"A Fit Subject"

One must be born into the Kingdom, and then he is a fit subject to be baptized into the church. (Baptist Scribe.)

Then "he is a fit subject" of the kingdom of God out of Christ. "For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ." (Gal. 3:27) "Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new." (2 Cor. 5:17) A man is a new creature only in Christ, he is baptized into Christ and yet according to this wild Baptist, he is a full-fledged citizen of the kingdom before he gets into Christ. "For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit." (I Cor. 12:13) The "one body" is the church. "And he is the head of the body, the church." (Col. 1:18) "Gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body." (Eph. 1:22,23) We are baptized into Christ, into the body, into the church. "Christ also is the head of the body, being himself the saviour of the body." (Eph. 5:23) How does one get into the kingdom? The same way, of course, for the church is his kingdom. "Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5) It is equivalent to "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16:16) A citizen of the kingdom is not a "fit subject to be baptized into the church" because he has already been baptized and is already in the church. The Baptists are wrong or else I have the wrong Book.

"The Place to Stick"

If our teachers and preachers will stick to the New Testament doctrines, as indicated and formulated by our Lord and explained and taught by Paul, we will continue to have just as staunch Baptists as were present fifty years ago; and three hundred years ago. (Baptist Scribe.)

Well, beloved, the New Testament is a mighty good place to "stick" but if you stick too close to it, it will rip you loose from the Baptist church where you seem to be mainly sticking at present. I'm not particularly interested in Baptists "staunch" or otherwise "fifty years ago" or even "three hundred years ago." The proposition to "stick to the New Testament" does interest me immensely. If there were any "staunch Baptists" back there, they must have been "extant" for the New Testament says nothing about them. It doesn't even mention the Baptist church. According to the best information I have get from unbiased sources, I can "stick to the New Testament doctrines, as indicated and formulated by our Lord and explained and taught by Paul" by simply being a Christian like Paul was before there were any Baptists. According to all the information I have and freely admitted even by Baptists, a man can be saved and reach heaven and never be a Baptist at all. Being a Baptist is one of the great non-essentials in religion. I propose to be a "staunch" Christian and "stick to" fundamentals.

A Digressive Church Without An Organ

E. G. Creacy

There is a digressive church that doesn't have an organ at Horse Cave, Kentucky. So the "music" is not the only difference between churches of Christ and the so-called Christian Church. A church that stood like a stone wall for the ancient order of things for a half century has become a digressive church without an organ. A few years ago this church became a victim of "Bollism," and this evil influence also pervaded most of the churches in south-central Kentucky, but as the brethren became aware of the evils of this sinister movement, they renounced it and severed all connections with it. As the last resort, the Horse Cave group and its Pastor, Kenneth Spaulding, allied with the digressive churches in that section and elsewhere. They now have all of the earmarks of the digressives, save the organ! Loyal brethren, whose bodies now sleep amid the dust of the dead, building the house of worship inserted a "restrictive clause" in the deed to protect the property, but it did not protect it—the property is now in the hands of the Baptist Church, and the only reason mechanical instruments of music are not used is on account of "the restrictive clause in the deed." This Horse Cave Bollite-Digressive Church has just closed an unsuccessful "revival" with the Christian Church "State Evangelist Bobbitt" in the lead. Spaulding is even showing symptoms of downright Modernism. The "conservative wing" of the Christian Church is too "conservative" for him. He has about reached the end of the broad way. A warning to the churches everywhere!

The Horse Cave tragedy is a blessing! Brethren every where are now able to see some of the fruits of "Bollism," and soft-pedal preaching. A decided militant spirit is shown in the churches of south-central Kentucky, and a demand for sound preaching and preachers is the common cry. A remnant is salvaged at Horse Cave and a promising congregation is in the making. A move is on foot to erect a house of worship which will be a credit to the cause of Christ.
The Gospel Advocate's Restated Policy

The Gospel Advocate is eighty years old. It has had a long and checkered career. It has been manned in the past by the ablest men of the early days of the church. Yet after eighty years of publication, the Gospel Advocate finds it necessary to restate its “policy” every few weeks or months. The question that comes from all directions is: Why does the Advocate keep stating its policy? Some are thinking that it has become a “policy” paper, and others have remarked that having no policy, it must talk about one. Another question that is heard all around is: Where is that “editorial committee” that was appointed to appease Clinton Davidson? Did it ever meet as a whole, even once? Was the announcement of that array of names on a great editorial committee a mere front? Was it the policy part of the Advocate’s late policy? Getting the Advocate to answer these questions is about as hard as it is to get Jesse P. Sewell to answer C. A. Norred’s question as to whether Clinton Davidson is financing his series of literature or not. But until Sewell answers the question forthrightly he will not have the respect of the brethren. And until the Advocate quits talking policy and goes back to defending the truth on important issues before the brotherhood, it will not have the respect of the brotherhood. It may talk of an increased circulation, but that would prove nothing except that it has found the popular side—and hence, its policy.

