One of our strenuous and bitter campaigners in Texas politics is reputed to have expressed a bit of homely philosophy. “I ain’t mad at nobody. I used to get a little pleasure out of hating a few folks but I don’t any more. It ain’t worth it. Why, it takes all your time to hate even three people.”

Hating even one can take up nearly all your time. If it were only time wasted it would not be quite so bad but the hater makes a fountain of poison of his own heart. When a rattlesnake gets mad and his rattles begin to sing, he emits an unpleasant odor. You can smell him about as soon as you can hear him. The sound of a hater is not the worst part of him. He stinks! We are a free people, free to think and free to express ourselves. Differences are likely to arise and issues will continue to be discussed. Some of these issues call for a vigorous clash of ideas in which truth and error will collide head-on. Let the fight be hard, if need be, and the nature of the issue justifies it, but let it be a fair fight and without hate. Personal malice is no part of the Christian’s equipment and never did aid in defining an issue.

My friend Jimmie Love11 is a funny man. At times I can’t make up my mind whether to get peeved at him or laugh at him. I usually wind up by laughing. I do not know of any way to take him very seriously, although some seem to. He is an avowed anti-premillennialist. He has told me so and written me so, given a one hundred percent indorsement of our fight against it both as to matter and manner, and calls God to witness his determination to smite it on its capital end if it ever rears that end in California. He goes out of his way to shout up and indorse the Jorgen-son song book. I wonder if he is ready to recommend that R. H. Boll’s literature be used in Bible classes conducted by the brethren? Does he consider Jorgenson loyal to the truth? He is terribly impressed over the fact the book is produced at the high school age is about five cents, the price of a good cig-arr or one cup of coffee, or a package of chewing gum, if you prefer it. I was amazed when I read his complaint un-til I got down to what was the matter with him. Jesse P. Sewell “is working on religious literature” which will “soon be ready for sale” and Jimmie is talking that up and thinks it will help to talk down what is being generally used. “There is not a man in the brotherhood who knows as much about Christian education as does Jessie P. Sewell” avers our Brother Jimmie. It looks like a conspiracy. Jimmie might have modified that sentence and averted controversy by declaring that nobody knows as much along that line as Brother Sewell and Brother Lovel thinks he does but there is room for an honest difference of opinion and Jim-mie should not be so dogmatic about the matter. If Broth-er Sewell thinks he can serve the cause of truth by getting out some literature, it is his privilege to have a try at it and may be he will succeed better than he has in the paper business. It is hardly ethical however for him to appear as a savior of the brotherhood from the cupidity of George Showalter and Leon McQuiddy. I know all three men person-ally, if not intimately and I did not know that Sewell was so far superior to them in his gifts until I saw it in Jim-mie’s paper. I wonder how Jimmie found it out. Brother Sewell has recently been in California but of course he did not tell him. Jimmie has a gift for inhaling floating im-pressions and putting them in his paper to be retracted lat-er.

Brother Jimmie made some wild statements about the other papers when he went in with the Christian Leader. He has recently and properly retracted them. There are some good men writing literature for use among the churches. Some of them are at least as smart, if not as talkative, as Sewell. They are not being paid as much as Jimmie is paid by the Du Pont Co. to sell gun powder. Jimmie needs to do some more retracting even if Sewell succeeds in reduc-ing the prices of quarterlies from five cents to four cents per copy. And he may be able to do it if Clinton David-son gets behind him strong enough. It looks like Jimmie has decided to quit trying to “clean up our messes” and start a trade war.

Over in Kentucky among the hills, there stands an an cient looking meeting house. Over its door is written “Little Hope Church.” Some churches outside of Kentucky are in that condition but have not been frank enough to write it over their door post.
THE UNITY MEETING AT LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

JOHN T. LEWIS

All I know about this "historic meeting" is what I have read from "F. L. Rowe's notes" in the New Christian Leader. All great shows must have a propaganda agent to go before with his advertising literature to prepare the minds of the people for the show. I do not know whether the committee on arrangements appointed Brother Rowe to this important task, or whether he was a self-appointed propagandist; but he did do a good job of it. The meeting could not have had a better setting than that which Brother Rowe prepared for it through the New Christian Leader. The first step in his stage setting was his refusal to let the Boll-Showalter articles, on the Millennium, appear in the New Christian Leader.

The editor of the New Christian Leader says: "The articles in question and their authors were first suggested by Brother Clinton Davidson. I approved. The executive committee of the board, of which Dr. C. B. F. Young is chairman, also approved. This done, the articles were secured and their proposed publication was announced. Brother F. L. Rowe, who had published the Christian Leader for fifty-one years, and who supposedly knew its readers well, immediately protested by letter and telegram, saying that churches where the Christian Leader had always gone had never been bothered over the issue and that its appearance in the paper would greatly distress and disturb them. (That is the same old smoke screen that the brethren spread over the religious societies and instrumental music was raging. In modern warfare they would be the "fifth column" element. J. T. L.) The manner of his protest, together with a milder one from Brother John E. Kirk, caused Dr. Young to ask that the articles not be published." When I read this I asked myself the question: Is F. L. Rowe, "also among the prophets?" But as he proceeded with his propaganda for the "Lexington Unity Meeting" the mystery cleared. The church where the "unity meeting" was to be held was a strong premillennial church, and it would never do to "disturb" his readers with such non- consequential articles before the great love feast came off. His next step was to write up "Historical Lexington." His effort was a classic, applying the same reasoning to the house of the Lord and the bond of love and Christian fellowship which once bound "the best preachers in the brotherhood" named by Brother McGarvey, as builders of the Cramer and Hanover Avenue church, had been broken by R. H. Boll's vagaries of 'a future earthly kingdom, in which Christ is to be demoted from a Spiritual Ruler to an earthly King to rule over an earthly kingdom, sitting on David's earthly throne in Jerusalem, for one thousand years. And surely they knew that the church in Louisville, Ky., where M. C. Kurfees preached for more than a third of a century, and the church in Winchester, Ky., where J. W. Harding spent a good part of his life, were supporting men trying to build up the church in Lexington, and that there is no fellowship between the church meeting now in a hall, supported by the Louisville and Winchester churches and the Cramer and Hanover church where the unity meeting was held. I wonder if it would "distress and disturb" the readers of the New Christian Leader to know these facts?

In a successful show there must be clowns as well as ring-masters. In his write up of "The Unity Meeting At Lexington," after it was over, Brother Rowe presents James DeForest Murch, Witty, and S. S. Lappin as the ring-masters, and "Happy" Adamsom, and Sam Hall as the clowns. He says: "The best preachers in the brotherhood," named by Brother McGarvey, as builders of the Cramer and Hanover Avenue church, had a whole lot of sunshine with the merriment that is a dominant part in his make up. He believes in demonstration and he always scores a point (A good clown never fails to score with the crowd). This time he used an innocent folding chair. After telling how he would protect the peace and harmony and order of his own household he applied the same reasoning to the house of the Lord and made the declaration that if there were anything in the Lord's house that didn't belong there he would kick it out, "Brother Rowe does not tell whether these illustrious dead fell asleep "in Jesus," in the hope of a glorious resurrection, when there "shall be richly supplied unto them the entrance into the eternal Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," or whether they died in the hope of going to Jerusalem to take part in a millennium of an earthly kingdom to be ruled over by Jesus Christ demoted to an earthly ruler-which is the faith and hope of the church where the "unity meeting" was held. Neither did Brother Rowe tell us what had become of the churches in Lexington built up by the labors of the pioneers. He did not even mention the Broadway Church that thought more of the organ than they did of the fellowship of Brother McGarvey-they put the organ in, and put McGarvey out. Of course, if Brother Rowe had mentioned that fact, it might have disturbed and disturbed his readers. Brother Rowe therefore very prudently leaves the pioneers in the cemetery, and takes up the history of "the Church of Christ now meeting at Cramer and Hanover Avenue, Lexington, Kentucky, as furnished by H. H. Shockney." Brother Shockney does not mention the pioneers nor their work; but gives a new list of preachers. He says: "We have also been blessed with the help and encouragement of some of the best preachers in the brotherhood. Some of which I will name: Brother J. W. Harding, M. C. Kurfees, H. H. Adamsom, J. K. P. South, S. H. Jones, E. P. Watson, F. L. Rowe, Dave Jones, J. W. Shepherd, H. L. Olmstead, R. H. Boll, E. L. Jorgenson, J. L. Hines, W. K. Harding and M. D. Baumer," etc. To my way of thinking this bit of propaganda, put out in the interest of the "unity meeting," was both deceptive and detestable. Both Brother Rowe and Brother Shockney knew that bond of love and Christian fellowship which once bound "the best preachers in the brotherhood," named by Brother McGarvey, as builders of the Cramer and Hanover Avenue church, had been broken by R. H. Boll's vagaries of 'a future earthly kingdom, in which Christ is to be demoted from a Spiritual Ruler to an earthly King to rule over an earthly kingdom, sitting on David's earthly throne in Jerusalem, for one thousand years. And surely they knew that the church in Louisville, Ky., where M. C. Kurfees preached for more than a third of a century, and the church in Winchester, Ky., where J. W. Harding spent a good part of his life, were supporting men trying to build up the church in Lexington, and that there is no fellowship between the church meeting now in a hall, supported by the Louisville and Winchester churches and the Cramer and Hanover church where the unity meeting was held. I wonder if it would "distress and disturb" the readers of the New Christian Leader to know these facts?
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with the audience.” Mirabile Dietu—wonderful to tell. It makes me shudder to think what might have happened if “that unity meeting” had been in a digressive meeting house, and if Brother Adamson had kicked the organ as he kicked that “poor chair.” He doubtless would have broken his big toe, and I am sure the ring-masters would have cracked their whips over their chief clown’s head, and that might have thrown the whole monkey tribe into a free-for-all fight. This is just a figure of speech—you know men make monkeys out of themselves some times, and when they do their ancestral (?) instincts will out.

