SIGHTING-IN-SHOTS

CLED E. WALLACE

"beautiful and scriptural" even though the Scriptures do not authorize it, while theirs is shocking and unscriptural because the Scriptures do not authorize it. It is in order to spoil a few tears over the "restoration Movement." The baby sprinklers should be profoundly impressed by this strict loyalty to the Scriptures "we disciples" exhibit in refusing to "baptize" babies.

H. G. Elsam, who wrote this defense of infant dedication in the churches may not amount to so many. I never heard of him before, but if he is not named among the prophets, he should be recognized as a typical digressive logician. His is the sort of logic employed in defense of all digressive innovations which have compromized the doctrine and corrupted the worship during "the seventy years" Brother Murch says it has taken to crystallize the division he and Brother Witty are talking and praying over. I suggest that they stop praying long enough to look into the logic of the situation. Even if this precipitated some debating, it would be a welcome change.

The importance of baptism should be magnified over and over by our preachers.

(Amien, brother editor! Such preaching should return. Baptism teaches a great truth in a most dramatic and convincing manner. (Baptist and Reflector)

These Baptist editors are lamenting the fact that Baptist preachers are not preaching "on the ordinance of baptism" like they did "fifty years ago." We are made to wonder why Baptist preachers should preach on it at all, or ever did as a matter of enough importance to "be magnified over and over." At best they magnify it out of one corner of their mouths while they minimize it out of the other corner. They talk through two spouts and the water of life flows through neither on the subject. Baptist baptism even according to them has no more to do with salvation than Methodist sprinkling has. It would be interesting to hear a Baptist explain in detail any real advantage either here or hereafter he enjoys over a Methodist who has never been baptized. He admits that a Methodist is saved by faith before and without baptism, even as the Baptist is, and cannot be lost even if he is never baptized. Baptist baptism would give him membership in the Baptist church and a right to close communion at a Baptist table, but Methodists seem to be satisfied with the assurance that they can be Christians and go to heaven without such "means of grace" and do not seem to sense the loss of such advantages. We can't blame them much at that. As (Continued On Page 20)
Campaigning In California

On the 9th of May the editor and family left Oklahoma City enroute to Los Angeles, California, for a series of gospel meetings covering the most of the summer months. The first of these meetings was held with the Central Church in Los Angeles. This meeting embraced a month of Sundays, from the second Sunday in May through the first Sunday in June. The second meeting was held at Riverside, and covered three Sundays. In an interval between the two meetings, a valley-wide service was held at Van Nuys, where I was asked to attend to the Seventh Day Adventists in reply to Mr. Knox, who is quite conspicuous in these parts. Mr. Knox refused to be present, but we attended to him anyway. The third meeting is at Santa Ana, and it is now in full swing and going strong. Both congregations there are participating in the very finest way. Between the Riverside and Santa Ana meeting we went North to San Francisco. Engagements were filled with the churches at Tulare, Fresno, Modesto and San Francisco. These services were attended by brethren over a wide area and represented many congregations. My heart was made to feel good at the cordial reception in these quarters. It is evident that much good was done in the one-night services at each place, and numerous invitations for engagements for meetings were extended.

The Bible Banner received a good welcome also and at each place a sizeable subscription list was formed. Most of the families in each of the congregations visited subscribed to the Bible Banner. My opinion is that the Bible Banner will have a larger subscription in Los Angeles and vicinity than all of the other papers put together.

The Long Beach meeting ‘will be, held following the meeting at Santa Ana, and will bring the series of engagements to a close. It has been a delight to our souls to be reunited with hundreds of friends of former years and to form new friendships true and enduring. It is conceded by all that the meeting with the Central Church was more successful from every standpoint. People have never treated the meeting with the Central Church (we have the proof), and to destroy it after it began, the meeting was a success from every standpoint. People have never treated us more royally, nor received preaching with more enthusiasm and interest.

The anonymous document referred to above was mailed in Los Angeles, but was evidently sent there to be mailed. There is enough evidence in my possession to prove that Clinton Davidson is back of these anonymous circulars. The brother (I started to say the gentleman) could be given plenty of trouble with “eminent legal counsel,” and who threaten to “sue the sox off” of editors, should not throw fits when they receive a letter on legal stationery. Yet Clinton Davidson himself has had more to say about Nolan Queen’s letter to Benson than anybody else. These fellows should learn to behave themselves and quit trying to slander every man in the brotherhood who opposes their schemes to control the churches of Christ. We are set for the defense of the gospel. If I wanted to sue somebody, Clinton Davidson would be an available subject to start on, but his dollar bills are but filthy rags and I wouldn’t decorate a scarecrow in a peanut patch with a pair of his silk sox.

Perhaps Davidson thought that by circulating the editorial from the Bible Banner anonymously in Los Angeles he could offend all of Jimmie Lovell’s friends and destroy the Los Angeles meeting. Perhaps, he also thought that when anonymity raised its serpentine head right at my feet in California, it would “scare” the sox off of me and render me impotent. He missed it on both counts. Jimmie Love11 is a joke in Los Angeles. The crowds were larger the last week of the meeting than at any other period of it. As for the article-It was written to be read, and circulating it in mass production only served to give it currency. A lot of subscriptions to the Bible Banner were received as a result of it. Thanks to its anonymous circulator. But these men cannot conceal their identity by anonymity. ‘We know who they are and can give their names and initials any time.

Despite the efforts of Jimmie Love11 and others to prevent the meeting with the Central Church (we have the proof), and to destroy it after it began, the meeting was a success from every standpoint. People have never treated us more royally, nor received preaching with more enthusiasm and interest.
**JUNE 1940**

**THE BIBLE BANNER**

**Doctor Jesse P. Sewell, D. D.**

The official organ of the United Texas Drys is named The Crusader. It is published from Dallas, Texas, Bishop H. A. Boaz, of the Methodist Conference, is president. On the masthead appear the names also of the vice presidents, five in number, and among them is listed "Jesse P. Sewell, D. D." Now that is something. D. D. means "Doctor of Divinity." Where did Brother Sewell get his "Doctor of Divinity?" Does he know that he is so listed? Does he take the paper of the organization of which he is "Vice President?" This "Doctor" business is going rather far among gospel preachers. Out at George Pepperdine College I heard more "Doctor" than "Brother." When "Doctor Pullias," was introduced to me, I replied, "You call him Doctor and I'll call him Brother." Jesus said, "They love to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi." Verily.

A Doctor of Divinity in the church of Christ is a misfit. In a letter to Brother C. A. Norred, which was published in the Bible Banner, Brother Sewell grew very defiant and dared and defied anybody to show where he had ever been unsound on anything at any time. His dare was called and it was pointed out that he is responsible for introducing about all of the Bollites we have in Texas and Oklahoma, through Abilene Christian College. All one needs to do is to check the record. It could have been mentioned at the same time that several years ago Brother Sewell did the preaching in a union meeting with the Christian Church at Waxahachie, in which the digressive preacher and his congregation had a leading part, and the digressive pastor had charge of the introductory services! That is real certified soundness! Nobody could even dare to question the soundness of a union meeting-with the digressives! Now, on the masthead of the official organ of the United Texas Drys, appears the name of "Jesse P. Sewell, D. D." as a Vice President. So Brother Sewell is somebody's Doctor of Divinity. Is this sound? The Doctors that are among us are going to give the church trouble. You may deny it; but mark it, and remember it.

**Fiascos And Fizzles**

Recently "Doctor G. C. Brewer, LL. D." (from Harding College) waxed warm over the fact that a digressive preacher named J. J. Walker had turned his Memphis congregation (a digressive church) to outright modernism and open membership even to the point of sprinkling babies. Brother Brewer was simply astounded, whereas the most of us knew such as that has been going on a long time. Where has Brother Brewer been? The digressives have been taking sprinkled adults into their open membership churches for years-why act surprised when they take a sprinkled baby into their fold? What's the difference?

But Doctor LL. D. Brewer rushed into the Gospel Advocate, all in a sweat, hot and bothered, and tried to throw a sensation into the staid columns of the now very tame Gospel Advocate. The Gospel Advocate will publish a sensation into the staid columns of the now very tame Gospel Advocate. The Gospel Advocate will publish a sensation on something like that but they won't publish the introduction! That is real certified unsoundness! No one dared and defied anybody to show where he had ever been unsound on anything at any time. His dare was called and it was pointed out that he is responsible for introducing about all of the Bollites we have in Texas and Oklahoma, through Abilene Christian College. All one needs to do is to check the record. It could have been mentioned at the same time that several years ago Brother Sewell did the preaching in a union meeting with the Christian Church at Waxahachie, in which the digressive preacher and his congregation had a leading part, and the digressive pastor had charge of the introductory services! That is real certified soundness! Nobody could even dare to question the soundness of a union meeting-with the digressives! Now, on the masthead of the official organ of the United Texas Drys, appears the name of "Jesse P. Sewell, D. D." as a Vice President. So Brother Sewell is somebody's Doctor of Divinity. Is this sound? The Doctors that are among us are going to give the church trouble. You may deny it; but mark it, and remember it.

Doctor Brewer dashed off some sensational spasms on "The J. J. Walker Fiasco" and challenged Walker to a calisthenic duel in Memphis on a bulky, unwieldy, and unscriptural proposition on the Restoration movement. He wants to affirm that J. J. Walker's church has left the Restoration Movement! As though all of the Christian churches had not done something worse-namely, left the New Testament! Of all the weak things for a supposedly strong gospel preacher to pull, this caps the climax.

When Doctor Brewer challenged Walker to this debate in Memphis, he had not consulted the Memphis church. The church had not invited the debate, nor had they invited G. C. Brewer to hold it. But Brewer is bigger than the church, according to his intimations, and so he was to become the independent custodian of the great Restoration Movement in the South, and called for the elect all over Arkansas, Tennessee, Mississippi, Kentucky, Missouri, and Louisiana, and even in Texas, to rally. Such a splash!

It comes through the news sieve now that A. Hugh Clark, preacher for the Union Avenue Church, Memphis, called Brewer's hand for inviting himself to hold a debate in Memphis without the indorsement of the church in Memphis. G. C. Brewer has been heard to pan J. D. Tant, with the usual Brewer grunt and grouch, for inviting himself to debate the Baptists in places where the church had not invited the debate and did not want it. Now he has done that which he erstwhile denounced.

If the J. J. Walker episode in Memphis was a fiasco, as Brewer called it, the Brewer challenge was a fizzle, according to the word that the brethren did not want a Brewer-Walker debate in Memphis.

Speaking of Walker, Brother Brewer says: "Walker never won any medals on his modesty, we opine." That is a hot remark for G. C. Brewer to make. Go back and read the article that he recently wrote in the Gospel Advocate about himself, which was printed in the Bible Banner with remarks by Cled Wallace, note the one hundred and fifty-five personal pronouns he used in talking about himself in that article, then ask Brother Brewer if he has ever been decorated for modesty! Anyhow, a man who appoints himself for an auditorium debate in a city where there are several strong churches, uninvited, should not talk on the subject of modesty. Verily, the legs of the lame are not equal! Brother Brewer reminds us all of the old preacher who was once asked who the most scholarly man in the brotherhood was, and he replied, "Modesty forbids me to say!"

**Jimmie Lovell's Code Of Honor**

Soldier killed by own troops. Have no worry about that in this paper. If you write me a personal letter and ask me not to publish it, I'll not shoot you in the back by making it public. I have some honor even if I do not know the newspaper "game."

The above paragraph appeared in the West Coast Christian, Jimmie Lovell's "West Coast Comic," with a printed prayer (as though the Lord takes his paper) asking God to forgive those who were persecuting him. Poor Jimmie, he is being persecuted! Has anybody been writing anonymous letters about you, Brother Jimmie? Maybe you had better dig into your files and reread a lot of the letters you have been writing over the country about other men. To refresh your memory, dig up the one you wrote Brother Cled trying to convince him that his brother Foy had falsified about the interview Hugo McCord had with Clinton Davidson. In this interview Davidson told McCord that he could worship where instrumental music was used and had not sinned in doing so for twenty years. Believing Brother Cled should know that, while he was in California last winter, I wrote him and relayed the information. Brother Cled in turn repeated it to you, Jimmie Lovell. You then sent Hugo McCord a telegram and asked him what he said. Meanwhile Brother Cled had gone home. Later you sent him an airmail letter in which you garbled the telegram from Hugo McCord, withholding the very part that sustained what I had told Cled. And you did this, Jimmie, to convict me of falsehood! Of course, you did not know that I was in Austin, Texas, visiting Cled, and was right in his home when the postman delivered your letter. When Brother Cled showed me your letter I simply reached for my hand bag 'and produced the letter from Hugo McCord. We did not believe that Hugo McCord had sent you a tele-
I am not taking objections just because I love Brother Brewer. I do not, because I know you are doing more harm to the church than you are doing good; and as for the Gospel Advocate, you stand right between the program it is trying to put over and the goals of policy. This policy looks good in writing, but it fits the Christians who take the Advocate just about like the one sin a man has, causing him to be guilty of all.

In case you wish, I would advise me just what good your attack on Brewer about his talk “has done.” Tell me if you believe it was what God expected you to do. Tell me if you desire that the full text of the telegrams be corrected, of telling thousands about it in the Advocate accomplished your purpose. Tell me if Brother Hinds reads these articles before they were printed and approved them. If he did, I have my opinion of his judgment and policy. However, I have an idea that your articles are entered without approval or objection, since they feel like pleasing you rather than hurting your feelings. Then the Lord would rather see your feelings hurt a bit.

That same old sin of yours is still burning, and you are still gurning for Brewer and Hall; and the way I feel about it is that you would like to rush the m-m to earth if you could do it and get away with it. But you know you cannot do it: therefore, you pacify your longings by taking these dirty digs at them every opportunity you get. The people in Nashville who never would have known Brewer was in the city had not the “preacher promoter” gone and asked them to allow Brewer to make his talk. Anyhow, Brother Srygley, I suppose that people in Nashville know Hall and Brewer than know Srygley; and, after all, to know God is to know his faithful preachers. Better take a good look at yourself, dear brother, else the Lord will have some things to talk to you about in that last day, which is not going to be very far off for any of us. Your good articles are gems, and I love them; but I hate the kind that hurts the church and is killing the Advocate.

This is a personal letter—not for publication in any manner. You have written, and your writings have caused me to think. I am writing, and I hope this will cause you to think. Both of us want to go to heaven, and I pray that both of us shall.

Your brother in the Lord,

James L. Lovell

---

BROTHER LOVELL GETS MAD

W. E. BRIGHTWELL

Some days ago F. B. Srygley handed me a letter from James L. Lovell, of Denver, Colo., with the observation, that he did not care to reply to it either publicly or privately. The letter is dated February 1, but arrived in this office on February 8, the day of Sister Srygley’s death. Receiving a copy of the telegram, the Gospel Advocate, withheld the letter from Brother Srygley for several days. Brother Lovell could not anticipate the untimeliness of its arrival, but the readers may judge as to whether or not the letter itself is timely. There is no time for an untimely message.

I can understand why, in his state of mind, with more correspondence of a pleasant nature than he will ever be able to answer, Brother Srygley would not be disposed to notice this personal attack, especially since the state of Brother Lovell’s mind does not indicate that it would prove profitable.

Brother Lovell is very active in religious work as a member of the church. For several years he has published, at his own expense, mimeographed church papers. Since returning to Denver, Colo., his publication is called the Colorado Christian. He travels extensively in the United States. He has a zeal that is truly commendable, but this letter reveals a remarkable lack of control. In fact, his zeal has run away with him and overpowered the apperceive of his judgment.

The letter follows:

Dear Brother Srvelev:

If you have-the” attitude of a Christian, I am certainly in the same mood. The articles which you write are pleasing and helpful to the Lord, I will have to admit that I do not know what he wants, just one article like the one, “Fighting for Americanism,” gives me aid to Satan winning my soul, rather than the total temptations which I encounter yearly. Frankly, this article “makes me mad,” and it’s already -after sundown; so just how long I can go on in this way and be pleasing to Him, I do not know.

I am not taking objections just because I love Brother Brewer. I do not, because I know you are doing more harm to the church than you are doing good; and as for the Gospel Advocate, you stand right between the program it is trying to put over and the goals of policy. This policy looks good in writing, but it fits the Christians who take the Advocate just about like the one sin a man has, causing him to be guilty of all.

In case you wish, I would advise me just what good your attack on Brewer about his talk “has done.” Tell me if you believe it was what God expected you to do. Tell me if you desire that the full text of the telegrams be corrected, of telling thousands about it in the Advocate accomplished your purpose. Tell me if Brother Hinds reads these articles before they were printed and approved them. If he did, I have my opinion of his judgment and policy. However, I have an idea that your articles are entered without approval or objection, since they feel like pleasing you rather than hurting your feelings. Then the Lord would rather see your feelings hurt a bit.

That same old sin of yours is still burning, and you are still gurning for Brewer and Hall; and the way I feel about it is that you would like to rush the m-m to earth if you could do it and get away with it. But you know you cannot do it: therefore, you pacify your longings by taking these dirty digs at them every opportunity you get. The people in Nashville who never would have known Brewer was in the city had not the “preacher promoter” gone and asked them to allow Brewer to make his talk. Anyhow, Brother Srygley, I suppose that people in Nashville know Hall and Brewer than know Srygley; and, after all, to know God is to know his faithful preachers. Better take a good look at yourself, dear brother, else the Lord will have some things to talk to you about in that last day, which is not going to be very far off for any of us. Your good articles are gems, and I love them; but I hate the kind that hurts the church and is killing the Advocate.

This is a personal letter—not for publication in any manner. You have written, and your writings have caused me to think. I am writing, and I hope this will cause you to think. Both of us want to go to heaven, and I pray that both of us shall.

Your brother in the Lord,

James L. Lovell
Is he wiser than those whom he would defend? And is he
calmer?
If his strictures are just and right, what particular ob-
jection can he have to their being made known? If they are
acted upon to learn the truth. Obviously this could not be ac-
complished by anything Brother Srygley might have said in
reply. It is not my aim to defend Brother Srygley-his life
speaks for him; nor to rebuke Brother Lovell-his letter
speaks for itself!
But it is really sad that one who has labored so long and
effectively, baptizing so many thousands, starting so
many churches, defending the truth in so many debates, and
writing letters that they do not want published, or do not
know how many of their letters have been sent to me-al-
though they sign their names to, are no criterion of honor. They should
clearly right to publish it. These men who are all the time
be harassed with letters displaying so little knowledge of, and
sympathy with, his lifework.
It is a splendid rule in writing-even in private corre-
spondence-to be sure of our facts; and if we happen to be
"mad" when we write, it is wise to hold the letter a few
days, months, or years-long enough to regain a sober, in-
telligent judgment. Most of us are short enough on judg-
ment when we know we are mad.
We hate to have to expose Jimmie Lovell in this way
but he has forced us to do it. Brother Brightwell's article
is praiseworthy. The most impudent thing I ever saw in
print is this letter from a squirt like Jimmie to a
grand old man like F. B. Srygley. Nor was it any violation
of honor or ethics for his letter to be published. It was
clearly right to publish it. These men who are all the time
writing letters that they do not want published, or do not
sign their names to, are no criterion of honor. They should
be made manifest. Let their deeds, and their letters, be
known and they will stop doing and writing them. They
have written letters about the editor of the Bible Ban-
er (yes, me) all over the brotherhood, but they often write
to the wrong men and their letters are sent to me. It might
be interesting to Clinton Davidson and Jimmie Lovell
to know how many of their letters have been sent to me-al-
most the full edition of everything both of them ever wrote
about me. And they boast of their ethics and praise their
own honor! Jimmie says he will "not shoot you in the
back," but it is known that when Cled was in Los An-
geles, Jimmie made love to him to his face but stabbed
him in the back to others. We do our fighting in the open,
they do theirs in the dark.
We are simply feeding Jimmie Lovell and Clinton Da-
vision who are Siamese twins in the Christian Leader-
Davidson Movement) out of their own spoons. If they do
not like it, let them change the spoons.

E. L. Jorgenson's "Suppose"

On the back page of the Word and Work, the Boll and
Jorgenson paper, E. L. Jorgenson gives the readers "a
song book story" with application to Great Songs Of The
Church, his premillennial song book, and himself, the mil-
ennial publisher of both the Word and Work and the song-
book. The songbook is supposedly published by Great Songs Press but E. L. Jorgenson is Great Songs Press, and
E. L. Jorgenson is publisher of Word and Work. When he
claims that no profit from the songbook accrues to Word
and Work, that is an academic question. Brother McQuid-
dy says that the Gospel Advocate does not show a profit,
but we know that McQuiddy Printing Company does make
money on the Gospel Advocate and its auxiliaries, the quar-
terlies, the books, and numerous other sources of Gospel
Advocate revenue. That is all right, in a way-if the way
is right. But it is not all right to deny it, as Jorgenson
does. It is purely a ledger proposition as to which pocket
the money is in-Jorgenson has two pockets, just as Broth-
er McQuiddy has. If the Gospel Advocate does not "show
profit, the money is in the McQuiddy Printing Company
pocket (which is one of McQuiddy's pockets, you see). So
Jorgenson is Doctor Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. If Doctor Jekyll
makes no profit, Mr. Hyde has the money in his pocket, and
if Mr. Hyde is broke, it is because Doctor Jekyll has charged
him too much-but Jorgenson is both of them, you see,
and in either case he has the money, for the pockets are both
in his pants.
So brethren, don't let the argument deceive you. When
you buy Great Songs Of The Church, you are furnishing the
Louisville party, headed by Jorgenson and Boll and 
Janes
the money to run their machinery to divide the churches.
Brethren's ought not to do.

The Jorgenson's "Suppose" article, on the back cover of
his magazine, supposes eleven different things-all of
which mean that he is supposed to have the one and only
perfect songbook on the green earth! And one would have
to be plenty green to believe it. He says his book is "fit
to hand to the King of England" but who is he? It still
might be very unfit for churches of Christ.
Among other "supposes" Jorgenson indicates that he
wants us to suppose that Great Songs of the Church made
less than $10.00 profit last year. That, of course, is purely
a ledger matter, salaries, the percent his sectarian affili-
ations received, his own income, and Great Songs Press, etc.
He gets 65 cents each for his books, and if he made less
than $10.00 profit, where is his business? A Jew said to a
Universalist preacher who was preaching that there
is no hell: "Well, Mister preacher, if there is no hell, please
tell me, where is my business?" We wonder where Jorgen-
son's song book business "has went."
He concludes: "And finally suppose-but why not send
for a returnable sample..." It looks like all the returnable
samples were returned, or else it may be—"finally supposed" that
the Bible Banner got in after his premillennial song-
book and reduced his sales to such an extent that he made
only $9.00 profit. An honest confession (though accidental)
is good for the soul. The Bible Banner is doing even better
than we thought it was! Praise the Lord.

A Faction Gets Recognition

Mention was made in a former issue of the Bible Ban-
er of a faction that was seeking recognition. Well, they
got it. In a recent Gospel Advocate Brother C. M. Pullias,
reports his meeting with a church in McAlester, Okla.,
known by informed brethren to be a factious church that
occupies a fine piece of property by seizure. Over the sig-
nature of such men as R. L. Whiteside and C. R. Nichol,
who know intimately and in detail the status of the whole
thing, the actual truth was published. Some strong gospel
preachers have, because of that condition, refused to recog-
nize that set-up until correction of their extremely bad
deeds has been scripturally made.
In Brother Pullias' report of the meeting he talked
about the personal qualities of some of the leaders of the
factious church and said they were held in respect by the
town. Morally and from all worldly standpoints that can be
true. But the same could be said of any digressive church
a week after they had divided a church of Christ with their
inovations. The town would probably act like they respect-
more for doing it, because it always pleases most
any town for anybody within or without a church of Christ
to divide it.

What Brother Pullias said about the men in the fac-
tious congregation at McAlester can be said of the per-
sonnel of most any digressive church, and it does not touch
the issue at all. The group that he calls the church in Mc-
Alester seized the property from the elders by sit-down
methods, had their schemes cut and dried, occupied the house early on Sunday and blocked the elders from taking charge of the services. They were following legal advice in their movements—certainly not the New Testament. The people who furnished most of the money to purchase the house went away rather than engage in a physical fray. The elders afterward sought duress in court. The "majority rule" plea was made to the court by lawyer Allen D. Dubney, of Eastland, Texas, who belongs to the church and ought to know better. The judge (who belongs to the Baptist church) said "no jurisdiction" and returned it to the original status, for the majority to hold or lose on the basis of the "survival of the fittest." The elders, and numbers of older members of the church, let the sit-down strikers have it, and are suffering "ill-treatment with the people of God."

And now Brother Pullias aids such an element by holding their meeting and bragging on them in the paper. Brother Pullias has held meetings for such an element in Lewisburg, Tennessee, who led by a preacher, voted the elders out by public ballot, even passing ballots and pencils over a crowd that looked more like a mob than a church of Christ. But he once lived there, and said that he thought he could get the wrongs righted. I knew also that there had been similar tendencies in other congregations where Brother Pullias has preached, but always attributed it to unfortunate conditions. But it now looks like Brother Pullias has deliberately favored these elements. It is lamentable that the influence of C. M. Pullias should be on the wrong side of such an issue and I am truly sorry. He and other leaders who have lately aided this sit-down faction in McAlester could have done something for the Cause by refusing to have anything to do with it until their wrongs were righted. Such a stand by all gospel preachers would bring these and other factionists like them to their senses.

Brethren Whiteside and Nichol said that if they were passing through McAlester on Sunday morning and there was no other congregation there than the one that now holds the house, they would drive on to the next town to worship. That should cause some to think, who apparently have assumed an indifferent attitude in the matter.

These lines are not written to vindicate some and vilify others, but for the sake of the New Testament Church. If the church that now holds the property in McAlester is a New Testament church then I simply do not know the New Testament. If they are right, the digressives are right.

Brother Pullias announces that he expects to return for ly every one in town. Your salary has been four dollars and you preach a few sermons on the establishment of the Church and a few on "brotherly love," and just slowly, but surely, lead up to our duty in the Church, etc. You get up some morning feeling great, and you begin preaching on dancing, bridge, beer guzzling and such like and daughter begins to look around at mama, papa looks at his buddy, I mean the one who nods his approval to whatever days in heaven (right). You step down to extend the invitation and you can just hear them singing "The Moving Blues." You might get to stay a few more Sundays, provided of course you do not say what you did. You coast along a few days and then you preach some Sunday on "The Good Shepherd" or one who could not feed the flock not having anything in the bag. You just couldn't help saying something about the qualifications of the elders and of course when you did it was like lighting the red hot coals and throwing them on the hundred yards to the fence? and you with a sore foot already. Well, now where you going to move? By the way, you owe nearly every one in town. Your salary has been four dollars in a year, your expenses are far more. The brethren are not going to help you move, because they just now kicked you out, see. You walk the floor for a few days, and forget to eat. You get a few little meetings in which the brethren promised so much and the last night of your meeting they come and hand you train fare and say, "We will send you some more money soon." Well, it looks like you are going to have to postpone eating a few weeks anyway. You coast along for a few days and you have a pop-off over at Podunk Holler hasn't heard how you split the church and he calls you for a meeting. You get there and he calls you out behind the building in the jimpson weeds, next to a window with a gunky sack stuffed in, where a twenty-five cent glass should be. Then he begins way back around over yonder and comes back in under and a way back over again about what not to preach on here. All the fire is taken out of you and so far as you are concerned the little meeting is over right there. You come home again with just enough money to pay last month's grocery bill and feeling like you had committed the unpardonable sin. You feel so weak that you should have known the Ananias, but you are trying to get to go back next year and of course if you had done what you knew they needed, they would have written you just two days. before you went back and called the whole thing off. You know for sure they did down in Punkin Center, called the meeting off after you planned for it. Remember, you did not have any other places to go and had to borrow money to eat that month?
Now, that is about the most ridiculous thing ever put in print. Dan is grown and married, and has started out to preach; but regardless of that, if he were a son of mine, I'd try to turn him over in my pot to the right where a paddle ought to be applied (literally, not figuratively), for writing such a thing about the elders of the church. You will notice that old time-worn, threadbare statement about the church needing some funerals before it could do anything. It is remarked that it would be profitable if the undertaker could remove the hindrances that some elders are to the church. The digressives said years ago that when we had some first class funerals the churches would no longer be hindered and handicapped by opposition to the organ and other innovations. Such language is worse than pitiable, it is lamentable. For a young preacher to take it up is tragic.

When some of these grand old people die, including some good old elders, consistency would require the preacher to say at their funeral: “Well, brethren, we are glad this old brother is dead. The church could not do anything while he lived, and now with him out of the way, us preachers can really do as we please. Thank God for this funeral!”

The elders of the Central church at Pampa are personally known to me. They are among the best men in the church. J. E. Williams has stood for the truth in Pampa for fifty years, and has paid the bills of the church when the church could not have paid them. Brother Williams is now up in years, but is strong in body and mind. Because some preachers have not been able to use him as clay in the potter’s hand, they have turned on him and be-meaned him and the other elders who have stood with him. But Brother Williams squares his shoulders, carries the responsibility, lets the preachers rave, and “takes heed to himself and to all the flock” over which the Holy Spirit has made him bishop to feed it and pay its bills. There is an irony in it which a man who did not love the church could not gracefully take. So the preachers come and go, but J. E. Williams stays at his post of duty. Such men are to be honored and I wish we had many more.

Brother Dan talks about displeasing the elders by preaching on “dancing, bridge, beer guzzling and such like.” But in this case the elders have disapproved some in the church because they have insisted on the preacher exposing these things, especially the “beer guzzling.” booze drinking, profanity, and general bad conduct at the local football games. This irked some of the teachers who were members of the church, including Dan, who teaches in the school, and who were expected to root and holler at the “beer guzzling” ball games. The elders have wanted the members of the church to stand against all such, and they have insisted that “the preachers preach against it. I wonder if that is not a part of Dan’s trouble. It is easy to deal in generalities and preach against “worldliness” without being specific. Anybody can do that. With sweeping phrases preachers can declaim against worldliness and let the members guess what!

To call the elders “popes” is nothing new either. The elders are perfectly good men when the preacher accepts their invitation to labor with them. But when they think he has served his time of usefulness, believe that he could do more good in another field, and another could come in and do more good there, all at once they become “popes” and the preacher cannot say anything bad enough about them. The strange thing to me is that preachers cannot tell when to leave before they have to be told.

At any rate, such will always be the course of things as long as preaching for a church is a job with preachers. The elders should make a mental note when they hear preachers defaming elders, mark it down-they will do to let alone.

I hope Dan Price will apologize for the thing he has written and redeem himself with those of us who have thought him capable of better things. Whoever put him up to it ought to be ashamed.

The Longview Elders To Harding College

It has become the practice of some of the Colleges to send a notice to the elders of the churches that they will be there a certain date to put on “a program” in the church. They know that it is usually embarrassing for the elders to write back and refuse their appointment. Many elders and churches doubtless will, for that very reason, appreciate the following exchange between Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas, and the elders of the church at Longview, Texas. Read it and shout.

Elders of Church of Christ, Longview, Texas.

Dear Brethren:

I am sure all the faithful congregations of the Church are deeply interested in the welfare of our boys and girls. The whole progress and growth of the Church depends upon their receiving the kind of training that will make and keep them faithful Christians.

One of the greatest factors today in giving our boys and girls this training is the Christian school. The wonderful things these institutions are doing should become better known to all intelligent Christians. Mr. Jack Wood Sears is making a tour of some Southern states, and adjoining states, speaking on Christian Education and showing pictures of the school and its various activities. We are arranging for him to be at Longview Monday evening, July 22nd to give the program there. Could you make announcement at Longview and have all the people who are interested in seeing the picture and hearing the talk be present for this meeting at Longview? Mr. Sears will be there Tuesday also to see any young people who are interested in the Christian school work. We should appreciate your getting word to any of the congregations round about.

Sincerely yours, L. C. Sears.

To this letter the Longview elders replied, as follows:

“Mr. L. C. Sears, Dean, Harding College. Dear Brother-Sears: In response to your recent letter bearing the announcement of your proposed tour including an appearance here on Monday July 11, we are writing you. It is our desire that you so alter your itinerary as to not include an appearance here. Various reasons, possibly, could be assigned for so requesting this on your part. However, we deem it sufficient to state that the reputation of Harding College for being weak and vacillating, doctrinally, would be sufficient cause. To retain on the faculty men who not only profess a liberal philosophy, but believe such errors does not meet our approval. Further, they have opposed some who have opposed Bollism. Rather than encouraging and being a party to securing students for such a school we would seek to induce boys and girls to go elsewhere.

We trust that you shall understand, and therefore grant,
that our only interest is in the safeguarding of the Faith and the integrity of the Gospel. It would be a serious in- volvement on our part to become responsible for the under- mining and destruction of the faith of any boy or girl by contributing to such a result. With kindest personal regards, we are, Fraternally, Bryan Vinson, N. A. Parker, J. W. Akin, W. J. Minnick, Elders, Church of Christ, Longview, Texas.

It is genuinely refreshing to find elders who sense the responsibility of guarding the church against the designs of men. Give us more elders and fewer "officers" in a preach- er's cabinet, who are controlled by the preacher who is controlled by the college he attended (his Alma Mamma), therefore leaving the church exposed to the domination of the colleges, and the prey of any scheme that is being pro- moted under the guise of "a program." Wake up, brethren, rub the dust out of your eyes and you will begin to see things.

For the same reason faithful elders cannot advise boys and girls to go to Harding College, no faithful teacher can afford to accept a connection with it. In doing so they be- come a part of a scheme that is not right. We hope Brother Batsell Baxter does not do it. He is a good man. He is not a premillennialist. But if he goes to Harding he will be under a Premillennial set-up from the Dean of Bible down to Clinton Davidson, its financier, Bro. Baxter's fine talents should be used elsewhere...

That "Alleged Church Of Christ" In Buffalo

From J. Clyde Shacklett, Nashville, Tennessee, we have the following:

Ford M. Jenkins and wife, both zealous members of the Chapel Avenue Church, Nashville, were transferred to Buf- falo, N. Y. They have succeeded in getting fifteen or twenty members together for regular worship. Ten or fifteen non-members are regular attendees.

The Chapel Avenue Church has engaged Hoyt Bailey to work with them.

If the reader knows of members or prospective members living within the Buffalo area, please send names and addresses to Hoyt Bailey, 1122 Hertel Ave., Buffalo, N. Y. -J. Clyde Shacklett.

How different is this from the course Clinton Davidson pursued when he went to Buffalo, New York-this very same city. He referred to the little congregation there as "the alleged church of Christ" and refused to even worship with it but went to a popular digressive church instead. Not only that, he began to help establish other digressive churches. And he is the man who would change the churches of Christ now. But we have the brother's num- ber. Even Abilene, Texas, has about deciphered it. Re- liable information comes that Davidson's recent appearance in Abilene just about finished him there. He made a speech to a group at the College in which he commenced the Premillennialists openly and criticised the opponents of that theory-"accenting love," of course. We are told that one of the college brethren even went so far as to tell David- son if that was the best he could do, it would be an accomo- dation to them if he would get out of town and stay out — or words of that import. Furthermore, the information is that even Jesse P. Sewell sent a telegram from San An- tonio (after he had left) insisting that he was not respon- sible for Davidson's blunders. But Brother Sewell is respon- sible for his connection with Davidson's movement. And he has promoted Davidson all over Texas. He recently told Austin Taylor, in San Antonio, what a great man Clinto- nion Davidson is, and how "little" some of the rest of us are who are exposing his plans—the editor of the Banner in particular. But now "Jesse P. Sewell, D. D." is having to renounce Clinton Davidson's activities at Abilene. The - truth is, these brethren see where the wind is blowing. They rode on Davidson's coat tail until it was frazzled off, and now they are looking for somewhere to light. Some men have played with politics so long that they just have the poly-tics, and when Polly ticks they click. Such men are timeservers and cannot be trusted to guard the church against the wolves in sheep's clothing. But when the wolves have been unmasked and chased away, they all with one accord begin to say, we were not responsible for this or that, and we dare anybody to prove that we have ever been unsound on anything! There is a way, to prove one's sound- ness without having to assert it, and there is a time to do it, and it is not after the battle.

May the "alleged church of Christ" in Buffalo prosper, and when I pass that way I want to meet them.

Another Case of Politics

Brother G. C. Billingsley, Nashville, Tennessee, sends an item of interest to the Bible Banner. Brother Billings- ley is a fine man, an elder in the Russell street church for many years; a man who is interested in keeping the church clear of objectionable influences; a man who has stood for the truth in Nashville against late forces of error. That all may know his standing, he was a personality in the last Ryman Auditorium Meeting, conducted by N. B. Harde- man, and backed by thirty churches of Christ in Nashville. Although Brother S. H. Hall and the Russell Street church opposed the meeting and refused to cooperate, Brother Bil- lingsley, an elder of that church did support it, and was a leader in its success, being one of the men in charge. He is entitled to be heard. Here is his statement:

Inasmuch as the Boll-Jorgenson songbooks are in dis-favor with the most congregations, want to state that these books are in the Russell Street Church of Christ over my protest.

On February 13th Bro. E. R. Derryberry, "chairman" reported in an elders and deacons meeting that he had looked at four songbooks and one of them was very good indeed and the one to buy. After I pressed him to tell us which book was so good he finally stated that it was the one published by E. L. Jorgenson, of Louisville, Ky. I stated to the meeting that we would be severely criticised if we bought that book and referred them to the criticism in the Bible Banner of churches buying that book and Jorg- enson using the profits to further Bollism. Bro. S. H. Hall stated that there was only $4.35 profit so far in the book, claiming to have a sworn statement to that effect.

The next Sunday, the 18th, I offered Bro. Derryberry a new Bible Banner further criticising the Jorgenson book, and he stated that he had already read it. The next Sun- day the 25th, Bro. S. H. Hall announced from the pulpit that ten or twelve boxes of songbooks from Jorgenson there for more like them and use them on and on. While I had long since learned to receive Bro. Hall's statements with a "grain of salt," yet under the circumstances I believed and dismissed the songbooks from my mind, feeling sure that Russell Street would not be afflicted with the Boll- Jorgenson books.

To my surprise on April 19th, two days before our meeting started, a postal clerk phoned me that there were ten or twelve boxes of songbooks from Jorgenson there for Russell Street congregation. On receiving this information I called Bro. Derryberry and stated to him that was one piece of hypocrisy he and Bro. S. H. Hall had pulled on the congregation that I was going to expose. It is a crime indeed for a once well rounded congregation of Christians to have to put up with just such schemes. Bro. Hall, who holds his schemed-in elders and deacons under his thumb as the bishop, did not have to announce that they were going to buy these songbooks. He can keep me quiet as he is always able to make them vote me down on any self- ish scheme ten to one. I, therefore, maintain that Breth- ren Hall and Derryberry had no right to slip a songbook in to the congregation that was questionable.

G. C. Billingsley.

Brother Billingsley has reasons for making these state- ments public. He has stood for the right things in the old Russell Street church and there are many who can testify to the fact that he has been opposed by much political
A Worthy Call From Some Worthy People

A letter from Brother W. S. Boyett, of Sanger, Texas, states that he has a request from Oscar Miles and his wife at Soap Lake, Washington, for a meeting. These good people were at Fort Davis, Texas, when Austin Taylor and I went there two years ago for a “mission meeting” and established two churches as a result—at Fort Davis and Marfa—and put some spine into the one at Alpine. Oscar Miles has had a baffling malady which gradually petrifies the members of his body. I have never known two better and braver people. He can live only at Soap Lake, where bathing in its peculiar waters, and drinking of them, his malady has been arrested. He can stay there and live. But they want the church established, just as they did it at Fort Davis. Brother Boyett and Brother Coppper, a preacher-singer, will go. But “how can they preach except they be sent?” The church at Sanger, Texas, will send them, but being a small town church itself, Sanger cannot furnish all the necessary funds. Let us have enough voluntary contributions to do this job and do it well. Send your communications and contributions to the Church of Christ, care of Clifford Greene, Sanger, Texas. I take utmost pleasure in inordinating this request, and urging a speedy response.

COMPLETE CHRISTIAN HYMNAL

L. L. Brigance, Freed-Hardeman College, Henderson, Term.-“I received a copy of your new song book some time ago and have given it a fairly good examination. I think it is splendid. The collection of old songs has a good proportion of new and old songs that ought to meet every need. I think it well adapted to the needs of the churches of Christ in general. It is attractively bound and is very neat in appearance. I would not hesitate to recommend it to my congregation in need of a good collecto of psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs. And besides, it is very reasonable in price. I trust it may meet with a hearty reception and have a wide use among the churches.”

C. R. Nichol, Semnole, Okla.—“I have examined your new song book the Complete Christian Hymnal. It is a collection of splendid songs—songs which can be used with profit to the work of the church. I am glad to see the large number of ‘standard songs’ in this collection.”
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In the May issue of "The Word and Work" R. H. Boll has an article under the above heading. Read his first paragraph. "The crystal-clear declaration of our Lord Jesus Christ that His kingdom is not of this world (John 18:36) should be sufficient to settle that matter for every believer. Any attempt to deny, to explain away, so clear and positive a statement of God's word should at once be discounted and condemned." "My kingdom is not of this world," said the Lord Jesus; and what He said, He meant. Any man who detracts from His word, does so at his own infinite peril. This is a very fine statement from Boll; but it is the preface to one of his characteristic articles filled with innuendoes and insinuations, which deceive none but the gullible. The devil quoted and explained (?) Psalms 91:11, 12 to Jesus Christ, as recorded in Matthew 4:6, trying to deceive him, and his efforts to pervert the passage were no more glaring than Boll's effort to bermuddle John 18:36. The devil tried to make Jesus Christ believe that Psalms 91:11, 12 was a "crystal-clear declaration" of God's protecting care over him in all circumstances, and therefore God would protect him in his jump from the "pinnacle of the temple." But the devil's ruse was apparent to the Lord, and his efforts to deceive were thwarted. So Boll puts John 18:36 in a Belligic paragraph of pretended profound reverence and respect for the word of God in an effort to show that "the crystal-clear declaration of our Lord Jesus Christ that His Kingdom is not of this world" does not preclude an earthly kingdom. I am astounded at this Germanic reasoning (?) of R. H. Boll, and wonder if his conscience is completely seared as with a hot iron when it comes to perverting the word of God to justify his vagaries about Jesus Christ ruling over an earthly kingdom sitting on David's earthly throne, in the city of Jerusalem.

Now read his explanation (?) of what he calls "The crystal-clear declaration of our Lord Jesus Christ that his kingdom is not of this world." He says: "on the other hand it would be equally reprehensible to draw unwarranted conclusions from statements of God's word, and to make the scriptures say what they do not say. (Boll is an adept in this art J. T. L.) That is not uncommonly done with this declaration. It is made to appear that Christ's Kingdom has no material basis, that it is wholly 'spiritual,' intangible, invisible, and could never include such a thing as a reign on the earth." It would not be necessary for one to raise his belly from the dust of the earth to make such ungracious charges against gospel preachers. There is not a man on the earth today who knows better than R. H. Boll himself knows that the above implications, and insinuations are absolutely false, and can only deceive the gullible. I challenge him to name one gospel preacher that he ever heard even intimate that the church or "Christ's Kingdom has no material basis, that it is wholly 'spiritual,' intangible, invisible, and could never include such a thing as a reign on the earth." Or let him produce an article written by a gospel preacher that teaches such nonsense. If he cannot do either, and he can't, then he should repent of these machinations, and pray God to forgive the wicked insinuations of his heart against his brethren. Will he do this or will he put himself in the class Paul describes in 2 Cor. 11:13-15? You may count on the devil's minions appearing to be the most humble and pious of the earth. No one can beat the devil personifying his witness, when he transforms himself into an angel of light. It is no great thing, therefore, if his ministers should clothe themselves with self imposed humility and piety, when they want to pervert the scriptures.

In Luke 8: 11-12, Christ said: "Now the parable is this: The seed is the word of God and those by the wayside are they that have heard; then commeth the devil, and taketh away the word from their heart, that they may not believe and be saved." Therefore any one who tries to keep the word of God out of your heart is a minister of the devil and he is more likely to come in humility and piety than he is to come with a pitchfork and forked tail. One of the devil's old tricks is to try to discredit gospel preachers by making it appear that they teach something ridiculous. For instance, by insinuating that gospel preachers teach that "Christ's Kingdom has no material basis, that it is wholly 'spiritual' intangible, invisible, and could never include such a thing as a reign on the earth." The church, or Kingdom of Christ, is made up of responsible beings who obey the gospel, as you and I are, therefore, since you and I are both tangible, and visible, the Kingdom must be both tangible and visible. No one but an ignominous, or a deliberate perverter of the truth would teach otherwise. This is the reason I resent with righteous indignation R. H. Boll's malignant charge against gospel preachers. Again since the kingdom, or church, is made up of men and women who obey the gospel of God, and who live on the earth, and since Christ, as King, rules over them, it follows therefore that his reign is on the earth; but his throne is in heaven. The laws that rule His Kingdom were given through the Holy Spirit, and are spiritual, therefore his Kingdom is a spiritual Kingdom. An earthly Kingdom is made up of human beings, who also live on the earth; but whose King rules from an earthly throne, through laws made by human beings absolutely nothing spiritual about it. Will Boll deny this? If so, will he tell you the difference between an earthly kingdom, and a spiritual kingdom? Or will he deny that Christ has a Kingdom on earth, different from an earthly or temporal Kingdom? Will he tell us frankly what he thinks Christ meant when he said: "My Kingdom is not of this world?" Does he think Christ was talking about the restoration of the earthly Kingdom of Israel? In other words, did Christ have reference to the same Kingdom that he announced as "at hand" at the beginning of his personal ministry? in Colossians 2:12-14, Paul says: "Giving thanks unto the Father, who made us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light; who delivered us out of the power of darkness, and translated us into the Kingdom of the Son of his love; in whom we have our redemption, the forgiveness of our sins." All Bible students know that Paul was talking about the same Kingdom that Jesus Christ had reference to when he announced "the Kingdom of heaven is at hand," and also when he said, "my Kingdom is not of this world." This is the truth, and nothing else is the truth on this subject, notwithstanding Boll's vagaries to the contrary. Unfortunately for the truth, since this bobbed hair nonsense, and God-flouting custom of women appearing in worship with their heads uncovered has been popularized, when a gospel preacher raises his voice against such unscriptural acts, and practices in the church, he is met with insinuations and slurs, from gospel preachers and elders who have been stung by the popular bee, "that no one knows everything, and he may be wrong." So when they go out to thunder away against Bollism, or other "isms" that they think (?) are wrong they are met with the same avalanche of their own making—"that no
one knows everything, and they may be wrong." Thus the gospel and its power have been neutralized by its supposed friends. Surely Christ has been "wounded in the house of his friends." If a gospel preacher even raises his voice against the ballroom, which has always been on open door to brothels, P.-T. A. mothers, who teach, have their children taught, to dance will put up a shout that they do not believe it is wrong for children to dance, and sissy elders will join in the chorus, and thus the preacher's teaching is neutralized on that subject. I recently heard of a poor deluded mother, that I baptized more than a quarter of a century ago, when she was only a girl, saying, "that her daughters had talents to dance, and she thought those talents should be developed." Of course she has never had her "senses exercised to discern good and evil," and her tribe is "legion" in the church today.

Paul says: "But speak thou the things which befit the sound doctrine: that aged men be temperate, grave, sober-minded, sound in faith, in love, in patience: that aged women likewise be reverant in demeanor, not slanderous nor enslaved to much, wine, teachers of that which is good; that they may train the young women to love their husbands, to love their children, to be sober-minded, chaste, workers at home, kind, being in subjection to their own husbands, that the word of God be not blasphemed" (Titus 2:1-5). This is the only kind of fathers and mothers that can save the home, and the church today, men and women who cannot be carried away with every wind of doctrine, fad, and fashion of the world. Again Paul said to Timothy: "I charge thee in the sight of God, and of Christ Jesus, who shall judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his Kingdom: preach the word; be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching. For the time will come when they will not endure the sound doctrine; but, having itching ears, will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts; and will turn away their ears from the truth, and turn aside unto fables" (2 Tim. 4:1-4). This is the only kind of preaching that will save the world, or the church, today; because both are full of "itching ears," and there are plenty of ticklers. The idea that a gospel preacher cannot know that he knows the truth, and therefore may be wrong in his teaching, is of the devil, and if I believed such buncombe I would never get in the pulpit again, because in such ignorance I might pervert the gospel and bring the anathema of God upon myself. No preacher can be free from the blood of people, if he does not declare "the whole counsel of God," and he cannot declare it, if he does not know what it is. God created man an intelligent being, and addressed his intelligence, and made man's welfare and destiny depend upon him doing what God commands. Therefore if man cannot understand what God has said, he cannot know that he is doing God's will, and it is only those who do God's will that enter the eternal Kingdom. So let us be done with this nonsense that we cannot know that we understand the scriptures, and therefore may be wrong ourselves. This tomfoolery was conceived in the minds of those who wink at, or have not the moral courage to fight the worldliness that is in the church, and destroying its influence in the world today. It is astounding at the number of gospel preachers today, who are always harping on God's love, braggling on everything and everybody including themselves-copycatting denominational preachers; but never reproving, nor rebuking anything nor anybody, therefore preaching a onesided gospel. "Behold then the goodness and severity of God: toward them that fell, severity; but toward thee, God's goodness, if thou continue in his goodness: otherwise thou also shall be cut off" (Rom. 11:22). It is imperative therefore not only to teach God's goodness; but we must teach his severity also. A half truth will mislead people quicker than an outright lie. Therefore we must teach the truth as a life or death proposition. We are not teaching the truth, when we are telling what other people teach, and what we think. What I think will not save you; but what I know God's word teaches will. Therefore, I am not going around telling people what I think; but I am telling them what God says, and telling them they can believe the truth and be saved, or believe a lie and be damned. The whys, and wherefores, about God's laws, or his dealings with the human family, which I do not, and cannot understand, I stay off when I am in the pulpit, or when I am writing for publication. "The secret things belong unto Jehovah our God; but the things that are revealed belong unto us and to our children forever, that we may do all the words of this law" (Deuteronomy 29:29). If R. H. Boll had followed the scriptural and common sense rule of preaching only the revealed things there would be no trouble in the church today over his future, earthly Kingdom nonsense. And there would not be so many good brethren neutralizing their teaching and influence by trying to apologize for Boll's vagaries, on the ground of his piety (?) and humility (?) which one of his schoolmates and friends described as "humble conceit." In 1903, when R. H. Boll was in Los Angeles, California, he told Gid Riggs that he wanted a title, wanted to become famous and great, and expressed the thought of being able to discover some new teaching in the Bible. If he did not tell Riggs this, let him deny it while Brother Riggs is yet alive. It was this foolish and vain Germanic, inordinate desire for preferment, honor, superiority, power, and attainment, that has led him to where he is today, the head of a small, disturbing, trouble making faction in the church. I know those who oppose his vain, ambitious desires are called the trouble makers in Israel, and they are, in the sense that those who oppose instrumental music, and missionary societies in the work and worship of the church are the trouble makers in Israel on those subjects or in the sense that protestants who object to Roman Catholicism dominating the world are the religious trouble makers in the world. If nobody objected to Catholicism, everybody would be Catholics. If nobody objected to digression everybody would be digressives. If nobody objected to Bollism (Boll's theory of the restoration of the earthly Kingdom of Israel, with Christ ruling on David's earthly throne, over an earthly Kingdom, in Jerusalem), everybody would be Bollites. Again if nobody objected to the devil, and his works, there would be but one Kingdom in the world today, the Kingdom of darkness. So it depends entirely on what you are advocating, or objecting to, as to whether or not you are the real trouble in Israel. I hope that it is not too much for me to hope that Boll may yet repent of his vagaries ceasing his speculations, and come back to his first love, be the gospel preacher he once was, loved and respected by all. I believe he would do this, if his close friends and admirers had not put him on such a high pinnacle that his vain pride keeps him from jumping. Anyhow I hope he will quit attributing absurdities to gospel preachers.
The question of divine healing is confusing to some folk today. This should not be so. One needs only to understand a few simple passages and what the issue is to be able to comprehend the matter.

Did Jehovah intend that miraculous healing be continued by His disciples for all time? Are miracles of healing wrought today?

In order to understand whether God intended for such to be a part of His program for all times we need to get a clear understanding of the issue before us.

The Issue

Do the scriptures teach that divine healing is for us today? Let us analyze this proposition.

1. Not yesterday but today. All believe that miracles of healing were performed yesterday that is in the days of the Apostles and our Lord. “For the man was more than forty years old on whom the miracle of healing was wrought.” (Acts 4:22). That Christ and the Apostles wrought miracles of healing no one will deny. The issue is not what they did? It is not were such miracles wrought, but where is the passage that says they are for us today? Where is the scripture for continuing them beyond that period?

2. It is not a question of power. Certainly God is powerful enough to heal a man by a miracle. It is not what God can do but what does God do? To say that God can do a thing does not prove that He does or will do it. In the creation God could have made pecans grow on a watermelon vine. It is not where can God make ‘pecans grow but where does He make them grow? God’s law is that pecans grow on a pecan tree. That is His law. In the healing of the sick it is not what God can do, but what is His law concerning the sick? The question before us is not one of power but of law and fact. What is God’s law today? Where is the passage that says that God will miraculously heal the sick today?

3. It is not even a question of prayer for the sick. We all believe that it is right to pray for the sick. We should pray for all men everywhere. We must even pray for our daily bread. That, however, does not mean that Jehovah will hand us a loaf of bread directly from heaven. Bread must be gotten according to God’s natural law. Yet we must pray for it. To ignore the natural law concerning bread is to starve. God has certain natural laws in regard to the sick. To ignore them is to fail in God’s plan for the sick today.

4. It is not a question of healing. Certainly God heals today. But how? And such healing is divine but not miraculous. There is a vast difference between being healed miraculously and being healed by using God’s natural laws. These laws of course are divine. All healing is divine but not all healing is miraculous. All bread is divine. It is provided by God’s natural law. Yet in the wilderness God gave the children of Israel bread from heaven. It was miraculously provided. They did not have to plant, harvest, and then make it into bread. This was a special providence of God. Miracles have always been special and provisional and never permanent. Should one become ill with appendicitis and an appendectomy is performed and then he is alright that is divine healing but not miraculous healing. It is God’s law that if the affected appendix is removed properly the patient will be well again. The doctors are simply using one of God’s laws. Such a law existed long before the Doctors discovered it. If a man had his leg cut off it would be right to pray for him, but it would be sinful to do nothing more. God expects us to use all natural laws we know. To ask God to set aside these natural laws and perform a miracle of healing is asking Him to do that which He has not promised. Where is the passage that says God will miraculously heal today.

5. It is not a question of what history teaches about the matter but what does the Bible teach about it. History is useless if it does not harmonize with the Bible. If the history books say one thing and the Bible says another then history is wrong. What does the Bible teach?

6. Testimonials of so-called healings cannot be introduced. They have no weight and do not touch the issue. The issue is what does the Bible teach? It is not what about this thing I saw and heard? To appeal to so-called miracles today is a begging of the question and an impudent assumption of the issue before us. The issue can only be settled by what the scriptures teach and not by the so-called healings wrought by professed miracle workers today.

The issue is: Where is the scripture for continuing healing miracles beyond the apostolic age? This issue must not be camouflaged nor evaded. It is not yesterday but today. It is not what can God do, but what is His law today? It is not a matter of prayer for the sick, but does God heal miraculously in answer to prayer? It is not even a question of healing, but one of miraculous or supernatural healing. To cite so-called miracles is to miss the point. To cite what Christ and the apostles did is to miss the point: The point is this-where is the passage of scripture that such can be done today?

Proofs Texts Examined

The advocates of miraculous healing today attempt to prove their doctrine in the following manner.

1. “Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and today and forever.” (Heb. 13:8)

This is indeed a fine passage. Yet it does not prove that Christ performs miracles of healing today. He is the same in character but not in method. His character does not change but He did change His method. “For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.” (Heb. 7:12) Christ changed the law but He did not change in character. He simply changed His method. That which proves too much proves nothing. If this passage proves that since Christ worked miracles of healing yesterday that He will do so today, it also proves that he will be working miracles of healing forever in heaven. He is the same “yesterday, today, and forever.” Will there be sickness in heaven?

2. The use of Matthew 28: 19-20 and Mark 16: 15-20 are the only other passage that seem to give weight to the doctrine that miraculous healing obtains today. Their argument runs like this: Christ was with the disciples and performed miracles of healing. He promised to be with them even to the end of the world. “And lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world.”

Does this passage prove that miracles of healing will be performed even to the end of the world. It does not say so. Then what does it say. It says “I am with you.” Certainly Christ is with His children but that does not say He performs miracles of healing. Is it not possible for Christ to be with one and that one not able to perform miracles? For the sake of clarity let us study these questions based on this fine passage:

(1) Is Christ only with the so-called healing groups? Now Mr. Healer be careful how you answer. You say that
Methodist and Baptist are the children of God. Yet they deny that healing can be done today. They cannot and do not heal. Is Christ not with them? Too, I believe that Christ is with me and yet I deny that He heals miraculously today. Are you ready to say that Christ is with only the so-called healers today?

(2) If Christ is with only the so-called healers just which one of them is he with? There is Mr. Mormon who claims to heal and says that all the rest are cheats and frauds. There are the McPhersonites and a dozen different warring sects who claim to heal. Too, there are the Christian Scientists who claim to heal and yet say that there is no such things as sickness. Which of the healers, if Christ is only with the healers, is He with? You, Mr. Mormon, Christian Scientist? The truth of the matter, He is with neither of you. He promised to be with His children. He has no children outside of his spiritual body. That lets out all so called healers today for not one of them teach and obey the commission given by our Lord. Christ is with His children and dwells in their hearts by faith—not by miracle. (Eph. 3:17).

Their next effort is on Mark 16. “These signs shall accompany them that believe.” The purpose of these signs can be seen by looking at the 20th verse. “And they went forth, and preached every one and not try to perform one.

Purpose of Miracles

In order to understand the matter of miraculous healing one simply needs to know the purpose of miracles. Why were miracles performed?

1. Miracles in God's plan were provisional.

This has been true in all ages. In the beginning God used miracles to create the world and all things therein. He created the first tree, but trees today come by natural law. He created the first man and woman, but men and women come today by the law of procreation. Miraculous power in creation was not part of the things created, but the means by which they were created ceased when this power was accomplished. Thus we see that God created animals and plants by miracle before natural law prevailed. That does not prove that He does so now. These miraculous 'powers used in creation were provisional and temporary and ceased when God's creative work was done.

This same principle is seen in God's revelation to man. Until the Bible was completed the Word dwelt in the inspired man. Now it dwells in the inspired Book. The inspired man was used to make the inspired Book. When the inspired Book was made there was no longer any need for inspiration. The miraculous powers manifested by these inspired men were to confirm the word they spoke. Miraculous power was to give inspired teaching, and rule provisionally the churches. It was the power to make our constitution—the New Testament.

There was a time when this nation was governed under the Articles of the Confederation. Under this form of government our fathers selected a constitutional making body. This body, in convention, gave us the constitution of the United States. The people ratified the constitution and organized a government under it. When our fathers had made the constitution the power in this matter ceased. Miraculous power was constitution making power. Our constitution, the New Testament, has been made, and therefore the constitutional making power ceased by divine limitation. Thus when miraculous power had given us the Book, the Bible, the constitution, miraculous power ceased.

But says one, “There were miracles then, there are surely miracles now.” This argument would continue creation of plants and animals. That God once created animals is no proof He that He does so now. Once-Not now.

2. Miracles were confirmatory.

Our Lord states that signs confirmed the word. (Mk. 16:20). “These signs” not one performed by so called healers today, “shall follow them that believe.” The signs for us today are written. “These are written that you may believe.” (Jno. 20:30-31). To ask for other signs than “these signs” that are written is to reject the word of God.

Surely our Lord knew the purpose of miracles. Why, Lord, did you perform miracles? Read his answer in the following:

(1). To bear witness of me. “The works that I do these bear witness of me.” (Jno. 10:25).

(2). That we might believe. “Believe me for my works sake.” (Jno. 14:11).

(3). To prove the Father had sent Him. “The very works that I do, bear witness of me, that the Father hath sent me.” (Jno. 5:36).

(4). To prove that He had power on earth to forgive sins. “That ye may know that the Son of man hath authority on earth to forgive sins (he saith to the sick of the palsy), I say unto thee, Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house.” (Mk. 2:10-11). Lord, why did you heal this man? To prove I have power to forgive sins.

Paul says the word was confirmed. (Heb. 2:3).

The fact that miracles were confirmatory shows beyond a peradventure that they were temporary.

3. They were not accommodative but provisional and special.

Special miracles of healing were wrought by the apostles. (Acts 19:11). Healings were special and provisional and never to accommodate the sick man. The following texts show plainly what is meant.

(1). Paul left Trophimus at Miletes sick. (II Tim. 4:20). Did not Paul have the power to heal him? Then why was he not healed?

(2). Paul advised Timothy to take wine for his stomach. (I Tim. 5:23). Why did not Paul heal Timothy's stomach? Surely Paul had the power and will any one doubt that Timothy had the faith? This is proof that the purpose of healing was not just to accommodate the sick person.

(3). Peter struck a man dead. (Acts 5:1-10). Striking a man dead produced the same result in the mind of those round about as did the healing of a man. When the people knew what was done, “Great fear came upon the whole church and all that heard these things.” This miracle proved that Peter was inspired and was speaking the word of the Lord. It confirmed his word. That was the purpose of all miracles. There is just as much authority today for a “Killing Church” as there is a “Healing Church.” Peter healed and Peter killed. Like effect was produced by both. Men were made to believe.

a man blind? This proved that Paul spoke by the power of the Lord. It confirmed his word, “The procounacal, when he saw what was done, believed.” Why don’t some one start a church to strike people blind. Paul struck a man blind. There is as much authority for a church to strike people blind as there is to open their blind eyes.

Let those who believe that there is a miraculous healing church today weigh well these words:

a. Why not start a bread making church? The Lord fed five thousand with five loaves and two fishes. He is the same yesterday, today, and forever. Why not start a bread making church and put the New Deal out of business? Why not end the depression?

b. Why not start a wine making church? The Lord made wine out of water. There is as much authority for a bread or wine making church as there is a healing church. Why did the Lord make wine out of water? “This beginning of His signs did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested His glory; and His disciples believed on Him.” (Jno. 2: 11). Thus His glory was manifested and His disciples believed.

c. Why not start a dead raising church? Did you know, dear reader, that in the same text where our Lord said heal the sick, He said raise the dead. Read it. “Heal the sick, raise the dead.”

4. Miracles are not essential to anything God wants His children to do in the world today.

Miracles were essential in creation. They are not an essential in procreation. Man was placed on this earth by supernatural power. Man stays here and multiplies by natural power. There was supernatural law in creation. There is only natural law in procreation.

Miracles were essential in revelation. Miracles are not essential in proclamation. God used miraculous powers to reveal and confirm His Word. Supernatural powers are not essential to reading and proclaiming this Word. We do not need revelation today. We need to preach that which has been revealed. We do not need signs to confirm our message. It has already been confirmed. (Heb. 2:3). Let us proclaim that which was revealed and confirmed.

Duration Of Miracles

To appreciate the Word of God there are certain things that are needful to know. The following will help form a basis for understanding and intelligent discussion.

1. Right division of the Word. (II Tim 2: 15).

2. Proper classification of passages. It is a mistake to take passages that apply only to the apostles and apply them to every one.

With this in mind let us for a little while study about the measures of the Spirit.

The baptismal measure of the Spirit was special and provisional and not permanent and general. This was an influence exercised on two occasions never exercised on mankind in general. There are only two cases of Holy Spirit baptism on record. The apostles received it on Pentecost to qualify them to make the Bible. (Acts 2). The household of Cornelius received it to prove to Jews that Gentiles had a right to obey the Gospel. To understand what the Holy Spirit is and what the baptism of the Holy Spirit is will help us in this study.

The Holy Spirit is not a puff of wind. He is a person. God is a person. Christ is a person. The Holy Spirit is a person. Christ dwells in the hearts of Christians and no one thereby acts abnormal. (Eph. 3:17) Yet let man get what he calls the Holy Spirit and he goes into a religious convulsions.

The baptism of the Holy Spirit was a promise and not a command. A promise may be received but not obeyed. There is only one baptism in the church. (Eph.4:5). The one baptism is a command. (Acts 10:48)

Holy Spirit baptism was a promised miracle. It was received. Miracles have ceased, therefore Holy Spirit baptism has ceased.

Persons who claim to be baptized in the Holy Spirit all teach things that flatly contradict the Bible. Show me a man who claims the baptism of the Holy Spirit and I will show you a man who teaches things that contradict the Bible. Not only do they contradict the Bible they contradict each other. Those who claim to have the baptismal measure of the Spirit are a living demonstration that they do not have it. The baptismal measure of the Spirit was to cause them to remember everything Christ said. (Jno. 14:26). Where is the mother’s son among them that knows all that Jesus said. Not many of them can even read what He said.

There is one sure sign that a person does not have the Holy Spirit. “He shall not speak of himself.” The Holy Spirit does not talk about Himself. He talks about Christ. “He shall glorify me.” (Jno. 16:14). The Holy Spirit talks about Christ and glorifies Him. When you go to a meeting today and they spend all their time talking about the Spirit you know by that they do not have it. If they had the Spirit they would talk about Christ. Christ is our Savior.

Those who had the baptismal measure of the Spirit could by the laying on of hands confer spiritual gifts on others. That is the Apostles had this right and power. (Acts 8:14-18).

There were nine of these special gifts. The baptismal measure was called a gift. The gift of the Spirit comes to believers who are baptized in water for the remission of sins. (Acts 2:38). These gifts are not the same.

The Samaritans were baptized in water and therefore received the gift of Acts 2:38-39. Yet Peter and John laid their hands on them that they might receive the Holy Spirit.

In the first Corinthian letter Paul writes about these special gifts.

a. I Cor. 12 he tells us the number of gifts. Nine in all.

b. I Cor. 13 he tells us how long they will last.

c. I Cor. 14 he tells the church how to use them while they existed.

In the last verse of chapter twelve Paul says, “Desire earnestly the greatest gifts. And moreover a most excellent way show I unto you.” The new way Paul points out is better than the old way. The old way was the use of special gifts. These gifts only furnished a partial revelation. “For we know in part, and we prophesy in part...” (Cor. 13:9) No one man knew the whole will of God so as to tell others. When they came together “each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation.” (I Cor. 14:26). The revelation was partial and fragmentary. God was revealing his message to man. This congregation at Corinth did not have the letter from which we now study when said condition existed. Paul wrote this letter to correct certain matters. In the period when they did not have the full revealed word they depended on special gifts to protect them against every wind of doctrine. This state of the church was called “childhood.” “But when that which is perfect is come that which is in part shall be done away.” (I Cor. 13:10). That which is perfect, is the perfect revelation, when these special gifts had ceased. The Bible, the perfect law of liberty was completed in 96 A. D. Thus when Jehovah had completed making the Bible the gifts ceased by divine limitation.

The word of God is called a “mirror.” In A. D. 57 the time Paul wrote the Corinthian letter he says, “Now we see in the mirror darkly.” Take a broken mirror and
In these verses Paul sets the limit of special gifts. The purpose for us. In fact Paul says they will cease. In I Cor. 13:8: 

b. Tongues shall cease. 
c. Knowledge shall be done away. 

It is evident that the “knowledge” that is done away is the “gift of knowledge” spoken of in chapter twelve verse eight. The taking away of the gift of “prophecies” shows that “inspiration” has ceased.

Men no longer speak in tongues. They have ceased. Some one says “I heard a woman speak in tongues.” I deny the statement. Perhaps you heard some woman speak a lot of nonsense and call it speaking in tongues. God never did give a woman a tongue. If she had one she could not use it. In I Cor. 14 where Paul discusses the matter of tongues he says, “Let your women keep silent in the church.” And he is discussing the use of tongues. Ninty percent of so-called talking in tongues in meetings round about is done by women. Again even if she had a tongue she could not use it as God told her to be silent. The use of tongues is the matter he is discussing.

All these gifts were “in part.” They were to cease when the “perfect” had come. When the Bible was completed that which was in part (special gifts) ceased. We have the “perfect law of liberty” and the more excellent way.

I Cor. 14 tells how to use these gifts while they last. It is well to note that James 5 comes under this same classification. The book of James was written in about 65 A. D. Special gifts existed among those to whom James wrote. He tells them how to use the “gift of healing” while it lasted. No one in the early church thought of these gifts as being permanent. They were all anxious for the “perfect law of liberty” to be completely written so they would not have to depend on that which was “in part.”

Should any one doubt this let him now read Ephesians 4:10-16. In these verses Paul sets the limit of special gifts. Surely all inspired teachers taught the same. God had placed in the early church certain inspired workers. That is, certain one who had these special gifts. The following is a list of them:

a. Apostles
b. Prophets
c. Pastors (elders of the church-Jas. 5:14)
d. Evangelists
e. Teachers

These men being guided by inspiration were thus used “for the perfecting of the saints.” (Eph. 4:12) When the saints had received the “perfect law” these “inspired men” were no longer needed. God still has pastors and teachers but they are not inspired. God’s word today dwells in the inspired Book and not in the inspired man.

How long, Paul, are these gifts to last? Paul in verse eight calls the power by which these teachers and evangelists are moved, “gifts.” These gifts will last says Paul, “Till.” They will last till. What then is the force of till? The “till” of Ephesians four and thirteen marks the end of these gifts. The “gifts” of Eph. 4:8 are the same as the “gifts” I Cor. 12:8:11. Paul taught the brethren at Ephesus, just as he taught them at Corinth that “gifts” were only provisional and temporary and not permanent. They were given to them “till.” When did they reach the “till?”

The “till” was reached when the “Unity of the faith was reached.” “Till we all attain unto the unity of the faith.” The unity of the faith was the Bible completed. If these “gifts” still exist then we do not have all the “faith.” We do not have all the will of God. If we have a complete revelation these gifts have ceased. They were to last only “till” the unity of the “faith” was reached. That unity has been reached, therefore these “gifts” have ceased.

To argue that healing were performed before the “till” was reached is to miss the point. No one denies that. Certainly Christ and the apostles healed before the till. But where is the passage that continues the healing miracles beyond the till? We live on this side of the till and after “that which is perfect” has come. These miracles were placed in the church till. The till is the completed, revealed will of God-the unity of the faith. (II Tim. 3:17).

Inspired men have no successors. Christ had no successor. Surely Christ is with us “always even unto the end of the world.” Yet He is not here on earth as He was before He went back to glory. The apostles have no successors. They are with us in their revealed word. Miracles have no successors. We have the miracles written. “These are written that you might believe.” (Jno. 20:30-31).

When men recognize the purpose of miracles they will no longer be confused. They were used to confirm the Word. The Word has been confirmed. (Heb. 2:3). Let us preach it as it is.

Prophecy Fulfilled

Those who claim to perform miracles today are instruments of the evil one. The Lord knew that miracles were only temporary and warned against those who would later claim to perform them. “For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show signs and wonders, that they may lead astray, if possible, the elect.” (Mk. 13:22). Those who claim to do signs and wonders today are false prophets and are deceiving all who follow them.

The lawless one shall be revealed Paul says, “even he whose coming is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders.” (II Thess. 2:8-10). Paul taught that “signs” or “gifts” would cease and then he warns us that Satan will try to produce such to lead people astray. Every so-called miracle worker today is a servant of the devil. All their healing services are of the devil. The Bible says that such would stop. The devil says they did not stop. They do not heal-they deceive. Their signs are not true signs. They are lying signs. Lying signs to deceive if possible the elect.

Many will say, “I saw this healing service, this sign performed, by so and so at such and such a place.” No, neighbor. What you saw was a lying sign. It was the work of the devil. True signs have ceased and Paul warns us not to let Satan lead us astray with his lying signs. Better stay with the Bible and forsake the devil.
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THE MORMON DOCTRINE OF APOSTASY

JAMES D. BALES

In this concluding article we shall present additional scriptures which refute this doctrine Matt. 28:19, 20. This passage teaches the perpetual presence of Christ with his disciples. Since his presence was to be perpetual and since the purpose of his presence was that he might be with his disciples the perpetuity of the church is assured. "Heaven and earth was an ordinary Jewish phrase to denote the universe in its proper extent." It does not denote, as some have maintained, "the termination of the Jewish dispensation by the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple." (Pye Smith, Scripture Testimony to the Messiah, Vol. II, p. 1). Smith also points out that this phrase is found four other times in the book of Matthew; but nowhere else in the New Testament ( Heb. 9:28; is not the same phrase). (Matt. 13:37-48; 47-50; Matt. 24:3).

The period of time Christ spoke of was to be the period of his promised presence. "It is evidently reasonable to consider the extent of our Lord's promise, as commensurate with the purpose for the advancement and success of which it was given. That purpose was 'to make all nations disciples' to the doctrine and authority of the Lord Jesus Christ: 'preaching repentance and remission of sins in his name,' and 'teaching them to observe all things whatsoever he had command.' To encourage his servants in their efforts for the effectuating of this design, the Saviour assures them of his own presence. But that purpose is not yet accomplished." (Pye Smith, Ibid, p. 13). "The promise of our Gracious Redeemer's presence is correlative with the obligation and work of teaching the Christian religion, and practicing its duties."

The Lord is not here speaking of "miraculous aid and gifts" but "altogether on subjects which are the common duty and privilege of the Christian church in all ages; his own supremacy, the diffusion of his truth, and the universal obligation of mankind to yield him full obedience." (See also Matt. 18:20).

2 John 15:16. "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you, and ordained you, that ye should go and bring forth fruit, and that your fruit should remain: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in my name, he may give it you." This was not true—that their fruit should remain—if a universal apostasy swallowed up their work. Then, too, notice that it was their work, and not the presence of apostles of Christ, that was to remain. (3)—Matt. 11:12. "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it (not will take it JDB) by force." The LDS turn this into a prophecy of the apostasy when in reality it is a historical statement. A LDS friend of mine illustrated it thus: "The violent (will) take it by force." Thus at one time this could have been true of Poland; "Poland suffereth violence" and "the violent (will) take it by force." The violent did take it by force and it is also true that the kingdom was taken by force. For, he said, "take it by force certainly means a complete capitulation of that which was taken, whether Poland or the kingdom."

Whether or not we can explain this statement to their satisfaction does not mean that it therefore speaks of a complete capitulation of the kingdom. No other Scripture speaks of such an apostasy and we do not have to accept such a subtle slipping of such an idea into this passage. I have found no commentator who agrees with the LDS in their interpretation, though they may disagree in some points in their interpretations. The Mormons interpret it in the above manner that it may fit in with their a priori conception of the apostasy.

The Jews were eager for the kingdom for in their selfishness they had come to a carnal conception and looked for physical and political dominion. Therefore when they heard the preaching of John and Jesus they were anxious to enter into this kingdom and to see the Jewish state freed and placed at the head of other nations. There was, a rush to it, they were earnest about coming into it; they were pressing into it to obtain the blessings. Banceres says, "There is allusion here to the manner in which cities were taken. Besiegers pressed upon them with violence, and demolished the walls. With such earnestness and violence, he says, men had pressed around him and John since they began to preach," Stier says, "in short all things proceed urgently with it. It works effectually upon all spirits on both sides and on all sides." Those who entered in entered eagerly and those who would not took offence, "He who will not submit to it, must be offended and resist; and he too who yields to it, must press and struggle through this offence." "It is the common expression of the enmity of unbelief and the struggle of faith together." "When some would enter, others oppose them; and when those oppose, the former struggle all the more vehemently against them." This kingdom indeed "suffereth violence; or comes with power upon the souls of men." It cannot be entered except by those who strive for entrance (Matt. 7:13, 14, Luke 13:24).

Though it may be true, and doubtless is, that the kingdom of heaven in every generation receives something of the same treatment yet the Lord's statement includes only from the days of John until the time in which he spoke. The last part of the sentence is connected with the first part. If "men of violence take it by force" is future-prophetic-then so is "suffereth violence." The same way in which it suffereth violence from the time of John is the way in which men of violence take it by force.

(4)—Matt. 13:31-22. Parable of the mustard seed also teaches, incidentally perhaps the continuation and growth of the kingdom.

(5)—Eph. 3:21. "Unto him be glory in the church by Jesus Christ throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." The Mormons should re-write it thus: "Unto him be glory in the church by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end, but with an historical hiatus of 1260 years."

(6)—Jude 3 and Matt. 16:19. The faith was once for all delivered unto the Saints (See American Standard Version and original text). In reading Matt. 16:19 we understand, of course, that the Lord did not have to wait until He had seen what Peter decided to do before He "bound" certain things in heaven that man must do. Peter bound the will on earth that had previously been bound in heaven. The Holy Spirit revealed unto the apostles that which had been bound in heaven in order that the record on earth might be in harmony with the Record in heaven.

Christ left his mark in the hands of his apostles (John 16:7). They were to bear witness of Christ's life, death, resurrection and doctrine. They did so and their witness was recorded. When a witness goes into court and gives his testimony and it is properly recorded you do not have to call that witness up again a hundred years later in order that he might again give testimony in order to make his previous testimony valid. He has given it and it stands. It is no more necessary for the Apostles to repeat
their witness every generation for it to true and binding is than it is for the facts which they witnessed to be repeated every generation for them to be true and necessary. We no more need an additional revelation of God’s will in order to be saved than we do an additional crucifixion of Christ in every generation in order that each generation might have access to salvation in Christ. (In addition to this, the Mormon Apostles cannot bear personal witness of Christ’s life and resurrection.

Of course, men must investigate in order to see if the records are reliable but if they are then the thing is still just as true as it was in the day in which it was recorded. It needs no further attestation. However, in the case of the NT we find further attestation comes through a practical application of Christ’s doctrine and through the fulfillment of prophecy (John 7:17).

After the testimony has been recorded it is then necessary for men to study and through prayer and application to fathom its meaning. Thus we have all that is necessary to convert men and to make Christians into full grown men in Christ. There is plenty of room for growth in the Word which we have now. Thus Jude wrote “Beloved, my whole concern was to write to you an appeal to defend the faith which has once for all been committed to the saints” (Moffatt’s, Also A. S. V.) Once for all. It was not to be taken from the earth and re-committed in 1830. It was committed to the saints, the church; not to a special priesthood in the church, but the priesthood which is the church.

(7)—Heb. 1:8. “But unto the Son he saith, ‘Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: A sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom.” His kingdom endures just as long as His throne and sceptre endure. This leaves no room for the Mormon doctrine of apostasy.

(8)—Heb. 7:17. “For he testifieth, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec.” This priesthood was to continue forever. Has he not had people to intercede for every since the time He was made such a priest? Melchisedec and the High Priest of Israel always had a people for whom they offered intercession.

(9)—Heb. 12:28. “Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken, let us have grace...” (King James’ gives it “cannot be moved”).

(10)—The church and the church’s officers. There is a difference between the church and its organization, or its officers. Many have failed to distinguish between the church and its officers and have thus brought upon themselves a great deal of confusion. The officers of a congregation might apostatize or bring in an ecclesiastical hierarchy without destroying all Christians on earth, though they might greatly hinder the work of the church. If false teachers and officers and organizations mean that all Christians are destroyed then most of the church was nothing but a member of the foundation stones of Mormondom collapses. This being true we reject it. With the proof of its falsity we should belong only to the church that Christ called ‘my church.’ (Gospel Advocate, Jan. 18, 1940. “The Church-What is it?” p. 53).

This is in harmony with Revelation. The voice from heaven said to some in Babylon, “Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.” (18:4).

Every individual who has heard the gospel and has, in harmony with Acts 2:38, been immersed into Christ has been added to the church by God himself (Acts 2:47). After this he may through ignorance join a religious denomination just as one may join a fraternal lodge which like a denomination is a fellowship organization. A Christian errs in doing such. God commands them to come out of error and stand for the unity of the church.

The validity of a believer’s baptism does not depend upon the administrator. It depends upon his own faith, knowledge and sincerity. If the baptizer has to be thoroughly Christian in order for the believer to be scripturally immersed then error in the life of the administrator would render invalid the baptism of the believer. If this is true then no one could be certain that he had been scripturally immersed; since we cannot read men’s hearts we might have received immersion at the hands of a hypocrite. What of those baptized by Judas? (John 4:2)? The Scripture does not justify anyone in believing that the validity of a believer’s obedience depends upon another person; any more than an observance of the Lord’s Supper is rendered invalid for all because a wolf in sheep’s clothing has presided at the table or passed the bread and wine.

Since the Mormon doctrine of apostasy is a false doctrine, constructed to fill a “felt-need” of the founders of THE Mormon Church, it finds no support in the Scripture. This being true we reject it. With the proof of its falsity one of the foundation stones of Mormondom collapses. This concludes our series on their doctrine of apostasy. If we have failed to sustain our position in the mind of the reader or if we have in any way misrepresented the LDS, we shall be most humbly grateful to our readers for bringing such to our attention.

TIME TO RENEW

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, Box 1804, Okla. City, Okla.
**WATCHMAN WHAT OF THE NIGHT?--REVERBERATIONS FROM THE UNITY MEETING**

Lexington, Ky., May 20, 1940. Dear Brother Wallace:

You no doubt have had a report of the recent so-called unity meeting here in Lexington. Well, it was held at the Cramer Ave. Church of Christ, a pre-millennial church, and their preacher acting as chairman. A real fellowship was evidenced between the two groups, reminded me more of a Methodist Conference than a unity meeting. Of course they had several things in common, neither of them had any respect for the Truth. To my way of thinking it would be better for all those who stand for the truth, if they would unite.

It was amusing how they avoided the real issues the first day. In fact it looked like they were going to have a real love feast but the last chance, during the open forum one of those sweet-spirited foreign missionaries (Bixler by name) mentioned the organ and at once one of the Christian Church preachers jumped up and ask any one to find a scripture which forbids the use of instruments in worship. Then S. H. Hall arose and said he intended to answer that question the next day in his speech, but he almost used his time in condemning his own brethren for lying on one another and airing their differences out in the papers. He denied any guilt of such himself and said he would even refuse to debate any more. It sounds like sectarianism to me (they never believe in debating.) No proposition was ever made to unite upon, other than some suggested in their addresses that we should all unite upon the Bible. Those meeting here in 1832 desired unity and on a sound basis, but no one at this time seemed to hope to get together here, expressed hope that it would eventually come. Said this was a step toward unity. They have been four years making a step, and I doubt if they really are any closer to real unity than at the first. A general softening up on the Truth was evidenced and I was told that those of our brethren who were on the program were told to go easy. Frankly, I was disappointed with those on the program that I had confidence in, and felt that they would speak boldly and without fear or favor. In such meetings I feel the Truth should be spoken in plain language understandable to all.

The Christian Church brethren were pleading for tolerance and a fellowshipping of them in their practices etc. If they can get brethren to stop opposing their innovations they will have won all they hope to. E. L. Jorgenson was there with his chorus one evening and displayed their ability, I wonder the object in all this? Many things that I do not have time and space to write but this is some of the high lights of the meeting. You may use this as you desire, part or all.

With all good wishes to you and yours,
I am, Fraternally.

* * * * *

E. C. Detherage.

Dear Brother Wallace:

Enclosed is a copy of the program for the “National Unity Meeting” held May 7 and 8, 1940 at Lexington, Kentucky in the building of the Hanover and Cramer Avenue Church of Christ. Sister Scott and I, together with Frank D. Young, Stoy Pate and A. J. Kerr, attended every session of the affair to our personal disgust. Of course, we expected nothing of value to be offered and therefore with one accord we refused to “register” our names, pin name card on lapel of coats, sing their songs, pray, contribute or in anyway leave the impression that we endorsed any part of the procedure. “Our heart was not with them” and our lips did not betray us.

You will want to know first of all, “Who was there?” Well, in addition to those who are listed on the Program there was present: Harry Fox, of David Lipscomb College church; B. D. Morehead, F. L. Rowe, Charles M. Neal, O. D. Bixler, Don Carlos Janes, and perhaps a few Others. J. N. Armstrong sent a telegram expressing regret that he could not be present but offered his best wishes for the success of the meeting. Those mentioned endorsed the proceeding. F. S. Harper, Charles Campbell, Jack G. Dunn also stood aloof.

“What did they do?” The usual thing “the love feast,” talk of fellowship, backslap each other, compliment each others speeches, talk about other meetings to be held, and a panel discussion between several brethren of each group as to the things that divide “us” suggested for an early date.

Not one difference was discussed until the “open forum” at 2:45 Tuesday afternoon when 0. D. Bixler waxed bold and mentioned societies and instrumental music. Brother McClain (Christian Church) questioned the slogan “Speak where the Bible speaks and be silent where it is silent.” He emphasized the Silence and placed blame for the division at the door of “Churches of Christ.” Adamson arose and told the story of the girl who asked the boy friend what did he mean by “love” with his answer—“Sit closer and I’ll demonstrate!” He stated that is what we should do with the “erring brethren” there. Then Sam Hall arose and stated, “I will answer that tomorrow.” (The question of silence) Twenty minutes early the forum ceased with things getting at a rather warm state.

At night Alva Ross Brown gave a dry and uninteresting talk on the work of early restoration activities with a digressive slant to all his remarks. T. C. Wilcox was really expected by us to “stand firm.” His speech was good with the exception of numbers of apologetic statements which in our estimation killed the force of his plain speech. I am sending you a copy of a letter mailed him today and will send you a copy of his sermon at the earliest possible date. I arranged for a stenographer to take his speech and he paid the major portion of the price. Of course, we were all disappointed.

Murch didn’t speak until Wednesday morning. Jorgenson had his chorus down from Louisville and they sang four numbers, entertainment style, after Wilcox’s speech. Murch used his same old line, declaring the divisions of both groups and especially exalted those of the “churches of Christ.” S. S. Lappin made his showful appearance for “unity” and forced a cry for effect. Homer Rutherford and another man each sang a solo.

S. H. Hall started out with his story of how he was an infidel in his teens and read his way out of infidelity without the help of one preacher, repeated his attainment in Atlanta in keeping down division by discussing differences behind closed doors. (He mentioned in forum on Tuesday he did not believe debating was the right procedure between brethren.) So he admits he has done wrong! His talk was based on the rereading of God’s testimony at the rebuilding of Jerusalem and made a fighting talk toward the close of his remarks and Rutherford called time on him and he did not reach the climax. Too much big “I” in his talk. I liked to have forgotten—He spent several minutes
in his first words talking about liars, liars, liars, among us. Never called any names but how he raved. !

W.R. Walker gave the most intelligent address of the meeting and really debated the issue and plead liberty in the realm of silence where he claimed instrumental music, societies etc., belonged. He was bold and defiant and made it known clearly that there would be no concession made by him on those things. He could preach with it or without and never bothered about it.

Adamson told many stories then finally reaching his subject denied his having introduced the organ. Suggested if it was a matter of opinion as they stated to leave it out for the sake of peace. He represented it with a folding chair which he kicked off the platform as he sat down. Of course, the next speaker Sala had to say something "I think there has been too much kicking of the organ out of the churches." So Adamson's speech failed! Sala's talk was on Unity and Evangelism and had little or no connection with the meeting. Witty read his speech and as for its value, it was about the worst of the meeting with no lines drawn.

Trusting this information will give you a little knowledge of the affair that you may expose it further, I am

Yours for the truth,

* * *

c. w. Scott.

Dear Brother Wilcox:

You should be in a position now to point out what you recognize as the "mistakes and failures" together with the "successes and accomplishments" of the "National Unity Meeting" last week at the Hanover and Creamer meeting house in Lexington, Ky. After arriving home and seriously considering the whole affair from every angle, I am persuaded that little or no good will come from such two day "National Unity" (?) sessions.

I have read and re-read your sermon. How fine it would have been if you had not been forced by your agreement with Brother Claude Witty "not to be too specific, nor antagonize." There are several things in your talk that denote a spirit of apology rather than a contending earnestly for the faith. You may say, "I did not mean to leave such an impression" but you can see from your sermon that it is there nevertheless.

For instance: You said, "I have not any patience with the individual who passed judgment upon this meeting prior to the meeting." Those who pass judgment on anything without cause do wrong but this last meeting was not the first one conducted. "A tree is known by its fruit." The "fruit" of such meetings before has been unworthy of praise by anyone. Why was that statement made? Maybe you have a reason unknown to me.

Again: "The only mystery to me is that all people of both the Church of Christ and the Christian Church are not here in this city to boost the thing that we hope will ultimately take place." Now, you know, as do I, that those weak in the faith would have been overthrown by the "fair speeches" made by Murch, Lappin and others. After all addresses have been heard you must admit that it was a good thing that no more were present than were there. Surely, you did not mean to leave the impression that those who were elsewhere about the Lord's work did sin in not going to Lexington?

Then you said, "Brethren, if the preachers of the two groups will lay down the things from which we differ or by which we differ and begin to preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified, as given in the New Testament, the people will follow us." What do you do that will have to be "laid down" as the Christian Church does in the matter of music, societies etc.? So far as I know, nothing. In your tract on "Music in the Worship" you speak in a positive manner and lay the sin for division at the feet of the innovators. The impression you left there was that you were a party to the division that exists now because you practice things "not given by the New Testament." Of course, you don't do that but that is what you said. Now, isn't it? Again, I repeat such statements are or have an "apologetic air."

"I will go home with you and eat your chicken after this thing is over regardless of what you believe." You surely didn't look upon the "unity meeting" with much reverence when you called it "this thing," did you? Will that jest hold up? Is it in harmony with the scripture in every instance? What about that individual or class that the Holy Spirit says, "No, not to eat with such a one?" They have a "belief" do they not? But that statement would mean that you disregard the Spirit's command to "mark" and "avoid" those who "cause division." Brother Wilcox, I know you try to do right in such matters but that is the "spirit of compromise" that made you dissatisfied with your own efforts and state, "I would give twenty five dollars to make another speech tonight [Wednesday, after W. R. Walker's address]."

Almost in the same breath you further stated, "...then may I give those that are not here a lesson that they ought to have?" Who were the "they" and what did the lesson you could give others have to do with the situation you were discussing? Did our Lord carry on a "courtship" with the Pharisees and Saducees, Peter with the murderers of the Christ, Stephen with the enemies of Jesus, Paul with the idolaters, or the apostles with the "Judaiizers?" Nothing in their action denotes a likeness to the "days of courtship." And I think you rightly criticized in an after session conversation the vain talk and palaver about love and courting that crowded every speech the first day of the meeting.

Another statement that you did not mean: "I would like very much to bring them (the piano, a violin and cornet) over into the church, and let me say honestly and candidly (underscoring mine, C. W. S.) that I would go into the Christian Church tonight if I believed that God would let me have music." That is a bad statement for any gospel preacher to make. You know better than that.

The instrumental music issue is just one "innovation" among many that will perpetuate the division between the churches of Christ and the Christian Church. Your sermon would have been most convincing had it not been for your "loose statements."

What was that but an apology when you declared, "I don't understand quite all of Revelation, there is just one verse in there I don't quite understand and that is the verse I don't preach."

You will remember our conversation at lunch time, only six hours before you made that statement, how that you told us you did understand that "one verse" and what it taught. You said "Christ is now reigning." You knew when you said that to the audience that the "premillennialists" are wrong and are sinning before God in dividing the body of Christ just as much as the "Disciples of Christ" are when they insist on the use of societies, instruments of music etc. Again, you did not mean what you said, did you? And you would not say again, "I understand quite all of Revelation but one verse?" You should... have laid the charge for the sin of division over the millennial "ism" at the feet of Jorgenson, Rutherford, Neal and others present who seek to minimize the devastating evil work done by Boll and others. But I am about to forget.
that you told me that you promised Witty “not to be too specific in your speech” and that you were just making an illustration of the matter by mentioning instrumental music and millennialism. Of course, you remember making that statement after you said W. R. Walker “has debated the question this afternoon.”

You have the advantage over others who made speeches for you can see what mistakes were made by you and correct them in the future. I trust you will never make these again. Please do not accuse me of being too critical. I am doing just what I would have you do for me under the same circumstances. It is with a genuine love and respect for the truth of God that I write and point these things out and I sincerely hope and pray that you will never become involved in another situation where you can not preach and teach without agreeing in the outset to “hold back” the truth as it is customary for you to declare it.

I would like to hear from you and learn just what you now think about the “meeting.” Awaiting words from you, I am

Yours for the truth of Christ,

C. W. Scott.

Dear Brother Scott:

Ten years from now I believe you will look back and see what an Ass you have made of yourself in the letter you sent me. I pray that God may forgive you and especially so in reference to some things you mentioned in your letter which have no foundation.

I am ready to defend what I had to say while in Lexington and hope it may accomplish good for our Heavenly Father. Very truly, T. C. Wilcox.

I must admit I was a bit surprised to get the base and vulgar reply that I did from him. Had he been humble and penitent and Christian enough to acknowledge his weak stand at Lexington, I would have hesitated in offering criticism of his action. But now that he is bold and most defiant and will defend what he had to say, I believe he needs attention.

Louisville, Ky., June 3, 1940.

Dear Brother Wallace:

You will not be surprised, I am certain, but I thought you will be interested in the following.

Our local papers announced a “Holy Week” service, at the Central Christian Church, with D. H. Friend as the speaker.

Friend-did speak, Don Carlos Janes prayed, Murdock, the Christian Church “pastor” prayed and Sterling Yeager, preacher for the Ornsby Avenue, “Bollite” Church, dismissed.

Friend extended invitation, requesting any one coming forward to give their hand to “Bro. Murdock,” which, of course, was inviting those present to become members of the Christian Church.

I know these reports to be correct, for my daughter and one of our members, Sister Brown, under a misunderstanding of the nature of the meeting, were present. . . .

I feel certain that the “Bollites” will be delighted with Brewers’ connection with Harding College. . . .

One of our members, Mrs. A. C. Brown, has a friend living in Manila and I give you below, a quotation from a letter Mrs. Brown recently received from her Manila friend—

“There is a “so-called” Church of Christ missionary over here, but they don’t even serve the Lords Supper on Sunday or hold meetings. They attend the Union Church and they only have Lord’s Supper every three months or so. Mother thought maybe Mr. and Mrs. Cassell served the Lord’s supper in their home—she inquired and they don’t. Of course it may be possible that the Church of Christ “isn’t paying their expenses—but I understood Willa May to say that they were missionaries of the Church of Christ.”

The “Willa May” mentioned above is the wife of Joe Blauvett, one of the members of the 5th and M. Church, where D. H. Friend preaches. The missionary referred to is H. J. Cassell and Don Carlos Janes tells Willa May that he believes her information is incorrect but that he would look into the matter. This looks like another “Bollite” has “gone modern.”

This morning I saw in front of the meeting place of the “Open Door Church,” where this man Cauble preaches (He preached for the Highland Church some years ago) a sign announcing that Virgil Smith, one of the “Boll boys,” is to hold a meeting for the “Church of the Open Door.” I think this man Smith also once preached for the Highland church.

I think at least fifteen or twenty young men, once faithful to the cause here in Louisville, after coming under the influence of Boll, Jorgenson and Janes, have had their faith wrecked. And yet these “softies” continue to defend those false teachers.

Am sending this information just to keep you posted.

I hope you are enjoying good health and a full measure of happiness.

Sincerely,

C. A. Taylor.

SIGHTING-IN SHOTS

(Con’t. From Page 1)

we see it Baptists have no right to high-hat the Methodists even on baptism. “The importance of baptism” is taught in the New Testament but the language that does it not express the Baptist idea on the subject. Instead of such vague expressions as “Baptism teaches a great truth in a most dramatic and convincing manner” it would be much better to go ahead and show “the importance of baptism” by quoting a few texts of scripture on the subject. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” (Mark 16:16) “Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” (John 3:5) “And Peter said unto them, Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.” (Acts 2:38) “And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name.” (Acts 22:16) “Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death?” (Romans 6:3) This is the sort of preaching that showed “the importance of baptism” before there was a Baptist church. “Such preaching should return” even if it does play hob with the Baptist church and gives Baptist preachers and editors creeping paralysis. “The importance of Baptism should be magnified over and over by our preachers.” I join the Baptist and Reflector in saying ‘Amen, brother editor! Such preaching should return.” When can we expect “our preachers” to ‘return?” “While the lamp holds out to burn. . . .” you know!
"CONCERNING HORSE CAVE"

E. G. Creacy

Under the above caption, the May issue of R. H. Boll's little magazine makes as follows:

Forasmuch as, in some parts and papers, a reported change at Horse Cave, Ky. (in attitude or fellowship) has been played as caused by "premillennial" teaching, the Word and Work wishes to state:

No one connected with this magazine had any previous knowledge of, nor anything what to do with, this reported change; nor had the "premillennial" doctrine any connection or relation to it. The good brother who serves the Horse Cave church as local minister sought no counsel of us. All has avoided cooperation with the brethren of the Word and Work-going so far as to state publicly (in the Gospel Advocate) his disavowal of agreement with the editor of this magazine on lines of prophecy. Nevertheless, for all this, we regarded him still as a brother beloved.

Whatever Horse Cave's new attitude or announcement may mean or imply, neither the Word and Work, nor any of its active friends, nor yet its prophetic teaching, can have any responsibility of blame in the matter. This church and this congregation have suffered much from virulent opposition, if not persecution, and this has had everything to do with events there. We mention this, not by way of extenuation, but as offering some explanation.

We make this statement in the interest of truth and fairness, and in order to forestall any possible misunderstanding and misstatement.-Word and Work.

Thus R. H. Boll seeks to shift the responsibility of conditions at Horse Cave from himself to another. It is generally known that the church at Horse Cave has recently joined the denominations— it went to the "Christian Church." But this church has been drifting for years. The drifting started when "Boll Preachers" began their divisive work there. D. H. Friend opened the flood-gate. H. L. Olmstead followed Friend. Then came J. Scott Greer, Homer McLain and finally, Kenneth Spaulding. Spaulding finished the job. The church is now a "Christian Church"— digressive.

This is the fruit of "Bollism." It is as impossible for R. H. Boll to shift the responsibility of the Horse Cave apostasy from himself to another as it was for old Pilate to wash his hands of the blood of Jesus who stood before him as the victim of his treachery. Brother Boll and his associates cannot escape the responsibility for the reaping that has come from their own sowing. "By their fruits ye shall know them."

A church may apostatize as well as an individual. The Horse Cave church has apostatized. Brother Boll says it is because of "virulent opposition, if not persecution," and that "this has had everything to do with events" at Horse Cave. If virulent opposition and persecution caused this church to apostatize, what has caused so many of Boll's satellites to apostatize in recent years? Will Brother Boll tell us? I shall give a few concrete examples:

1. Hume McHenry and 0. S. Martin, schooled in Boll's teaching, went to the Adventists.
2. 0. S. Boyer, schooled in Boll's doctrine, went to the "Holiness Church."
3. Virgil Smith, a strong Boll satellite, departed from the truth and now teaches that we may speak in "unknown tongues."
4. Virgil Smith's father, who was closely associated with Boll, went to the digressives.
5. O. E. Phillips, a strong Boll sympathizer, went to the digressives.
6. Wallace Shuble, who was Boll's "Child in the faith" and as Pastor of the Jorgenson-Janes church in Louisville, pulled off and started his own "Church of the Open Door"-right in the shadows of Boll, Jorgenson, Janes and Friend! And, this Virgil Smith has recently assisted Cauble in a revival, and at this writing is assisting another "Holiness" cult in Louisville in a revival.

7. Homer McLain, who came to Horse Cave direct from the "Boll Headquarters" in Louisville, went to the digressives.
8. David L. Cooper, who was a strong Boll sympathizer, has gone so far from the truth, that he no longer claims his identity with the church.
9. Frank M. Mullins, Dr. Eugene V. Wood and his son, Vernon, who are "premillennial-Bollites" of first-rank, stood with J. Frank Norris in Forth Worth, Texas, against the dozen or more churches of Christ. They also supported John R. Rice, Baptist, in Dallas, Texas.

Others could be listed, but this is enough to definitely prove that those who accept the Boll doctrine, or even apologize for it, lose their respect for the word of God as their guide. It is folly to try to evade or minimize the bad effects of this Russellistic garbage that is being dumped into churches of Christ by R. H. Boll and the sweet-spirited, modern San-ballats, of the present day.

The Word and Work's explanation (?) of the Horse Cave apostasy is an apology for Spaulding, "as a brother beloved," going into denominationalism. With Boll it is only an "attitude or fellowship." Brother Boll cannot "forestall" the results of the erroneous teaching and the party movement he has launched.

The June issue of Boll's paper carries a "statement" from Kenneth Spaulding, but it does not help matters for Spaulding to disclaim premillennialism, and declare that it has not been taught at Horse Cave in more than five years! It is a matter of record that it was taught there, and that the church was at peace until it was taught; and when Friend began to teach it, and had Boll to come and deliver "ten lectures" on premillennialism, division resulted. Then the preachers (Friend, Olmstead, et al) began to court favor with the denominations. The church was engulfed in a whirl-pool of denominationalism. and now it is a "Christian Church." These are facts that cannot be explained away. Digressive preachers are "filling the pulpit."

It is refreshing to note, however, that a remnant is saved at Horse Cave. Cecil B. Douthitt and Marion Davis recently labored in a two-weeks' tent meeting. The ancient gospel was preached again in Horse Cave. Spaulding did not attend the gospel meetines, but he did attend the picture show and worked to keep others from attending. This I know upon good authority.

We are indebted to R. H. Boll and the "active friends" of the Word and Work for the sad plight at Horse Cave, Kentucky.

THE LIPSCOMB COLLEGE PAMPHLET

An alumnus of David Lipscomb College sent me a copy of Bro. Ijams' pamphlet on the second coming of Christ.

Thanks for the Ijams' pamphlet. Just like Clay Purlias' tract, it is good against the doctrine but doesn't show any stand or convictions at all on the question of fellowshipping the Boll faction that has torn Jesus' body. On contrary by implication he says those of us who "mark them" (Rom. 16:17) are not doing the edifying things, see his statement quoting I Cor. 14:26 on his first page. The sympathizers cannot even write a against false doctrine without an indirect slap at those who militantly are fighting the fight of faith.-Hugo McCord.
IDENTITY OF THE CHURCH No. 2

OSCAR SMITH

There is in the world an institution which the Lord calls “my church.” This is the Lord’s own way of referring to it. On another occasion he called it “the kingdom of God.” (Jno. 3:3) After the Holy Spirit came into the church to give it life, inspired preachers in describing it used such terms as “the church of the living God” (1 Tim. 3:15); and “one body.” (Eph. 4:14.) To be in this one body, kingdom or church is the same as to be “in Christ.” It is to be in a state of justification or pardon.

The Lord’s people have always been misunderstood. When Paul entered Rome as a prisoner, he met “the chief men of the Jews” who were anxious to hear what he had to say. “But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest: for as concerning this sect, we know that every where it is spoken against.” (Acts 28:22.) We are told that the original word from which we have “sect,” occurs nine times in the New Testament and is translated “sect” five times, and “heresies” four times. It is never used in a good sense in the Bible. What the Lord calls “my church” the “chief men of the Jews” referred to it as a “sect.” They also declared that “it was every where spoken against.” Thus the institution which the Lord founded, the only divine institution in all the world, was every where spoken against, and was called a “sect” by the religious leaders among the Jews. In the twenty-fourth chapter of the book of Acts we have an account of the high priest and elders attempting to prosecute Paul. They brought along an orator named Tertullus, who was familiar with Roman courts and their procedure. This orator as he is called began his address by complimenting ungodly Felix. Then in the fifth verse he stated the charge against Paul as follows: “We have found this man a pestilent fellow, and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world, and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes.” (Acts 24:5.) Paul’s answer to these charges is given in verses 14-21 of this same chapter. Hear a portion of it: “But this I confess unto thee, that after the way which they call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers, believing all things which are written in the law and in the prophets.” (Acts 24:14.) Paul did not admit that he was a member of a “sect,” but admitted that “after the way which they call a sect” he worshipped the true God. It is not enough to know that we are religious, or members of a religious society; we must know that we are members of the church which our Lord himself established. And now, continuing the study of Church Identity, I call attention to point No.

5. Jesus Christ is the only head of the Church. “And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the firstborn from the dead; that in all things he might have the preeminence.” (Col. 1:18.) Paul tells us again that the head of the church was raised from the dead, and was then made head of the body. (Eph. 1:19-23.) The head of the New Testament church is in heaven at the right hand of God. Any institution with any other head is not the church which was founded by our Lord. Do you say that is rather strong teaching? What have we to go by in making the journey from this world to the heavenly Canaan except the Bible? Man is permitted to make the trip but once; hence the importance of “speaking as the oracles of God.”

6. There was a well-defined law of admission into the church. After Christ’s resurrection from the dead, he gave to the apostles the Great Commission.” This commission contains the conditions upon which all nations may enter into the kingdom of God. It is given in Matt. 28:18, 19; Mar. 16:15, 16; Lk. 24:46, 47. The book of Acts is a Divine commentary upon the Great Commission. When men entered the kingdom of God in apostolic times, they obeyed the “law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.” This law is called the “perfect law of liberty” in James 1:25. It demands of those who desire to enter the church faith in Christ, repentance, confession of the name of Christ and immersion into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. A society which has a law of admission unknown to the New Testament is not the church of Christ.”

7. The followers of Christ were distinguished by a divinely-given name. One of the best ways to identify a person or an institution is by its name. If you were looking for a man by the name of Brown, and should find one wearing the name Smith, you would know at once that he was not the man you were looking for. We should be content to wear only the names which are given in the Bible. The slogan “Where the Bible speaks, we speak; where the Bible is silent we are silent,” is just as appropriate now as when it was first spoken. It is a paraphrase of the Bible statement, “If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God.” If the church is an institution belonging to the New Testament, why not use a New Testament term in referring to it. There is no necessity for a new term to describe it, unless it is a new institution. In Rom. 16:16 Paul says, “the churches of Christ salute you.” The church belongs to Christ because he built it. It is said to be his bride, and as such, it should honor him by wearing his own precious blood.

Individuals were called by a new name. God thought the name of so much importance that he placed it in a prominent place in prophecy. “For Zion’s sake will I not hold my peace, and for Jerusalem’s sake I will not rest, until the righteousness thereof go forth as brightness, and the salvation thereof as a lamp that burneth. And the, Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory: and thou shalt be called by a new name which the mouth of the Lord shall name.” (Isa. 62:1, 2.) Again: “Even unto them will give in mine house and within my walls; a place and a name better than sons and daughters: I will give them an everlasting name, that shall not be cut off.” (Isa. 56:5.) And again: “Behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name.” (Isa. 65:14, 15.) Immediately after the Gentiles were brought into the kingdom of Christ, Luke informs us that “the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch.” (Acts 11:26.) The name “Christian” is derived from Christ. You cannot speak the name Christian without speaking the name of Christ. King Agrippa said unto Paul, “Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.” (Acts 26:28.) Peter wrote, “But let none of you suffer as a murderer, or as a thief, or as an evil doer, or as a busybody in other men’s matters. Yet if any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed: but let him glorify God on this behalf.” (1 Pet. 4:15, 16.) Notice the following Scriptures: “Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name.” (Phil. 2:9.) “And ye shall be hated of all men for my name’s sake.” (Matt. 10:22.) “Do not they blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye are called?” (Jas. 2:7.) “And thou holdest fast my name, and hast not denied my faith” (Rev. 22:16.)
When they shall continue to occupy thrones as judges in the final roll call will be made, and all nations will assemble. It identifies those who wear it without any explanation. Lord, and his name one."

3:17.) "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named." (Eph. 3:14, 15.) "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day there shall be one Lord, and his name one." (Zech.14:9.) The name of Christ, the name Christian is important to a follower of the Lord. It identifies those who wear it without any explanation. The Bible states plainly and emphatically that Christians are married to Christ. Brides, in order to be respected must wear their husband's name. It was Paul who said in about the year A. D. 64 that the whole family in heaven and on earth recognizes and honors the name of Christ. In no other name is there salvation declares Peter. When the apostles began their work under the last great commission of the Lord, one of the first declarations they made, embraced the name of Jesus Christ. One of these days, the final roll call will be made, and all nations will assemble before the Judge of the living and the dead. Then, we shall not be asked if we followed this man or that man; if we wore this human name or that human name: but we shall be rewarded because of our faithfulness to the Lord, or we shall be punished for unfaithfulness. If God punished the Jews for refusing to wear the name of Jehovah and who went after strange gods, what do you think will be the destiny of people who wear human names instead of the name of Jesus Christ?

8. The apostolic church assembled for worship upon the first day of the week. Today, we hear much about "the Christian sabbath." But a careful study of the word of God will reveal no such day as belonging to the kingdom of God. Christ by his death abolished the law of the Ten Commandments, and established a new institution. (Eph. 2:15.) Instead of the Old Covenant, we have the New Covenant. Instead of the Passover feast, we have a new feast called the Lord's supper. The sabbath day of rest is no longer observed, but the Lord's day is as a restful Sabbath of the Lord. In the act of slaying the Passover lamb, the first day of the week is alluded to as the remembrance of the Lord's resurrection and ascension. The Christian sabbath was" ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things." And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ." (Eph. 4:10-12.) The apostles and prophets had no successors. We have the same apostles now that the church of the first century had. They shall continue to occupy thrones as judges in the kingdom of Christ as long as the kingdom stands. The terms "bishops," "pastors," "elders," and "overseers," are applied to the same class of officers in the church of Christ. Each local congregation had a plurality of such officers, who had no jurisdiction outside of the congregations to which they belonged. There was also a plurality of deacons in each local congregation. It was their duty to serve the local congregation to the best of their ability. The evangelists were the public proclaimers of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Today we have in some societies, Presidents, and many officials unknown to the New Testament. And all preachers are "Reverends" in the estimation of the public. Think of Paul referring to Peter as the "Rev. Peter," or think of Peter referring to Paul as "the Rt. Rev. Paul!" The term "reverend" is used only once in the Bible, there it is a title belonging to and applied to Jehovah. The Lord forbid that I should take a term which is applied only to God, and apply it to myself. An institution having any other system of church government or organization, is not the apostolic church.
The Nominal Professor And The True Believer

CLED E. WALLACE

“Baptist Strength” is very impressive according to Dr. J. H. Rushbrooke, President of the Baptist World Alliance. He cites statistics that show a total membership of over twelve million throughout the world and an increase of something over three hundred thousand during the past year. This is truly remarkable in view of the fact that the whole New Testament calls only one man “the Baptist” and such expressions as “a Baptist,” “Baptists,” “Baptist churches,” “Baptist denomination” etc., are not found at all in that inspired volume. “Baptist strength” is really remarkable considering the late start it got. Evidently somebody has been pretty busy sowing tares in the field and if they keep on growing at the present rate until the harvest there’s no telling how many there will be. Possibly Baptist statistics will be of aid to the angels when the time comes to gather them into bundles.

When a man is saved can he ever become unsaved? A spurious or merely nominal professor of religion may, indeed, lapse into his former manner of life, as that is his nature (Peter 2:22). But what is said of him cannot be predicated of the Lord’s true “sheep.” Whoever lapses into confirmed rejection of Christ has not once been saved and then lost his salvation. He has never “believed to the saving of his soul” (Heb. 10:39) The true believer is saved forever.

(Editor Baptist and Reflector)

The editor is having a hard time walking the tight rope ‘of his Baptist foolishness without falling into the Calvinistic mess of “If you seek it you can’t find it; if you find it you can’t lose it; and if you lose it you never had it.” We are supposed to believe that the Lord has two kinds of sheep in his fold, “nominal” sheep and “true” sheep. When he points out to his sheep the danger of falling, instructs them how to keep from falling, tells them how to get back in case they do fall, and warns them of the perdition that awaits them if they do not come back, he is talking to his “nominal” sheep. The registered ones are safe, it is only the scrubs that are in real danger. These more than twelve million Baptists sheep who bear witness to “Baptist Strength” throughout the world have all been voted as regenerated and received Baptist baptism. How many of them are only “nominal” and wear sheep’s clothing over their goat hides nobody knows. Then there are a lot of “true” sheep with Methodist and other brands on them who contribute nothing to “Baptist Strength” statistically or otherwise. It is a tangled mixup, if you ask me.

The editor is unfortunate in his selection of a text to prove his theory of the impossibility of apostasy. He cites 2 Peter 2:22 to prove that this “nominal professor of religion” had never been saved at all. Peter says otherwise. Read the two preceding verses. “For if, after they have escaped the defilements of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein and overcome, the last state is become worse than the first.” They that once knew the Lord are now entangled. The editor thinks they just escaped nominally. He should not pervert the scriptures that way. “Let us therefore give diligence to enter into that rest, that no man fall after the same example of disobedience.” (Heb. 4:11) “So then, brethren, we are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh: for if ye live after the flesh, ye must die: but if by the Spirit ye put to death the deeds of the body, ye shall live.” (Romans 8:12, 13) Paul did not use up a lot of paper warning “nominal professors of religion” against falling from grace they were never in. Don’t search Paul for such inconsistency. You are more likely to find it in the editor of the Baptist and Reflector. “My brethren, if any among you err from the truth, and one convert him: let him know, that he who converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins.” (James 5:19, 20) He who contends that a believer cannot lapse into unbelief should study the scriptures on the subject.

Charles A. Leonard, Sr., tells us in the Baptist and Reflector how “a Chinese finds salvation of soul and restoration of sight.” It happened “at one of the distant outstations of the North Manchuria field.” This makes it quite impossible for me to check up on the facts in the case. I have been hearing of such miracles all my life, but it has so happened in each instance that such wonders were in some remote part of the earth from where I happened to be. Catholics, Mormons, Christian Scientists, and an occasional Baptist, relate their stories of miraculous marvels but the scene is always far-away and defies investigation. They do not favor us with a case like Peter and John did the inhabitants of Jerusalem, where a miracle was performed in the open on a well-known victim. A searching investigation was so satisfactory that even the skeptical Sanhedrin was forced to admit “that indeed a notable miracle hath been wrought through them, is manifest to all that dwell in Jerusalem; and we cannot deny it.” (Acts 4:16)

In this case, the author of the article was “caused to rejoice in hearing of the spiritual and physical blessing that had come to a dear old brother. Swen.” It appears that “the dear old brother” had lost his sight through “indignation and sorrow caused” by persecution and loss inflicted by Chinese bandits. The bandits didn’t punch his eyes out, they just made him so all-fired mad he couldn’t see! But later he contacted a Baptist missionary, found Jesus, and “asked the Lord to restore his sight as a proof that his sins had been forgiven.” It is stated that the Lord accommodatingly furnished the proof. I nowhere read in the New Testament that physical restoration of sight is a proof of pardon to blind alien sinners, else there should be no blind Christians. I am not convinced in the first place that anger will produce physical blindness that will last tiny longer than the tempest of anger. Had the bandits punched the “dear old brother’s” eyes out, it is inferred that the Lord would have given him a brand-new pair in answer to prayer.

There must be something in the water or the air in China that affects missionaries. I’m sure they do not smoke opium, so their opium-like dreams must come from another source. Why, even one of “our” missionaries was allegedly convinced that a Seventh Day Adventist preacher was casting out devils over there. This brother had an honorary degree bestowed upon him for his superb services over there and is now President of his Alma Mater. The evidence of demon exorcism must not have been airtight, for the brother changed his mind when he returned to normal American life. He should have known all along that the Lord didn’t think that much of a Seventh Day adventist, unless he forgot all that he ever knew of the New Testament, if he ever knew anything about it. Modern miracle-workers are all heretics anyhow. They do not tell sinners what the New Testament teaches that they must do to be saved.