He Washes His Hands

My friend, Eddie McMillan, editor of the Christian Leader, washes his hands before the multitude of his readers in a recent issue of his paper, if the present circulation amounts to as many as a multitude. The editor has stoutly defended Clinton Davidson, the erstwhile promoter of modern, honeyistic journalism among us. But Brother Clinton suddenly took a nose dive in the estimation of even some of his publicity agents. Even Jesse P. Sewell bowed before the wave of resentment among the brethren over Davidson's premillennial sympathies and his obvious schemes to put something over on them. In his hurried departure from Abilene Christian College, he left a hurriedly scrawled note of Davidistic disapproval to be read in chapel, after Davidson had made a speech thoroughly characteristic of him. That is going some after Sewell got so hot under the collar at some of us for telling him what he afterward found out under such embarrassing circumstances. It isn't the first time Brother Sewell has picked up some red hot coals and showed both surprise and hurt when he got his fingers burned. His responsibility for David L. Cooper on his faculty when he was president of Abilene Christian College is just one case in point. He could have found out earlier all he now knows about Davidson, had he even been inclined to, and saved himself and others a lot of embarrassment.

Now since the truth is out, Brother Eddie who has been some-what of a publicity agent for Davidson, hastens to assure his readers that he is personally so much opposed to premillennialism that it amounts almost to nausea, that he took Brother Davidson's word for it that he was also, that if he isn't he is guilty of self-deception, or words to that effect, and calls on the New York wonder in promotion to clarify his position. Such a challenge to Davidson is strikingly obsolete. Declare himself indeed! "He's done it." He did it at Abilene and about all he has done since he hatched up his digressive scheme to pull the teeth of our journalism so we could do nothing but gum things, has been shouting from the housetops what he is. I'm inclined to think that washing his hands before the multitude will not meet the demands of the case, in Brother McMillan's case, at least until he washes Barney Morehead of them. Clean up and come to Texas, Brother Eddie, have me seasonally on your hands as you used to and maybe so you will absorb enough spunk to write some articles for the Bible Banner. At least Davidson would no longer pester you with embarrassment. I could save Brother Sewell from periodic spells at the anxious seat, but he won't listen to me till its too late, and when what I have known all the time hits him smack between the eyes, he acts as though he thought he was the original proprietor of the idea. On with the battle!

Another thing. If these brethren knew all along what has all of a sudden given them such a scare, they should as a matter of good sportsmanship, string along and take their medicine with Brother Davidson. If he has to swallow a tablespoonful, they shouldn't make too many faces over a teaspoonful. If they "cross my heart and hope to die," didn't know it and have just now found it out, it seems in order that some sort of an apology is due some of the rest of us under the circumstances. The more I think about this handwashing business, the more superficial it appears.

A PARTIAL REPORT OF A PREACHER'S MEETING

Place — Jerusalem. Time — the apostolic age. Host — the Jerusalem Church. Purpose of the meeting-to discuss an "ism" that was disturbing the peace and harmony of the church. Speakers, Peter, Barnabas, Paul and James. Results—Then it seemed good to the apostles and the elders, with the whole church, to choose men out of their company, and send them to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas; namely, Judas called Barsabbas, and Silas, chief men among the brethren: and they wrote thus by them. The apostles and the elders, brethren, unto the brethren who are of the Gentiles in Antioch and Syria and Cilicia, greet: Forasmuch as we have heard that certain who went out from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls; to whom we gave no commandment; it seemed good unto us, having come to one accord, to choose out men and send them unto you with our beloved Barnabas and Paul, men that have hazard their lives for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have sent therefore Judas and Silas, who themselves also shall tell you the same things by word of mouth" (Acts 15: 22-27). A complete victory for the truth, and the advocates of the "ism" stamped as "subverters of souls." But I said a "partial report," because Luke evidently overlooked the fact (?) that Sister Simon Peter addressed the sisters. This was a small matter, however, because according to modern parlance and practice the Holy Spirit failed to report lots of things we are doing, today. In fact about all the Holy Spirit did bind on Christians were only "the customs of that day" according to the wiseacres of our time. What has become of that old moss-back (?) that said: "Brethren, we are drifting!"
THE WONDER GROWS

CLED E. WALLACE

The first phase of the fight against premillennialism has been definitely won and we propose to keep a weather eye cocked in the direction of seeing that it stays won. In the none too distant past some alarming signs portended that the disruptive future kingdom theories might break out among us in epidemic proportions. Boll, Jorgenson, Janes and company seemed poised for a regular blitzkrieg. The danger of a direct invasion seems to be over, at least for a long time. Avowed premillennialists are so scarce among us, some consider it unsportsmanlike to shoot at the rare specimens still remaining and want to declare a closed season. Who are they? There are Boll, Jorgenson, Janes and Olmstead together with a few smaller imitations. The vast body of the disciples including elders and preachers have turned thumbs down on the doctrine.

What other phase or phases of the fight are left to be waged? We are not supposed to charge a man with the consequences of a doctrine which he distinctly disavows. And about everybody disavows premillennialism these days. If you found an avowed one, even in Harding College, you would probably have to pull him out from under the bed by his two heels. Right here “the wonder” begins. When you pull him out, stand him up, or have somebody to hold him under duress long enough for an interview, he presents the phenomenon of “blessing and cursing coming forth out of the same mouth.” Out of one corner flows a noisy disavowal of Boll’s doctrine, while out of the other blessings descend as gently in the dew of Hymn 19 on Brother Boll himself. Is it possible that the only issue we have left is a man, and that shielding him has become more important than defending the church against his heresy? We may be reminded that some think the doctrine, even though false, is not disruptive. Yes, and there are some rare souls still enjoying their freedom who still think the earth is flat, and that they can prove it by the scriptures.

The wonder grows. Along about the time the heresy was taking the count of ten, along comes an insurance salesman from New York who had to be introduced to us, inasmuch as he was almost a total stranger. You see, when he wasn’t under premillennial influence during the previous twenty years, he was going in and out finding pasture among the digressives. He is introduced with a dream in his heart and a check book in his hand. It seems that the check book blinded the eyes of some of his brethren to the true color of his dream. Verily, “the love of money is a root of all kinds of evil: which some reaching after have been led astray from the faith, and have pierced themselves through with many sorrows.” It should have been evident to all who could see beyond a dollar mark that this man had a hatred in his heart for most of the preaching and writing that was being done by us outside of Louisville and some even in Louisville. His every move from his survey and questionnaire on, revealed this. He did not even make a decent effort to conceal his feeling. He proposed to buy and bluff his way into leadership. It is amazing that F. L. Rowe, Jesse P. Sewell, Eddie McMillan and others could not see this. By their own admission they are smarter than I am and I couldn’t see anything else. Sewell has a habit of locking the stable after the horse has been stolen but I expected better things of McMillan. In a late issue of the Christian Leader Brother McMillan says:

There have been constant charges the last two years that Brother Clinton Davidson has a covered desire to make the Christian Leader helpful to premillennialism. When these charges first started, Brother Davidson told me that he was not a premillennialist and that he had no interest in uppromoting or assisting premillennialism. I believed him.

Brother Eddie is old enough not to believe everything he is told when the evidence all denies it. They might have got by with it, in a way, if they could have kept Davidson in New York with his mouth closed. But Brother Sewell conceived that brilliant scheme of having him invade Texas and show off at Abilene Christian College. The show he put on there exploded in his face and even gave Brother Sewell a hard chill. Even as he shook the dust off his feet and left for other parts, he left a disapproving note to be read in chapel which didn’t exactly sound like President Cox’s extravagant effort to whitewash Davidson on the pages of the Firm Foundation. The whole thing was a fiasco if there ever was one. As for the Leader, Brother Davidson is reputed to be out, back in New York still writing a few checks for Harding College, and Brother Eddie is still in the woods holding a sack open, momentarily expecting a snipe to pop into it. He has been imposed upon. “I believed him.” The wonder grows if he still believes him. Nobody else much does. Brother Eddie’s faith in him seems to be wavering. He said editorially:

“If Brother Davidson, in reality, holds the beliefs or the sympathies of which he is accused, he should make them known clearly.”

To my mind he has already in various ways made “them known clearly.” If these brethren knew all along what Davidson was and now desert him when he is whipped, it is a cowardly thing to do. They ought to stand or fall with him. Why desert him now? If they did not know, their course is equally clear. A timid editorial gesture does not meet the demands of the case. I wish I were in Brother Eddie’s shoes just long enough to show him how to act in a crisis like that. Some knots that cannot be untied should be cut. He tells us sagely and evasively that “clearing the misunderstanding is Brother Davidson’s responsibility.” Responsibility doesn’t shift that easily.

“And still the wonder grows!” There are some other things that need clearing up. Don’t pile all the odium on Davidson. If he gets to be too much of an “underdog” I’m liable to go to his rescue. We have done enough to him without you fellows jumping onto him. ... after he is whipped. It is unsportsmanlike. You received him, defended him, flattered him and ate out of his hand. Now, don’t turn around and bite the hand that has been feeding you! Personally, I think he is at least as good as some of the rest of you. View the white-robed angel band who waved palms of welcome to Davidson and his schemes! They, of all places, come from Harding College, Pepperdine College, David Lipscomb College, Abilene Christian College. And there is not a single premillennialist in all this angelic choir! No wonder the colleges are having to sow down the whole brotherhood with bulletins of disavowal and explanations. And still the wonder grows.
THE PERTINENT POINT

The following quotation is G. C. Brewer's article in the Gospel Advocate concerning the death of Brother A. B. Lipscomb, except that he wrote the article on G. C. Brewer instead. It was remarked by a young man at Abilene Christian College some months ago that Brother Brewer was the only man he had ever seen who could "strut sitting down!!" And now he adds another performance to his role of egotism, taking advantage of a funeral to talk and write about himself, and did not stop to mus as to whether our faith is in better harmony with the solemnity of the "passing of A. B. Lipscomb," the proper title for the Brewer article with reference to it would be "Crowning Over A Corpse"—because that is exactly what he does. Read it and blush.

Old Point Still Pertinent

G. C. Brewer

With the passing of A. B. Lipscomb we are again reminded of the rapidity with which the years race by, and of the changes that are constantly taking place in the affairs of life. When Brother A. B. came to Nashville to be editor-in-chief of the known G. C. Brewer, it was for the purpose of placing the paper in the hands of younger men. The venerable David Lipscomb and E. G. Sewell knew then that they must soon cease from their labors, and Brother Lipscomb solicited that his name and his own name could be placed in position to carry on his work. The associates of Lipscomb and Sewell-A. A. Elam, J. C. McQuiddy, F. B. Strygey, and M. C. Kufieres-were not then reduced to a state of their labors. They were old men, and Lipscomb has also been mustered out of service and gone to join those who appointed him to carry on their work! When I think of these things, I feel as David did when he lamented the death of Absalom, "my heart is sick and my maw wath weak."

I was associated "with A. B. Lipscomb in some things both pleasant and unpleasant, but all the unpleasant incidents were long ago forgotten and we were brothers and fellow laborers in the great cause we love. While I grieve over his going, I honor his memory and commend his work.

Brother Lipscomb published two or three books that are still valuable. He was not so much the author of these books as the compiler. He requested men to write or collect these writings in book form. Some of these books, if not all of them, are still obtainable. Three of these books are "Consolation," "The Profitable Word," and "Christian Treasures," obtained from my own feeble pen may be found in each of these books. While this is in a remissful mood I have been reading from these books, and I came upon an article which Brother Lipscomb reasued me to write in 1915. The title is the "Selection of Themes for Public Discourses." It is on pages 195-198 of "Christian Treasures." Believing this article to be more timely now than when it was written, I am her republishing it with the prayer that its suggestions may cause us to be more thoughtful in the selection of themes and in their development before the public. Here is the article in full:

Selection Of Themes For Public Discourses

The selection of a theme for a discourse is the most difficult problem in the preparation for the pulpit, and the preacher who does not recognize the problem lacks an essential qualification for his work. The preacher who has nothing but a set number of stereotyped sermons is just as limited in his usefulness as he is in his range of subjects. Often a sermon is a failure before an audience, not because it is not well delivered or because the subject is not well handled, but because the theme was unjustly or inappropriate. Unfortunately for the preacher, he sometimes thinks he has made a big "hit." When in reality his sermon was an utter failure. He thinks it a success because it pleased the brethren and elicited compliments in wholesale lots; but, judged from its effects for good and permanent results, it was a signal failure. Strangely enough, we appreciate hearing a man tell us something we already know more than something we do not know, and we have to grasp the thought and realize it in our minds and finally make it our own before we appreciate its value. If you enjoy what I say, it is because it was yours already. If I echo back your thoughts or advocate something that you have already gleaned the need of, you are ready to come down at my feet or to go into ecstasies at my profundity.

In protracted meetings in small towns and country places where they never have preaching except during the annual big bi, the preacher sometimes finds places where the brethren want him to use the same themes that have been used by the men who have held their meetings for the last ten decades. Sometimes when the preacher is original in thought or somewhat different in arrangement and delivering his discourse, he is unjustly criticized.

It is right to preach first principles; but in a community where there is an active church, it seems to me these principles should be so well taught the evangelist could spend the few days of the meeting trying to persuade people to obey the Lord. By pertaining the goodness of God and by pointing out the advantages of a Christian life, the beauties of holiness, the sinfulness of sin, the sure consequences of sin; the infinite stupidity of following a course that is sure to lead to their ruin, we must be able to tour that there is a difference in convincing a man of the truth of a doctrine and converting him to Christ. Select themes that will make men think more of Christ as the Savior of the world and head of the church that it will seem blasphemous to disown his commandments and make the man who says it is not necessary to do his biddings appear contemptible without mentioning him.

There is not the hard and fast rules of procedure for every preacher to follow. Preachers should be conscientious and sincere in their preaching, and should select subjects that to them seem appropriate and that they follow through. But, however, may be profitably regarded in choosing themes for our public discourses, whether in protracted meetings or otherwise. First I will mention a few things that should not influence us in selecting a theme:

1. Don't, discuss your hobby.

2. Don't be actuated by a personal feeling against anyone.

3. Don't treat the audience whom you should be endeavoring to save to an onslaught against some brother or paper that happens to differ from you.

But—

1. Select a theme that you consider worthy of your very best efforts.

2. Select a theme that is worthy of the time and the most serious consideration of those who hear it discussed.

3. Select a theme that you know at least some of your hearers need to hear.

4. Select a theme that is more edifying and instructive than sensational or entertaining, more practical than theoretical.

5. Consider what the permanent value of the theme may be. Have before you everyonden how it will arouse.

6. Always have in mind the salvation of those who hear you.

May the Lord help us all to feel our responsibility and to be true to our trust. ("Christian Treasures," Volume 1, pages 195-198).

When Brother Brewer wrote the article about himself and Harding College, telling the brotherhood how much he would be worth to the College, in which he used the personal pronoun (mostly in the first person plural) over one hundred and fifty times in a two column article, it was considered the climax of all egotism. But he has gone one better. I have attended many funerals of all kinds of people, have heard many funeral addresses and read many funeral essays of varied character by many kinds of preachers, but...
in all of my life (not “our lives” as he would say) I have never before seen such an exhibition of colossal conceit, as making himself the subject of a funny little story of the departed brother! It has been said of an extreme egotist that if he should attend a funeral he would want to be the corpse, but the statement was always taken figuratively and I never expected to see an actual example of it. But here it is literally enacted!

In this article of two columns in length, twenty lines are devoted to the deceased merely as an introduction to the “pertinent point.” Reference is then made to three books of which Brother Lipscomb “was not so much the author” but rather the “compiler,” the “pertinent point” in all of which was the fact that he had requested Brother Brewer to write some of all of these books,” a distinction, perhaps, none other ever had! And in “reminiscent mood” Brother Brewer “came upon” these writings of his in Brother Lipscomb’s books, just in time to make them (his own writings) the subject of his essay on the passing of Brother Lipscomb! True, he refers to his “own feeble pen,” but who will believe that he thinks his “own pen” is feeble when he goes back into the books a dead man “compiled” just to relate what he himself had written in the books! And he gave the article he wrote “in full”—which is too much space for an article that he really believed was “feeble.” He was too anxious for everybody to know that he wrote it for a book A. B. Lipscomb “compiled” for anybody to take his “feeble” estimate of himself seriously. But why say more, Or, some may say, why say this? Just to keep before the readers the unmitigated egotism of some men who are doing all that they can to help a group of other men change the church, and who are all the time criticizing the简单 from the faithful pioneers until now who have borne the brunt of battle against error and innovation in their day.

In this two column article, purportedly about Brother Lipscomb, G. C. Brewer devotes actually only twenty lines to Brother Lipscomb and the other one hundred and twelve lines to himself and what he had written. So, humble reader, “The Old Point Still Pertinent” even at a funeral is Doctor G. C. Brewer, LL. D., and his writings! “For I say unto you through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think more highly of himself than he ought to think.”—Paul, “a servant of Jesus Christ,” to the Romans—F. E. W. Jr.

**Gunpowder Jimmie’s Salesmanshin Methods**

In a recent issue of his West Coast Comic, Jimmie made a running reference to those brethren in Louisville, Kentucky, who had offered him money for relief purposes, which he did not happen to need—and then he added, his thanks to them for the privilege of making a draft on them in any emergency in his work, etc. Now that seemed rather unusual to me, as well as to others, and I had the feeling that it was just another puff of wind from Jimmie Lovemall. So here are the facts. What did happen was back in 1938—two years and nine months ago—wonder why Jimmie is talking about it now? Read this from Louisville:

Our records show that in a business meeting on March 6, 1938, Haldeman Avenue decided to send relief to the flood sufferers in California. No one among us was acquainted with the brethren in Los Angeles at that time, and we did not know with whom to communicate. The name of James L. Love11 was obtained somehow, and our help was proffered through him. He thanked us for our willingness to send relief, but said the brethren there were not in need of outside assistance at that time.

In March, 1938, none of us knew James L. Lovell’s views regarding the matters now under discussion. The help was offered without any thought of endorsing anyone or forming any connection with anyone in California, but merely to relieve human suffering.—C. B. Douthitt.

Can you imagine why Jimmie, after two years and nine months, would refer to this incident? Why, just to leave the impression that he has such a standing with the brethren that he can just draw drafts on them for money all over the country for the “great” work that he is doing! Jimmie just deliberately went back to an instance nearly three years old, brought it down to date, and made it look like to those who do not know any better, that he is the general treasurer, check writer and exchequer for the church. But that’s Jimmie, and that is why the brethren cannot rely on anything he says, he is just talking and puffing, and puffing and talking. Those who know him just consider the source. Some who do not know him are foolish enough to send him money for his missionary fruit-juar.

Another trouble is, if anybody even sends Jimmie two bits for his jar, or four-bits for his paper, he takes it that they are giving him their vote of confidence and endorsement. Roy Stephens, of Roaring Springs, Texas, subscribed for Jimmie’s paper, just to keep a line on him. Jimmie writes Roy as follows: “I want you to know that I sincerely appreciate your apparent approval of the feeble work I am trying to do and I want you to watch every word and when you think I have made a mistake or written something that is wrong tell me and I shall correct it if the same be true.” But Brother Roy did not know that he was approving Jimmie, apparently or otherwise. He was just paying the price to see his comics. If anybody gives Jimmie a pleasant look, or offers to shake hands with him, he thinks they are about to adopt him, and he begins waving his tail like an orphan pup wanting a bone, or a missionary wanting a sponsor! As for asking all of his readers to watch him—he certainly needs watching: as for correcting his mistakes, his whole sheet is a mistake. Jimmie ought to take some time out and “watch” awhile himself, learn some things he needs to know, be taught instead of trying to teach when he is wholly unprepared to teach, and he would not be making so many mistakes.

Brethren over the country generally will soon learn him, many already know him, and it will be Exit-Jimmie, so far as his aspirations to the generalship and leadership of the church is concerned, just as it was Exit-Clinton Davidson. They are in the same boat, have tried to work the same schemes; they are “Mike and Ike—they look alike,” and they will alike be rebuked by brethren who learn the tricks and the treachery of their spiritual salesmanship schemes. To me, and many others who know these things, it is a tragic shame that the church must be belittled and humiliaded and victimized by these particular men who know nothing about the church, nor the Bible, but have spent their time learning to be specialists in the field of salesmanship and suddenly decided to take over the church. If these men would “stick to their last,” do what they are qualified to do, let the elders manage the churches, and the preachers preach the gospel without their efforts to control them, they would save both themselves and the church the embarrassment of these exposures. But as long as they try to run the church—some of us will be in their way. Jimmie shall not pass, either, if we have to stop up all the cricket holes! And, by the way, did you notice on Jimmies card that like Brother Brewer’s “own feeble pen,” he refers to his own “feeble work.” So he stages the humble act; and when these men are exposed (they will do it every time)—they play the martyr act, they are persecuted, and they are pitied and humility embodied and personified. Thus have all false teachers been able to gain their following from Russell down to Boll, for not many people seem to discriminate between piety and putty. How long, O Lord, how long! F. E. W. Jr.
America's Religious Harvest

HOMER HALLEY

The so-called “Christian society” may be divided into three groups, it is usually divided into two, but correctly divided there are three: Catholicism, Protestantism, and Christianity. A consideration of these, even though brief, may reveal the cause and offer the remedy to the existing condition.

Catholicism

With Catholics the Bible is insufficient, incomplete and a dead letter. I quote from some of their own works: Says Cardinal Gibbons in his book, “The Faith of Our Fathers,” fifty seventh edition: “That God never intended the Bible to be the Christian’s rule of faith, independently of the living authority of the Church, will be the subject of this chapter.” (p. 98). “Now the Scriptures alone do not contain all the truths which a Christian is bound to believe, nor do they explicitly injoin all the duties which he is obliged to practice.” (p. 111) “We must, therefore, conclude that the Scriptures alone cannot be a sufficient guide and rule of faith, because they cannot, at any time, be within the reach of every inquirer; because they are not of themselves clear and intelligible even in matters of the highest importance, and because they do not contain all the truths necessary for salvation.” (p. 112) Bishop Purcell says, “The Bible is a dead letter.” Campbell-Purell Debate. (p. 213)

But if the Bible doesn’t contain all truth, and is a “dead letter” without the interpretation of the “living authority of the Church,” just who is to be this interpreter and supplier of missing truth? Answer: The Pope, the “man of sin” who rules from the Vatican of the seven hilled city on the Tiber. Hear Mr. Gibbon again, “A Pope’s letter is the most weighty authority in the Church.” (p. 116) Read the statement again! Think about it! That is Catholic doctrine in a word, but it is blasphemy, gone to seed. But hear Mr. Gibbon as he interprets Matthew 16:18, 19, “When he says to Peter: ‘I will give thee to the keys,’ etc., He evidently means: I will give thee supreme authority over My Church, which is the citadel of faith, My earthly Jerusalem. Thou and thy successors shall be My visible representatives to the end of time.” (p. 124) Strange, isn’t it, that if that is what Christ meant, He couldn’t have said it. But hear him once more as he utters “great swelling words of vanity,” “Why should not the Pope be equally justified in appealing for similar offerings to the Christian people, among whom he exercises supreme authority, as Moses did among the Israelites?” (p. 435)

“Supreme authority” would put him above God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit. Such is the kernel of Catholicism. One quotation more, this time from “The Dogmatic Decrees of the Vatican Council Concerning the Catholic Faith and the Church of Christ. A. D. 1870,” the last paragraph: “That the Roman Pontiff, when he speaks “ex cathedra”. . .is possessed of that infallibility with which the divine Redeemer willed that his church should be endowed for defining doctrine regarding faith or morals.” This, the declaration of papal infallibility, was the crowning blasphemy of the ages.

What is to be the religious harvest of any nation where Catholicism is planted and rooted? Ignorance of God’s law and will, and His standard; the establishment of a false standard of authority and righteousness; religious bondage to men and traditions; and moral corruptions, the outgrowth of this ignorance and the glorification of celibacy, virginity, mass, auricular confessions, and such. Spiritual blight must be the harvest in our country as Catholicism grows and abounds. It is growing. Why?

Protestantism

One of the greatest contributing factors to the growth of Catholicism in this country is the complete failure of Protestantism. Protestantism is a little better than Catholicism in its regard to the Bible. It claims to respect its authority, yet it is the Bible “plus” with them. The final appeal of authority is how one “feels” about it. Protestants claim to accept the authority of Christ and the Bible, yet preach “it matters not what one believes, so long as he believes something; it matters not what he does, so long as he does something; he doesn’t have to belong to the church, but ought to belong to something.” Then, along with all this, modernism is honeycombing the entire protestant structure today to where it stands for less than nothing.

Such a code of faith makes every man his own standard of authority, and his feelings the final appeal of law. The result is, over two hundred bodies in the U. S. claim to belong to Christ, but standing for nothing definite, with no definite message, and no definite standard. Each preaches that he is right, but all others are all right too. That being true, why be anything? is the logical conclusion, and the one being accepted by the people in general. For with no standard doctrinally, there is no standard morally. Here we find a prolific source of infidelity and indifference. And not only so, but as said above, also one of the greatest contributing factors to the growth of Catholicism.

Christianity

The solution to the whole problem of today, as of all days, is Christianity. But Christianity can counteract the blighting effects of Catholicism and Protestantism only as it is preached in a definite and positive way. Christianity recognizes the all-inclusive authority of Christ; the all-sufficiency and completeness of the scriptures; the Holy Spirit as the revealer and infallible interpreter of truth; and the Bible as the only perfect rule of conduct. Its doctrine is the doctrine of Christ, which will transform lives, reform society, and hold up a definite standard and hope toward which to strive.

Correction of the present situation can be realized only as error is uprooted. Error can be uprooted only as every false doctrine is exposed and proved false, and the thoughts of men’s hearts are brought into captivity to Christ. This demands preaching, and much preaching; preaching from a firm and unshakable conviction in the power of truth to uproot and save. Preaching that plants the same conviction and love for truth and right in the hearts of others.

It likewise demands that both those preaching and those believing the things preached live the principles in their own lives. It demands an uncompromising and unflinching spirit of self-sacrifice and self-forgetfulness on the part of all Christians. Let the church awaken to this truth, and both preachers and congregations set themselves to the mighty task before us, of dethroning error and sin, both of Catholicism and Protestantism. It is silly to waste time in so-called “Unity Meetings” when, unless the error of digression and rebellion against God’s law is up-rooted, the thing must end in compromise. Quit apologizing for certain false teachers among our number, but expose their error as readily as that of any other. Quit trying to find some ground on which we can fellowship sectarians in Ministerial Alliance, whois, love feasts, and such; and a loophole through which we may encourage them in the belief that they are saved, somehow, in their error. Having ceased these things, then concentrate our efforts, and legitimate instruments such as periodicals and colleges to one definite end: the complete uprooting of false doctrine and son, and the establishing of Christ’s principles in the hearts of men. When this becomes the definite task of this generation, a different harvest will be the blessing of our children in the generation to come.
Addition to what? To vocal music, the kind of music prescribed in the new Testament for God’s people. “To the law of the testimony,” they speak not according to his word, surely there is no mourning for them.” (Isaiah 8:20)

Let us notice the kind of music used, and prescribed by Jesus Christ and his apostles.

“And as they were eating Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake it; and he gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat: this is my body. And he took a cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, drink ye all or it; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out (not spilt) for many unto remission of sins. But I say unto you, I shall not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom. And when they had sung a hymn, they went out into the Mount of Olives.” (Matthew 26:26-30) Thus we see that vocal music was used by Jesus Christ and his apostles when the “Lord’s Supper” was instituted. A man who can see through a ladder can see that the editor of the Christian Standard, and all its constituents, with James DeForest Murch who thinks the Christian Standard is the centripetal pivot of religious journalism, add to this vocal music when they use the man made instruments while singing.

Some of the digressive churches use instrumental music while partaking of the “Lord’s Supper.” Since there is no singing to aid in cases like this, I suppose Brother Errett would say it aids those passing the emblems; but I do not see how they could keep step with the music in a crowded house.

Saul, the first King of Israel, thought he knew more about what should be offered to God, and how it should be offered than God himself. Therefore, in trying to worship God in a way that was right in his own eyes he committed the presumptuous sin, and paid for his folly in the loss of his kingdom, in a humiliating defeat of his army, and in a disgraceful suicidal death. When the digressives add instrumental music to that worship prescribed in the New Testament, they are presuming to know more about the kind of worship that we should render to God than God himself knew. Too smart, brethren. And these are the ones that Claud F. Witty, and his colaborers are holding love feasts with, and calling their gatherings “unity meetings,” thus trying to amalgamate two incompatible elements into a conglomeration of faithless people. Just as well try to “weld a wooden handle to a pewter spoon”—it cannot be done, neither with the active suport of the New Christian Leader, nor by the silence of other papers.

When you add the organ, fiddles, horns, and orchestras to the New Testament worship, you have opened the flood gate that lets in baby membership, open membership, and all other ships, sailing the denominational seas and headlong for the port of Rome. But by the grace of God they shall never pass, so James DeForest Murch and Claude F. Witty had just as well “call off their dogs.” Old Ahab, King of Israel, said to Jehoshaphat, King of Judah, “Wilt thou go with me to battle to Ramoth-gilead?” And Jehoshaphat said to the King of Israel, I am as thou art, my people as thy people, my horses as thy horses.” (1 Kings 22:4) The battle ended in disgrace and shame to both kings and their armies. James DeForest Murch and Claude F. Witty may be the Ahabs and Jehoshaphats among us; but there will be no battle of Ramoth-gilead, because the rank-and-file of church members will not follow the Murch-Witty combination either in love feasts or in battle.

But we must go on with our study of New Testament worship. “What is it then? I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also” (1 Cor. 14:15). No organs, fiddles, horns, nor orchestras here, therefore they would be an addition to the worship, so far as this scripture is concerned. Remember I have offered to affirm that an “instrumental accomplishent” is an addition to the New Testament worship, if Brother Errett would give me line for line in the Christian Standard. However, I am going ahead with my part of the discussion, whether Brother Errett sees fit to notice it or not. Maybe I can help some of Brother Witty’s brethren. In Ephesians 5:18-21, we read: “And be not drunken with wine, wherein is riot, but be filled with the Spirit, speaking one to another in psalms and spiritual songs, singing and making melody with your heart to the Lord; giving thanks always for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to God, even the Father; subjecting yourselves one to another in the fear of Christ.” No fiddles and horns here. A parallel passage is Col. 3:16, 17, “Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; in all wisdom, teaching and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts unto God. And whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God the Father through him.” Kicking folding chairs, or expostulating against brethren who contend for the New Testament teaching cannot be done “in the name of the Lord Jesus,” even at a love feast.

We read again, in Heb. 2:11, 12, “For both he that sanctifieth and they that are sanctified are all one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare they name unto my brethren. In the midst of the congregation will I sing thy praise.” Finally, in Heb. 13:15, we read: “Through him then let us offer up a sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his name.” The music that is prescribed in the New Testament must be made in, or with the heart, and offered as the fruit of our lips. The only instruments that can be used in offering this “sacrifice of praise” are the vocal cords with which God had endowed man. Not all singing is worship, it is only that which consists in prayer and praise that is acceptable to God, the kind ordered in the New Testament. Music made on man made instruments and offered by the touch of your fingers, or by pushing the bow over cat gut strings stretched across the face of a violin consists neither of prayer nor praise, and therefore, when used in the worship, must be an addition to the kind of music God has authorized, the only kind used in the apostolic church. This is a clear cut issue, and if Brother Errett will deny it, and discuss it with me in the Bible Banner and in the Christian Standard, I feel sure that Brother James DeForest Murch will decide that the Christian Standard is centrifugal (away from the center), and not centripetal, (toward the center). It might be a little surprising to Brother Murch to learn that the Christian Standard is veering toward the “diatonic fringe” of religious journalism, and that the Bible Banner is where he thought the Christian Standard was.

Brother Murch will never get out of “De” Forest of denominationalism by attending the “Murch-Witty” unity meetings (?) where all discussions that would show the difference between the instruments made of the forest, and those made of God with which we sing praise to Him, are tabooed. This is because James DeForest Murch and his brethren know that sprinkling for baptism is found in the
same chapter you find “instrumental accompaniment.” Both are relics of Catholicism, born in the beginning of the dark ages. Instrumental music was first introduced into public worship by Gregory the Great, about the middle of the sixth Century. I quote from “Coleman’s Ancient Christianity Exemplified,” page 331: “Great attention was paid by him to the rhythm of sacred music, though regardless of poetical measure and rhyme. Both prose and poetry were sung in a peculiar chant by a choir of singers. But his music became so complicated, that a good proficient in music would scarcely master it by diligence and skill in less than ten years. For the cultivation of this style of sacred music singing-schools were established, the leaders of which rose to great distinction. Instrumental accompaniments were introduced and especially that of sacred church music. Church music was thus a refined art of difficult attainment and limited to a few professional singers.”

This is where, when, and how instrumental accompaniment was added to singing in the worship transferred from the theater to the church. With this transfer, to a large extent, devotional singing passed from the man to an orchestra or a robed choir, as the church went into total apostacy where it remained under the light of Roman Catholicism for a thousand years—that period known in history as the dark ages, not only for the church; but civilization also. The purpose therefore of the nineteenth century Restoration was to restore the New Testament Church, with its work and worship. It would be interesting if Brother Errett and Brother Murch would tell us, through that beacon of religious journalism—the Christian Standard—just what they are trying to restore. Are they trying to carry the New Testament worship back through the denominational swamps, and restore it to the bosom of the Mother of Harlots? It may be that Brother Errett and Brother Jorgenson can get up some kind of a business combination, and try to get all their brethren to agree to use only one kind of an instrument in their accompaniment, and call it “unity.”

I will now show that instrumental accompaniment is not only an addition, but an intrusion into the Nineteenth Century Restoration movement, that which both Edwin R. Errett and James DeForest Murch misrepresent. W. K. Pendleton succeeded Mr. Campbell as editor of the Millennial Harbinger, and also as president of Bethany College. Will these gentlemen who imagine they are the quin- tessential of sanity, in religious journalism, accept Mr. Pendleton, as authority on this subject? Two years after Alexander Campbell died, Mr. Pendleton wrote: “It has been said, that nothing is so absurd but that some one would be found foolish enough to embrace it. It would seem especially true in matters of religion. This folly of elevating organ grinding and accompaniments into the place of apostolic worship illustrates it. Who could have thought that with the Bible in their hand, the American people could ever have drifted into such idolatry!” (Millennial Harbinger 1868, page 41.) Of course, Brother Errett will not deny my proposition when he reads the above, but he should thank me for this information, and never again stubbility himself when he is writing on this subject, by pretending that instrumental accompaniment is not an addition to the New Testament worship. As to Brother Murch, a man may be so irrational on a subject that he will think everybody else is crazy on the subject but himself. Recently in writing up “our” religious journals Brother Murch put the Bible Banner on the “lunatic fringe” of religious journalism. Whereas the Bible Banner is standing exactly where Alexander Campbell, W. K. Pendleton, Moses E. Lard, I. B. Grubbs, Charles L. Loos, J. W. McGarvey, and others of the Restoration Movement stood in their fight to keep this invention of the Mother of Harlots—instrumental accompaniments—out of the New Testament worship, which they were trying to restore.

J. W. McGarvey wrote in Millennial Harbinger 1888, page 219: “The loudest call that comes from heaven to the men of this generation is for warfare, stern, relentless, merciless, exterminating, against everything not express-ibly or by necessary implication authorized in the New Testament.” The Bible Banner is trying to answer “this call that comes from heaven,” because it is louder today than it was in J. W. McGarvey’s day, and the only regret it has, is, it has not a sufficient command of the English language to make the fight as “stern, relentless, merciless, and exterminating” as the pioneers made it.

If the Bible Banner is judged or measured by the writings of the pioneers it will never be criticized for its severity. I say, without fear of a successful contradiction, that The Bible Banner is standing where the pioneers stood in their fight for New Testament simplicity, while the Christian Standard is floundering around in the swamps of denominationalism. Defend your position, and your paper, on instrumental accompaniments, if you think you can, Brother Errett. But whether you do or do not, I would advise you to keep the braying of James DeForest Murch, on religious journalism, out of your paper, because he does not know enough about the restoration movement to write intelligently on the subject.

An Announcement
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EDWIN ERRETT ADMITS CHARGES

D. H. HADWIN

Edwin Errett is the editor of the *Christian Standard*, a paper published in the interest of our digressive brethren. In the issue of March 23, 1940, an editorial appeared entitled, “Quite Unfair.” I meant to give attention to this editorial long before this. However it is just as pertinent now as then. In order not to be “unfair,” we are quoting the entire editorial, as follows:

“Our good brethren whom we sometimes designate as the ‘conservatives’ and who are characterized chiefly by their anti-instrumental position with reference to worship, complain at times that the rest of us have been unduly harsh toward them and have misrepresented them. It is occasion for congratulation all around that, as we learn to know some of them face to face, we find our use of harsh terms inhibited by our own consciences.

“Unfortunately, however, there are some among them who make charges quite untrue and, we are sorry to say, charges that they must know to be untrue. Some of these charges originate with men who have formerly labored with the more liberal churches, and therefore are not justified in stating as fact what is not so among these churches of more liberal character.

“There is, for instance, the charge that these liberal congregations use women dancers in their worship programs. That is absolutely false. We have heard of but one congregation that ever tried such a thing, and, so far as we know, it never tried it again, partly, we suspect, because of the general condemnation of the other churches.

“There is the charge that these churches observe Lent. While a few of them do fall into phases of pre-Easter emphasis on prayer and devotional reading and special services, we know of none that really observe Lent, and even those who have special services are in decided minority.

“There is the charge that these churches practice open membership. Perhaps a hundred or two follow the practice, but the sneaker is so untruthful as to assert of eight thousand congregations, that as solid on baptism as his own fellowship, that they are guilty of a practice most of them condemn.

“There is the charge that they are affiliated with the International Convention and guilty of whatever it does— a palpable absurdity, since most of them have nothing to do with that body.

“There are various charges about the use of women as preachers and about agencies ruling the churches. All these assume that congregations all do this or are guilty of it if some congregations do it.

“Such falsification—and in some cases it appears to be nothing less—would seem to be actuated by factious spirit. That spirit is listed by Paul along with lasciviousness as a work of the flesh. If we were to return in kind, we should attribute to the so-called ‘antis’ all the works of the flesh. This we will not do, because we are happy to have learned that a large number of them are saintly leaders eager for not only truth, but fellowship.”

This editorial is interesting in a peculiar way. The very charges which brother Errett would refute, he admits to be true. He says, “Some of these charges originate with men who have formerly labored with the more liberal churches.” Well, I formerly labored with the **dissatisfiers**, if that is what he means. I have mentioned some of these things in my preaching and writing, but he speaks of some that I have passed by. But he admits some charges that I have made.

For instance, the charge about women dancers. In my tract, *restoration or digression?* I wrote, “To illustrate the extremes to which such digressive practices lead, I quote the following news item. The church mentioned is a prominent church, and the minister is a well known preacher. The same argument that justifies instrumental music in the worship will justify dancing in the worship. Their fundamental premise is unsound.” I quoted the news item telling about the “women dancers” without further comment. I merely wanted to illustrate the extremes to which their unscriptural position will carry them. Brother Errett speaks of the charge that these liberal congregations use women dancers in their worship programs. He says, “That is absolutely false.” Then he admits the charge. He says, “We have heard of but one congregation that ever tried such a thing.” Well, that is all that we charged, and he admits the charge. And for the life of him, Edwin Errett cannot advance one argument against dancing in the worship that will not also be against instrumental music in the worship. I challenge him to do so. Dancing was acceptable to God as an act of worship in the Old Testament, and so was instrumental music. But God left dancing out of the New Testament, and he also left instrumental music out. By what authority would Edwin Errett declare dancing in worship to be wrong and instrumental music to be right? Evidently by his own authority. By the authority of the New Testament we declare that they are both wrong. Jesus said, “teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you” (Mt. 28: 20), and it is evident that dancing and instrumental music in worship are not authorized by Him, for His apostles did not teach us to observe them. They are not in the New Testament.

Then he says, “There is the charge that these churches observe Lent.” I am sure that all will freely admit that the digressives do not observe Lent in the sense in which the Roman Catholics observe it, but he admits all that we charged when he says, “While a few of them do fall into phases of pre-Easter emphasis on prayer and devotional reading and special services, we know of none that really observe Lent.” No, they do not “really observe Lent.” But they do all these “special” things which brother Errett admits. They have all kinds of “pre-Easter” services, and of course they observe “Easter” itself. Ever Since I was a little boy I remember that these things have been done. But he says, “even those who have special services are in decided minority.” If you will read the *Christian Standard* when the special Easter reports are published, you can draw your own conclusions as to the correctness of his statement. I do not know of one of their churches that does not put special emphasis upon Easter.

In my own personal references to them, I have said very little about their practice of open membership. But he does admit the practice. He says, “Perhaps a hundred or two follow the practice.” That is really more than I supposed. But this is just another example of the ultimate possibilities of their unsafe and unsound attitude toward the authority of the New Testament. Although there is no doubt only a few who openly practice open membership,
The Sinner Saves Himself

HUBERT ROACH

In Acts 2:14 we have a record of the descent of the Holy Spirit. The Apostles were all filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. From verse 5 to 13, we have the effects of this baptism of the Holy Spirit. The people, Jews from every nation under heaven, were confused, amazed, perplexed, and marveled, saying, Are not all these that speak Galileans? What meaneth this? Peter gives an explanation, vs. 14-21, showing that it is a fulfillment of a prophecy spoken by Joel. Peter then preaches to them a sermon (vs. 22-36) of which the basic principles were the atonement, burial, resurrection, and ascension of the Lord. His conclusion was that He is both Lord and Christ, seated at the right hand of God. The people accepted these things preached by Peter as being true. They were pricked in their heart, and ask the question, What shall we do? Peter told them to repent and be baptized. And with many other words he testified, and exhorted them, saying, Save yourselves from this crooked generation.

The theory of many today is that man cannot do anything to save himself; that the sinner is dead in sin, and that salvation is the work of God. Does this statement hold true, or is it possible that man can do something to save himself? The Savior spoke of some people who were not converted, and the reason for it was: ‘their heart was waxed gross, their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest they should see with their eyes, hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted.’ (Matt. 13:15) Paul speaks of some who were alive, who had been dead in trespasses and sins. And he tells us how they were made alive. It was by grace through faith. (Eph. 2:1-9) Salvation is obtained today just like it was then: by the grace of God through man’s faith. (Acts 4:32) Salvation from sin requires one to turn away from his sins. That the Gentiles might receive remission of sins and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith. (Acts 15:14) Salvation is obtained today just like it was then: by the grace of God through man’s faith. When Jesus said that no man could come to him, except the Father draw him, he told us how the “drawing” would be done. All shall be taught of God; and every one that hath heard, and hath learned, cometh unto me. (Jno. 6:44-45) Man, then, can do something. He can be taught of God. He can hear the gospel; he can learn what his duty is; and he can come unto God by obeying him. The Gentiles were to turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God; but, how was this to be done. Must God do it? Paul was to preach the Gospel to them, open their eyes, that “they” might turn from darkness to light. (Acts 26:18) From this we can see that “man,” a sinner, can “turn” so that he might receive remission of sins and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith.

Seeing, now, that the sinner is not “wholly passive,” but that he must “act,” that there is something for him to do, the question is, What must he do? What is the sinner required to do to save himself? The Jailor ask Paul and Silas the question, “What must I do to be saved?” They said, “Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved.” And they spoke the word of the Lord unto him that he might believe. (Rom: 10:17) The result was that, believing, he repented, which is manifested in his washing their stripes, and was baptized immediately. (Acts 16:29-33) When the Lord appeared unto Saul, Saul said, “What shall I do, Lord?” The Lord told him to go into Damascus and there it would be told him all things which are appointed for thee to do; what he must do. Arriving in Damascus, Ananias, being sent by the Lord, told him to arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins. The people on Pentecost ask, “What shall we do?” Peter said unto them, “Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins.” In his effort to encourage them to do this he said, Save yourselves from this crooked generation. (Acts 2:37-41) Note what we have here. These people, as the others of the New Testament, had an idea that man must do something to be saved; and believing this they said, What shall we do? Were they wrong in believing this? Did Peter say, “Brethren, I’m sorry but there is nothing you can do toward your salvation, seeing you are dead in your sins?” Peter, knowing they could and were to do something said, “Repent and be baptized.” And he then told them to “save themselves.” What could they do to save themselves? They ask what to do, Peter told them what to do; and they could save themselves by doing what Peter told them to do. So, they could save themselves by repenting and being baptized.

Salvation from sin requires one to turn away from his sins. That the Gentiles might receive remission of sins and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith, they were to turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God, Acts 26:18. This was what the people were to do when Paul told them that the Lord commanded all men everywhere to repent. (Acts 17:30) But before one will turn from sin, he must cease to love it. Christians must abhor that which is evil. (Rom. 12:9) They cannot love the world, neither the things that are in the world; for, if they do, the love of the Father is not in them. (1 Jno. 2:15) And before one will cease to love sin, for therein is revealed the corruption, wickedness, and deceitfulness of sin. It is sin that corrupts the old man through the deceitful lusts. (Eph. 4:22) It is because of the deceitfulness of sin that Christians must watch and exhort one another lest they be hardened and there be in them an evil heart of unbelief, in falling away from the living God. This what we believe about sin when we believe the Gospel, and believing this, will cause us to cease loving the things which are sinful. Then, when we really believe the gospel, we will cease to love sin; and when we cease to love sin, we will love God. (Heb. 6:18) Believing the gospel will not only cause us to cease loving sin, but it will cause us to love the Lord. When we read the Four Gospels and see what it is the Lord has done for us, we learn to love the Lord. We love him because he first loved us. When we learn to love the Lord, we will obey him. Jesus said, if a man love me, he will keep my word. (Jno. 14:23) By keeping his word, Jesus becomes the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him. (Heb. 5:9)

God requires the sinner to do what he can toward his own salvation, God does for him what he cannot do for himself. These things that man cannot do are many. Man through his wisdom did not come to know God. But God revealed himself unto man in his Son, and in the Gospel. Man could not make atonement for his sins. In this he was weak, without strength, but Christ died for the ungodly, that we might be free from sin, He gave himself a ransom for all. Man could not discover a pathway to heaven. It was not in man that walked to direct his steps. Man, like sheep, had gone astray. But God revealed the way unto us in the gospel.

Though there are some things man cannot do in the saving of his soul, we are to remember that there are some things which man can do. The things man cannot do, God will do for him; and the things he can do, God holds him responsible to do them. To save ourselves, we must believe on the Lord Jesus, repent of our sins, and be baptized for the remission of our sins. Then, being true, faithful, and loyal to the Lord in obeying his commands, we shall at the end of our faith receive eternal life.
As far back as I can remember I have heard the statement, either by word or mouth or from the pen of certain preachers, that “we ao not claim to be the only Christians, but we claim to be Christians only.” It is a very beautiful expression, having a pleasing sound to the ears (especially to the ears of Sectarians), but does it fully accord with the principles of scripture? The statement is usually made when in conversation with, or when preaching to, members of the denominations. “they reprimand members of the church of the Lord because such claim “you have to belong to your little bunch in order to be saved.” And when that charge is made some preachers soften it considerably by saying: “uh, you do not properly understand us. You have a misconception of our teaching. We do not claim to be the only Christians, but we claim to be Christians only.” The statement indicates that we accept the oft-repeated declaration of Sectarians that “there are Christians in all Denominations.” And if that is not the meaning of it, what purpose does it serve anyway? The statement is made to soothe the ruffled nerves or denominational members and to allay their prejudice against the church of the Lord. It can convey to their minds no other idea than that the speaker agrees with them that there are Christians in all churches; and if the speaker does not intend so to teach he chooses words that are very unfortunate. And if he does not believe there are Christians in all churches, he purposely deceives his hearers in making such a statement. The expression simply says there are other Christians, but they are not Christians only. We are Christians only, but they are Mormon Christians, Catholic Christians, Presbyterian Christians, Methodist Christians, Baptist Christians, and so on. Hence, they are not Christians only but Christians and something else. Now, let us look the situation over a little.

What Is A Christian?

In order to determine whether we are the only Christians we need only to settle the question, What is a Christian? The word means, of course, a follower of Christ. But a follower of Christ does not necessarily mean one who does all the things that Jesus did, but rather one who follows the teaching of Christ. Now, are members of all the denominations, or any of them, following the teaching of Christ? If so, then we can well afford to in-dorse and promulgate denominationalism; but if they are not following the teaching of Christ, how can we then intimate that their members are Christians? And that is what the expression being studied intimates, if it does not say it in so many words.

Christ and his apostles gave to the world sufficient revelation on what it takes to make a Christian. Briefly stated, the plan for making Christians is as follows:

1. The truth must be heard. This is evident because faith rests upon hearing, faith comes by hearing the word of God. (Rom. 10:14-17) And if one cannot be a Christian without faith, one cannot be a Christian without hearing the truth, for without hearing there is no faith.

2. The truth must be believed. To the Philippian jailer Paul said: “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.” (Acts 16:31) And in Heb. 11:6 we read: “But without faith it is impossible to please him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.”

3. Men must repent of his sins. Peter declared: “Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord.” (Acts 3:19) And Paul adds the following testimony: “And the times of this ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all men every where to repent.” (Acts 17:30)

4. There must be a confession of the Son of God. The language of Paul in Rom. 10:9, 10 is applicable here: “That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.” This confession is therefore shown to be a condition of salvation for Paul made salvation depend on “if thou shalt confess.” It is not a confession of one’s feelings, nor a confession of salvation, but a confession of salvation, but a confession of the Lord. Just such confession as was made by the Ethiopian officer (Acts 8:36-38) is involved here.

5. And man must be baptized for the remission of his sins. Read the answer of Peter to inquiring sinners in Acts 2:38: “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall received the gift of the Holy Ghost.” In connection with this you may also read Acts 22:16 and 1 Pet. 31:21.

Now, by these definite steps in obedience to the will of the Lord men are made Christians. And the man who has not obeyed these is not a Christian, regardless of how much moral goodness he may possess. But do the members of denominations obey these principles? How many of them make a proper confession of the Lord? They substitute various confessions for the one the word of God requires. Can they substitute something for what God says and still become Christians by so doing? And how many of them baptize men for the remission of their sins? Almost all of them administer baptism because, as they think, sins are already forgiven. Hence they do not obey the commandment of the Lord concerning baptism. Can one reject baptism as commanded in the word of the Lord, substitute something else, and still become a Christian? Then why intimate that there are Christians in any denomination that does not require men to comply with the simple terms of salvation revealed in the word of the Lord?

I know of no denomination, except the Christian Church, which is a faction from the Church of Christ, that has men to submit to these divine requirements. And in many places even the Christian Church no longer adheres to these principles. It is often thought that the Mormons hold to these principles, but such is not really so. They claim to baptize for the remission of sins, but at the same time they teach you can get to heaven without baptism. So they do not really baptize men in order for them to be saved. And the faith required by them, which involves a belief in the inspiration of Joe Smith, is not the faith which the gospel requires. And similar things may be said about the Adventists that are often thought by some to teach these principles. So in reality there is no denomination, except the Christian church in some places, that really requires men to do what the Bible teaches must be done in order to become Christians. Shall we then make them believe themselves to be Christians by saying: “We do not claim to be the only Christians, but we claim to be Christians only?”

Remaining A Christian

It is one thing to become a Christian but quite another thing to remain one. As one is made a Christian by obeying the first principles of the gospel, so he remains a Christian by worshiping and serving God according to principles of divine truth. While men may become Christians under the teaching of many Christian Church preachers, they soon...
ruin it all by leading them into a perverted worship that cannot be called “following Christ.” All these things, it seems to me, upset the expression that serves as a sweet morsel to Sectarian appetites. It strikes me in about the same way another expression, “Undenominational Christianity,” strikes me. Brethren often talk and write about undenominational Christianity. But that implies there is a “Denominational Christianity.” And personally, I do not believe there is such thing. It is either Christianity or it is not. And so men are either Christians, being made so according to the divine pattern, or they are not. I believe it is time for the expression to be revised. If we believe denominationalism will make Christians, we should quit fighting it; if we do not believe it, we should say: “We do not only claim to be Christians only, but we claim to be the only body of people on earth who meet faithfully the divine requirements, and therefore we claim to be the only Christians.” Maybe some one will want to crucify me for making this suggestion, but if so, go to it. I believe men are either for Christ or they are against him. And we have the truth, or we do not have it. I have no patience with compromise.

The Angel With The Everlasting Gospel

JAMES D. BALES

The Mormons claim that the gospel was taken from the earth as a result of the apostasy and that it was restored through Joseph Smith by the angel of Rev. 14:6. A revelation of September 1830 states that this angel was “Moroni,” whom I have sent unto you to reveal the Book of Mormon, containing the fullness of my everlasting gospel, to whom I have committed the keys of the record of the stick of Ephraim.” (Doctrine and Covenants, Sec. 27:5). Apostle? Kelley informs the world that:

This ‘everlasting gospel’ is the grand old Jerusalem gospel that was preached by Jesus and the apostles, pure and unsullied. It was to be restored to earth by an angel just before the end of the world, or the destruction of the wicked, and in time for it to be preached to all nations before the second coming of the Savior. (Presidency and Priesthood, p. 208)

But it turns out to be a case of mistaken identification. Smith did not see the same angel John saw. Let us note the angel John says that he saw.

And I saw another angel flying in mid heaven, having eternal good tidings to proclaim unto them that dwell on the earth, and unto every nation and tribe and tongue and people; and he saith with a great voice, Fear God, and give him glory; for the hour of his judgment is come; and worship him that made the heaven and the earth and sea and fountains of waters. (Rev. 14:6-7)

This is simply a case for identification. The first and reliable granted by both sides-description is given by John. Does this description fit Smith's angel? If not the two are different.

John's angel must have been symbolic for we know that the task of preaching the gospel to men has not been committed unto celestial beings but unto men. The gospel has been committed unto earthen vessels. Moroni is declared to have been a real person. The angels in the Book of Revelation have been classified as follows:

(1) Those employed as “embellishments with no significance either literally or symbolically.” (2) Those to be understood as symbols with symbolical significance. (3) Those who are literal beings; such as the angel who talked with John. If this angel in Rev. 14:6 is not symbolic he flies in mid heaven preaching the gospel to those who dwell on earth.

Other religious leaders, besides Smith, could apply this to their work with just as much justification as Smith had in applying it to his work. They have not, however, done so; but if they had they could make out just as strong a case as Smith has made out. Mrs. Eddy was sure that hers was the eternal truth. Likewise Amie S. MacPherson. It comes just as close to describing the "Holiness Movement" as it does Mormonism.

The Bible never hints that John's angel was to appear in Smith's bed-room. Instead it locates him in mid heaven. In fact there is no mention of any prophet in this passage; or of any human being doing any preaching.

John's angel did the preaching. “Having eternal good tidings to proclaim;” not “to be preached by Smith,” but by the angel. There is no hint that Smith was to be left with the work of publishing the gospel brought by the angel. Instead it plainly states that the angel did the preaching. This difficulty is not cleared up by saying, as one LDS said, that “Jesus came to preach the gospel but most of his preaching was delegated to others why not that of Rev. 14:6,7?”, Jesus walked and talked with men. Others, even unbelievers and scoffers, saw him before he delegated the work to others. Jesus himself stated that he was to delegate the preaching of the gospel to others. Smith's angel was seen only by him and spoke only to him-they possibly might claim to a few others also. Many heard and saw Jesus (Acts 2:22). The angel-not Smith or LDS-was sent to all people.

John's angel spoke with a loud voice. This is a part of the description. I find no record of Moroni using a loud voice in addressing Smith or anyone else.

John's angel preached to every nation, kindred, tongue and people. Smith's angel to him and possibly a few others. A LDS wrote me: "Of course the exact spot and exact person to whom the angel was to appear was not stated." He was mistaken. Place-Mid heaven. Preacher— the angel. Audience-them that dwell on earth; every nation, tribe, tongue, people. Message-Eternal good tidings; Fear God, give Him glory. Judgment. Worship God. If the place and the audience are to be understood symbolically then does not the same apply to the angel? John's angel said 'Fear God, and give him glory.' I have found no record of Moroni using these words.

John's angel warned of a judgment already begun while Smith's angel warned of a judgment to come.

Conclusions: If John's angel is not symbolic the angel himself did the preaching-all of it. If he did not do the preaching he is symbolic and if symbolic he is not Smith's angel. If he is not symbolic and did do the preaching he is not Smith's angels for this angel's audience was all the earth and his pulpit mid heaven. Either Smith did not see an angel; was a victim of an overheated imagination; or he saw some angel besides the one of Rev. 14:6,7 which he claimed to see; or it was the angel of Gal. 1:8.

Much of that which was preached by Smith was the truth that all that is true is to be found in the Bible. We need neither Smith nor his BM to be qualified for the work of preaching the gospel and baptizing converts.

We reject his claim on this passage because we see no similarity between what John saw and what Smith reported: either as to identity of the angel, his audience, his message, or his method.

James D. Bales, 660 9th Ave., San Francisco, California, March 30, 1940.
What's that about the “Murch-Witty Unity Meetings?” So much has been said in the last few years about “peace conferences” and “unity meetings,” I may have confused what I have read in the papers. Where was the unity meeting, at Munich? Did you say “Murch” or “Munich?” Did Brother Witty have an “umbrella?” Did they propose “settlement” by “argument” or “appeasement” with “peppermint?” Did this fellow Murch claim that certain of his kind of folk were “dwelling among us” but “not of us” and that all he wanted was to get them under the protection of the “First Christian Reich, or Church?” I could see no objection to all such as will not be converted or naturalized into the church of the Lord-His “elect race” or “holy nation”-I could see no objection to their being united to the “Christian Church.” But if “her Christian Church” proposed, while the “Shamberlin's appeased,” that the church of Christ commit all those sins which they have committed, I'd say let brother Witty get his umbrella and go home and we all, like Nehemiah, go on with God's work-not down to any unity compromise. From here it looks like a “Wittyschism” and not a “witticism.”

We want unity which will not damn our souls. If we united with evil that would be imp-unity. But we want unity with impunity. Only “the unity of the Spirit” is to be kept “in the bond of peace.” The Spirit forbids Christians being united with sinners. (2 Cor. 6:14-16).

Since the issues are the same, one of which is the music question, and no unity is possible until it is removed, we offer here a discussion on

The Sin Of Using Instruments Of Music In Christian Worship

I. The Instrument is not According to Truth
1. “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God” (Matt. 4:10)
2. “God is Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth” (John 4:24)
3. Jesus said to God, “Thy word is truth” (John 17:17)
4. “Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ” (John 1:17)
5. All acceptable worship must be according to the word of Christ-the New Testament-the truth.
6. Instrumental music is not a part of the New Testament. It is not a part of the truth which “came by Jesus Christ.” It is therefore an error to play an instrument in worship to God.

Unity lesson: “What communion hath light with darkness?”

II. The Instrument is Against the Will of Christ
1. The New Testament is the will of Christ.
2. His will is what He wants. He knew when the New Testament was written what He wanted. We can know what He wants by what He has said. We cannot possibly know in any other way.
3. He wants Christians to sing, for He said so. (Eph. 5:19)
4. He did not say to play an instrument. He does not therefore want an instrument played-it is not in the will of Christ. It is against the will of Christ, and he who uses it is against Christ. (Matt. 12:30) “Who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct Him?” (I Cor. 2:16)

Unity lesson: “What concord hath Christ with Belial?”

III. The Use of the Instrument is to Transgress the Law of Christ.
1. We are under law to Christ. (I Cor. 9:21)
2. The New Testament is the law of Christ.
3. “Sin is the transgression of the law,” or the transgression of the law is sinful. (I John 3:4)
4. There is no word in the law of Christ for the instrument.
5. It is a transgression of the law of Christ to use it.
6. Therefore it is a sin to use instruments of music in Christian worship.

Unity lesson: “Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather even reprove them.” (Eph. 5:11)

IV. The Use of the Instrument is Unrighteous
1. Righteousness is revealed in the gospel. (Rom. 1:16, 17)
2. What is not in the gospel is not righteous.
3. “All unrighteousness is sin.” (I John 5:17).
4. Instruments of music are not to be found in the word of Christ.
5. The use of instruments of music is therefore unrighteous when used in the worship.
6. And “all unrighteousness” (including musical unrighteousness) “is sin.”

Unity Lesson: “What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?”

V. The Instrument Cannot be Used by Faith
1. Faith comes by hearing the word of Christ. (Rom. 10:17)
2. Where there is no word of Christ there can be no faith.
3. “Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.” (Rom. 14:23)
4. Instruments of music are not to be found in the word of Christ.
5. Instruments of music cannot then be used by faith.
6. The use of instruments of music in Christian worship is therefore sinful.

Unity Lesson: “What part hath he that believeth with an infidel?”

VI. The Instrument is not Pleasing to God.
1. Faith comes by hearing the word of Christ. (Rom. 10:17)
2. No word of Christ, no faith.
3. “Without faith it is impossible to please Him.” (Heb. 11:6)
4. There is no word of Christ for the instrument.
5. It cannot be by faith that instruments are used in worship.
6. They do not therefore please God.

Unity Lesson: “Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers.”

WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?

EDD HOLT (Port Arthur, Texas)

THAT "NATIONAL UNITY MEETING"

What's that about the “Murch-Witty Unity Meetings?” So much has been said in the last few years about “peace conferences” and “unity meetings,” I may have confused what I have read in the papers. Where was the unity meeting, at Munich? Did you say “Murch” or “Munich?” Did Brother Witty have an “umbrella?” Did they propose “settlement” by “argument” or “appeasement” with “peppermint?” Did this fellow Murch claim that certain of his kind of folk were “dwelling among us” but “not of us” and that all he wanted was to get them under the protection of the “First Christian Reich, or Church?” I could see no objection to all such as will not be converted or naturalized into the church of the Lord-His “elect race” or “holy nation”-I could see no objection to their being united to the “Christian Church.” But if “her Christian Church” proposed, while the “Shamberlin’s appeased,” that the church of Christ commit all those sins which they have committed, I’d say let brother Witty get his umbrella and go home and we all, like Nehemiah, go on with God’s work-not down to any unity compromise. From here it looks like a “Wittyschism” and not a “witticism.”

We want unity which will not damn our souls. If we united with evil that would be imp-unity. But we want unity with impunity. Only “the unity of the Spirit” is to be kept “in the bond of peace.” The Spirit forbids Christians being united with sinners. (2 Cor. 6:14-16).

Since the issues are the same, one of which is the music question, and no unity is possible until it is removed, we offer here a discussion on

The Sin Of Using Instruments Of Music In Christian Worship

I. The Instrument is not According to Truth
1. “Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God” (Matt. 4:10)
2. “God is Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth” (John 4:24)
3. Jesus said to God, “Thy word is truth” (John 17:17)
4. “Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ” (John 1:17)
5. All acceptable worship must be according to the word of Christ-the New Testament-the truth.
6. Instrumental music is not a part of the New Testament. It is not a part of the truth which “came by Jesus Christ.” It is therefore an error to play an instrument in worship to God.

Unity lesson: “What communion hath light with darkness?”

II. The Instrument is Against the Will of Christ
1. The New Testament is the will of Christ.
2. His will is what He wants. He knew when the New Testament was written what He wanted. We can know what He wants by what He has said. We cannot possibly know in any other way.
3. He wants Christians to sing, for He said so. (Eph. 5:19)
4. He did not say to play an instrument. He does not therefore want an instrument played-it is not in the will of Christ. It is against the will of Christ, and he who uses it is against Christ. (Matt. 12:30) “Who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct Him?” (I Cor. 2:16)

Unity lesson: “What concord hath Christ with Belial?”

III. The Use of the Instrument is to Transgress the Law of Christ.
1. We are under law to Christ. (I Cor. 9:21)
2. The New Testament is the law of Christ.
3. “Sin is the transgression of the law,” or the transgression of the law is sinful. (I John 3:4)
4. There is no word in the law of Christ for the instrument.
5. It is a transgression of the law of Christ to use it.
6. Therefore it is a sin to use instruments of music in Christian worship.

Unity lesson: “Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather even reprove them.” (Eph. 5:11)

IV. The Use of the Instrument is Unrighteous
1. Righteousness is revealed in the gospel. (Rom. 1:16, 17)
2. What is not in the gospel is not righteous.
3. “All unrighteousness is sin.” (I John 5:17).
4. Instruments of music are not to be found in the word of Christ.
5. The use of instruments of music is therefore unrighteous when used in the worship.
6. And “all unrighteousness” (including musical unrighteousness) “is sin.”

Unity Lesson: “What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?”

V. The Instrument Cannot be Used by Faith
1. Faith comes by hearing the word of Christ. (Rom. 10:17)
2. Where there is no word of Christ there can be no faith.
3. “Whatsoever is not of faith is sin.” (Rom. 14:23)
4. Instruments of music are not to be found in the word of Christ.
5. Instruments of music cannot then be used by faith.
6. The use of instruments of music in Christian worship is therefore sinful.

Unity Lesson: “What part hath he that believeth with an infidel?”

VI. The Instrument is not Pleasing to God.
1. Faith comes by hearing the word of Christ. (Rom. 10:17)
2. No word of Christ, no faith.
3. “Without faith it is impossible to please Him.” (Heb. 11:6)
4. There is no word of Christ for the instrument.
5. It cannot be by faith that instruments are used in worship.
6. They do not therefore please God.

Unity Lesson: “Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers.”
VII. The Instrument is not a Good Work
1. The scriptures furnish us completely unto every good work. (II Tim. 3:16, 17)
2. But the New Testament does not furnish us unto the use of the instrument.
3. It is therefore not a good work.
4. Since it is not a good work it is a bad work. And a bad work is a sinful thing.

Unity lesson: "Touch not the unclean thing."

VIII. The Instrument Pertains to Ungodliness and Death
1. God has given us all that pertains to life and godliness in the New Testament. (II Pet. 1:3)
3. Then they do not pertain to "life and godliness."
4. Since their use does not pertain to "life and godliness" it must pertain to ungodliness and death.

Unity lesson: "Wherefore come out from among them, and be ye separate.

IX. Thou Shalt Not Use Instruments of Music in Christian Worship.
1. It is written in the New Testament to sing. (Eph. 5:19)
2. It is not written in the New Testament to play an instrument.
3. Thou shalt "not go beyond the things that are written." (I Cor. 4:6)
4. Thou shalt not therefore use the instrument in worship.

1. The doctrine of Christ says to sing. (Col. 3:16)
2. The doctrine of Christ does not say to play an instrument.
3. Thou shalt not go beyond the doctrine of Christ if you would have God and Christ. (I Jno. 1:9. 9th. verse).
4. Therefore you shall not use an instrument of music in your worship of God.

X. Authority for Singing, Authority for Playing
1. Matthew 26:30
2. Acts 16:25
3. Romans 15:9
4. Hebrews 2:12
5. I Cor. 14:15
6. Ephesians 5:19
7. Colossians 3:16
8. James 5:13
9. Hebrews 13:15

Unity lesson: "If we walk in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John 1:6, 7)

XI. There is no authority from Jesus for the instrument.
He has "All authority in heaven and in earth." (Matt. 28:18). So, authority for the instrument did not come from heaven nor earth. It must have come from hell.

Unity lesson: "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols?" And again: "What concord hath Christ with Belial?" (2 Cor. 6:14-16)

Let Us Have Some Debates Instead
Under "Watchman, What Of The Night?" the sentiment is that such meetings are simly a disgrace to the cause of Christ. There is an issue involved, either let them give up unscriptural practices and restore unity, or let us have some debates. That honest people may see what the issue is. This cannot be done by such mushy love feasts as have been carried on.--Homey Hailey, Abilene, Texas.

The Unity Speakers Are Hand-Picked:
I am wondering if members of the church in general realize the gravity of the situation that faces the church today; and I sometimes wonder if some of our preachers are informed. To me the matters that you discussed in that article indicate that we have some trends that must be corrected immediately if the church maintains her purity of life and doctrine. Those Unity Meetings have been a joke to me from their beginning. That the Christian church does not intend to tolerate him is beyond any reasonable exaggeration. People who cater to titles of distinction, however deserving they may be.

As for Clinton Davidson and his attempt to regiment the church, the sound spanning that has been administered to him through the Bible Banner is exactly what he deserves: personally, I am seriously wondering what would have happened by now had nobody called his hand. Men of his caliber cannot speak where I have anything to say about the matter. Why any informed person, whether he be preacher, elder, or president of a school would listen to him is beyond comprehension. And when I reflect upon some of Lovell's stunts, the only difference that I can detect is that Jimmie can usually be more ridiculous: take for instance that prayer stunt. Are people who think impressed with a man's reverence who puts on such acts? If so, then I am not think. It reminds me of Neal's public-private prayers that he put on in the Winchester debate. Had I been one of those preachers, I think I would have quoted Matthew 6; 5-6 to him.

Then, there is the Doctor fever among us. How can a gospel preacher who accepts these "onye" degrees consistently criticise a Methodist or Baptist for using the title Reverend? To me the difference between the two is the difference between six and a half dozen. It is a bit disappointing to some of us younger preachers who have held in high esteem for their works' sake some who cater to titles of distinction, however deserving they may be.

But, one other thing, and I will make room for some body else. The only reason that I can see for one's being discouraged when discussions wax warm is the lack of information; truth has always flourished in the field of controversy. Where would the Cause be, had it not been for the debates conducted by Campbell and others of that period? What would be the condition of (Cont. On Page 16)
The Spirit Of The Unity Meeting

Under the heading “Watchman, What Of The Night?”—Reverberations from The Unity Meeting” in the June issue of the Bible Banner letters bearing a true report of the National Unity Meeting procedure and speeches were published in an effort to reveal to the brethren the nature of a movement that affects the welfare of the church in every place. If what was reported caused brethren to look upon the participants with any less favor it was not due to the publicity given but to the action of those in the affair.

Brother T. C. Wilcox believes that the writer has betrayed him and had made statements that were false and without foundation. There were others who heard his speech and were greatly disappointed in his effort. What was discussed after the day sessions was in the presence of others besides myself and they have verified my report and letters as being correct. I also have copies of the speech made by Brother Wilcox—the original copy as first presented by stenographers Wilhoit and Hays, of Lexington, and a copy approved as being correct by the speaker after his return to Detroit. If there is a single misquotation or “misrepresentation,” as he asserts, the writer is in the dark as to what it is.

Two letters have been written Brother Wilcox requesting something “definite and specific” but that he refuses to supply. Of course, it is easier to make a general charge but to name the thing itself is what will stand. The latter he has failed to do.

Brother Wilcox made a “public speech” at Lexington that reveals a “spirit of apology and compromise” in several instances. When these things were pointed out, instead of expressing regret, he manifests bitterness and replies with the charge of “meddling in other men’s matters,” referring to 1 Pet. 4:15. If my appeal for him to be more careful of his statements as a gospel preacher is “meddling,” just when can a Christian exhort another or rebuke those who err? It is not a question of “meddling in other men’s matters” when doctrinal matters affecting the salvation of souls are involved. I believe Brother Wilcox knows that to be true. If telling the truth and condemning error is “meddling” there would be no need for preachers and teachers of righteousness. To show the readers the spirit possessed by these unity meeting promoters, the following exchange is submitted:

Dear Bro. Scott:—

I have been intending to write you for some time and let you know that I have the corrected copy of the speech I made at Lexington which I will be glad to send you if you care to return the old copy. I judge you had rather have the correct one.

By reading Bro. Wallace’s paper I find some things which make me sad of heart in regard to you. It always did hurt me to know that any of my brethren were traitors or “stool-pigeons.” Tell me, who are you—or where did you get your authority to attend to my business? I will be glad to show any one the speech I made at Lexington;—but—who gave you this authority? I hope you will find when you grow older that if you take care of your own business and let the other fellow do likewise you will have about all you can care for. Why not take a little Bible advise and cast the beam out of your own eye and then you can see clearly to cast the mote out of your brother’s eye. You know, God must have had an awful time with all these “ungodly brethren” before you were born. I am sure now, with your care and help, He will soon have them all “rounded up” and under His and your control.

I will be glad for Bro. Wallace to publish my speech if he cares to, but let him correspond with me and not you in regard to it. I at least think I am still able to manage my affairs and I am sure of one thing—I have not asked you—Why can’t you preach the gospel, live it, try to save all you can, and keep your nose out of the other fellow’s business? Read Prov. 6: 16-19 and see what God hateth. You have the possibilities of doing great things for God—why then don’t you face about, ask forgiveness, and really show by your life that you are a Christian? I am sure my brethren and even my wife and family will be happy to know that I had some one as wise and noble and righteous (?) as you to look after me while I was in Lexington. Am inclosing your 100 pennies which you were so good to donate towards my success. I hope you got value received for telling the brethren about helping finance the proyect. It was kind of you to risk me with that vast amount of money.

You mentioned in the paper about you and certain other brethren not registering, singing, etc. Well, God mentioned in the Bible at least two places of similar circumstances: one, the Pharisee with the publican: the other, the Priest and Levite, with the man who fell among robbers. I wish you would read these and see yourself. Some of us brethren were at Lexington doing all we could to “become all things to all men that we might gain some.” From what you say and from what you have done, you were there to spy out our liberty, to act as a “stool-pigeon,” and to be more holy than thou. May God Almighty have mercy on all such.

Is Bro. Wallace your God? Do you have to answer to him for our actions? I am glad for anyone to know what I did; but who is Brother Wallace or any other brother that he has to pass on it? It might be well for you to read the Bible and know that you have to answer to God and not to Wallace for what you have done in this matter. While I am at this point, you either ignorantly or knowingly misrepresented a number of things in your letter to Bro. Wallace and which was published in his paper. As you claim to be a Christian you should either retrace these things, ask forgiveness, and have them published in the same paper, or, admit you lied and have Bro. Wallace publish it. I am wondering which you will do—if either.

Don’t forget I am ready to defend what I did in Lexington, but I prefer some one who is able to defend the other side. My admonition to you is—report of this thy wickedness, pray the Lord for forgiveness, and mind your own business from now on.

Very truly,

T. C. Wilcox

Dear Brother Wilcox,

There has been no “wilful misrepresentation” of what took place in the so-called “National Unity” session at Lexington and reported by me in the Bible Banner.

Any thing that has been “ignorantly misrepresented” will be gladly corrected when it can be shown that such is true. Please specify wherein a false report was made in my letter to Brother Wallace and the instance where a misquotation was made of what was spoken by you at the meeting.

The stenographer sent me a corrected copy of your speech as was sent you. Only typographical errors and spelling were corrected. These did not in any sense affect what was written you as having a “spirit of apology” and weakening the stronger words uttered by you.

Desirous of making any and all proper corrections, upon receipt of sufficient and specific words, before the brethren and awaiting an early reply to that end, I am
Yours for the truth,  

C. W. Scott.

Dear Bro. Scott:—

Your letter seems as innocent as you appeared to me when I met you in Lexington. To anyone who did not know the difference he would think you certainly were a good man. Of course to anyone who has the experience with you that I have, he knows the great contrast between your words at times and your words or actions at other times. I pray God that I may never give you the opportunity to lie about me any more, either by letter or by contact, therefore I am waiting until such time as I have some witnesses present or have opportunity to expose your rottenness on the same pages you so “innocently” misrepresented me. I have no desire to retaliate, I only want the brotherhood to see who lied. If you can go to the judgment with the harm that you have done a brother and to the brotherhood on your soul, I certainly can go with my part in the matter.

In your “innocent” way you did not tell me where you got your authority to meddle in other men's matters, I. Pet. 4:15, or, what you gained by sowing discord among brethren, or, why you didn’t remove the beam out of your own eye, or, where you got the scripture for being so righteous you could not contaminate your dear little sweet self by even singing with people who were in error-unity meeting. Before God! In view of the fact that you have to go to the judgment why don’t you repent?

Because your letter was in Bro. Wallace's paper you have caused some people to believe a lie. If this thing were reversed would you think I was a certain were a good man. Of course, if you do not care to correct these matters on earth we will set-table God and not deceive people any longer.

Very truly,  

T. C. Wilcox.

Dear Brother Wilcox,

I am anxious to correct publicly every “misrepresentation” made in regard to the “National Unity Meeting” procedure upon receipt of the specific examples from you. You have asserted my reports to be false and, if they are, you should be ready at once to point them out. When that is done and it is proven that an incorrect statement or statements have been made by me, I will be more than glad to offer public apology. A Christian could not do otherwise and please God.

It is sincerely regretted that a better spirit has not been manifested on your part in writing and I want you to reconsider your attitude toward the matter and retract what has been written. However, regardless of what you would action will be, I am ready to do what is right when proper information is received so that all may see whether or not what has been written is false and without foundation.

Trusting that I may have an early reply from you and that it will be favorable to truth and right, I am.

Sincerely yours in hope of heaven,

C. W. Scott.

Mr. D-. explained the way of salvation to her and she promptly put her faith in the Lord Jesus Christ and entered the same salvation as her husband.

It is to be overlooked and my prayer is that God may do likewise.

C. W. Scott.

(Many of us know Brother Scott to be a consecrated, truthful young man, and one of the very best evangelists in the church.-Editor).

Musings From The Motor City

A. B. Keenan

Somebody must think I’m good material for Baptists to work on, for today I received in the mail the first copy of a complimentary subscription to “The Fundamentalist,” J. Frank Norris’ “in dependent voice.” I haven't read every word in it, but I have looked it over: “Great and marvelous are thy works, 0 Frank, (Norris) and that my soul knoweth right well.”

In the 29th, 30th, and 31st chapters of Acts, the book of conversions, we have a number of instances of men and women turning to God closely after the manner cited by the “F”:

“Another that came forward was Mr. A. C., who was saved in his home the previous Sunday. Mr. W. D., a consecrated member of the Berean Class, visited Mr. C. in his home and explained the way of salvation. He refused to accept Christ at that time. However, that evening after Mr. D had left him with prayer, Mr. C. -was under such conviction that he could not sleep.

“After many moments of deep conviction, he buried his face in his hands and called on God to save him. His prayer was answered. God saved him.

“He came to the Wednesday night prayer meeting, and openly confessed his salvation, told how happy he was and that he knew he was saved and was going to tell everyone he came in contact with about his Saviour.

“He asked prayer for his wife who was in D. Hospital and unsaved. Special prayer was offered for her. That prayer was answered.

“Mr. D. explained the way of salvation to her and she promptly put her trust in the Lord Jesus Christ and entered the same salvation as her husband.”

Somewhere I’ve got the notion that it isn’t our salvation we confess, but our faith in a resurrected Lord. If good Mr. C knew he was saved on a few fragile evidence, he might well know himself into being a millionnaire with as little trouble. What havoc a little unbridled emotionalism can work!
there are many of their churches that accept members from the Baptists and other denominations who have been baptized, but not according to the Scriptures. This is at least a "cousin" to open membership.

He speaks of the International Convention, and says, "most of them have nothing to do with that body." By this statement, he at least admits that some of them have something to do with it. And I have noticed in recent years that the Christian Standard gives it very little opposition. And when it comes to fighting the U. C. M. S., the Standard opposition is almost a thing of the past.

You will notice that brother Errett did not dare deny the charge about the "use of women as preachers and about agencies ruling the churches." He merely says, "All these assume that congregations all do this or are guilty of it if some congregations do it." He knows all too well that

(Cont. From Page 8)

affairs had it not been for the work of Harding, Lipscomb, and later men who defended the truth in oral and written debates? Bro. Wallace, we are for the Bible Banner and the truth for which it contends. I make this prediction, if the church is maintaining the truth, and purity of life and doctrine twenty-five years hence, it will be because of such efforts as the Banner is making, and not because of what Witty, Davidson, Lovell, and their sympathizers are doing.—Albert Smith, Pampa, Texas.

Not According To The Slogan:

I know of no Unity except that based on the Bible that would be pleasing to God and acceptable to a loyal brotherhood. What is needed is unity based on the slogan pronounced by the pioneers so often, "Where the Bible speaks we speak and where the Bible is silent we are silent." Loyal preachers and churches will not be able to see unity in the Murch-Witty meetings.

Altho I have not said so before I never killed Cock Robin. So don't let any one lay that at my door.—Hugh S. Boydston, Uvalde, Texas.

A Multiple-headed Combination:

When the Murch-Witty Combination was first formed and they sent out their first literature, I was asked by Bro. C. A. Buchanan and others for my opinion of the proposition. My answer, which appeared on the editorial page of the "Firm Foundation," was the first article to appear in print against the proposed "Unity" efforts. I said then, and I still say, it is a sinister move on the part of the premillennialists to gobble up as many true churches of Christ as possible and sow discord among others. All gospel preachers and true Christians who love the Lord and the church will do well to leave the Errett-Jorgenson-Murch-Witty-Premillennial-Digressive Combination alone, except to exert every effort to help defeat their diabolical, divisive designs which they have on the church of Christ.—Clarence C. Morgan, Midland, Texas.

"National Iniquity Meetings":

The time, money, talent, and effort that has been wasted in the "Iniquity" meetings, could well be used to the preaching of the Gospel. While Murch has been courting Witty faithful gospel preachers have seen the fruits of their labors consumed in men and churches that have left the errors of the Christian Church. Not one elder, preacher, or member of the church that I know of in these parts, will endorse these meetings. I must also add that a Minnie descends on Springfield he may be met with anti-aircraft fire.—Maurice A. Meredith, Springfield, Mo.

No Good—Nuff Sed:

I can see no good to come from the National Unity Meetings.—A. S. Landiss, Chattanooga, Tennessee.

Question Mark About His Name:

As to the Unity Meeting, will say in my judgment, and in the judgment of most brethren I've talked with about the matter, we think that any man who participates in such meetings has question mark about his name as to loyalty to the word of God and it's teaching. In fact, they are S-O-F-T and will do to watch. They are simply letting the Digressives make them a laughing-stock to brethren who think. If this is not stopped some of them will wind up in the Digressive Group when possibly they belong and will feel more at home.—Will M. Thompson, Okmulgee, Okla.

Just Remove The Cause:

May I say that here is one more "Watchman" who is ready to say that he is opposed to all "isms" and to these one-man and one-ring shows that seem to be springing up all over the country.

As to the so-called "Unity" meetings (Unity on their terms) I have very little patience with them. Why don't they say: "Let's get together on the Lord's terms? Oh! No. That would mean giving up something that they would rather have than the Unity they are crying for. Hear them talk about "how the division of God's people just about breaks our hearts" and at the same time refuse to give up those practices that are causing the division.—Victor W. Kelley, Champaign, Illinois.

Keep The Church From Compromise:

I really fear that many are being led away from the simplicity that is in Christ, and you seem to be the man of the hour to point out these dangers. I know that it takes a lot of courage to speak and write against these things and if you are doing it, but it must mean a lot to you to know that you have no little backing among the brethren. Please remember that I am with you in your effort to keep the church of our Lord free from all compromise, worldliness and encroachments of every kind.—C. B. Thomas, Corpus Christi, Texas.