Brother Rowe next says: “Sam Hall is another loud speaker. Several times in his dramatic outburst in defense of the purity of the worship, he almost scared me with the electrical suddenness of his expostulations and dramatic climaxes.” “Sudden expostulations” and “dramatic climaxes” are the “electrical” shocks that characterize the antics of a good clown all right. Brother Rowe then takes up the ring-masters. He says: “James DeForest Murch presented a barrage of questions. He didn’t answer them nor ask for answers but left them with his hearers to think about.” If “Happy” Adamson and Sam Hall had answered “James DeForest Murch’s barrage of questions,” instead of kicking chairs and expostulating they might have gotten somewhere. It is possible, however, if they had done that, the readers of the New Christian Leader would have been “distressed and disturbed.” Next: “Brother Witty (Detroit, made the closing address in which he deplored the present divided condition with an earnest plea that we get together on the Bible patterns. (Does Brother Witty believe that missionary societies, organs, fiddles, and horns are in the Bible pattern? If not, why didn’t he tell the brethren that at their next meeting he would have “Happy” Adamson to kick those things out? J. T. L.) If we continue to justify our conduct by the judgment of man?” If so, I agree with him—we will get nowhere, but if we pray and plan to do God’s work in his own way we can get together and actually be one.” What does Brother Witty mean by these last statements? Does he mean that they have to justify their conduct in these farcical “union meetings” by the “judgment of man?” If so, I agree with him—they will get nowhere. Surely he does not mean that those who oppose, and fight, missionary societies, and instrumental music in the work and worship of the church have to justify their opposition “by the judgment of man.” If he means to say that many of the Churches of Christ have about every thing that the digressives have but the musical instruments, then I agree with him: but I do not see any need for them to have “union meetings” to get together—just let them get a Jew’s harp, a fiddle, a horn, or an organ and they will “actually be one.”

Finally Brother Rowe says: “S. S. Lappin made a masterly address. His experience among the brethren lapses over as a connecting link or bond between the former days and the present. If so, Lappin should have been able to point out, in his “masterly address,” the things that have caused the division, so “Happy” Adamson could have kicked the right thing. As it was some of the digressives may have thought that they have as much scripture for the organ as “we” have for the “ folding chair.” Any how any body could kick a “poor chair,” but not everybody can deliver “a masterly address.” I conclude, from Brother Rowe’s report of the “Lexington Union Meeting,” and love feast, that the digressives won the draw.

While the New Christian Leader was dishing out this “union” hash to its readers the Christian Standard was reporting Frederick D. Kershner’s finding among the “Stars.” In the Christian Standard of June 22, 1940, page 23 Mr. Kershner says: “Certain busy ones from the most strait-laced Southern nonconformists took it upon them-selves to go to Washington and insist that the Federal census should not include their congregations among the heretical progressives.” This is a bit of information (?) that Mr. Kershner did not get from the “stars,” most of the “Stars” were light bearers, not falsifiers. The above is a fable fabricated in the fertile mind of the Dean of the school of religion at Butler University, and published in the Christian Standard to smear the Churches of Christ in the South. The facts are these. At the turn of the century, the government at Washington sent a man to Nashville to see Brother Lipscomb, and get him to set up a list of the Churches of Christ for the census bureau, but Brother Lipscomb was not interested in numbering God’s people, the census man then asked Brother Lipscomb to suggest some one that he might get, and Brother Lipscomb suggested Brother J. W. Shepherd, and Brother J. W. Shepherd did the best he could in getting up a list of the Churches of Christ for the census, at the request of the government. If the Dean of the school of religion at Butler University has any respect for his veracity he will either name “the most strait-laced Southern nonconformists” who went to Washington, or he will with-drawn his false statements. I have named my men, and one of them is yet alive. Will Mr. Kershner deny the facts that I have given?

The “Dean” continues: “They wanted everybody to understand that in following their own Simon-pure plea for Christian union they definitely excluded and excommunicated three-fourths of the group to which they belonged. This action was tragic in the extreme, not only because it washed some particularly dirty linen in the full gaze of the public, but also because, like the decrees of the council of Trent, it crystallized and confirmed what had been before only a more or less indeterminate schism. After the official census reports divided the undenominational Disciples into two denominations, Disciples of Christ and Churches of Christ, the plea for Christian union was not heard as frequently as of yore along the banks of the Wabash, the Buffalo or the Monongehela.”

Brother Kershner got rather poetical in the above. Judging from the above he can handle poetry and fiction better than he can handle facts-the truth. The absurdity of the thing is, he makes the government census responsible for the unfortunate division among God’s people—whereas the government was only publishing the conditions as they found them. As to his reference to “washing some particularly dirty linen in the full gaze of the public,” turn to page four of the same issue of the Christian Standard and you will see that Edwin R. Ereett, the editor, is washing some “particularly dirty linen” for his and Brother Kershner’s open membership brethren and that in “full gaze of the public.” After all, I like the Christian Standard’s way of washing “dirty linen” better than I do the papers among “us” that try to hide the dirt.
If you will read my article in the May issue of the Bible Banner in connection with this article you will have my review of Boll's theory of "The Kingdom in Acts." The whole superstructure of Boll's vagaries about a thousand years reign of Christ over an earthly kingdom, sitting upon David's earthly throne restored in Jerusalem, beginning at Christ's second coming, stands or falls upon his arguments (?) on Acts 2:30-33. Read those verses, then read Boll following exegesis of them. "And what do we see in Peter's statement? A declaration that Jesus is sitting upon David's throne now? That God has actually seated Him on the throne of David? If so, that settles it for evermore. But what do we find? Simply that David, foreseeing that of his natural descendants God would set one (the great promised Son) upon his (David's) throne spoke of the resurrection of the Christ. In other words, the promised Christ of David's line was to be raised from the dead in order that He might be seated on his father David's throne. This Son of David, this Jesus (Peter declares) was so raised up. He therefore is the rightful claimant. He is the God-appointed Heir of David's throne. To Him and to Him exclusively the throne of David belongs by every right. But that He is now already occupying that throne is precisely that which Peter does not say. Still less does he say that the throne of David which always meant simply the Divinely delegated sovereignty over the nation of Israel, the "house of Jacob," Luke 1:32, 33 was now spiritualized and removed to heaven." Thus Brother Boll deposes, and disposes of the Holy Spirit's explanation of David's prophecy concerning the resurrection of Christ.

After studying Boll's book "The Kingdom of God," and other writings of his, his theory, in a nutshell, is this, if I understand it, and if I do not he will correct me. When John the Baptist, and Jesus announced, and preached—"The Kingdom of heaven is at hand" they were speaking of the restoration of the earthly kingdom of Israel, which Brother Boll says was clearly foretold in the prophecies of the Old Testament. John the Baptist died without learning any better, that is, he was beheaded before he or Jesus either learned that God had had the prophets set the restoration of the earthly kingdom too close "at hand." After John was beheaded Jesus kept on preaching "the Kingdom of heaven is at hand," and he was so sure that he understood the prophets, he said: "Verily I say unto you, There are some here of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, but shall live forevermore." He might be seated on his father David's throne. This Son of David, this Jesus (Peter declares) was so raised up. He therefore is the rightful claimant. He is the God-appointed Heir of David's throne. To Him and to Him exclusively the throne of David belongs by every right. But that He is now already occupying that throne is precisely that which Peter does not say." Brethren you now have the two positions before you, stated without equivocation. These two positions are antipodes, both of them could be wrong, one of them must be. In the July issue of The Word and Work, an eminent brother deposes as follows: "With pity, not hatred, I am constrained to say, it seems that anti-premillennial brethren excel in fallacious assumptions." With sincere sympathy and "pity" for this eminent brother, "I am constrained to say," that I think the above statement was only the Irish strain in this eminent brother trying to be funny. I consider the following a real gem from his fountains of Irish wit (?) "But the fallacies of brethren on this subject must not in any way have the effect of causing less fellowship and cooperation with them, 'as brethren in the Lord,' except that they themselves shut the door of fellowship and cooperation against those who will not line up with them in marking and rejecting faithful brethren who cannot accept their assumptions." As to whether or not these fallacious assumers should be considered "as brethren in the Lord" is beside the issue, and must be left to the elasticity of the individual conscience. I am reviewing Boll's arguments (?) on "The Kingdom in Acts." His exegesis of Acts 2:30-33 is irreconcilable with the position of gospel preachers on the same scripture, Will this "eminent brother," tell us through The Word and Work, the paper through which his Irish wit is oozing now, if he considers both positions fallacious assumptions, if not both, which one is? I am not asking this "eminent brother" to mark...
anybody now. I am simply asking him if he believes Boll’s positions on Acts 2:30-33. He may state his position “with pity, not hatred,” for any brother. The question is, does he believe Boll’s position on Acts 2:30-33? Boll’s emphatic position is, that “Christ does not now sit and reign on David’s throne.” What does the “eminent brother” from South Alabama believe about this?

We will now notice Boll’s argument (?) on this subject. He says: “David had been anointed God’s king long before he actually sat upon his rightful throne over Israel, suffering indignities and persecutions at the hands of Saul, and rejection at the hands of the people; and he never took the government until the people themselves willingly sought his rule. He never intended for David to take his throne as long as Saul sat upon it. J. T. L.” As it would be put in legal language, the throne was his “de iure et potestatis,” at first; and became his “de facto et actu” afterwards; that is, it is his by right and authority at first, and in fact and act afterward.

This may all be said of David, and more. He would not lift his hand, nor allow his subjects to lift their hands against God’s anointed Saul, so long as Saul lived.

Now if the earthly kingdom of Israel has been in existence since Pentecost, with a God anointed king sitting on David’s earthly throne, and if Jesus, as “the God-appointed heir of David’s throne” has been hiding around in mountains and caves, “suffering indignities and persecutions at the hands of God’s anointed king as David suffered at the hands of Saul-Brother Boll would have something in his “de iure et potestas” argument. But no such conditions have existed since Pentecost, therefore this profound argument, “chose him anagal phrasing is nothing but a “fallacious assumption.” Boll then takes another inapt example and makes another absurd illustration. He says: “Moreover, His all-inclusive authority does not remove the necessity of his special introduction into a special subordinate sphere of rule and investment with specific authority. George V. became King of England, sovereign therefore over all its wide domain upon which the sun never sets. Yet some six months after his coronation in England, he must needs go to Delhi to be there crowned Emperor of India. As King of England that crown belonged to him alone. Because he was King of England he was, by right, Emperor of India. Therefore he went to Bengal to claim that crown. Let that serve as an illustration of a situation which is really simple enough in itself.” If I understand this case when “George V. King of England,” went to Delhi to receive “his special introduction into a special subordinate sphere of rule and investment with specific authority,” which was already his by right, “as King of England,” and having “claimed that crown,” he immediately returned from Bengal to England, and there sat upon, and reigned from the ancient throne of the Kings of England. Does Brother Boll mean to teach by this example that some day Christ is going to Jerusalem to receive “His special introduction into a special subordinate sphere of rule and investment with specific authority,” which is already his, because of “His all-inclusive authority,” and as soon as he claims his crown over the earthly Kingdom of Israel, that he will immediately return to heaven and there rule and reign from the throne he now occupies? If this is not what Brother Boll means to teach by the example of King George V. then we cannot, as he says; “Let that serve as an illustration of a situation which is really simple enough in itself.” Boll’s illustrations may be “simple enough” for premillennial brethren; but they are not so simple to “anti-premillennial brethren” who “excel in fallacious assumptions.”

**Peter’s Second Sermon**

Boll says: “The second recorded sermon in the book of Acts which, like that of Pentecost, was preached by Peter, also contained an important kingdom reference. (Yes a very important one, but not of an earthly kingdom J. T. L.) How long a time had elapsed since Pentecost we have no means of telling; but the gospel testimony was still confined to Jerusalem (Acts 1:8) and the sermon itself shows that the appeal was still to the nation of Israel, and there was yet a chance of Israel’s being turned nationally.” I deny this statement in toto. If the sermons Peter preached on Pentecost, and in Solomon’s porch “to the nation of Israel,” gave Israel “a chance to turn nationally,” then the sermon he preached to the Gentiles, at the household of Cornelius, gave the Gentiles “a chance to turn nationally.” If not, why not? The only authority that Peter, or any other apostle, had for preaching to nations is found in Matthew 28:18-20. If therefore they gave one nation “a chance to turn nationally,” they had to give every other nation the same chance because Jesus said: “Make disciples of all the nations.” The gospel Peter preached on Pentecost and also at the home of Cornelius, was addressed to individuals, and not to any nation as such.

However, Brother Boll in disposing of the “Judgment of Matt. 25:31-46,” says, on page 84, “Moreover Israel is not in this judgment; for it is the ‘nations’ that are here judged before the King; which term is elsewhere translated ‘Gentiles,’ and always means the nations as distinguished from Israel, who are not reckoned among the nations.” According to this theory Israel was not included in the commission given in Matthew 28: 18-20. I would like therefore for Brother Boll to tell us by whose authority Peter gave Israel “a chance nationally,” to accept Christ, since they “are not reckoned among the nations,” and therefore cannot be included in “the all nations” of the world wide commission. If Israel is not included among “the nations.” in the judgment of Matthew 25, how does Brother Boll know that they are included among “the nations,” in the commission of Matthew 28? Does Brother Boll think that Israel will be converted “nationally” at the second coming of Christ, which would have to be by sight, and not by teaching, and go with him to Jerusalem to claim David’s earthly throne? Let him tell us what Christ will do when he receives his “special subordinate sphere of rule and investment with a specific authority.” Will He follow the example of George V. King of England, and immediately return to the throne of his first coronation? If Brother Boll will explain these matters “simple enough” for the “anti-premillennial fallacious assumptionists” to understand, I will let his “Kingdom In Acts” alone, because it is made up with every kind of ingredient but the truth.

**A Statement Concerning “Complete Christian Hymnal” To All Who Have Purchased Cloth-bound Books**

Marion Davis

Due to defective workmanship in the binding of the cloth covered board Complete Christian Hymnals of the first edition, we are replacing all copies with new ones. If you happened to get one or more of these defective books, and will return them to us, we will be glad to replace them. Please write us for directions on how to return them before shipping, if have more than a dozen to return.
The Church as revealed in the New Testament is just as God would have it be. It began on Pentecost following the death of our Lord. Peter, to whom was given the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, preached on that memorable occasion. In words fraught with terrible and convicting meaning, he accused the multitude of having murdered the Son of God. Luke, with his characteristic graphic style, records the import of Peter's sermon, how that Peter announced this same Jesus had arisen from the dead and ascended into Heaven; and then, called upon the multitude to "repent and be baptized..." in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Those who did this were added to the Church.

This institution was known as "the Church of God;" "the Church of the Lord;" "the house of God;" "the Church of the living God;" and when a number of congregations were considered, "the Churches of Christ." It's creed was the teaching of the inspired apostles. The worship was simple, consisting of singing, the Lord's supper, fellowship, prayers, and teaching the Word. In fact, such an order of worship is too simple for the average twentieth century religionist; for, there is no place in it to allow sister corntassel to spread herself and sing a solo: Nor, is there any place for all the pomp and ceremony and programs designed to entertain, which are characteristic of the average sectarian church service. The local congregation was the highest unit of action. It's organization consisted of a plurality of bishops whose responsibility it was to feed the flock and care for them spiritually; deacons who were to care for the material welfare of the congregation; evangelist to preach; and the congregation to participate to "repent and be baptized."

The peace and unity of the church was not long to continue. A dark cloud appeared on the horizon. The membership of the church was soon divided into two separate bodies—the clergy and the laity. In course of time the clergy turned their collars hind-part before, and took charge of the church; giving it out that the only approach to God was through them. Innovations upon the divine order, such as: infant baptism, the substitution of sprinkling and pouring for immersion, the burning of incense, auricular confession, and instrumental music were introduced. Ecclesiasticism became the order of the day. Through organizational development a great hierarchy was in the making. This was effected by first appointing a priest over the individual congregation. The next step was to include several congregations in a district, and bishops were appointed to exercise dominion over the districts. Then, for the various districts of each state an archbishop was appointed as head. Next, a cardinal was appointed to exercise dominion over the states of each nation. Finally in 606 Boniface III was designated Pope, and thus was made head of the whole religious world. The Catholic church had become a full grown institution.

This great hierarchy placed the Bible in prison and bound its influence in stocks. The clergy grew fat, but the laity became priest-ridden and poverty-stricken. Indulgences were sold as cattle in the markets to fill the coffers of the clergy, who used the money to give vent to all their baser desires and private pleasures. The church had apostatized. Conditions grew worse as this dark night grew to be more than a thousand years long. Historians speak of this period of time as the "Dark Ages."

Finally, in the sixteenth century Martin Luther appeared on the scene of action in open defiance to the corruption of the Roman Catholic church. In September 1520, a papal bull was served against him which, in the presence of a vast multitude of all ranks and orders of the church, he burned. Martin Luther was commanded to appear before the Diet of Worms on April 16, 1521. One cannot help but admire the courage of this great man as he stood before the diet and made a mighty speech. He consummated it by saying, "Here I stand, I can not do otherwise. God help me, Amen!" He was excommunicated from the church; and here, we have the genesis of protestant denominationalism. The Lutheran church began in 1521. In 1535 the Presbyterian Church was begun by John Calvin. During the same year King Henry VIII, because the Roman Catholic church would not grant him a divorce from his lawful wife Catherine of Aragon so that he could be married to Ann Boly, a young maid of nineteen summers, pulled away and declared himself to be head of the church of England. The Church of England is known to us as the Episcopal Church. The Baptist Church began in the year 1606 by a man named John Smythe who baptized himself by affusion or pouring. The Methodist Episcopal church began in 1726—the result of the efforts of John Wesley to reform the Church of England.

Space will not permit the mention of the beginning of all the denominations; for there are many. This will suffice to show how man-made churches came to be. They are no part of the true church, and are antagonistic to the prayer of Christ that all His followers be one.

During the second quarter of the nineteenth century there were several movements begun by men of great talent and ability, who were in the main ignorant and far removed from the feelings, purposes, and labors of each other. The spirit which characterized each of the movements was to return to the Bible. Chief among the leaders of the various "back to the Bible" movements were Barton W. Stone, Thomas and Alexander Campbell, "Raccoon" John Smith, and Walter Scott.

These men and their movements became known to each other. United they came to be a mighty power in the earth. Primitive Christianity was restored. The church of the liv-
ing God was again established as it had been before the Primitive Christianity was restored. The church of the living God was again established as it had been before the foul breath of apostasy had been breathed upon her. Its unprecedented growth knew no bounds. One congregation after, another renounced their man-made creeds and accepted the Bible as their only law of faith and practice. Sectarianism began to fall before her conquering conquest.

But alas, the old devil changed his tactic. He organized a fifth column and put them to work within the church. Ever long our Lord's people were demoralized, and just at the strategic moment he made a “blitzkrieg” on the church of God. He placed his mechanized unit of “mechanical instruments of music” in the front ranks, and followed them with his highly organized “society units.” The nation of our Lord fell. It was a day of mourning. The enemy treated the fallen church with contempt and lavished in the spoils taken in their victorious warfare. The Lord's people were left stranded. A dire famine was on. From East to West their property and possessions had been taken. They were not left with a single meeting house worth over $5,000.00. Nashville, the Athens of the South, was left with only three small struggling congregations.

The fence-straddling preacher was one of the chief contributing causes of the sudden fall of the church. There were those who espoused the use of mechanical instruments of music and societies; and, those who bitterly opposed them. But, the fence-straddlers were neither for nor against this encroaching evil. They, with all sissiness and sanctimonious piousy loved everyone so much till they could not take a stand against any thing—not even the devil. The thing they really did was apologize for the heresy-scouts; and discredit the work of the defenders of the faith by suggesting to the brethren in a very sanctimonious vein that brother-defender, even though he was right, was not maintaining the spirit of Christ in the fight he was making. When the introduction of these innovations into the congregations caused the great rent in the brotherhood; the fence-straddlers fell off the fence on the band-wagon of digression. The sweet, window-dressed-with-piety preachers proved to be vultures of truth in disguise.

Another contributing factor to the fall of the church was the attitude many of the leaders of the congregations, especially the rural ones, sustained toward this wave of digression which was sweeping the church. They maintained that they did not believe in the organ and societies and were not going to have them; and, that they did not want the question agitated by preachers coming in and preaching against them. They definitely refused by such an attitude to have the congregations indoctrinated against this grave evil. The result was that when the boys and girls in the congregations grew up; they married, and many of them moved to town and became easy prey for the digressive churches. Soon they became steeped in digression, and would return home at intervals to tell the leaders of the home congregations what old fogenies they were. Hence, the congregations of the churches of Christ fed the digressives for many years.

Our Lord blesses those who love him. The faithful who refused to bend to the Baal were destined to become a mighty people on the earth. Brother David Lipscomb was the outstanding leader of the day for this loyal band of Christians. Contemporary with Brother Lipscomb and co-operating with him in a plea for New Testament Christianity were such giants as; Harding, Sewell, McQuiddy, Barnes, the Srygleys, and others too numerous to mention. Brother Lipscomb began the publication of the Gospel Advocate, and started the Nashville Bible School. These agencies became mighty forces for the promotion of truth. Through the influences of these great men a host of courageous young preachers, loyal to the truth, and well trained, went out into the world and waged a great fight against the devil. From East to West the church grew. The members built new and better meeting houses in the place of the ones the digressives stole from them. It was a day of great accomplishments and much rejoicing.

More than twenty years ago R. H. Boll of Louisville, Ky. was front page editor of the Gospel Advocate and wrote under the title “Word and Work.” He was given to speculation, and, began to feature such teachings in the columns of the Advocate. This resulted in his dismissal. Later upon agreement with the management of the Advocate not to teach his theories, he was restored to his place. His fantastical brain-storm theories would not wait; he could not hold them as private opinions, and so, began again to feature his theories. He was again removed from the Gospel Advocate staff. He then began the publication of a monthly magazine called “Word and Work” which he publishes till this day. “Word and Work” is devoted to the policy of promoting this visionary teaching. Boll has pushed this teaching upon the brotherhood, even to the dividing and demoralizing of the church in some sections.

His teaching in the main is that Jesus came to this earth to be king over national Israel; to sit on David's literal, Judaistic, and earthly throne in Jerusalem, that, the Jews refused to accept Him, and instead put Him to death; this thing was neither foreseen nor expected and so, in this unexpected emergency God ushered in the church age, a contingency, a vestibule of the kingdom; that Christ has gone back to the Father to stay till the Jews are willing to accept him, and, then, he will come to earth and reign over literal Israel from Jerusalem for a thousand years. This heresy defaults prophecies concerning the death of Christ and the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. It dethrones Jesus Christ, and makes the church a mere accident. It would make Christ king over a world kingdom patterned more after the pagan kingdom of Rome than the glorious kingdom of heaven. Though R. H. Boll and his co-theorists will not admit it, the doctrine admits of a second chance. The doctrine is infidelity in the raw. Its devastating influence has permeated and ruined many congregations. In Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Texas, churches are divided because of this damnable heresy.

It goes without saying that a battle has been fought, and the enemy has been checkmated. The Bible Banner deserves much credit for our success. But the teachers of this heresy are not extinct. The doctrine of premillennialism is, at all times, a potential enemy to the cause of Christ. Like Germany, this vicious enemy will rise up when least expected. In order to salvage the church this fight must go on to the end.

"History repeats itself," is an old adage. At least, this is the case in our fight against premillennialism. We, like the defenders of the faith in their fight against instrumental music and societies, are faced with a host of preachers in our ranks who are fence-straddlers. They are the good boys. They have a sanctimonious appeal in their window-dressed-with-piety, and co-operating with him in a plea for New Testament Christianity were such giants as; Harding, Sewell, McQuiddy, Barnes, the Srygleys, and others too numerous to mention. Brother Lipscomb began the publication of the Gospel Advocate, and started the Nashville Bible School. These agencies became mighty forces for the promotion of truth. Through the influences of these great men a host of courageous young preachers, loyal to the truth, and well trained, went out into the world and waged a great fight against the devil. From East to West the church grew. The members built new and better meeting houses in the place of the ones the digressives stole from them. It was a day of great accomplishments and much rejoicing.

"History repeats itself," is an old adage. At least, this is the case in our fight against premillennialism. We, like the defenders of the faith in their fight against instrumental music and societies, are faced with a host of preachers in our ranks who are fence-straddlers. They are the good boys. They have a sanctimonious appeal in their manner and speech, and love everybody-except the men who are making the fight against premillennialism.

The "New Christian Leader" was launched some two years ago to promote the policy of these stand-for-nothing fence-straddlers-vultures of truth in disguise. Lipscomb, Harding, Abilene, Pepperdine colleges have each a president or professor writing for this magazine.
THE PERPETUITY OF GOD'S PEOPLE

JAMES D. BALES

In former articles the Mormon doctrine of apostasy has been stated. If their doctrine is false their church is not the church which it claims to be; for if the church was not destroyed it could be restored to its original simplicity by destroying denominational doctrines and teaching New Testament truth. Thus it would not stand in need of a "restoration from heaven at the hands of Christ and the Holy Angels." Let us notice the following fact: There never has been a time since the population of this present earth that God has not had a people on earth though at times they may have been a remnant.

Adam fell but after the fall God instituted a system of worship and sacrifice whereby they might worship Him. Though Cain departed from the true way yet Abel and his parents did not go forth from the presence of Jehovah. Though Cain's works were evil Abel's were righteous; for Abel offered according to faith (1 John 3:12; Heb. 11:4; Matt. 23:32-35). Seth worshipped God: Enoch walked with God (Gen. 4:25; 5:21). Then came those terrible days when Jehovah saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth. "And the earth was corrupt before God and the earth was filled with violence. And God saw the earth, and, behold, it was corrupt: for all flesh had corrupted their way upon earth." But this did not mean every individual for Noah was still righteous (Gen. 6:8-13).

Abraham was not the only faithful one during his time for Melchizedek a Canaanite was a priest of God most High (Gen. 14:18) if he was a priest of God he must have ministered for some of the people of God. Then, too, though he had many faults, there was "righteous Lot." (2 Pet. 2:7-8). Cowley (Utah) states that a line of authority existed on earth from Adam to Moses (p. 163, Talks on Doctrine).

Though the Jewish church often sinned previously due to the introduction of ungodly doctrines there was always a remnant whom God preserved.

The Mormons must believe that during the apostasy of the church of Christ that an Elijah, who was the last of the faithful line, died and left God without a people on earth until the "restoration of the gospel through Smith." Perhaps they could well sympathize with and say amen to. Elijah's lonely protest; and equally well, or more so, profit by the Lord's answer. Elijah himself lived in a day of great apostasy (1 Kings 12, 13). His bitter wail was, "Lord, they have killed thy prophets, they have digged down thine altars; and I am left alone, and they seek my life." He seems to say that with his death-natural or violent-that the last of God's people on earth would cease to exist; thus it would be necessary for the Lord at a later date to "restore his kingdom from heaven" that he might once again have a people on earth. But Elijah was wrong for "What saith the answer of God unto him? I have left for myself seven thousand men, who have not bowed the knee to Baal" (Rom. 11:3-4). Elijah's ignorance of their name and address did not prove their non-existence. So even though we may not be able, through lack of information, to call by name all those saints of God who lived during the Great Apostasy of the church yet the Bible teaches that God had some who did not bow the knee to idols and false teachers; for it was many, not all, who fell away from the faith. This was true even during the worst conditions pictured in Revelation.

Amos

The book of Amos reeks with a description of the corruption of Israel, of the famine of hearing God's word. In fact they were so sinful that Amos said, "Jehovah said unto me, "The end is come upon my people Israel: I will not again pass by them any more. And the Songs of the temple shall be wallings in that day, saith the Lord Jehovah." (Amos 8:2-3). But this did not mean that Israel would totally and universally perish for God said, "I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob." "For, lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all the nations, like as grain is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least kernel fall upon the earth. All the sinners of my people shall die by the sword, who say, the evil shall not overtake nor meet us (9:8-10). All of God's children were not to perish for in verse 11-15 God said that the tabernacle of David would be raised up "and I will raise up his remnant, and I will build it as in the days of old: that they may possess the remnant of Edmon, and all the nations that are called by my name. ...And I will bring back the captivity of my people Israel. ...And I will plant them upon their land, and they shall no more be plucked up out of their land which I have given them, saith Jehovah thy God." Christ died to gather together the children of God; those who were to be called by his name. This promise is to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord shall call (Acts 2:39). James told the brethren that God's visitation of the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name is in harmony with the prophets. It was written, "after these things I will return, and I will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen. ..." (Acts 15:14-18). The tabernacle of David, was rebuilt with the establishment of Christ as King and the church or kingdom of heaven as God's nation, the spiritual Israel-the Israel indeed, the only true Israel which is of the faith of Abraham. Amos 9:15, Indicates the perpetuity of the church. God grants it; for it is the kingdom which he gave them and God confirms and maintains his own grants." God lives and his church lives and has continued to do so since its establishment.

Isaiah

Certainly the wickedness that rode high during the apostasy could not have been more terrible than the condition of Israel at the time of Isaiah's ministry. (1:2-6). Elijah said, "from the sole of the foot even unto the head, there is no soundness" God had a small remnant (1:9). As long as the blessing was in Israel; until the Messiah was born, they could not be destroyed for "the sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from his feet, until Shiloh come: and unto him shall the obedience of the people be." (Gen. 49:10). Jesus was this Shiloh, who was born of a virgin and was called Immanuel (Gen. 3:15; Isa. 7:14; Matt. 1:21-23).

In Isa. 9 the prophet speaks of the deep darkness and of the coming of the light when "the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwelt in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined." Christ came and dwelled in the borders of Zebulun and Naphtali and this prophesy was fulfilled (Matt. 4:13-16). All this was to be done by the Messiah, Immanuel (9:6,7) whose birth had been foretold (7:14); it is now spoken of in the "prophetic style, as a thing already done." This is him of whom it was said, "unto us a child is born. The government shall be upon his shoulder." This day in a city of David, a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord (Luke 2:11). The prophet said, "unto us a son is given," and John tells us that God so loved the world that He gave his only begotten son (John 3:16). The government was to be upon his shoulders. Jesus said, "all authority hath been given unto
me in heaven and on earth,” (Matt. 28:18), and Paul tells us that “he must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be abolished is death.” (1 Cor. 15:25-26). Christ was at that time reigning and he was to continue to reign until the abolishing of the last enemy which is death. Since this has not occurred as yet and since Christ was reigning when Paul wrote, and was to reign until death was abolished, we know that He has been reigning since that time. This must be true for his reign was to extend from that time until some time which is still in the future. Thus there could have been no time in which Christ’s kingdom on earth was abolished for if there had been his reign would have been interrupted for a time without the abolition of death.

The prophet continues saying: “His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace.” Of the increase of his government and of peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to establish it, and to uphold it will justice and with righteousness from henceforth even for ever. The Zeal of Jehovah of hosts will perform this.”

The Angel said to Mary, “And behold, thou shalt conceive and bring forth a son, and shall call his name Jesus. He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Most High: and the Lord God shall give unto him the house of Jacob for ever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.” (Luke 1:32-33). These refer to no one save Christ, his first advent and the work to which he was called at that time. His government was to be an increasing peaceable government ruled with justice and righteousness; it was to be an ever lasting kingdom. This kingdom was established, the throne of his father David was given to him, and he began his reign in which everlasting kingdom upon the first Pentecost after His resurrection (Acts 2:30). The Mormon doctrine of apostasy would have an end put to his rule and kingdom on earth for a period of around 1260 years—or at least from the completion of the apostasy until 1830.

Isaiah 10:20 tells of a remnant which should escape and should lean upon Jehovah. “A remnant shall return, even the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God.” The usage of this passage in Rom. 9:27 indicates that the Spirit meant to also foretell of a more important event; the conversion of the remnant unto Christ.

Jeremiah
Jeremiah is replete with statements of woe and apostasy but even then God had a remnant. “Woe unto the shepherds that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pastures saith Jehovah.” “And I will gather the remnant of Jacob, unto the mighty God.” The usage of this passage in Rom. 9:27 indicates that the Spirit meant to also foretell of a more important event; the conversion of the remnant unto Christ.

Daniel
Daniel and others refused to bow the knee to false gods (3:1). Daniel also tells of the everlasting kingdom which should never be destroyed and which should be set up in the days of the fourth kingdom-the Roman Empire. Christ came during this time and set up his kingdom. If this does not refer to Christ and his kingdom and its establishment in the days of the Roman Empire then what does it refer to; if it refers to something else then what was Christ doing during the days of the Fourth Empire? This kingdom was the stone cut out of the mountains without hands. “It should neither be raised nor supported by human power or policy but by the Spirit of the Lord of hosts. This was the stone which the builders refused, because it was no stone of man power or policy but by the Spirit of the Lord of hosts. This was the stone of the corner.” This kingdom was not to decay and die in a universal apostasy. There are those who contend that Dan. 2:44 did not find the beginning of its fulfillment upon the Day of Pentecost but that it was either established in 1830 or will be set up after the restoration, so they suppose, of the Roman Empire. Daniel MacGregor (A Marvelous Work and a Wonder, p. 61) says, “Eighteen hundred and thirty, then, is the date marking the completion of the image. In that year the head, the arms and breasts, the belly and thighs, the legs, the feet and toes, were perfectly joined together. But 1830 marks more than this. It marks the appearance of the little stone, the setting up of the kingdom of God.” If that be true then what meaneth the setting up of the kingdom and the existence of the Fourth Empire of Christ’s day; which kingdom and which fourth empire are not even referred to according to the above interpretation.

But Christ’s kingdom was established, and established upon the rock. The church which is the superstructure reared upon that foundation remains as long as the foundation remains. The everlasting kingdom was established on that Day of Pentecost and there has been no capitulation before a universal apostasy. Nebuchadnezzar in (4:3) speaks of God’s kingdom “which is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation.”

At the time of the coming of Christ many of the Jews in Egypt had so far departed from the faith that they regarded the Messiah as an allegory while some in Palestine looked upon him as a man, a hero and a soldier. Yet even at the time of Christ there was a remnant. Jesus was brought up in a faithful Jewish family and reared under the laws. A remnant remained (Rom. 10:5).

God showed to Jeremiah that those (Jer. 24) who went to Babylon were men “picked out by God’s providence, that in them the Jewish church might live.” “The captivity of Israel had no return but the exile of Judah was for seventy years and it had a return.” “Judah returned to work out that purpose for which God had called the Jewish Church into existence and watched over it from the days when Abraham first left his birth-place. That purpose was the giving the one true religion to the whole world.” “Of them sprang a carpenter’s son, and some fishermen; and they were the Saviour of the world, and his Apostles. On so slight a thread seemed to hang the destinies of mankind; but really that thread was a chain of adamant” (p. 214 Smith RO. P.) Prophecy a Preparation for Christ. Though Judah did apostatize Isaiah’s exhortations reached the remnant in whom the Jewish church lived on until the time came for it to do God’s work. God punished Judah (Ho-sea 12:2) but he did not utterly destroy and discard her for she was yet to serve his purpose.

Daniel
TWO LITTLE WORDS AND THAT TEN-CENT HISTORY

E. C. KOTLENBAH

Apparently through the author's generosity I was spared the expense of "A Ten-cent History of 'Music in Worship'" third edition, by Charles Butz Titus. The new edition reverses good surgical practice in that it comes forth having acquired a large appendix consisting of a questionnaire. While some of the questions appear well put, most of the answers are masterpieces of evasion. Moreover, some of the questions do not appear to have been asked by those who really believe in apostolic worship. Be that as it may an appendectomy would help the patient but little for it suffers severely also from lack of logic and scriptural nutrition.

The tract marks the third position to which defenders of the use of instruments of music in the worship of the church have retreated. The first was a bold affirmation that such music in the worship is scriptural. Perhaps the pinnacle of that defense was Payne's book on the subject. Experience taught that such a position was all too painfully held. A general retreat took the main body of the "instrumentalists" to a new line of defense, namely, that the use of instrumental music in worship was neither scriptural nor unscriptural. The inconsistency grammatically inherent in this position has apparently led some to modify their views so as to effect a retreat to the third position, 1. e., that neither singing nor playing on instruments is scriptural. Consistency was not improved by this move however. In other words the author of the tract would have us believe that music of no kind was ever authorized by the Lord for the worship of the church. It is purely incidental.

Of course, there are a few preachers left about who will affirm that the use of the musical instruments in worship is scriptural, but they have not awakened to the fact that their colleagues "have progressed" to other ground. Also some still hang around the second position, but apparently Mr. Titus and many others think it is easier to defend the use of the instrument at the third redoubt.

A cursory examination of the tract convinces one that much of the material in it is irrelevant. This helps to cover up its main thesis and to give it an air of more scholarly authority. That thesis is, that music in the worship of the church is purely incidental. Mr. Titus says, "From time to time during the Christian era, this one incidental of incidentials in worship, 'Music,' has been used to divide God's people."

Again, "Let us trace, then, the history of this 'singing-music' non-essential through its successive caprices to the present time," p. 4.

He tries to prove this through an appeal to history. What a source of appeal! If God's word has anything to say on the subject it will not matter about the history. Furthermore, the historical appeal is primarily to sectarian practice. Yet we are invited to counsel this source of use and misuse of music to effect a rule for the church of the New Testament! In all of his searching it is noticeable that he does not mention Chamber's Encyclopedia and its testimony relative to the introduction of musical instruments into the worship. He rather confuses than clarifies the matter.

The main thesis of the tract rests, as far as its lack of logic permits, upon these following premises: That the confusions and persecutions among sectarian bodies over the music question proves music to be an incidental; 4-That the ability to make music and enjoy it gives man a right to use it in worship without respect as to kind of music; 5-That the use of harps in heaven gives a right to their use in the worship of the church. This about sums up the gentleman's arguments. If there be a reply to the effect that Mr. Titus has not so laid down his arguments, let it be remembered; first, that his failure in being so explicit is in his disfavor; I can discover no other reason for the tract than to prove music in worship to be an incidental, hence permissible to use any kind. A teacher ought, above all else, make himself understood even if it hurts his "educational polish." I am giving the pamphlet every advantage possible.

Let us consider these several premises in order. 1—That the confusions and persecutions among sectarian bodies over the music question proves music to be an incidental, Many of Mr. Titus' random quotations are summoned to support this view. Following this logic we could as readily show that, since religious sects are confused over baptism and are guilty of persecutions over that very matter, baptism is an incidental. Hence, we may use any "mode" we please or just let it alone. The same conclusions are drawn with equal force relative to every controverted matter in the whole round of sectarianism. What proves too much proves nothing. On the other hand all sectarianism is carnal (1 Cor. 33:3, Gal. 5:20). Hence, every element of sectarianism in doctrine and practice is without the pale of divine authority. The practices, then, among sectarian bodies relative to the music question, or any question, cannot be cited to determine what is the divine sanction relative to that question or any question. It follows that the gentleman's appeal to this source in order to establish the incidental nature of music in the worship is without logic or reason. Such an appeal positively and completely ignores the one and only source of appeal to determined the merits of the proposition, namely the word of God. Will people and preachers in particular not know that the merit of any doctrine of practice does not rest upon either its use or misuse by any individual or group? Do they not understand that the truth of any doctrine does not rest upon either the understanding or misunderstanding of an individual or group of people? It must forever rest upon what God says. "Thy word is truth" (Jn. 17:17).

2—That singing is in the same category with circumcision, hence is an incidental. The author says on page IO, "Singing comes among such 'non-essentials' as circumcision (Gal. 6:15), i. e. neither singing nor no-singing, (music nor no-music), (organ nor no-organ) avails anything in 'getting' and 'keeping' saved. And 'keeping saved' is bearing the much fruit' (Jn. 15:8) of 'love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance' (Gal. 5:22) — 'singing' unnoticed."

While he cites other texts in passing in his historical excursions, this happens to be his one real appeal to the scriptures. Evidently he is striving hard to prove the digressive view that only that which has to do directly with remission of sins in the N. T. is essential, all else being non-essential. This unwarranted division of God's word reminds us of the Adventist division of the law into ceremonial and moral laws and of the premillennial bogey of the authority of Christ being divided into authority by right and authority by fact. Verily, every creed must have its fundamental hermeneutical (?) rule.

In the first sentence of the above quotation we are
treated with a bald assertion. But positively no proof! All that assertion rests upon is Titus' ipse dixit. (He makes the same assumption on p. 4). Who told him that music in the worship is in the same class as circumcision? The text he cites cancels circumcision, but where is music alluded to in it? Where is the singing canceled in the N. T.? The text preceding affirms the crucifixion of the saved to the world and the world to the saint, but did the apostle place music with circumcision? Nay verily! The circumcision mentioned is of the flesh, it never had a part in the law of Christ, but served as a shadow of that circumcision which is of the heart (Rom. 2:28-29). No man lives who can show that fleshly circumcision ever had a part in the worship of the church under apostolic direction. On the contrary he does not live who can show that the singing was left out of the worship by the apostles. We respectfully challenge the author of the tract to produce the text that even remotely hints "that neither does singing avail anything nor no-singing." Since Mr. Titus waxes bold to substitute "music" for "circumcision" in paraphrasing Gal. 6:15, suppose we with equal freedom substitute "circumcision" for a musical term in another text: "Is any cheerful? let him circumscribe praise!" If this does violence to Paul's teaching on circumcision, then Titus' paraphrase does violence to James' teaching on singing. It is a poor rule that can't work both ways.

An examination of the second sentence discloses more wishful thinking than consistent reasoning. He says "Keeping saved is 'bearing much fruit'" and then proceeds to quote Gal. 5:22. Unfortunately for him the first fruit named is "love." But the Bible defines love (1 Jn. 5:3; 2 Jn. 6). The latter reads, "And this is love, that we should walk after his commandments." We have

1-Element one of the fruit of the Spirit to be borne by Christians is love (Gal. 5:22).
2-But love is the walking in the Lord's commandments.
3-Therefore, keeping the commandments is an element of the fruit of the Spirit. Again,
1-To bear much fruit we must keep the Lord's commandments,
2-But singing is commanded (Jas. 5:13).
3-Therefore, the singing of praise is necessarily involved in the bearing of much fruit.

Another item mentioned in the fruit of the Spirit is "faith." So we have

1-Faith rests on testimony (Rom. 10:17).
2-But singing is testified (Eph. 5:19).
3-Therefore, singing as of Eph. 5:19 is a matter of faith.

Since faith is placed in the list of those elements of the fruit of the Spirit it follows the singing as directed in the New Testament is necessarily involved in bearing "the much fruit." To be consistent if the author of the tract accepts the Pauling foundation of faith he must accept the above conclusion; if, to avoid it, he has a better foundation or definition than the one Paul gave let him produce it.

He adds, "singing unmentioned" (Gal. 5:22). Well, neither is prayer, but it is not excluded as singing is not excluded. Any exegete (?) who attempts to propound a doctrine or defend a practice upon strained interpretations of texts not bearing directly upon the doctrine or practice in question while ignoring the explicit and relevant texts thereby disqualifies himself as a teacher and commits himself to folly! This Bro. Titus has done, his tract carrying the high-sounding title, bearing witness.

He says further,

"There is no word 'singing' in the gospel sayings of Jesus, nor in John's record, nor in James, nor in Peter's, nor in Matthew's, nor in Mark's, nor in Luke's."

It seems not to have occurred to the brother that the very fact that he could not include Paul in this list, destroys utterly the force of his argument. Some of these writers do not mention the Lord's Supper! Does that render it unimportant? Does that set those inspired writers who do not mention it against it? Are we to suppose that these writers must 0. K. Paul's use of "singing" to make it valid? As a matter of fact most of them do mention the subject, even if not confined to the participles, and what they have to say in no wise helps the cause of the "instrumentalist." He goes on in his musings,

"And why should Paul's two words (‘singing’) be plucked out of the 181, 253 N. T. words to divide a people who avow they were 'called' to get all Christ's followers united? Should not the infinitesimal littleness of offering (out of 181, 253 words) a non-essential to salvation, two-word excuse for causing division among ourselves, shame us into ’quitting it,’ that our children hang not their heads in shame because we 'covedet so earnestly' the divisive spirit?"

Aye, Brother, who plucked those two words out of the N. T.? Who, but he who has the effrontery to say in the face of Paul, "This is a mere incidental?" And who covets a divisive spirit but he who practices division in maintaining a divisive incidental, himself having rendered it an incidental? And how many times, pray tell, does a thing have to be repeated in the N. T. in order that it be authoritative? Evidently, our informant (?) would demand more the two times!

1-All (every) scripture is inspired of God (2 Tim. 3:16).
2-Eph. 5:19 is scripture (2 Pet. 3:15-18).
3-Therefore, Eph. 5:19 is inspired of God.

And, Brother, it says "singing and making melody with your heart unto the Lord!" No amount of incanticals can brush that aside. Again,

1-No authority is higher than that of the Lord (Eph. 1:21).
2-But Eph. 5:19 and Col. 3:16 are by the Lord's authority.
3-Therefore, a thousand repetitions would lend to it. If it be a shame to follow these scriptures implicitly, then it was a shame to write them, but the apostle was guilty of no such shame. The shame is that men will seek to ignore them and to nullify their teaching and make void their authority in order to follow a practice whose highest authority in the church is that of the papal crown! The added shame is the same men will render void God's word in order to practice an opinion! The shame of shames is that brethren were divided asunder by the exercise of an opinion pure and simple! Will the brother adduce the rule which renders the participial form of a word all important and rules out of all consideration the same root word (or words) as it occurs in its other legitimate grammatical forms? Bro. Titus must have something here that has escaped the world's best grammarians, lo, these many centuries! Inconsistently and unwittingly he witnesses against himself. In answer to question 2 of the questionnaire, p. 17, he says,

"Command Christians to play instruments of music is not new Testament language (emphasis mine), and the questioner thus betrays his possession of another gospel than Paul preached (Gal. 1:8)."

We wonder if he thinks Eph. 5:19 is N. T. language. Would he say that he who so much as asked whether singing is commanded in the N. T. has a different gospel than Paul? In answer to question 3 he says in part,

"This 'Christians playing instruments of music' is also from a source outside the N. T., and Paul warns: 'As we said before, so say I now again, if any man preacheth unto
you any gospel other than that Ye received, let him be Anathema' (Gal. 1:9)` (Emphasis mine).

He admits that the use of the instrument is from a human source and even cites a warning as to its use! Yet on pages 13 to 15 contends for its use! He thus sits in judgment on his own case and renders the verdict, “Guilty!” Again notice, Bro. Titus pronounces instrumental music in worship unscriptural, applies a fearful curse against it; yet he uses it, insists upon the right to it, will sacrifice unity to keep it! Shades of Bacon, who ever heard of such logic! Honestly, we are surprised that that sort of mentality is “running loose” west of the Mississippi. Of course, he denies that the singing as taught in the N. T. is worship, but

1-The N. T. singing is praise (Jas. 5:13)
2-But praise is a form of worship.
3-Therefore N. T. singing is worship.

Again true worship must be in the spirit (Jn 4:23-24) and the singing must be with the spirit (1 Cor. 14:15), hence, is worship. Besides Paul says, “unto the Lord.” A man must be hard pressed for proof material when he on the one hand admits that singing is in the N. T. and on the other that instrumental music is not, yet casts them together as incidentals and then puts both in the same class with circumcision. His arguments may be puerile, but not even a child could accomplish this comedy of errors without a great deal of coaching. If the gentleman could be induced just for an hour to forget that he wanted to use the instrument in the worship, he would undoubtedly set about to call in his tracts and bury them, appendix and all, not even risking the appendectomy.

3-That the gradual development of singing and of playing on instruments in worship by Jewish, Catholic and protestant bodies shows both practices to be incidental.

This idea is in a large measure set forth on pages 11 and 12. If other pages convey the same idea it only shows the utter lack of orderly detail in the preparation of the tract. Whether or not the use of music, both vocal and instrumental, in the multitude of sects included among the above mentioned groups is incidental has absolutely nothing to do with what the Bible teaches on the subject. Practically the protestant bodies shows both practices to be incidental.

But if the worship neither is the praying nor the singing incidentals, then it is an assembly large enough to worship “together” in Christ’s name.

3-Therefore Paul’s instruction on the singing requires at least two or three gathered together.

2-But where two or three are gathered together there is an assembly large enough to worship “together” in Christ’s name.

5-That the use of harps in heaven gives a right to their use in the worship of the church, If this is not the inference in Mr. Titus’ reference to the Revelation, why should he even mention it, seeing that no one objects to what God has placed in heaven? It seems strange that men will yet persist in using this as an argument, but it is no more strange than that drowning men will snatch at straws in the first place a spiritual realm cannot be likened to the world of flesh and blood. Even if the “harps” of Rev. 15:2 which he cites are literal they must be literally spiritual, for it is a heavenly scene and Paul makes the spiritual (1 Cor. 15:44ff.). But in ordinary usage of the word “literally” the “harps” could not be literal; this is a heavenly and spiritual scene. Again, we say that what proves too much proves nothing. If literal harps are used in heaven (Mr. Titus nor I do not know that they are), and that gives a right to instrumental music in the worship of the church, then is Bro. Titus prepared to carry his argument to its logical conclusion? There are babies in heaven, (Matt. 19:14) (if not what is their destination?). Does that argue for infant church membership? The logic in both cases is
identical. If we accept one we must take the other, or else reject both.

A final word is in order. Mr. Titus says, “Singing in the worship is only incidental.” Paul says, “Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly....” How, Paul? “...In all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto the Lord.” If the method named by Paul is incidental, what about the injunction which the method describes? If I don’t have to sing as Paul points out then I don’t have to let the word dwell in me so as to sing. In the next verse (Co. 3:17) he adds (same context), “And whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name (by the authority) of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him.” Did Christ authorize Col. 3:16? If so why not obey it in submitting to Col. 3:17? What we would like to see now is a tract proving that singing as of the above mentioned text was not in the worship of the church in the days of the apostles. Instrumental music in worship rests upon an opinion. Therefore it cannot be used at the cost of unity (I, deny its use in the worship at all). “But a factious (opinionative) man after a first and second admonition refuse; knowing that such a one is perverted, and sinneth, being self-condemned.” (Ti. 3:10-11).

The one main difference on the music question between the apostle Paul and C. B. Titus takes it out, then puts it with the instrument which he evidently admits was never in what Paul taught. Then he rides them both back into the church as “incidental.” Incidentally, he prefers to ride on the tide of digression and its attendant division rather than give up his self-confessed unscriptural instrument in order to effect unity on exactly what Paul taught.

Mr. Titus, give the instrument back to the pope and be satisfied with Paul’s “two little words.” To do so will not curse your soul even if you do think it has nothing to do with saving it. Remember, “Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.” (Matt. 4:4), even including “two little words!” No, those “two little words” out of 181,253 do not divide us. We are divided by an inordinate desire on the part of some to do exactly as they please about the worship of the body of Christ regardless of unity. If God had spoken two thousand “little words” on the subject of music in worship and somebody wanted to toot a horn in spite of God’s “silence,” we would soon have an orchestra in “the amen corner.”

---
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THE WORK OF THE INDIAN CHURCH OF CHRIST

James E. White

The entire history of preaching the Gospel to the American Indians is very interesting from start to finish. It has to do with a peculiar and interesting class of people in our continent. Since there are over one hundred Indian tribes in America, scattered over widely separated places, it will take many more years before the gospel of Christ in its simplicity will reach all Indian reservations. Every phase of Indian life is always interesting. The most interesting and sacred part of the Indian's life is his traditional religion. All ceremonial traditions taught to us by our forefathers were the strongest impressions left in the hearts and life of the younger generation. To break down this morale means unfaithfulness to the tribe's traditions and to the great spirit. Indian people have gone through in recent years a damaging set back in religion that could have come to any class of people. His true conception of a true God almost has been destroyed by false teachers of religion, who came among them as pioneers and introduced "denominationalism" which in time has produced theories, isms, sects and creeds of every sort. In this category, in a period of years, there is a gradual spread among American Indians such parties as Infidelity, Catholicism, Russelism, Adventism, Spiritualism and Modernism. There is growing up a doubting age which now exists among the American Indian people, because of divisions in the religious world brought about through much speculation and perversion of the word of God.

Church Of Christ Mission Point

Geographically, the city of Green Bay in the state of Wisconsin is perhaps the most nationally advertised city in the country, because of its great professional football team. When you find the City of Green Bay, Wisconsin, the Oneida Indian reservation is located ten miles west of the City. Two leading Highways, No. 54 and No. 29, pass through the reservation. The population of the Indian reservation is three thousand. Many white people live among them. Upon entering the Indian reservation you will be guided by large bill boards placed along the Highways for the benefit of those who wish to find the exact place of Lord's Day worship of the Church of Christ. This Indian church of Christ in the United States now functioning under the New Testament order in origin, doctrine and practice.

Success Of Church Of Christ Among Indians

Gospel was preached in this reservation as far back as 1930, but not on definite basis. Now since June of 1937, we started to preach to this tribe in the most humble way. About this time we were without equipment, so we confined our preaching in public halls and school houses. It was the hardest place to interest people in hearing the Gospel. At the end of 1937, the work looked for a time discouraging. By now we have realized that equipment was needed. Churches who stood by us so nobly supplied our needs. Beginning of 1938, our work took on new life and looks very promising. More meetings were conducted during the summer of 1938. Deep impressions were made by this time among the Indian people so much that the combined forces of the opposition plan to get reservation authorities to stop the church of Christ from entering the reservation. With about eight members, the struggle went on until the end of 1938; however, the church of Christ and its teaching were the outstanding religious development among them. The teaching was not so poison as they had thought it was (being mislead by their religious leaders) circulating falsehood about the church of Christ. When everything against the church had proven itself by teaching, by works, by worship to the contrary, and the vile picture the Indians had of the church of Christ, have completely changed to a brighter picture. The year 1938 closed with brighter hopes and more confidence on the part of the Indians and officials of the reservation. The financial support of the Indian Church as insufficient to fully justify the work that ought to be done on better basis. With added burden and as much as we dislike to burden the brotherhood, Mrs. White and I, together contacted churches in the interest of the mission to begin the year 1939.

The churches responded so well with interest once more the Indian work took on new life. By April, 1939 the Indian work was never better situated in so far as support and equipment were concerned. By May, 1939 a well planned program was mapped out and got underway for the summer's work. Under a new tent, 40 x 60 in size, gospel meetings were held within the reservation. The visible results of the meetings were thirty new converts. Our next problem was to find a meeting place in which we could keep these converts together for further teaching. We had a little surplus fund in the regular support, from which we were able to buy a basement built property from the Lutheran organization located in the heart of the Indian village. This property is being paid for on installment payments from our regular support. The financial status at this time of this Indian congregation is insufficient to maintain its own support; hence, we have to rely upon outside support to maintain the work of the church.

A word here about the Murray Hill Church of Christ of Flint, Mich., sponsors of the Indian Work. This church is not blindly sponsoring this particular mission field, not knowing the present conditions nor the future possibilities, but rather their objectives and sponsorship over this work has been carefully planned by both elders and deacons of the Flint Church. They have sent a representative to make a careful survey of the possibilities and the future of the work. Through their special effort, report of the work was sent out to the brotherhood, as a result Indian financial support slightly increased. It was largely through this effort that property was purchased. The Flint Church of Christ has proven itself worthy in all respects, very capable overseers of this great mission field.

Religious Activities In The Reservation

About eighty per cent of the Oneida Indians are of the Episcopal faith. Ten per cent are of the Methodist faith. Very few follow the Lutheran faith. About five families are of the Catholic faith. Of all religious activities sponsored in the entire reservation, the church of Christ stands out, well spoken off, well respected, and the most
aggressive in the reservation. The church of Christ is the only body to hold Lord's Day evening and Wednesday evening services. Also the only active benevolent church, in the community. If present development and interest continues as they are, much work will be accomplished in 1940. We can only hope that our humble beginning may result into a strong congregation among my people.

Future of Indian Mission

Leaders are now being trained in this Indian congregation for future leadership. Regular Bible classes are being conducted, every opportunity is put before them, both men and women, Mrs. White has the women of the church busy in their line of work. This is only the beginning of the gospel training for the Indians. It will be from this point that the word of the Lord will go forth into all Indian inhabited states. So the year will go down in the history in the hearts of my people as the year Oneida Church of Christ among the Indians began to function. We hope the year 1940 will be more profitable in the harvest of Indian souls. Our success in the work of the Lord has been due to the loyalty of churches and especially do we give credit to certain individual friends from Texas who love the Lord so much that they have a part with us in the Gospel. But above all we humbly and earnestly submit ourselves to Him who said in the long ago "Go preach the gospel" and to him be glory and praise.

The latest addition to our present equipment were one hundred folding chairs for the Oneida Church which were bought by Chicago churches as follows: Northwest Church of Christ ($20.00), Central church ($20.00), Gary Indiana church ($10.00), Cornell church ($32.00).

To churches and individuals, who with their means and every word of encouragement which comes from far and near, once more we express our thanks. Your cooperation and friendship in the work of the Lord is appreciated. Address all Communications to James E. White, Box 7, Oneida, Wisconsin.

Report of Work at Portland, Oregon, for July, 1940
Rolfie Wagner, 4437 S. E. Hawthorne

We are here in the Northwest to help spread the Gospel. The harvest is surely white, and the workers few and support weak all of which tends to discourage, but by the Grace of God and to the support of you brethren of the South, we can take this country for the Lord.

Portland is a natural hub, so located that if we can first establish a good strong congregation here, we can direct the spreading of the Gospel throughout the Northwest.

Here in this great city of 300,000 souls, the congregation is not able to support the work alone. They only number about 45. They have a comfortable building, well located, owe something over a thousand dollars on it, making payments of $15.00 per month. We have a fine group of young people who are helping to sow the city with Gospel literature. I baptized one man, expect others soon.

Here is a financial report of our support for July, 1940:
Bro. Leonard Dennis, Matador, Texas .......... $ 1.50
Anthony New Mexico Church ............. 2.75
Bro. and Sis. L. P. and Ruth Bennett, Plains, Tex. ... 5.00
Portland, Oregon Church ....................... 50.00
Total ................................ $59.25

Bro. Ross, Editor of Vernon Tex. Times . 2,000 circulars
Vermont Ave. Church, Los Angeles, Calif. . 1,000 Booklets

We have not received contributions this month from a number who have promised to help.

We also need any good literature you can send.

PRICE BILLINGSLEY IN TEXAS

It seems very fitting that Brother Price Billingsley has returned to Texas to continue his work of preaching the Gospel. After years of absence from Texas, the thousands of people whom he baptized and the hundreds of congregations he was instrumental in establishing in Texas will again have an opportunity to listen to his musical voice and be stimulated and encouraged by his powerful and persuasive preaching.

It has been more than 25 years since I enjoyed the privilege of hearing Brother Billingsley preach until recently. Although time has left some its marks upon him, he still preaches with all the vigor and burning zeal that characterized his preaching as we knew him in Texas in years gone by. He is still that happy soul, radiating cheer and encouragement to all with whom he comes in touch. It is marvellous that his mind is as alert and clear as most minds that are housed in young bodies. His voice is just as it was 30 years ago and his skill as a preacher has increased with the years. Billingsley has many years of useful service ahead if the Lord permits him to live.

Recently he has spoken to a number of the congregations in Fort Worth where many of his close friends of yesterday as well as many strangers heard his messages. All his messages demonstrated his familiarity with the Book and his clearness of thought. Time has developed in him that asset which all speakers need, mellowed and condensed Biblical teaching that hits the "bull's eye." He never uses notes and he quotes the Bible freely. He relies almost solely on the Book for his illustrations and language. His messages are presented in a kind yet positive way and he wins the confidence of those whose false teaching he exposes, because of his unusual sincerity and deep earnestness.

Brother Billingsley still pleaded with all his power for a return to the simple New Testament order of things. His messages have the ring of the best pioneer preachers who had a deep and profound understanding of the cardinal principles of the New Testament. Hence, all his preaching is clustered around some guiding principle of truth rather than that style of preaching that takes a "text" and preaches "from" it. His choice of words is a powerful asset to his preaching. His spirit of sacrifice and his implicit trust in the providence of God assure him contentment and happiness that transcends the experiences of those who are as much concerned with the "salary" as with preaching the Gospel.

From the reactions of hundreds to his messages in Fort Worth, I am convinced that he will soon have more calls from Texas congregations than he can fill. I am sure that hundreds join with me in bidding Brother Billingsley God-speed in his Texas labors.

Carl A. Gardner,
1817 Gould Ave.
Fort Worth, Texas

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, 1304, Okla. City, Okla.
WHAT TO TEACH

HUGO McCORD

There are people who think God today appears to them in dreams or visions and saves their souls. But the Bible teaches everybody must hear and learn of the Father (Jno. 6:45) in being saved. Salvation comes by teaching. People not taught are not saved; hence, Jesus commanded that everybody in all the nations (Mark 16:15-16; Matt. 28:18-20) be taught. And he commanded it not for one generation only, but until "the end of the world."

But one has to be certain it is God's teaching.

Since all teaching is not of God it is important that one knows what teaching is good and what is bad. The New Testament of Christ being the standard, some false teachings are:

(1) That we are under the Old Testament today. True, it is inspired of God, just as much so as is the New Testament. But it is the old one, not the new; it is of Moses, not of Christ. For me to try to live under the old is to say I am not satisfied with Christ's new and perfect law. As a matter of fact, nobody lives up to the Old Testament, though many teach that we must. If a baby is born in your family, you must offer a sheep or two young pigeons in sacrifice; and if the baby is a male, you must have him circumcised as part of your worship to the Almighty. Those things, and many others, the Old Testament required. Paul asserts we are not under the law now that Christ has come (Gal. 3:23-24), and asks us not to be entangled again in the yoke of bondage (Gal. 5:1). He further contends the old covenant was just a shadow of things to come, that the real thing is in Christ's new law (Col. 2:16-17).

(2) Another specimen of false teaching, growing out of the above error, is that "just so a man keeps the ten commandments he will be saved." The ten commandments say nothing about drinking, say nothing about prayer, say nothing about Christ. Are they the perfect law? The only perfect law ever given is the New Testament. When we read the way Jesus "made honorable" and made perfect some of the ten commandments in his Sermon on the Mount, then we will not say "just so a man keeps the ten commandments he will be saved."

(3) Many say, "Just so a man is sincere and does the best he can, he will be saved." Jesus presented a picture of the judgment in Matthew 7:22-23 that shows sincerity is not enough; there were those who had done many wonderful works in Christ's name but lost forever. Just because a thing seems right does not make it right; the end thereof may be the way of death (Prov. 14:12).

(4) More false teaching is: "Everybody ought to join some church." The Holy Bible speaks of the church as the body (Col. 1:18), and says there is "but one body" (I Cor. 12:20). We all know there are many churches round about us, but the fact remains that in the Book there is only one. And every church that God did not start will be rooted up (Matt. 15:13). Hence, we must be careful to know we are in the one church, the one for which Jesus' blood was shed (Acts 20:28).

One thing that must be taught until the end of the world (Matt. 28:20) is Christ's plan of salvation: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mk. 16:16). That is Christ's way to save people. The Old Testament became outdated, according to God's plan, but Christ's law of salvation is to end only with the ending of the world. Though there is much false doctrine, Christ's law can never be; it is as true as the Alpha and the Omega. Hence, it must ever be taught.

The way to wash one's past sins away is one thing; the way to keep saved day by day is another thing. One is as much a part of Jesus' teaching as is the other. All nations are to be taught to make them Christians, and then all Christians are to be taught how to be faithful unto the end. Hence, one must be taught before he becomes a Christian, and he must be taught after he becomes a Christian. And both kinds of teaching, before and after, are found in the New Testament—which is never to be replaced. Therefore, the teachings of the New Testament can never be classed as false doctrine, but always true, always new, always fresh.
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