Personally, I like the editor of the Gospel Advocate—B. C. Goodpasture. He is a princely man, a gentleman, and a friend of mine just as long as he wants to be. But important issues know and recognize no friends—the truth is at stake. And since Brother Goodpasture has become editor of the Advocate the truth has been suffering for the want of a forthright defense. There has been a let-down which has been felt everywhere, even in Advocate circles. There has been a definite recoiling from the issues—a recession, or retrenchment, or whatever you may call it, in plain terms, simply a back-out.

The publisher of the Gospel Advocate has recently remarked that Premillennialism is a dead issue. A dead issue, indeed! So say the digressives of instrumental music and “the conservative brethren”—dead issues. That is the spirit of the Murch-Witty Unity Meetings. For a man to say that Premillennialism, which is the liveliest religious issue of this day, is a dead issue is the same kind of a joke that it is for the digressives to talk about the organ being an issue only south of the Mason-Dixon line. It is expected of the digressives, but not of men who head publications among loyal brethren.

But, even so, if the Premillennialism is a dead issue—who killed it? Did the “policy” of the Gospel Advocate kill it? Or, maybe it was the New Christian Leader, or little Clinton Davidson, who, with his little bow and arrow, killed the Cock Robin of that brave type of journalism that the old Gospel Advocate was once so bold to espouse.

On every hand is heard, What is the matter with the Gospel Advocate? And on every hand is heard the answer, It has succumbed to the sweet strains of soft-pedalism. And that is so. Sometime ago an editorial feature appeared on “Abraham And Lot” which held out the olive branch of compromise to all classes of errorists among us with the plea of toleration because, forsooth, “we be brethren.” But it was pointed out that Abraham and Lot separated to avoid strife, and the Advocate was asked if that should be the application of the illustration now. Now, much later, evidently smarting under the sting of review of the editorial in the Bible Banner, the Advocate makes a back-handed reply (calling no names, as that is not ethical according to Clinton Davidson—not in the papers), and the following belated reference to the Abraham and Lot episode appears in the editorial: “The separation, as the veriest tyro knows, or should know, was physical rather than religious. Abraham later rescued Lot from the victorious kings and interceded for him when the hour of Sodom’s doom had struck. Much more should brethren in Christ seek to conduct themselves in such a manner as will reflect no reproach upon the brotherhood. ‘Brethren!’ ” Well, then, if they were physical brethren and the separation was a physical separation, why does he try to apply it to brethren in the church as an example of religious peace? The truth is, as fine a man as Brother Goodpasture is, he misapplied the example of Abraham and Lot. When his attention was kindly but firmly called to his misapplication, he ignored it until now, and now he says, “the veriest tyro knows, or should know, that the separation was physical and not religious.” Then why does he insist on making the religious application? It was his illustration, and his misapplication, and he has apparently unwittingly acknowledged it in his attempt to recoup his lost score on Abraham and Lot. Verily, the “veriest tyro knows, or should know,” that if “the separation was physical and not religious” it is Brother Goodpasture who has mixed it all up by using the case of Abraham and Lot to apologize for the attitude of tolerance toward error and errorists and the smoothing over of conditions that are not smooth, pleading for a peace where there should be no peace, a tranquility of fellowship where there can be no fellowship and a general compromise on everything. That may be the line of least resistance but it is far from being compatible with the defense of the truth and the preservation of the integrity of the church. Simply to say, “Brethren!” or “heathen brethren,” is not the kind of ammunition need-ed in a fight to death against error and compromise which is raging in the church today. Brother Goodpasture would make a firstclass delegate to a “Munich Conference,” and should take his umbrella along.

Now comes the latest Advocate editorial on “A Restatement Of Our Policy Of Publication.” Is it not strange that a paper eighty years old must ever-so-often restate its policy? It certainly indicates that it is either all policy or that it has no policy at all. In this editorial much is said of “wrangling, personal abuse, and imputation of character, harsh and censorious words, the recrimination among brethren.” And the editor avers that “it is evil, and only evil continually, and perhaps, of downright dishonesty and falsehood.” And the editorial avers that “it is evil, and only evil continually, and it is a blighting shame that anybody professing to be a Chris-tian ever wants to engage in such an exchange of personal-ities either in the columns of a religious paper or anywhere else.” So, in this last sentence, the editor of the Gos-
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pel Advocate does precisely the thing that he condemns. In his "religious paper," if not "anywhere else," he hurrs epithets at those whom he thinks -are doing that thing, just as severe as the epithets which he says they hurl at some "fallacious brother." Read his language over. Imagine who he is talking about (if you can) and then see what he has called him! Such as "evil and only evil," "a blight- ing shame," and "anybody professing to be a Christian," "censorious words," "recrimination," that and much more does he accuse another of. But an article of that character he says of them, the great Gospel Advocate, as of the attitude preachers and papers should take toward the kled in their breast, or soured on their stomach, for they name, but it is very evident that he is not fighting those who have defended the church against the designs of these men, and who have been forced to use strong language in their criticisms. Yet Brother Goodpasture has used language just as severe in criticising whoever he is talking about. In view of his contention, or purported lack of contention, in these matters, he should say nothing whatsoever, simply nothing at all.

In a final word every editorial that has been written under the present regime of the Advocate, which has had any bearing at all on the issues before the church now, has been a weak apology for the defense of the truth, has reflected on men who have fought the church's battles in these trying days and has given encouragement to the and innuendoes, leaving everybody to draw their own conclusions. Like the preacher who in a general way says "worldliness is wrong" -but leaves the worldly to guess what. So the Advocate deals in its generalities and the reader has to guess what.

It might be that it would sound better for someone else to say what I am saying, but I have no diplomacy anyway. A well known man in the church once wrote me as follows: "You are utterly unschooled in the realm of diplomacy." To which I replied: "Thank you, indeed." "I am not a diplomat, but knowing my own heart, I love the church, and if the Gospel Advocate, as big and powerful as it is, persists in weakening the fight that is being mad, to save the church from deprecatitng men, who like wolves a.nong us, would ravish the church, we humbly but grimly say of them, the great Gospel Advocate, as of others.-They Shall Not Pass!-F. E. W. Jr.

P. S. Since the above editorial was put in type, another issue of the Gospel Advocate has come. The editor is on the warpath against somebody whom he does not name, but it is very evident that he is not fighting those who have promoted false movements among us. Rather is he attempting to castigate some who have been defending the truth. It was in September 1939 that the Bible Banner replied to the Advocate's "untimely and ill-chosen" editorial on Abraham and Lot. "If it is a fight that the Gospel Advocate wants now, since Davidson is out of the way, they are starting at exactly the right place to get one."

The Advocate makes no reply to our strictures but it has evidently ranked in their breast, or soured on their stomach, for they have' since made repeated "digs" without coming out in the open. If the Advocate wants to make an issue out of the attitude preachers and papers should take toward the errors, isms and schisms, and errorists, ism-ists, and schismatics among us, and on how to fight them or not fight them, why not just come on out in the open and let everybody know what they are driving at?

The Gospel Advocate would not fight the New Christian Leader-Clinton Davidson Movement. It settled back on its dignity and let others do the fighting until that movement was killed. Now they join with the element that is howling about it, and are beginning to criticize the ones who have borne the brunt of the battle.

Brother Ted W. McElroy, of Colorado Springs, has already asked if it is possible that this same element is now trying to resurrect through the Gospel Advocate the spirit that is dying with the New Christian Leader. That will be the reaction of a great host of brethren to the editorials in the Gospel Advocate. Broth-Ber B. C. Goodpasture is about to reveal where his heart really is on some of these questions, much to the disappointment of many. He has not, and he would not, fight the New Christian Leader Movement. He did not, and he would not, criticize editorially the activities of Clinton Davidson. But he will, and he does, criticize and attack those of us who have had to lead this fight, and he does so in the most ignoble way-by insinuations and innuendoes. Protest against "personalities," "recriminations," the "imputation of character," and the impugning of motives, Brother Goodpasture himself, without the mention of names, lays down a veritable barrage of such language in his editorials. In irate manner he uses such expressions as the following: "so obsessed with the idea of condemning that he looks for, and sees, nothing except something to condemn"; "more interested in concealing the facts or coloring the truth than he is in faithfully presenting them;" "so bent on personal recrimination that truth and facts are only secondary considerations"; "distort the facts and suppress the truth in order to make the impression that he ardently covets;" "more interest in carrying a point than in telling the truth"; "a matter of having to criticize something rather than having something to criticize"; and with, a flourish, he adds "imagine some journalist frantically echoing the charge, "untimely and ill-chosen" (the episode of Abraham and Lot is evidently rankling in his bosom). Thus he uses many words and expressions that he condemns others for using. Motives could not be impugned more serenely than Brother Goodpasture has impugned motives, not the "imputation of character" more definitely implied.

It is only when the Gospel Advocate has laid itself open, and when it has thrown its editorial influence to the encouragement of the wrong element in the church, that the Bible Banner has criticised the Gospel Advocate. And the editor of the Advocate is now proving to everybody that the criticisms were justifiable. Their present attitude makes the existence of the Bible Banner all the more necessary and will rally to its support more than ever those among us who see so clearly the course that the Gospel Advocate has charted.

If it is a fight that the Gospel Advocate wants now, since Davidson is out of the way, they are starting at exactly the right place to get one.

The Gospel Advocate's editor says that "it is not difficult to find fault; it is one business which does not require large capital." And in the same vein, we add: It is not difficult to stand off on the side-lines and criticise the methods of the ones doing the fighting when you are doing no fighting, nor does it not require large quantities of ammunition to do that. The Christian Leader is folding up, Clinton Davidson is out, the Gospel Advocate has not even helped in the fight, and now turning to sarcasm, scorn, impugning of motives and actual "imputation of character" against those who have made the fight for the church against these men, they are showing their true color, Indeed."Let the reader judge."
A Harsh Note From A Siren Voice

CLED E. WALLACE

The Bible Banner has brought forth a wail from the office of the Literary Editor of the Christian Standard James DeForest Murch. He is promoting "unity" and "fellowship" between the "two groups" (Christian Churches and Churches of Christ) but he noticeably forgets to address the editor of the Bible Banner as "brother," and bluntly calls him "Mr." He is evidently irked. Read his letter.

Dear Mr. Wallace:

Through the kindness of one of our "conservative" preachers my subscription has been called to your bitter attack upon our "National Unity Meetings" in the October number of "The Bible Banner."

It is encouraging to know that you consider these meetings important enough to devote so many pages of your journal to this subject. It would seem that the tide toward unity among the Churches of Christ must be assuming growing proportions or you would not need to initiate a campaign to organize an opposition.

It is furthermore encouraging to note that this organized opposition will come from "The Bible Banner." It has been my observation that the more intelligent, progressive, and Christian spiritual elements among the "conservatives" do not trust your leadership. Many such brethren may go on your "Unity Meetings" but their attitude is based on high-minded conviction and is expressed in all good spirit. These brethren are hoping and praying (in harmony with Christ's prayer in John 17) that true unity may eventually come to our divided ranks. It seems from your October number that your type of opposition, while expressing deep conviction, is full of "strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputations of men of corrupt minds," which things, the Apostle Paul told Timothy, are the hall mark of those who oppose the words of Jesus Christ and the doctrine which is according to godliness. This type of opposition is always expected by those who put God's will above all else. It only serves to increase their faith, steel their courage and intensify their efforts.

It is also encouraging to know that your influence will not be sufficient to stop the "Unity Meetings." We are planning one for next May and also a panel discussion or two. Those you can influence will not participate, both others-free men who put the Restoration cause above partyism-will do so. This group will grow. Hundreds are already fully committed to the imperative necessity for this adventure toward unity. There is every evidence that God is using these meetings to His glory. We are trusting in His over-ruling power and praying that He will show us the way to the consummation of our hopes. "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

Sincerely yours, James DeForest Murch.

Brother James DeForest Murch, as nearly everybody knows, has persistently pressed his suit for a union between the "liberal" and "conservative" disciples. The question of whether the union shall be solemnized with or without instrumental accompaniment is apparently no nearer a settlement than when Brother Murch's wooing first began and some of the "conservative" brethren began to listen to his siren voice. He evidently hopes that if he keeps saying things sweet enough and long enough, he can overcome the scruples of this coy maiden of conservatism and she will finally become so obsessed with his charms that she will take him "as is" organs, societies, premillennialism and all. We have yet to see her.

It is said that true love does not run smooth and Brother Murch is encountering some difficulties. It seems that a naughtly little brother in the family, the editor of the Bible Banner to be specific, has been playing some practical pranks on the ardent suitor, much to his embarrassment and irritation. He wipes the honey from his lips and takes time out to administer a verbal spanking to the prankster in the form of a personal letter.

This letter is revealing, and reminding. It reveals a rather agitated frame of mind on the part of Brother Murch. This was mildly expressed sometime ago when Brother Murch published a classification of religious journals among us and put the Bible Banner out on "the lunatic-fringe." This letter reveals that his agitation has grown steadily more violent. Don't be fooled over the pretension that the opposition of the Bible Banner to his schemes is an aid to them. He doesn't even think so, or he would not have written such a letter. I heard a story once of an old Primitive Baptist preacher who arose to address an association which met in an old building which was used very infrequently. There were spiderwebs in the corners and knotholes in the floor. The fervent old brother was loudly proclaiming the fact that the word of the Lord was in his mouth, when one of those insects whose power to hurt is in their tails, advanced up his trousers-leg. The audience was properly shocked, when with appropriate gestures, the speaker shouted his climax: "but the devil-ah is in these britches-ah!" One would think from the way Brother Murch is "carrying-on" that the Bible Banner is a yellow-jacket under his shirt. His weeping and wailing and gnashing of teeth is no great surprise to us. We are rather familiar with the relation that usually exists between cause and effect. The result is not exactly displeasing to us, and not wholly unforeseen. In the present situation we welcome his frowns and relinquish all claims to his smiles. Brethren Witty, Jorgenson, Janes and brethren of like mind with them, may have all of his smiles. We are set for the defense of the gospel and have no compromise whatever to offer to digression.

This letter is reminding. Brother Witty, whom the editor has called Brother Murch's Siamese-twin in this unity movement, wrote a similar one to the editor some months ago. These men still carry sugar in one hand and acid in the other. They will feed you on sugar if you go along with them but throw acid in your face if you oppose them. Brethren might suspect that they are not as sweet as they claim to be should they be as public with their acid as they are with their sugar, so they shoot the acid at you in private letters, and usually howl with shocked anguish when we publish the letters. While they are feeding sugar out of their right hands, we think the brethren are entitled to know what their "left hand doeth."

The brother is not satisfied with the compliments "that the more intelligent, progressive, and Christian spiritual elements among" us have showered upon him. He is a glutton for praise. He tries to squeeze a compliment out of us on the ground of the supposed "need to initiate a campaign to organize an opposition" to his schemes to draw away loyal brethren to his digressive mode of thinking and acting. The compliment is too far-fetched. We are not organizing anything of the sort. We are exercising our liberties as "free men who put the Restoration cause above partyism" to warn brethren everywhere against any movements of any kind whatsoever, which we conceive to endanger the "simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ." And neither abuse nor scorn will frighten us. If "the Restoration cause" is identical with the cause of Christ, we are for it, otherwise we are against it for the same reason we oppose other human movements in religion.

Brother Murch is rather arbitrary in his definitions and classifications. He and his crowd of rooters and sympathizers are the hub of the so-called "Restoration cause." We are out on "the lunatic-fringe." You are "intelligent, progressive and Christian spiritual" to the degree that you trust his leadership, not ours. The most intelligent, I take it, are those who like Brethren Witty, Jørgenson and Janes, step right along in the front line with him, The less intelli-
gent and spiritual oppose, or rather “may not favor” his schemes, but express only mild opposition, or say nothing at all. Those of us who speak out in no uncertain terms are well, read the letter and smell the acid. Sweetness is supposed to sit enthroned when these brethren speak, even if it does sometimes abdicate when they write personal letters. Another thing for pause is that if these unity meetings cause Brother Murch to think that loyal brethren are following his leadership, that fact chalks up an additional point against them.

Brother Murch has made it clear in the Christian Standard that the editor of that journal did a good job sometime back in justifying the use of instrumental music in worship and the use of human societies as means of carrying on missionary work. He will have to divorce these things before the Bible Banner will even listen to his love-making. We are not minded to even tolerate his courting, much less entertain any notions of marrying with him. I do not think he would reform for the sake of the wedding much less afterward. If he isn’t permanently married to his digressive ways and his premillennial theories, I’m not qualified to distinguish between a goat and a sheep.

There is nothing whatever new in the brother’s effort to make it appear that he has a monopoly on all the intelligence and spirituality there is in this fracas. I know better because I’m on the other side. I do not think it could by any stretch of the imagination be called boasting were I to contend that we have as much of both as he has. Such an outburst of mixed rage and egotism is just an old digressive trick. I have been in the thick of the fight against digression for many years in many states and am quite familiar with the trend of the fight from the time it started. Digressives have from the beginning belittled the opposition to their innovations as lacking in intelligence and spirituality. That trick is as stale as the worn-out arguments they have tried to utilize in justifying their departure from the truth. It scares us not at all. “This type of opposition is always expected by those who put God’s will above all else. It only serves to increase their number. And it may appear that intelligence may be discovered outside him and the crowd that runs with him. It has never occurred to us that we can “stop” this or any other movement of a subversive character that arises among us. We are not deceived as to the compromising tendencies of some of the brethren and how they strut and preen their feathers when even a digressive tells them how “intelligent, progressive and Christian spiritual” they are. What cannot be accomplished by argument and reason can often be done by flattery. But there is one thing we can do, regardless of what we can or cannot stop. We can lift up our voices in defense of the New Testament order of things in doctrine, organization and worship, and warn the brethren against dangerous tendencies we see looming up. Even Brother Murch seems to be more than moderately exercised over the success we are having in our influence over some of the brethren. Thanks for the compliment.

I think I can tell you what will stop this unity-movement in its tracks. If Brother Witty and the other “intelligent” brethren who seem to trust Brother Murch’s leadership will make it clear to him that the much-longed for unity will have to be without the organ, I think Brother Murch will stop it. It is my impression that this point has not been made clear to Brother Murch. I sometimes wonder just how strongly this point is going to finally be insist-ed on. If “the more intelligent, progressive, and Christian spiritual elements among the ‘conservatives’ trust Brother Murch’s leadership far enough to bring about unity, without the surrender of instrumental music and other innovations which have caused the division, it will simply mean that they, too, have gone digressive. Then it will be left up to us less intelligent “elements” to carry on alone the “type of opposition” the case calls for. In which case we shall continue to shell the wiseacres with heavy loads of gospel truth.

It was real kind “of one of our ‘conservative’ preachers” to call to Brother Murch’s attention the “bitter attack” of the editor of the Bible Banner on this pet scheme of his. He and Brother Murch do not need further unity meetings to get together. They are already together.

CORRECTING AN ERRONEOUS ARTICLE

The Bible Banner is glad to give space to Brother Don H. Morris’ correction of an unfortunate and erroneous report in the Dallas Morning News, and also to voice our confidence in Brother Morris in his efforts to do what befits sound doctrine in all departments and along all lines in Abilene Christian College.

December 6, 1940.

Dear Brother Wallace;

My attention has been called to a news article which appeared in the Dallas Morning News of Saturday, November 30, in which article it was stated that Miss Lydia Tarnower of Dallas had been invited to come to Abilene to conduct a “master class in modern dancing for students” of Abilene Christian College and two other institutions of higher learning of Abilene. Of course this was an unauthorized and completely false announcement. I am writing Miss Tarnower today and also the editor of the Dallas News asking them that they make proper corrections in the Dallas News, which I am sure they will do.

Abilene Christian College is eager for all to know that the school stands firmly and aggressively against dancing and all such types of worldliness. We would not ask you to help us correct every incorrect statement about the college that might appear in some daily paper, but we shall appreciate it if you will find room in the Bible Banner to help us correct the impressions made by this erroneous article, which must have been set up by the organ of Abilene Christian College. I am enclosing a copy of the letter which I have written to Miss Tarnower.

With best wishes, I am Sincerely and fraternaly,
Don H. Morris, President.

December 6, 1940, Miss Lydia Tarnower, 4126 Hawthorne, Dallas, Texas.

Dear Miss Tarnower:

My attention has been called to the announcement in the Dallas Morning News of Saturday, November 30, that you had been invited to conduct a master class in modern dancing for students of Abilene Christian College and two other colleges in Abilene.

As you know, you have received no invitation from anyone connected with Abilene Christian College to conduct a class for our students in any type of dancing. Furthermore, if you did operate a dancing studio in Abilene, Abilene Christian College students would not be permitted to take lessons in dancing from you. Neither would they be permitted to take such lessons from any teacher.

We are eager for all to know that our institution stands firmly and aggressively against dancing and all such types of worldliness. Therefore, we are asking you, since apparently you are responsible for the above mentioned announcement, to have the announcement corrected in a prominent place in the Dallas Morning News. We shall thank you if you will attend to this at once.

Sincerely, Don H. Morris, President.
The Bible teaches that the church was established on the first Pentecost after Christ’s resurrection and ascension. All prophecy points to that Pentecost as the time when the church was established; after it the church is spoken of as being in existence. The church could not have been established in the times of Adam, Abraham, and Moses for long after their deaths, Isaiah said, “And it shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of Jehovah’s house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, ‘Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of Jehovah, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of Jehovah from Jerusalem.’” (Isaiah 2:2, 3.) Please note that Isaiah used the future tense in speaking about the establishment of God’s kingdom, and that he said it was to be established in the latter days, at Jerusalem, for all nations. Micah, another old Testament prophet, duplicates Isaiah’s prophecy. (Micah 4:1, 2.) Daniel uses the future tense in speaking of the kingdom of God. In his interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar’s dream, Daniel told of the rise and fall of four great world empires and pictured the establishment of the kingdom of God in the days of the last one. He said, “And in days of those kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed nor shall the sovereignty thereof be left to another people; but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever.” Daniel 2:44. Please remember that Daniel said that the kingdom was to be established in the days of the last world empire and was to be indestructible. The time of the kingdom’s establishment is fixed more definitely in Daniel 7:13, 14. Daniel said, “I saw in the night visions, and behold there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto the Son of man, and he came even unto the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.” Please note that the Son of man was to come with the clouds of heaven, to the ancient of days, and then and there receive his kingdom. When we begin reading the first few books of the New Testament we find that the future tense is used in describing the kingdom or church. Please consider the following instances. John the Baptist preached, saying “The kingdom of heaven is at hand.” (Matt. 3:2.) Christ began his ministry, preaching “The kingdom of heaven is at hand.” (Matt. 4:17.) We know that this is the kingdom prophesied of in the Old Testament for Christ plainly said, “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand.” (Mark 1:15.) Early in his ministry Christ taught his apostles to pray, “thy kingdom come.” (Matt. 6:20.) Christ sent the twelve to “the lost sheep of the house of Israel, to preach the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” (Matt. 10:17.) Christ sent the seventy disciples out to preach “the kingdom of God is come nigh you.” (Luke 10:9, 11.) The church or kingdom was not established during the lifetime of John the Baptist for after his death we find Christ saying, “upon this rock I will build my church.” (Matt. 16:18.) Christ taught that the kingdom was to be established in the lifetime of some of the people then living for he said, “Verily I say unto you, There are some here of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power.” (Mark 9:1) But the kingdom was not established during the personal ministry of Christ for just before his death, at the time of the institution of the Lord’s supper, He said, “I shall not henceforth drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come.” (Luke 22:18.) Christ was buried by Joseph of Arimathaea “who was looking for the kingdom of God,” (Luke 23:51), After Christ’s resurrection he appeared unto the apostles by the space of forty days “speaking the things concerning the Kingdom of God.” (Acts 1:3) The kingdom had not been established up to this time for the apostles asked Christ at this time, saying “Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?” Christ said to them, “It is not for you to know the times or seasons, which the Father hath set within his own authority. But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth.” (Acts 1:6-8) After making this statement, Christ ascended to the Father. The apostles went back to Jerusalem to wait for the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit came on the first Pentecost after Christ’s ascension and upon that day the church or the kingdom was established. Old Testament prophecies were fulfilled on Pentecost. Peter declared that the last or latter days were fulfilled, quoting Joel, “But this is that which hath been spoken through the prophet Joel: and it shall be in last days, saith God.” (Acts 2:21) Jerusalem was the place of beginning mentioned by Isaiah and Micah: it is the place where the church was first established. Isaiah also said, “all nations shall flow unto it.” Peter said, “For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him.” (Acts 2:39) Peter also quoted from Joel on this point, saying, “And it shall be, that whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.” (Acts 2:21) Daniel said that the kingdom of God was to be established in the days of the fourth world empire. Four world empires rose one after another, the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Macedonian, and the Roman. In the days of the Caesars, Jesus said, “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand.” (Mark 1:15). It was unquestionably established in those days for Jesus said, “There are some here of them that stand by, who shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the kingdom of God come with power.” (Mark 9:1). In neither instance did the Lord limit the phrase, kingdom of God. Daniel also said that the kingdom was to be indestructible: Paul says that the church is that kind of kingdom. He said, “Wherefore, receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken—
en, let us have grace, whereby we may offer service well pleasing to God with reverence and awe.” (Heb. 12:28) In the seventh chapter of Daniel one like unto the son of man was to come with the clouds of heaven. We see this being fulfilled in Acts 1:9. He was to be given dominion, glory and a kingdom when he came to the ancient of days. This was fulfilled upon Pentecost. Peter said, “Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this which ye see and hear. For David ascended not into the heavens; but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand. Till I make thine enemies thy footstool of thy feet. Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus, whom ye crucified.” The kingdom was to come with power. (Mark 9:1) Later he said that the power was to come when the Holy Spirit came. (Acts 1:8) The Holy Spirit came upon Pentecost. Therefore Pentecost is the time when the church or kingdom was established.

The founder and owners of the church is Jesus Christ. He said, “I will build my church.” (Matt. 16:18) He is the architect. He drew up the plans and specifications of the church. The apostles were subordinate to Christ and could not go beyond His blue print for He charged them, saying, “teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you.” The commands of Christ were the limit of their authority.

The foundation of the church is the great truth confessed by Peter, namely, “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.” (Matt. 16:18). Upon this foundation Christ said, “I will build my church.” According to Holy Writ the church can have no other foundation; “For other foundations can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.” (1 Cor. 3:11).

The creed of the church is Jesus Christ. Paul said, “I know him whom I have believed.” (1 Tim. 1:12) Confession of this creed is necessary to salvation. Paul said, “because if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved: for with the heart man knoweth whom he has believed.” (Romans 10:9, 10) This is all the creed that the sinner is required to confess in order to become a Christian.

The Bible is the church’s book of doctrine. Christians should do what it says and only what it says. For instance, Peter said, “If any man speaketh as it were oracles of God.” (1 Pet. 4:11) Paul said to the Corinthian church, “Now these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and Apollos for your sakes; that in us ye might learn not to go beyond the things which are written; that no one of you be puffed up for the one against the other.” (1 Cor. 4:6) Paul said to Timothy, “If any man teacheth a different doctrine, and consenteth not to sound words, even the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness, he is puffed up, knowing nothing, but doting about questionings and disputes of words, whereby cometh envy strife, railings, evil surmisings, wranglings of men, corrupted in mind and bereft of the truth, supposing that godliness is a way of gain.” (1 Tim. 6:3-5).

The worship of the church must be “in spirit and in truth.” (John 4:24) It must also be in faith for “without faith it is impossible to be well pleasing unto him.” (Heb. 11:6) This faith must be based upon a thus saith the Lord: “So belief cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ.” (Rom. 10:17) Furthermore, “whatsoever is not of faith is sin.” (Rom. 14:2 3) For instance: God told Moses and Aaron that they did not believe him because Moses struck the rock instead of speaking to it as He commanded. (Numbers 20:7-12) Again, Nadab and Abihu were put to death because they offered strange fire before Jehovah which He had not commanded them. (Leviticus 10:1-3). So we are not at liberty to do things in worship which the Bible has not authorized, such as, for instance, the burning of incense and the playing upon mechanical instruments of music. In worshipping God the early Christians “continued steadfastly in the apostles’ teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers.” (Acts 2:42). The special day of worship is the Lord’s day or the first day of the week. This day has its special acts of worship which are to be rendered upon it, namely, the eating of the Lord’s supper and the giving of the free will offering. While the Lord’s supper is eaten in remembrance of Christ and to proclaim his death till he comes again. (1 Cor. 11:23-26) The offering or contribution is to be given cheerfully, willingly, freely, and purposely by the contributor. No one has the right to assess another. Furthermore, the church has not been authorized by Christ to compete with commercial institutions in order to raise money. Each individual is to give as he has been prospered. Other items of worship mentioned in the New Testament are singing, reading, prayer and teaching. These acts of worship may be performed upon the first day of the week or upon any other day.


In government the church is an absolute monarchy with Jesus Christ “head over all things to the church, which is his body.” (Eph. 1:22, 23) The church is Christ’s lawyer: (Romans 8:2) The local congregations are independent of one another. Each congregation is overseen by a plurality of brethren who are God’s stewards and who are called elders, bishops or pastors. Their qualifications are given in I Timothy 3:1-7. Titus 1:5-9 and 1 Pet. 5:3. Their qualifications are such that the work of the local congregation is overseen by the wise, godly and experienced. Other servants are deacons, evangelists and teachers.

As a universal organization the church is called (1) the body of Christ, 1 Cor. 12:28; (2) the church, which is his body, Eph. 1:22, 23; (3) one body, 1 Cor. 12, 13, (4) the church of God, Gal. 1:13; 1 Cor. 11:22; (5) the church of the first born, