is not edified.”

To “pray with the spirit” the audience must follow heartily, though silently, the prayer expressed by the leader. If one lets the mind drift away from the thoughts expressed in the prayer, one is not worshipping “in spirit.”

The length of a prayer is not as important as the spirit in which it is offered. “Vain repetitions” should be avoided, for men are not “heard for their much speaking.” (Matt. 6:7) The state of the heart means far more than the number of words used.

Form Of Words

It is probable that the Pharisees, some of whom the Savior called hypocrites, had forms of prayers which they repeated over and over, but there is no evidence of confinement by divine authority to forms of words in prayer.

The Savior’s pattern, sometimes called the “Lord’s Prayer,” was not given as an established form of words. It is expressed in Matt. 6:9-13 and Luke 11:2-4, but it is not expressed in the same words in both places. The disciples were not told to pray in the exact words of this pattern, but “after this manner.”

Forms of prayer become groups of stereotyped phrases or empty ceremonies and should be avoided. They do not give the worshipper the freedom, fervor, and spontaneity that God wants his children to manifest in their requests to him.

Postures


Posture of the body in prayer should result from an inner impulse. It should not be a mere conformity to a religious custom.

Conditions Of Effectual Prayer

Acceptable prayer is conditioned upon the character of the supplicant. It is the supplication of a “righteous” man that avails. (Jas. 5:16) The man whose sight was restored said, “We know that God heareth not sinners: but if any man be a worshipper of God, and do his will, him he heareth.” (Jno. 9:31) The sinner who regards iniquity in his heart (Ps. 66:18), or turns away his ear from hearing the law of the Lord (Prov. 28:9) is the kind God will not hear.

Conditions to be regarded in prayer may be classified as follows:

1. Must ask in faith. (Matt. 21:22; Jas. 1:6 7; Rom. 14:23) To “ask in faith” does not mean that the supplicant must believe he will receive everything for which he asks. It means that the supplicant must believe in God—that the Father will grant the request, if it is best for him to have the thing requested, and that he will withhold it, if it is not best for the supplicant to have it. The scriptures do not teach that one will receive everything asked for in prayer. Paul “besought the Lord thrice” that the “thorn in the flesh” might depart from him, but the Lord did not remove the thorn for the simple reason that it was not best for Paul that it be removed. The Lord never teaches anyone to believe a thing that is not true.

When Jesus prayed, “Let this cup pass away from me,” he expressed doubt that the request would be granted by saying, “if it be possible,” and “not as I will, but as thou wilt.” A prayer of faith requires that all requests be qualified with the submission expressed by Jesus, “Not as I will, but as thou wilt.”

2. Must ask according to God’s will. (I Jno. 5:14) God’s will as to material things is expressed through the laws of nature. The Bible is a revelation of his will as pertains to spiritual matters. A prayer is not “according to his will” when a violation of either the laws of nature or the law of the Spirit is requested. So-called “divine healers” do not ask according to God’s will when they pray for the sick and at the same time refuse natural remedial agents and ignore all laws of nature governing the health of the body. The law of the Spirit of life states certain conditions of forgiveness from sin. To disregard these conditions and to pray for forgiveness without obedience to God’s spiritual law is to fail to ask according to his will.

3. Must respect God’s word. “He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer is an abomination.” (Prov. 29:9) When God speaks to man through the scriptures, man must hear God; otherwise God will not hear man when he prays. Cornelius prayed before he became a Christian. He had obeyed in so far as he had heard the will of God. The Lord answered his prayer by sending Peter to tell him what to do to be saved. If Cornelius had turned away his ear from hearing the things Peter commanded him to do, then his prayer would have been an abomination instead of a memorial.

4. Must forgive others. “But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your tres-
pass. (Matt. 6:15) It is useless to pray for forgiveness, while refusing to forgive those who are penitent of their sins against us.

5. Must be unselfish in requests. (Jas. 4:3) When we pray, the good of others as well as our own welfare must be considered. With every blessing received from God there is a corresponding duty of blessing others. God's promise to Abraham was accompanied with an obligation; namely, "Be thou a blessing." This should be remembered when we make our requests known unto God.

Ridiculous Claims

For many years the Holy Rollers, Mormons, Adventists, and various groups of so-called "divine healers" have made ridiculous claims concerning answers to their prayers. Gospel preachers have tried to teach these fanatics that they were profaning the sacred use of prayer. There is nothing to indicate that faithful gospel preachers thought a few years ago that the silly claims of these sectarians would ever make much head-way among plain churches of Christ; but they were wrong in that conclusion.

Only a few years ago the religious journal, the Christian Leader, has issued a call for examples of answers to prayer like the answers that Clinton Davidson claims to have received to his prayers, if the Holy Rollers and Adventists read the Leader, Brother McMillan ought to get many responses to his invitation. But it is extremely doubtful that anyone, regardless of how fanatical he may be, can invent an example more manifestly absurd than Brother Davidson's example. He relates that while working in a bank he asked the Lord to direct him to a misplaced cancelled check; that the Lord performed some kind of an operation on his hand, and his fingers went straight to the check wanted, and he was spared the trouble of looking for it. And thus Brother Davidson drags the sacred use of prayer down to the level of a labor-saving device. God has given man two good eyes to look for lost and misplaced articles (such as cancelled checks) and the scriptures do not teach that prayer will take the place of eyes. Modern divine healers (?) claim that prayer takes the place of natural remedial agents in sickness; Clinton Davidson claims that in his case prayer took the place of eyes and effort in finding a lost check; one is no more absurd than the other. They are both contrary to everything the New Testament teaches on prayer.

While Davidson was a regular worshipper in a denominational church, he was very anxious to put over a million dollar deal, but some financial sharks were about to double-cross him. So he went to the Lord in prayer. He did not ask the Lord to lead him out of sectarianism; the million dollar deal had his attention. He prayed and the Lord immediately operated on a telephone "switch-board" and presto! the deal went over and the financial sharks went down in ignominious defeat. That story as reported in the Leader sounds like the author of it has been listening to Dick Tracy or the "gang busters" when he ought to have been reading his New Testament.

Brother McMillan not only publishes such unprovable claims, but he calls for more of such stories. Brother Davidson has been among sectarians for more than twenty years and he does not know any better than to believe and write these ridiculous tales; but McMillan should know better than to print them, and it is his duty to teach Davidson the truth on prayer instead of encouraging him in his erroneous views.

Since the Christian Leader has given its endorsement to the miraculous answers (?) of Davidson's prayers while he was a divisive, it will be difficult for that journal to present any effective opposition to the miraculous answers (?) of the prayers of Holy Rollers, Mormons and Adventists.

"THE KINGDOM IN ACTS"

(Continued From Page 9)

(Peter declares) was so raised up. He, therefore, is the rightful claimant. He is the God-appointed Heir of David's throne. To him and to Him exclusively the throne of David belongs by every right. But that He is now already occupying that throne is precisely that which Peter does not say. Still less does he say the throne of David-which always meant simply the Divinely delegated sovereignty over the nation of Israel, the 'house of Jacob,' Luke 1:32, X3—was now spiritualized and removed to heaven. (In other words, according to Brother Boll, the Holy Spirit, through Peter, was simply telling the Jews on Pentecost that God had raised Christ from the dead to do what the Jews would not allow him to do at his first coming-establish the earthly kingdom of Israel, and to reign on David's earthly throne, in Jerusalem for one thousand years. Therefore, we who have been teaching that Christ was raised for our justification, and to be made head over his church, and king over spiritual Israel, with his throne in heaven, (as stated in Psalms 103:19) Jehovah hath established his throne in the heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all) according to Brother Boll, have been hoodwinking the people, and causing all the trouble in the church by persisting in such teaching. Again, I say, we should not expect Brother Boll and his friends to fellowship us. J. T. L.) The risen Lord Jesus is indeed exalted and enthroned now. (Brother Boll would seem to be trying to palliate our teaching in this statement. J. T. L.) But the position of authority He occupies up there was in no sense inherited from his father David. David never occupied that throne, nor could have; just as it is equally evident that the Lord Jesus has never yet exercised the authority of David's sphere of rule. (Brother Boll has almost hid himself here in the shades of Aristotle. We read in 1 Kings 2:12, "And Solomon set upon the throne of David his father; and his kingdom was established greatly.") We read again in 2 Chronicles 29:23, "Then Solomon sat on the throne of Jehovah as King instead of David his father, and prospered; and all Israel obeyed him." Of course Solomon did not have to go to heaven to sit on the throne which was both David's and God's. Neither will Christ have to come to the earth to sit on David's throne in spiritual Israel. We read in Psalms 11:4, "Jehovah is in his holy temple; Jehovah, his throne is in heaven." There would be just as much sense in claiming that the Church of God, the Church of Christ, and the church of the first borns, are three different institutions, as it would be to claim that the throne of God, the throne of Christ, and the throne of David are three different thrones. J. T. L.) The throne which our Lord occupies is the all-inclusive sovereignty of heaven. It is a position of supreme authority held by Him as the glorified God—man—'until I make thine enemies the footstool of thy feet' (Ps. 110:1; upon which it will be surrendered. (1 Cor. 15:25-28)). It is a joint sharing of God's throne, on which no mere creature ever sat on or could sit." I believe this last statement of Brother Boll is absolutely true; but when he says Christ will have to give up, or get off of his throne at his second coming to sit on one, on which a mere creature has sat, I dissent, and will fight such demotion of my King as long as I can push a pen.

When Brother Davidson left the church and went into denominationalism he turned "away his ear from hearing the law" (Prov. 29:9), and his prayers received the same treatment at the hand of God as those of any other apostate. Does Brother McMillan believe that the prayers of a divisive for money will receive more attention from God than the prayers of others who forsake the church?
The Reader’s Digest relates the following incident:

When a U-boat wrecked a ship and landed the survivors in South Ireland, two Civic Guards discussed the problem. “We ought to intern them.”

“And why, I’m asking?”

“Why? Because we’re neutral.”

“Sure, we are. But who are we neutral against?”

Neutrality gives comfort to the forces of error and is just as much a thorn in the flesh of the forces for the truth as if they had openly opposed it.

The agitation in recent years over the premillennial question has been as much a hindrance to the Allies as her declaring “for Germany” would be a help to Germany. Hitler realizes this. But to adopt a position of neutrality on the music question forced him to compromise the truth on other matters.

In the European holocaust now raging there are certain countries which Hitler desires to remain neutral. Their neutrality is more help to him than should they go to his defense. Sweden’s neutrality in the Finnish war, probably, largely prevented active aid from the Allies. Up until the present moment Italy’s neutrality (?) has been as much a hindrance to the Allies as her declaring “for Germany” would be a help to Germany. Hitler realizes this. But to the application. To adopt a position of neutrality on the music question, premillennialism, or any other ism demands either that the teacher of error be given just as free rein as the teacher of truth, or it means that the defender of the truth must shut his mouth on such disturbing and obnoxious questions. Nine times out of ten you will find that these “neutrals” are that way only on the surface—in subterranean channels they supply the enemy with information, they hob-nob with the denominations, they announce the presence of a satellite of Louisville with a great deal more fervor than the presence of a fearless proclaimer of the truth who is more concerned with standing in the old paths than in keeping his ear to the ground and preaching and printing only what “the brotherhood wants as shown by surveys.”

Ignorance of the law is no excuse in man’s court, how much less, shall it be at the Supreme Tribunal the Last Day. “The times of this ignorance God overlooked, but now he commandeth men that they should all everywhere repent.” (Acts 17:30). Before we declare our neutrality on any vital question that is disturbing the church, let us ponder well God’s voice of Rev. 3: 15, 16: “I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I will spew thee out of my mouth. If thou wert cold or hot, I would have somewhat to say. But because thou art lukewarm, and neither hot nor cold, I will spew thee out of my mouth.” If we are not informed on the issues confronting the church today, enough to recognize error when we see it; and if we have not courage enough to refute it when we recognize it, then let us at least retain love enough for the church to withdraw from the front ranks until we learn better, and let those with the, armor and courage fight unhampered by our vacillation. To brag of our neutrality is but to give comfort to the enemy. He is using us as a “buffer state.” By such action it becomes apparent that one is “neutral against” the truth.
The Doctors and Precepts of Men

Leonard Johnson

One of the most vivid, lively, and interesting stories of all the Bible is presented in the fifteenth chapter of Matthew and the seventh chapter of Mark. Read these passages for a better understanding and fuller appreciation of the article.

"While it was the aim of Jesus to call men to the law of God itself as the supreme guide of life, the Pharisees, upon the pretence of maintaining it intact, multiplied minute precepts and distinctions to such an extent that the whole life of the Israelite was hemmed in and burdened on every side by instructions so numerous and trifling that the law was almost if not wholly lost sight of. These traditions, as they were called, had long been accumulating. Of the trifling character of these regulations innumerable instances are to be found in the Mishna. Such were their washings before they could eat bread, and the special minuteness with which the forms of this washing were prescribed: ..." (Peloubet and Adam's Bible Dictionary.)

These same writers say of the scribes, "The written law, which was considered binding by all the Jews, did not cover all the details of daily life, and some of its regulations were liable to be misunderstood by the less educated class of the people. The duty of the scribe, therefore, was (1) to add to the law the regulations for the minor details there omitted; (2) explanations of the law itself. These together formed the oral law. (3) The scribes were to teach the law to others, and later (4) made decisions, or practically be judges, under the law. Since it was understood that only the scribes fully understood the meaning of the law, their words grew to be honored above the law. It was greater crime to offend against them that against the law. ... We can therefore understand why they were constantly denounced by our Lord along with the Pharisees."

A group of these Pharisees and scribes from Jerusalem gathered about Jesus as he taught in Gennesaret, some 75 miles north of Jerusalem. They had seen some of his disciples eat their bread with what they called defiled i. e. unwashed hands. "And the Pharisees and scribes asked him. Why walk not thy disciples according to the tradition of the elders?" or as Matthew records it, "Why do thy disciples transgress the tradition of the elders? for they wash not their hands when they eat bread."

There was no hesitation on the part of Jesus-no covering or evading of the issue. He did not say (as many modern "divines") that it is wrong to discuss religious questions to expose error and teach truth—but immediately replied, and how effective was that reply! For in one stroke he knocked their foundation from under them and exposed their doctrine as falsehood and them as hypocrites. "And he answered and said unto them. Why do ye also transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition? Ye leave the commandment of God and hold fast the tradition of men. ... Full well do ye reject the commandment of God that ye may keep your tradition."

The issue has now been squarely drawn. The Pharisees and scribes have affirmed that it is sinful to eat without the ceremonial washing of the hands and have given as their proof the tradition of the elders. Jesus has denied the statement and submitted as his evidence the word of God. He declared that by following their tradition they have contradicted, transgressed, rejected, left, set aside and made void, the commandment of God. By this means he cleared the issue of all irrelevant matter. He left the subject which caused the discussion and drove them immediately to the real issue. The issue between them when simply stated was: the tradition of the elders contra-diets and makes void the word of God. Jesus now takes the affirmative and presents his proof.

His proof that the tradition of the elders contradicted the word of God and made it void was conclusive. "Why do ye transgress the commandment of God because of your tradition? For God said, Honor thy father and thy mother, and he that speaketh evil of father or mother let him die the death. But ye say, (i. e. your tradition says) whatsoever shall say to his father or his mother that wherewith thou mightest have been profited by me is given to God, he shall not honor his father." The practice of declaring what they might have given to their father and mother for their needed support as being given to God was not because of their love for God, but was a bit of artifice and trickery on their part to keep from supporting their parents as the law of God taught it was their duty to do. The law of the Lord made no such provisions; it was furthermore contradictory to what the law had said. When the fifth commandment said "Honor thy father and thy mother," it did not devise at the same time a means of escaping the force of such commandment, and when their tradition provided the means of escape, it transgressed and made void the word of God. Thus his point was proven that their tradition made void the word of God, set it aside as of no importance. "And ye have made void the word of God because of your tradition."

Christ did not stop at simply proving that they were teaching false doctrine, but affirmed and proved that the Pharisees and scribes were base hypocrites. "Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, This people honor me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me; teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men." Here stood a group of Pharisees and scribes posing as teachers of God's law, when in truth they were teaching the tradition of the elders, which was not only not the word of God, but contradicted it, made it void, set it aside. But wherein lay their hypocrisy? In the fact that they themselves knew they were playing a double game, in the fact that they knew they were not teaching the law of God but the precepts of men. Had they been honestly mistaken, the rebuke of Jesus would have been unjust, but he knew, and they knew, that they were pretenders, deceivers and hypocrites.

Jesus next shows their worship to be vain. Jehovah never accepts the worship of hypocrites. Nor does he approve the worship of those who teach and practice for their doctrines the precepts of men, though they may seem to be very pious. Men who know God's word but do not obey it can only worship with the lips and never from the heart. "This people honor me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me; teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men."

Now that the real issue has been settled, Jesus comes back to the washing of hands. This was a tradition of the elders. There was nothing whatever wrong in washing the hands to cleanse them of dirt before eating, but it was emphatically wrong to do the same act as worship to God, because such was not authorized by the word of God. "Not that which entereth into the mouth defileth the man, but that which proceedeth out of the mouth this defileth the man," for what enters the mouth perishes, "But the things which proceed out of the mouth come forth out of the heart and they defile the man: but to eat with unwashed hands defileth not the man."

Let us now draw some lessons from this incident. We have learned that Jesus regarded God's law as the only
authority in his religion, that men's worship is vain when they teach as their doctrines the precepts of men. Therefore, every thing not expressly taught in God's word is error, and is to be opposed and exposed as such.

How the religious world needs today to forsake the traditions and precepts of men and get back to the truth! Jesus said, "The words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life." (Jns. 6:63) The Holy Spirit through Paul said, "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good." I Thess. 5:21.

The denominations around us are held in bondage to the commands, precepts and traditions of men. The churches of Christ cannot in every case "cast the first stone." Each spring most of the churches of our land celebrate Easter. The day is said to commemorate the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. But by what authority has one Sunday of the year been set aside for the celebration of his resurrection when the word of God teaches every first day of the week is a celebration of this memorable event? Such a practice contradicts and makes void the word of God. Here are churches celebrating once a year an event which the Bible teaches should be celebrated once each week, the first day of the week. Many of the same churches which celebrate Easter and Christmas with such punctuality and splendor without any authority from God refuse to take the Lord's supper on the first day of the week which is authorized by him. They refuse to do what God has said do, but are very faithful to do something he has not authorized and which is entirely of human origin. Such worship, being as the washing of hands unauthorized as an item of worship, is vain. Furthermore, the leaders of such are either unnecessarily ignorant of God's word, or are rank hypocrites posing as teachers of God's word when they know they are teaching instead the precepts of men.

Is it because these leaders and those led have such deep devotion for Christ and such great desire to exalt him that they present such ostentatious programs at Easter, Christmas and other seasons? I will not presume to judge every case, but one example would probably not be out of order. The following is quoted from a local newspaper: "Complete preparations have been made for a gala Easter service at the Frazer Memorial Methodist church. The annual Triumphant Missionary march will be the main feature of the 11 o'clock service. The congregation will make their missionary sacrifices in silver dollars. Each will count 1,000 votes for Easter queen. The one elected will be awarded a golden star as an honor medal. The service will open with special Easter anthems. The baptism of babies will follow. Then after the pastor's Easter message will be the march. The crowning of "Easter Queen" will take place in the 7:30 service."

You may search in vain for any mention of Christ or the gospel. How can the world ever learn the truth and come to Christ when the "main feature of the 11 o'clock service" is the "Triumphant Missionary march," and the "main feature" of the 7:30 service is the crowning of the "Easter Queen"? This is only one illustration of what and who are featured in all these pompous services held supposedly to exalt the Christ and Commemorate his glorious resurrection.

How long will men hypocritically pose as teachers of God's word while they teach for their doctrines the precepts of Jesus declared, "If the blind guide the blind, both shall fall into a pit." Isaiah of old said, "To the law and to the testimony! If they speak not according to this word, surely there is no morning for them." Ye hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophesy of you, saying, This people honor me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men.

### EVANGELISM OR PASTOR?

**ALLEN E. JOHNSON**

It is generally conceded that evangelists or preachers in the churches of Christ have drifted into being pastors; some willingly, some unwillingly. Most of us still try to get the local paper to leave off the "Rev." when referring to us in a news item and not to put "Pastor" after our name in the church announcement, but the fact remains that the latter title fits most of us preachers. Most of us preach where the eldership is weak or unqualified and the burden of the elders work is forced upon us gradually or was done by our predecessor and expected of us also. Members are thinking in terms of the "pastor." They will pass by an opportunity to relieve the needy or break to them the bread of life, to tell the preacher he ought to see about such cases.

We have given much time and money to educating young men for the ministry, but have given little or no time and money to the educating and training of elders. To my mind, it is just as essential to the welfare of a congregation, yea, more essential, to have a well qualified and functioning eldership. Chance conversations with brethren from many localities and reports in our religious papers all indicate that the brethren are thinking in terms of the "pastor." The preachers are given credit for the growth or failure of the churches. We read such reports as the following: "I resigned the work here to take up the work in ......... Since I have been here there have been 150 baptisms, 200 restorations, and 500 placed membership." The report doesn't say so, but it implies that the preacher was directly responsible--it was through him that all this was done. This strengthens the "pastor" idea in the minds of the brethren. No small wonder that young preachers going out to minister to the congregations in the proclamation of the word think they are going to "take charge of a church." What is the difference in our practice and the theory and practice of the popular denominations?

In New Testament times the elders had "charge of a church." At least one elder "labored in word and doctrine" and was paid for his work because he gave all of his time to it. The church grew tremendously. It is time we began seriously to do something about such a sad state of affairs. There are many today trying to be evangelists who ought to be elders. They are fitted by natural abilities and scriptural qualifications to be elders. One reason we have more qualified preachers than qualified and functioning elders is that as soon as a man reaches the point of being a good elder, he immediately turns preacher. The preachers are to blame and the churches are to blame; the preacher, because he has not taught the congregation the truth on the eldership question, and the church because it has not searched the Scriptures to really find out God's plan in the matter.

I believe in "pastors," but in pastors of the New Testament pattern. Elders can be developed and begin work in a congregation and function as such through a life-time of usefulness better than the churches can announce that they are ready to "try out preachers." Which reminds me that the present practice of choosing preachers among us is a disgrace to the cause of Christ in many congregations--too many. It reminds one of the methods used by the judges in a bathing-beauty contest.

When we begin to practice the Lord's plan of elders "feeding the flock," we will take on a new period of growth. The elders will have "charge of a church," and the evangelists will be loosed from "pastoral duties" to preach the gospel and establish churches where the word has not been preached.
WHAT KIND OF PREACHING DO WE NEED?  
W. WALLACE LAYTON

Well, what kind are we getting? Possibly a review of the several varieties extant over the land may bring to light the kind that we need. Foremost in our modern pulpitering is the sweet-spirited, non-combative type that leaves a good taste in the mouth, a light burden in the heart and a lack of conviction in the soul. A sort of an aesthetic soothing sauce that one can receive or reject without a sacrifice of principle nor a change of character; an eloquent, flowery preaching containing the essence of nothing. From this we turn away only to be encountered with a hobby-riding harranguing seeking to promote some weird and speculative ideas. There is something contagious in this type of preaching that catches instantly in the fantasy of the public. When a man can warp the Word of God into such angles and designs that men can see a Hitler riding the black horse of the Aprocrapha, or a Mussolini with four heads and wings like the leopard of Daniel's prophesy, they are simply swept off their feet and made to believe that such a preacher has received a magisterial office from God Almighty. From this we again turn away in disgust and are momentarily attracted by the wild and illiterate ravings of a fanatical contortionist whose emotions (the weakest of man's trivalent qualities) have overcome the intellect and will, and we find him calling on high heaven for manifestations that are incompatible with the attributes of God, Christ and the Holy Spirit. And around him are dishonest they need preaching that portrays God's Father, and every doctrine endorsed.

When men are "tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine by the slight of men in craftiness" it is time that we have some preaching, church-wide, that roots up and exposes all such in the light of God's Gospel power.

We need preaching that names the issue and shows which side we are on:

When issues arise in the brotherhood, preaching is the remedy and the power of correction and restoring fellowship. There are always two sides to any issue-the right side and the wrong side. God is on the right side with a few zealoum and militant followers and the devil is on the wrong side with a ruling majority. There is no middle ground, no place for neutrals-for "if you are not for me you are against me," and again "one cannot serve two masters." It is as impossible to be in equal sympathy with two opposing sides, as it is to worship equally God and the Devil.

The issue that arose at Antioch concerning circumcision was not settled by saying nothing about it. The Apostles did not encourage neutrality in the following fight between Judaism and Christianity. They decided that falsehood could not be exterminated either in or out of the body by being let alone. The early church did not sit at home and wonder which side the Apostles were on. The voice and pen of Paul placed before the brotherhood the right side of that issue. "Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace" (Gal. 5:4). He was accused of being a "pest" and a mover of insurrections among the Jews, and a "ring leader of the sect of the Nazareens." They certainly knew which side Paul was on.

There are issues within the body of Christ today, just as there were issues then. Preachers must declare themselves on these matters now as they did then. "Choose ye this day whom ye will serve." Gideon was determined to know who would fight on the right side-and when these had declared themselves, and the faint-hearted had returned home, the battle was entered into and victory was the result. Paul, Joshua and Gideon are but three examples of the attitude to be assumed in the work of God.

Issue No. 1 today is Premillennialism, fostered in the church by R. H. Boll and his Word and Work.

Issue No. 2 is the spirit of dictatorial and copyrighted journalistic censorship that is the progenitor of the Christian Leader.

Issue No. 3 may be called the Witty compromise. This is merely an outcropping of the general strata of doctrinal weakness and non militant preaching that has fastened itself on the church like a leech.

The whole motive behind preaching is to make one conscious of their sins and their need for a Savior-and how else do it but in the way, method and manner set forth in the Bible? Thus and thus alone we please God who is the Father of our spirits.
ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF LIBERALISM IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH

LINDSAY ALLEN

Dr. Edwin W. Wyle, Pastor of The First Christian Church, Decatur, Alabama, is the author of the following article that recently appeared in the Decatur Daily in the interest of “church-going.” Incidentally, the page on which these articles by Dr. Wyle appear weekly is headed by this statement: “Attend The Church Of Your Choice,” But read the Dr.’s article.

WHY NOT GO TO CHURCH?

The City of Decatur has many fine institutions and enterprises, all seeking to do business with the people. We are proud of them all.

Do you realize that the largest of these—from the point of view of capital invested and workers engaged—and certainly the most important, is The Christian Church, of which the local congregations, under various denominational names, are the branches. The oneness of the church in all essentials is real and vital.

In age, world-wide extent, membership and influence, the Christian Church is the greatest institution on earth; of the local churches in this city, every one confesses itself but a ministering part of the church universal, of which Jesus Christ is the head.

The churches in our city do not exist for themselves. As directed by their Master, they are in your midst “Not to be ministered unto, but to minister.” They live to serve. Their business is the greatest on God’s earth, they exist to help people in the highest ways.

The various agencies of every congregation—and these agencies are many—are all meant to minister to man in his worship of God, in his service to his fellow man, and in the development of his own character.

Look at the churches listed on this page, a real welcome awaits you, and there are a thousand reasons, some of them self-evident, why you should go to church, why every Decaturite should be identified with the church.

Many readers of the Bible Banner will find nothing new in Dr. Wyle’s article. To many, it is but another example of the ultra-liberal attitude of the Christian Church toward denominationalism and error in general. Our aim in giving it here is to re-state and re-phrase, especially the younger element in the church, the danger of departures from the word of God. Let our readers remember that there was a time in the history of the Christian Church when the line was drawn on sectarianism and denominationalism. I have in my own library several splendid volumes of sermons delivered by Christian Church preachers as late as thirty-five and forty years ago. With but few exceptions these sermons ring true to apostolic preaching and teaching. The New Testament church is set forth as the only divine institution though which men are promised salvation. Men are commanded to be baptized for the remission of sins. Religious division is denounced in strong terms and the sin of denominationalism is clearly shown. Yes, and they called names too! But not so today. There has been a complete change in the attitude as well as the preaching of Christian Church preachers. The line between error and truth is not drawn but instead false teaching is overlooked, condoned and even practiced on a large scale by these preachers themselves.

There is hardly an error practiced by denominational churches today that the Christian Church has not accepted and taught. This has continued until the Christian Church has taken its seat among the religious denominations of the day. Positively and without a doubt, the Christian Church is but another denomination among denominations! What, then, is the lesson to be learned here? Simply this, that one departure from the word of the Lord, small though it may seem to be, opens the flood gates for further departures and deviations. When instrumental music and missionary societies (“agencies”—Dr. Wyle) were first introduced into the church, many looked (as they do today) upon it as a small and insignificant matter. But the history of the years has shown that little was to evidence today, that it was not a small matter. Instead, these departures were but leaders to the gross departure from the truth as seen in the Christian Church today. We have learned that societies and instrumental music were not the issue at all, rather it was the liberal attitude toward the word of God. When once the authority of God is rejected in one item, that but paves the way for other innovations and corruptions. The same spirit that brought in the two items mentioned above, will also bring in every error practiced by the denominational churches today. The attitude that will tolerate one addition or subtraction to God’s will, will tolerate any and all additions or subtractions. The fact is, when men have flaunted the authority of God in one particular, they have rejected all of his word. When once the word of God is left, there is no anchor to which men can cleave for security and safety. The Roman Church and the Christian Church are parallel examples.

Space forbids a full and detailed exposition of Dr. Wyle’s article, but let us notice briefly a few of his statements... The Christian Church, of which the local congregations under various denominational names, are the branches. (Emphasis mine).

The oneness of the church in all essentials is real and vital. “The modern denominational conception of New Testament Christianity could not have been more positively and definitely stated. Plainer language could not have been used. According to Dr. Wyle the church that Jesus built and for which he gave his life’s blood is nothing more than a conglomerated mass or cluster of heterogeneous religious factions! What a picture of the church of our Lord and how foreign to that given in the New Testament by inspiration! Imagine, if you can, the kingdom of God, the church of Christ, being made up of more than two-hundred war-ring, fighting factions with each one teaching a doctrine or doctrines contrary to the others. Yet this is the picture that Dr. Wyle, as well as all other denominational teachers, would give to the world. Is there any wonder that the world is filled with indifference toward religion, worldliness and sin? It must be remembered that the New Testament was written hundreds of years before the birth of any denomination—the Catholic Church included? Furthermore, that Jesus had no reference whatsoever to religious bodies as branches, but to his disciples? It is difficult to be charitable to such gross perversion of God’s word. Yet, that is modern denominationalism!

It would be hard to conceive of the mental and spiritual makeup of any man who would suggest or intimate that there is oneness in the religious world today. Yet Dr. Wyle says that “the oneness of the church in all essentials is real and vital.” We wonder just what the Dr. would list by the denominational world today on which there is common accord besides the Catholic Church included? Furthermore, is there a single item taught or practiced by the denominational world today on which there is complete oneness and unity. Thus, in one bold move the Dr. has thrown overboard the entire scheme of redemption and rejected in a wholesale manner the word of God.

May these examples serve to warn us lest we “fall after the same manner of unbelief. Brethren, let us be true to the word of God.
JACKSON’S TEMPLE ARGUMENT

W. CURTIS PORTER

In a recent debate at Rush Springs, Oklahoma, D. N. Jackson, Missionary Baptist, of Texarkana, who was my opponent, made what may be called his “temple argument.” At the time we were discussing the establishment of the church. He was affirming that the church of the Lord was established during his personal ministry. The argument presented the temple of Solomon as a type of the church of the Lord, and the purpose of it was to prove Jesus established his church before he died. A blackboard outline of the argument was used by Jackson. The outline follows:

**Temple**

3. David prepared the material. 1 Chron. 22:1-5.
6. Finished before Solomon died. 2 Chron. 5:1.
7. Law placed in temple. 2 Chron. 5:7-10.
8. 120 trumpeters sounded. 2 Chron. 5:12.
9. Dedicated with blood. 2 Chron. 7:5.
10. Prayer of dedication. 2 Chron. 6:14-42.
11. Fire came down on finished building. 2 Chron. 7:1-3.

**Church**

God ordered church built. John 4:34.
2. Typified by the temple. Heb. 3:5-6.
5. Finished before Jesus died.
7. 120 saints prayed. Acts 1:15.

I had to take down this outline hurriedly, as Jackson kept it covered with papers till he was ready to use it and erased it as soon as the session was over. As a result I failed to get his Scripture reference on points No. 4 and No. 6 on the “church” side. But whatever scripture was used, all will admit that Jesus built the church, according to No. 4, and the point in No. 6 is the point to be proved by the outline. At least I have all the points of the argument as they were made. No elaboration of the argument is necessary as the outline is self-explanatory. The entire argument is for the purpose of proving point No. 6 concerning the church that was established before Jesus died.

For the benefit of any who hereafter may be called upon to meet Jackson’s argument on this, I wish to give some suggestions about it. These will include the answer I made to the argument during the debate and some other things that became apparent on a later look at the outline. I insisted that no chain is stronger than its weakest link and that it would not be necessary to break every link in the chain. But the breaking of one vital link will ruin the whole thing. The chief link in the whole chain is line No. 6. “The temple was finished before Solomon died.” “The church was finished before Jesus died.” In order for the Solomon must be a type of the death of Christ. Certainly the temple was built before Solomon died. But does that prove the church was built before Jesus died? Not unless you can prove the death of Solomon to be a type of the death of Christ. But this parallel is based upon an assumption. Jackson offered no proof whatever that the death of Christ was typified by the death of Solomon, although I insisted him repeatedly to produce it. Jesus died for the church but Solomon did not die for the temple. The parallel breaks down and the argument is ruined. It is true that Solomon did not die before the temple was built, but his death is not typical of the death of Christ; yet the sacrificial lamb that typified the death of Christ was slain before the temple was built. The parallel then would prove the church to be built after Christ, our passover lamb, was slain. And this completely upsets the whole argument.

The principle involved in the argument is this: Whatever occurred concerning the temple before Solomon died must find its parallel concerning the church before Jesus died.” If this is not true, the argument is not worth anything. It insists that the church must be finished before Jesus died because the temple was finished before Solomon died. That same “because” must run throughout the argument, and a number of other things concerning the church must have occurred before Jesus died because parallel things respecting the temple occurred before Solomon died. So let us look at some other points involved.

Consider point No. 5. There was a consecrated priesthood for the temple before Solomon died; and for its parallel there was an ordained ministry for the church before Jesus died. But the text tigen is Lev. 8:1-13. This tells of the consecration of the Aaronic priesthood under the direction of Moses. This was an unfortunate text from Jackson for it not only shows a consecrated priesthood before Solomon died, but the priesthood was consecrated before the temple was ever built, or before the building of it ever began. His cases on No. 6 are therefore not parallel. Furthermore, the priesthood was consecrated more than 400 years before Solomon was born. To get his parallel to work here, the “ordained ministry” for the church would have to exist before Jesus was born. If not why not? If the church had to be finished before Jesus died because the temple was finished before Solomon died why would not the ministry have to be ordained before Jesus was born and the priesthood was consecrated before Solomon was born. So this parallel proves entirely too much for Jackson.

Next, let us examine parallel No. 7. “The law was placed in the temple, and the commission was given to the church.” But 2 Chron. 5:7-10 tells of an incident before Solomon died. Before the death of Solomon the law was placed in the temple. The argument requires that the commission be given to the church before his death. Yet the passage introduced misses the point entirely. The great commission given in Mat. 28:19, which Jackson uses as his proof-text, was not given before the death of Jesus. It was given after his resurrection from the dead. I insisted that Jackson find his commission before the death of Jesus, for the one he introduced was given at the wrong time. The same fault is found in his parallel No. 8. The 120 trumpeters who sounded their trumpets, according to 2 Chron. 5:12, did so before the death of Solomon. This would require its parallel to take place before the death of Jesus, but the parallel given by Jackson did not occur before Jesus died. The praying of the 120 saints, according to Acts 1:15, occurred after the ascension of Jesus to heaven. This ruins another link in his chain of evidence.

Parallel No. 9 is equally faulty. “The temple dedicated with blood—the church dedicated with blood.” But the
TREMBLING AT GOD’S WORD

P. W. STONESTREET

Thus saith Jehovah, Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool: what manner of house will ye build unto me? and what place shall be my rest? For all these things hath my hand made, and so all these things came to be, saith Jehovah: but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and that trembleth at his word.” (Isaiah 66:1, 2.)

Scholars tell us in substance that the original word translated “look,” in the above text, means to have regard for; to esteem worthy of consideration; and that the word translated “trembleth” means to stand in awe of; to have fear concerning. What a gracious and precious promise! Jehovah, whose throne is heaven and whose footstool is the earth, esteems worthy of consideration those who have fear concerning his word. Think of it! What more could be desired?

Since God’s “look” means innumerable blessings, including salvation, but is conditional upon “trembleth at his word,” it behooves us, then, to carefully observe the principle of trembling at God’s word that we may share in its benefits. What is it? It is inseparable from a “poor” and “contrite spirit.” It is not a mere sentiment to be allowed; to be, saith Jehovah: but to this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite spirit, and that trembleth at his word.” (Isaiah 66:1, 2.)

This principle did not change with dispensations, but is binding as long as man is responsible to, and sustains an attitude toward, God’s word. Commands changed with dispensations, according to God’s will, but the principle of trembling at his word remains the same from the beginning. We are given many Old Testament instances of the principle, which it is not necessary to mention particularly, but every case of obedience is one, and every case of disobedience is a warning. They “were written for our learning, that through patience and comfort of the Scriptures we might have hope.” (Romans 15:4)

Under God’s providence, we are thus given an opportunity to profit by the experience of others. A timely statement accredited to Senator Gore, of Oklahoma, is in point here: “Wise men profit by the experience of others; ordinary men profit by their own experience; and fools profit by neither.” That statement is not Scripture but it is scriptural. Both human experience and divine revelation testify to its truth. The Bible anticipates all three of the important distinctions (1 Thes. 2:13.)

Note the word “received” occurs twice in the above text, on which we observe the following scholarly comment: “The Greek for the first ‘received,’ implies simply the hearing of it; the Greek of the second is ‘accepted,’ or ‘welcomed’ it. The proper object of faith, it hence appears, is the word of God, at first oral, then for security against error, written (John 20:30, 31; Romans 15:4; Galatians 4:20).”

(“Commentary on the Bible,” Jamieson, Faussett and Brown.)

True, the “American Standard Version” renders the second “received” of the next “accepted” in harmony with the above comment. Hence, to receive God’s word with more reverence and confidence than the word of men, is to fall short of trembling at God’s word, and consequently, to fall short of God’s esteem (Isaiah 66:2) and the inspired commendation (1 Thes. 2:13). Of course, to accept the word of men, their doctrines and commandments, in religion, in preference to God’s word, is even more lamentable. Yet, Christ anticipates religious people doing this very thing.

came down on a finished building, and the Holy Spirit came down on a finished church.” But-in 2 Chron. 7:1-3 the fire came down on a finished building “before the death of Solomon.” Yet his parallel is not parallel, for the Holy Spirit came down “after Jesus ascended to heaven.” This tears his argument apart.

Other minor faults in the argument might also be shown. The reference given to the “church” side of the argument in Parallel No. 2 points to Moses instead of to Solomon. And a prayer of dedication in No. 10 is not the same as the prayer of intercession. There can be intercession without dedication. Since, according to Jackson’s argument, the law was placed in the temple, the 120 priests sounded, the temple was dedicated with blood, and fire came down on the temple, before the death of Solomon, without proving that their corresponding points concerning the church were done before the death of Christ (for all his references show it otherwise), then why would the completion of the temple before Solomon died prove the church built before the death of Jesus? No man will ever be able to make this temple argument and at the same time answer this question.
QUESTIONS ABOUT BAPTISM

HUGO McCORD

Are you a Christian? Are you sure you are a Christian? The question is not, Are you a good man? Some infidels are good moral men, but not Christian men. The question is not, Are you a praying man? Captain Corneius was so devout he not only prayed always, but taught his family to fear God. Yet he was not a Christian and needed to be told words whereby he might be saved (Acts 11:14). The question is not, have you been sprinkled or immersed? About twelve men had been immersed (Acts 2:4), but they were not Christians. Thus, you may be a good man, or you may be a praying man, or you may even have been buried in baptism, but you still may not be a Christian. What does it take to make a Christian?

Milton Stovall was immersed by a Birmingham Baptist pastor. When Mr. Stovall came to Washington some plain New Testament preaching convinced him he should not wear the Baptist name or any other party name. He immediately made known the fact that he wanted to be baptized. Questions about baptism brought the answer that he was perfectly satisfied he had been baptized scripturally. Then, October 8, 1939, he listened to a sermon from Acts 8 showing the good confession comes before Bible baptism, and that rejoicing comes after. The point was emphasized that denominations do not ask for the good confession, that most of them do not baptize unto the remission of sins. Mr. Stovall then wrote the following letter:

Dear Dr. Stivender:

When I lived in Birmingham I was a member of the Ruhama Baptist Church. When I became a member of that church I did so with the hope of becoming a child of God. However, while there my interest waned and I did not attend church very frequently. Since coming to Washington, however, I have become more interested in religion and have studied the scriptures more than I did then.

In the scriptures I read, (Acts 2:38) “Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins”. The question has come to my mind ‘if that was the purpose of my baptism?’ I have learned that Baptists believe that baptism is to bring one into the church, sins being forgiven as soon as one believes. Baptism being only a formal rite to bring one into the church after sins are forgiven. I would appreciate your telling me which of these was the reason for my baptism.

I am endeavoring to live the Christian life according to the scriptures. I know that when God speaks through His Word, I must obey His command and it is for that purpose that I want to learn if I have been baptized according to the scriptures.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Milton Stovall

The following was soon received:

Dear Milton:

I was glad to get a message from you and to know that you have become more interested in your religious life. May God richly bless you.

Now concerning your baptism. You were baptized according to the scriptures, the same kind of baptism that the New Testament teaches and the same kind of baptism that your father and mother and I had. Do not worry about it. Be sure that your baptism was all right. Baptists believe that we are saved by the grace of God and not by water or any other form, ceremony or work. After we are saved by grace through the exercise of faith in Christ, we are a child of God and would be saved if we were never baptized. However, we must be baptized as an act of obedience and every saved man wants to be baptized. Baptism sets forth in symbolism our death to sin and our resurrection to a new life in Christ. Water has absolutely no power to save.

This is the interpretation of the greatest Bible scholars of Protestantism.

Seek out a Baptist church in Washington and have fellowship with them and do not let those who believe that water saves you disturb your mind. I rejoice that you are interested in the study of the Bible and in your spiritual life. May God continue to bless you.

We shall always be looking forward to seeing you on your visits here. Come to see me every time you are in East Lake.

(Signed) J. C. Stivender

Who had said anything about water saving? Mr. Stovall’s letter had not. He had just quoted a verse of scripture and asked if he had been baptized as that verse taught. Dr. Stivender, instead of answering the question on Acts 2:38, tried to prejudice Mr. Stovall against it by three times talking about water salvation. I suppose nobody in all the calling and the water itself was alive, but it is still necessary “unto the remission of sins” says our God. Water did not save Naaman from leprosy but it was necessary for him to dip himself in the water unto the remission of leprosy. Advice like this would not have helped Naaman: “Naaman, we are saved by the grace of God and not by water or any other form, ceremony or work. Naaman, you will be saved from leprosy if you never dip yourself, although you should dip yourself as an act of obedience, and every saved man (saved of leprosy) wants to go dip himself. This is what a group of men say-real scholars. Do not let those who believe water saves you disturb your mind.”

Note too that Dr. Stivender appeals to Mr. Stovall on sentiment instead of scripture: “Your father and mother and I had your baptism; therefore, do not worry about it.” If Luther had stayed with his mother’s religion we might all be Romanists. Mr. Stovall knew though, fortunately, that his mother’s religion could not save him, knew he must work out his own salvation (Phil. 2:12). He had your baptism; therefore, do not worry. So he brought his clothes to the meetinghouse, made the good confession, and was baptized unto the remission of sins.

HOLY SPIRIT BAPTISM

Is there such a thing as Holy Spirit baptism today? If so, there is nothing any objector can do to stop it, for the Spirit is of God. If there is no such thing as Holy Spirit baptism today, then that fact should be proclaimed from the housetops. Many honest people are taught they must wait for such a baptism before they can be saved. If there is no such thing, they are waiting in vain, they are being fooled, they are wasting valuable time, and they may never find the right way to be saved. Therefore, “to the law and to the testimony” are people baptized in the Spirit today?

That there has been a time when the Holy Spirit baptized people just cannot be doubted. The Good Book tells of two cases, no more and no less: Acts 2 and Acts 10.

1. Men and women today sometimes get down and roll, run from one end of the building to the other shouting and mumbling, and accuse the Spirit of making them act that way. Such did not happen in Acts 2. If today they received a “Pentecostal outpouring” they would act the way people did at Pentecost. “God is not a God of confusion” such an exhibition.

2. Not the audience, but the preachers only, received the baptism of the Spirit. Why, the Spirit had already come, the baptism had taken place, before the audience
heard about it. When the audience assembled, they heard the baptized men speaking in languages they had never learned. They were all amazed and marvelled, "were confounded," "were perplexed, saying one to another, What meaneth this?" In modern Holy Ghost meetings, does the Spirit come only on the preachers?

3. In present day services, preachers exhort people to pray for the baptism of the Spirit. Such was not done at Pentecost.

4. The Pentecostal baptism came before the audience had ever assembled, before the people had gone to church, so to speak. Today?

5. At Pentecost, the Spirit did not go directly to the audience, but to the preachers; then the preachers went to the audience with words: "Hear these words" (vs. 22). Thus, people were acted on by preaching, not by a power from above. Today?

6. At Pentecost, the preachers exhorted people to repent and be baptized in water in order to be saved and to receive the gift of the Spirit (vs. 38) Today? Today preachers exhort sinners to pray for the Spirit, which is not just teaching error: it deludes people keeping them from the right teaching; verse 38.

The only other Bible mention of Holy Ghost baptism is in Acts 10, in Caesarea. Why did the Spirit come?

1. Not to save sinners, for those people were to be saved by words (Acts 11:14) just as were the sinners at Pentecost (Acts 2:22).

2. Not because they were already saved, for Peter had not yet spoken the words whereby they would be saved (11:14); he had only begun (11:15).

3. Why did the Spirit come? To convince the six Jews with Peter that God had accepted Gentiles as worthy of being saved (Acts 10:47-48; I Cor. 14:22).

Holy Spirit Baptism Today?

1. If people are baptized in the Spirit today as in Bible times, they can also talk in tongues as in Bible times. But today nobody can speak any tongue unless he learns it by hard study. Many who claim to speak in tongues cannot even speak their mother tongue without horrible mistakes in grammar. If their every word is guided by the Spirit, as on Pentecost (Acts 2:4), then it follows that the Spirit makes mistakes.

2. If preachers today are Spirit-baptized, they do not need to study, they do not need to think what they are going to say (Matt. 10:19-20). But there is no preacher today who does not have to think what he is going to say. If Spirit-baptized, they do not need a Bible. In view of the days when Spirit-inspired men would be gone, Paul told Evangelist Timothy to study (II Tim. 2:15). And that is just what all preachers have to do today, even those who really think they are inspired from above.

3. If preachers are Spirit-baptized today, they are able to tell of future events (John 16:13), and make no mistakes about them, for the Spirit does not make mistakes.

4. Paul announced in A. D. 60 there was only one baptism. Water or Spirit? (a) There had not yet spoken the words whereby they would be saved by hard study. Many who claim to speak in tongues cannot even speak their mother tongue without horrible mistakes.

(b) The one baptism that was to last "until the end of the world" (Matt. 28:19-20) was a baptism men can perform, as the eleven apostles were told to administer it. No man can administer Spirit baptism: it comes only from Heaven. Hence, the one baptism that was to last "always" could not be Spirit baptism.

In A. D., 30, Pentecost, there were two baptisms: Spirit and Water.

In A. D. 40, Cornelius' house, there were two baptisms: Spirit and Water.

In A. D. 60, there was only one baptism (Eph. 4:4).

---

THE WORM TURNS

(Continued from page 1)

The church as I observe it today is about as black as any other cloud in the sky. We have about as many bench-warmers, nap-takers, money-grabbers, bottle-sniffers, sniff-dippers, vulgar-tonguers, warmers, nap-takers, money-grabbers, bottle-sniffers, as any religious body I know. Furthermore, we have the finest percentage of do-nothings I know.

Now if Jimmie happens to toll an outsider in with a sugar-teat from the Christian Leader and then gives him a big dose of bitterness from the West Coast Christian, he is liable to gag him, or permanently impair his digestion. It would be a decided improvement just to start him off on the Bible Banner. With such a start he would at least endure sound counsel. By the way, the Bible Banner is doing fine, has more than doubled its circulation, is doing some lively stepping throughout the nation and Canada and its effectiveness is both startling and gratifying, depending on your point of view. It hasn't had to drop any copyright, because it didn't start with one, and its policy is clear enough that a seasonal restatement of it is unnecessary.

It doesn't have a president or a governing board to lay down conditions for its doctrinal discussions that would make it impossible for a lot of things that such men as David Lipscomb, J. W. McGarvey, J. A. Harding, J. C. McQuiddy, F. W. Smith, M. C. Kufee, and other noted pioneers of the faith, wrote, to appear in its pages. Subscribe for the Bible Banner. You'll like it. And if you don't like it, it'll do you good "as doth a medicine." We are going forward.

STATEMENT BY C. B. F. YOUNG

(Continued from page 3)

agreement is to illuminate the truth, rather than publicize faults and errors of individuals, the Leader's columns will be kept free from pernicious disputes, and from the products of jealousy and personal rancor.

This policy is by no means tantamount to condemning sin. Error, because the only way to correct error is with God's Word—not with bitter incriminations. Wrong doers, in the church and out of it, must fearlessly be brought to repentance; but church discipline is a thing apart from public life, lying within the province of the eldership.

In the hope that the Leader may enjoy the respect and confidence of people seeking truth and righteousness, it will be in the interest of the body and brotherhood among honest followers of Christ. Doctrinal questions, on which there are disagreements among godly men, may be discussed in the Leader; with two provisions, namely: Both sides of the disputed question must be given equal prominence in the same issue of the magazine; and each writer must confine his writings to what he himself believes, saying nothing about what he may imagine the other brother's convictions to be. To be sure that the latter stipulation is observed, it will be preferable that each writer be allowed to read the other's manuscript before it is cast in type.

Brother E. W. McMillan, editor of the Christian Leader since January, 1939, whom I trust as a godly man who stands firm for the Truth, will continue as editor, having full support of the officers and directors. He has won the deserved respect of his readers and associates in this service. The President and the officers and the brethren have the right to seek counsel from any brother in Christ available to him and will be glad to confer, anywhere, any time, with anybody interested in the spread of the Gospel and the furtherance of Christ's kingdom, on matters in which the Leader's work may be improved.

We earnestly solicit your prayers, your help, your constructive criticism (favorable or unfavorable) and humbly dedicate the best we can do through the Christian Leader to the honor and glory of God.

(Note: It will be observed that the "president" of the Christian Leader does not hesitate to attack others in his starved and impugn their motives, without the mention of their names. His statement is full of insinuations and false implications. But for further comments on the statement read the articles by Cled Wallace and John T. Lewis in this issue.-Editor)
HOW TO IDENTIFY THE CHURCH
OSCAR SMITH

This is an age of religious confusion. In the United States of America, according to reports, there are about two hundred different brands of religion. I do not deserve any credit for being religious; my father and mother before me were religious. But if I were not religiously inclined, I wonder what I would think of modern religion. What does Mr. Average Citizen think of religion? I have tried to put myself in his position, especially each Sunday morning. I have an idea that he sleeps a little late Sunday morning, and when he does decide that it is time to get up, he gets the morning paper, and reads about what Russia and Germany, two arrogant “bullies” have done and are trying to do to some of the smaller nations, and then if he should out of pure curiosity read some religious announcements, he might conclude that the churches are trying to compete with the theaters in entertainment. He might also conclude that if they are all recognized by heaven’s authority, Christianity is not a religion of peace, because there is always war in the religious realm. The divided condition of the religious world, is one of the most fruitful sources of infidelity. However, we should remember that there is on this earth somewhere, a kingdom over which Christ rules as King, and through which he is saving the souls of all who comply with the laws of that kingdom. Hence, to the task of trying to identify the church or kingdom, I invite your attention.

It will be remembered that when God decided to destroy the corrupt nations of the earth and save Noah and his family from the flood, he instructed Noah to “build an ark to the saving of his house,” and gave to him the complete plans and specifications for building the ark. After the Israelites were delivered from Egyptian bondage, God delivered to Moses, their leader, the law of The Ten Commandments. After giving to them the Ten Commandments which contained the conditions upon which they could enter the promised land, Moses was again called to the summit of Mount Sinai, to receive the pattern of the Tabernacle. When that divine system of worship was set up, every department was constructed according to the pattern which God gave to Moses, and every piece of furniture was placed in its position “as the Lord Commanded Moses.” In the last chapter of Exodus beginning with the seventeenth verse, we have an account of the erection of the tabernacle. It is significant that when each piece of furniture was placed in its proper position, the inspired writer says that it was placed “as the Lord commanded Moses.” That system of worship was but a type of the worship under Christ. The apostle Paul speaks as follows: “Who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle: for see, saith he, that thou make all things according to the pattern showed to thee in the mount.” (Heb. 8:5) Thus the church was established according to the divine plan. From time immemorial, the prophets of the Old Testament pointed forward to the time of its establishment, and declared that the “God of heaven would set up a kingdom.” Man therefore had nothing to do with its establishment. And now, for a little while let us forget the conditions of religious society at present, and go back nineteen hundred years to Jerusalem, take our position at the old beginning corner, and find out, if possible what the kingdom of God is, and how men became members of it then. The founder of the church put unchangeable marks upon it, by which it is to be known throughout the ages. Before presenting the cardinal principles of the kingdom of heaven, I will endeavor to show what it is not.

1. It is not a political institution. Since the time of the establishment of the first human government, there have been political institutions. Some of the greatest kingdoms of all the earth were in existence at the time of the Prophets of the Old Testament. Daniel prophesied about six hundred years before Christ. In Daniel 2:31-45, we have some prophecies concerning the most remarkable political occurrences that have ever taken place upon this earth. The rise and fall of four universal empires is vividly described. The four kingdoms are: (1) the golden kingdom or the Babylonish Empire; (2) the Persian or the Silver empire; (3) the Grecian or the Brazen kingdom; and (4) the Roman or the Iron kingdom. In history of course the Golden kingdom yielded to the Silver empire; the Silver empire yielded to the Brazen empire, and the brazen yielded to the Iron kingdom. Now at the conclusion of this prophecy Daniel said: “In the days of these kings (the Caesars) shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.” (Dan. 2:44.) Jesus on trial for his life answered, “My kingdom is not of this world.” (Jno. 18:36.) Hence, it is not a political institution like the Roman government. It was not established by means of the sword: the God of heaven established it, or brought it into existence by Divine power.

2. It is not the Old Covenant. The Old Covenant was in existence at the time of Daniel’s prophecy, and had been for nearly one thousand years. Yet Daniel appeared before Nebuchadnezzar and said “the God of heaven shall set up another kingdom.” Paul in Gal. 4:24 speaks of two covenants, and human wisdom can never make them one. When Paul went to Rome the people said, “We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest: for as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against.” (Acts 28:22.) The Jews were all members of the Old Covenant, born in it. (Gen. 17:5-14.) Yet during the preaching of Paul and the other apostles, the Jews were the bitterest enemies of the church of Christ. If the old and New Covenants are one and the same, there never was a time in the life of Paul when he was not in the covenant of the Lord, for he was a born Jew. Yet while persecuting the church he was the chief of sinners, (I Tim. 1:15) which is a clear indication that the New Covenant is not identical with the Old. Nicodemus was a Jew born in the Old Covenant. To enter the New Covenant, he had to be born again of water and the Spirit. (Jno. 3:3-5) In speaking of the Old Covenant, Inspiration says, “He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.” (Heb. 10:9.) The “first,” the Old Covenant was abolished when Christ died upon the cross. The “second,” the New Covenant began at the time of the coronation of Christ at the right hand of God. On the very day of its inauguration, three thousand members of the Abrahamic covenant left that old system of religion and became members of the New Covenant by faith in Christ, repentance and baptism.

And now let us study some of the distinctive principles of the kingdom of God with the hope that we may be able to positively identify the institution which is so prominently mentioned in the Bible. We should bear in mind that the principles which shall be discussed are not recent discoveries. They are spread over the pages of Inspiration from the beginning of the prophecies until the closing chapters.
of the book of Revelation. They have lived for almost nineteen hundred years, and will live until the angel Gabriel shall announce that time shall be no more. Let us therefore examine them in the light of God's eternal truth, with unprejudiced minds.

1. The Founder of the church was born in Bethlehem of Judah. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell (hades) shall not prevail against it." (Matt. 16:18.) A gate is a passage-way. The Lord says "the gates (plural) shall not prevail against it." The gate of death took him into the "unseen" and the gate of resurrection brought him back from that realm. As Isaiah says (28:18) "Your covenant with death shall be disannulled, and your agreement with hell shall not stand; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, then ye shall be trodden down by it." Notwithstanding the fact Christ was put to death, he came forth from the grave, ascended to heaven, and began to reign at the Father's right hand. Before the church could be established, the "foundation stone had to be tried." It was tried when Christ was nailed to the Roman cross, but on the morning of the third day, the rubbish was cleared away and Christ came forth victorious. Later, as the prophet says, the "tried stone" was placed in Zion. Hear Peter's statement, "This is the stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner." (Acts 4:11.) At Corinth Paul laid the foundation. Hear him, "As a wise masterbuilder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (I Cor. 3:10, 11.) The 21st verse reads, "Therefore let no man glory in men." It is an easy matter to turn to the pages of church history and see where men have founded religious institutions and societies, but none of these can be the church which was founded by the Son of God. His church began a long time ago, and was brought into existence by creative power.

2. The church of our Lord began in Jerusalem. "And it shall come to pass in the last days, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." (Isa. 2:2, 3.) This prophecy was made at least seven hundred and fifty years before the advent of the Messiah. Just before he returned to his father he commanded the apostles to wait in Jerusalem for the power to come from on high. (Lk. 24:49.) This agrees with the prophecy of Zecharias, "Therefore thus saith the Lord; I am returned to Jerusalem with mercies: my house shall be built in it, saith the Lord of hosts, and a line shall be stretched forth upon Jerusalem." (Zech. 1:16.) The redemption in Zion is spoken of in the same connection as follows, "Sigh and rejoice, 0 daughter of Zion: for, lo, I come, and I will dwell in the midst of thee, saith the Lord. And many nations shall be joined to the Lord in that day, and shall be my people: and I will dwell in the midst of thee, and thou shalt know that the Lord of hosts hath sent me unto thee. And the Lord shall inherit Judah his portion in the holy land, and shall choose Jerusalem again." (Zech. 2:10-12.) Paul says, "Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all." (Gal. 4:26) An institution which began at any other place is not the church of the Lord. Societies have sprung up in Oxford, London, Scotland, Germany, Geneva and Rome; but these cannot be the church which was founded by the Lord. His kingdom began at Jerusalem. We must go back of Geneva, we must even go beyond Rome; we must go up to Jerusalem and the chosen twelve, in the year A. D. 33.

3. The organic law of the kingdom of God is the New Covenant, dedicated with the blood of the Son of God and signed by the name of Jehovah. We hear about the church in the time of Abraham, in the time of Abel in the time of John the Baptist; but the church of the Lord could not have existed before the New Covenant became binding. "And for this cause he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth." (Heb. 9:15-17.) Thus we find that if the church existed prior to the death of Christ, it existed before the organic law became binding.

The organic law of the United States is the constitution. Any law that is passed in this country, must harmonize with the Constitution, or it will be declared unconstitutional by the supreme court. Any country with any other organic law for its constitution, is not the United States of America. The Bible and the Bible alone is the guide of the citizen of the kingdom of heaven. Any religious body with any other organic law in the form of so many articles of religion, or Catechism, or Manual, or confession of faith, cannot be the New Testament church. When Paul gave instructions to the young evangelist Timothy he declared that the scriptures given by inspiration will make the man of God perfect and thoroughly furnish him unto every good work. (2 Tim. 3:16, 17.)

The question might be asked, what are the objections to man-made creeds? The logical answer is, they have to be revised too often. To illustrate what I mean, a few years ago, one could read in most of the creeds "that all men are conceived and born in sin." Today, that article has been either dropped or changed till it teaches the very opposite. There has never been a time in the history of the kingdom of God when men could sit in convention and pass laws by heaven's authority, governing the activities of the church. The church is not a Democracy, but it is a Kingdom. All the authority-judicial, legislative and executive is vested in the King. Let us suppose that we call a convention next week for the purpose of passing on matters of vital interest to the citizens of the kingdom of God. And let us suppose further that a delegate arises in said convention with a serious expression on his face and speaks as follows: Brethren, I have been preaching for a number of years on the question of repentance. Ordinarily, I do not succeed in getting sinners to repent. I therefore move that inasmuch as people pay little or no attention to preaching on the subject of repentance, abolith from our creed the doctrine of repentance.
SIGHTING-IN SHOTS

CLED E. WALLACE

The Federal Council Bulletin takes an “editorial outlook” on “our unity in Christ.” The Bulletin is Pollyannaish in keeping its editorial eyes wide open to the good in all parties and holding them tight shut to the fact that serious doctrinal differences exist which make real unity impossible as long as such conflicting doctrines are maintained. It is evident that “The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America” classifies doctrinal and administrative differences among the churches as diverting hobbies that should in no way interfere with “interchurch cooperation.” If party tenets are really no more vital than that, they could easily be surrendered for the sake of unity, a state which all seem to agree is desirable. One trouble seems to be that the Federal Council has swung to an opposite extreme which cancels out the divine admonition to “contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered to the saints.” Their scheme of unity is itself a perversion of the gospel, a blind disregard for the fundamentals of true unity laid down by the Lord and his chosen apostles. The early disciplines “continued steadfastly in the apostles’ teaching.” A basic cause of all parties in religion is, a departure from this teaching. The one point that stands out prominently is that the sort of unity the Federal Council is, preaching would not be a restoration of the New Testament church in origin, doctrine or practice. Anything short of such a restoration cannot be a satisfactory demonstration of them who know, believe, and practice New Testament teaching.

The Bulletin lifts up its editorial eyes and sings a paean of praise “for the gifts and graces of each great division of Christendom.” It begins by blessing the holy name of the Lord “for the Roman, Catholic Church; its glorious traditions; its disciplines in holiness; its worship, rich with the religious passion of the centuries; its noble company of martyrs, doctors and saints.” It would be interesting to have the Bulletin tell us if there is any such a thing as perversion of the gospel and point out a modern example of it. The New Testament speaks of some who “went out from us because they were not of us.” As the Bulletin sees it, none can go out from us for any such reason, because all, even the Catholics, are of us. Such tolerance would make Jesus appear dogmatic and narrow in his denunciation of the Pharisees for making void the word of God by their traditions. If the Catholics have not done that, it cannot be done. We wonder what sort of an editorial the angelic Pollyannas of the Federal Council could write on this text: “Then came the disciples, and said unto him, Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, when they heard this saying? But he answered and said, Every plant which my heavenly Father planted not, shall be rooted up. Knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, when they heard this saying? But he answered and said, Every plant which my heavenly Father planted not, shall be rooted up.” (Matt. 15:12-14)

“Hermes.” This saying was a condemnation of the “traditions” of the elders which they considered “glorious” and were in fact far less offensive than the “glorious traditions” of the Roman Catholic Church, which the Bulletin blesses the holy name of the Lord for. Such froth in the name of unity is nauseating, if not mildly blasphemous, when blown in the face of well-informed defenders of the faith.

“For the great Protestant Communions” the Bulletin also blesses the name of the Lord. It selects and eulogizes certain beliefs and points of emphasis which are supposed to be leading characteristics of various parties, and blesses the name of the Lord that these parties exist to hold out the light, each in its own peculiar fashion. Greek Catholics, Anglicans, Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians, Lutherans, in fact everything from Romans to Quakers, is liberally soused with the ointment of praise. This is unity with a vengeance! The only thing that seems to be ignored or overlooked is the New Testament order of things, and being a charitable somebody myself, I’m venturing the guess that the Federal Council Bulletin doesn’t even know what that is. If it does know and doesn’t care that is even worse.

The need is obvious that we keep hammering away on a few of the simple facts of the case. That all religious parties demonstrate some excellencies in both teaching and practice is freely recognized and admitted. The point is that these are not distinctive, exclusively held, by them. The truths and practices of all denominations, were true and practical before there were any of the denominations. True unity demands that believers in Christ believe and practice what is true and right without being partisans. The New Testament church, the body of Christ, exhibited every excellence that the Council Bulletin can point out in any religious party, before these parties ever came into existence. It is enough to be a Christian and follow the teaching of the New Testament and not be anything in religion of a partisan character anywhere along the denominational setup from a Roman Catholic to a Quaker.” Since all admit as much why shouldn’t all act as much? We are for the church and the faith and against all schisms and party doctrines. The Federal Council’s “Interchurch Cooperation” is too flimsy a compromise to even be mistaken for the unity Christ prayed for and the apostles preached. We will have none of it even if we have to be as lonesome as Elijah was in the days of Ahab.

Big headlines in the Dallas News broadcast the breaking of a “precedent” by a Methodist church in Dallas. So many people are demanding immersion that the pastor has prevailed in having a “five hundred gallon baptism” installed for their convenience. This is “going some” for the Methodists. The following statement is attributed to the pastor:

As long as Methodism believes that there is any scriptural foundation for immersion, we expect to practice it with the due decorum in our own church. While we are persuaded that the better method is by affusion, there is undoubtedly room for belief in immersion as an accepted mode of Christian baptism.

The “scriptural foundation for immersion” as baptism, not a mode of it, is found in the word itself which means to dip, and in such circumstances as coming to water, going down into it, coming up out of it, being buried in it etc. Not a word or a circumstance suggest affusion and the pastor didn’t take the trouble to tell how he was “persuaded that the better method is by affusion.” If he will briefly state his grounds for such a persuasion we will publish it. If he will tell the Dallas News and have them print it as they did his assertion, we will copy it. If immersion and affusion are modes of baptism, maybe he will be willing to tell us what baptism is. We will accept nothing short of plain scriptural authority on the point. We also suggest that if all Methodist churches universally practiced immersion and that exclusively it would not make them “churches of Christ” such as we read about in the New Testament. The Methodist church is too narrow in the middle and too short at both ends for a man to make a journey as far back as the New Testament and still stay in it. A man can be a Christian, a full-sized Christian, and not be a Methodist or anything of the kind. We have a point here.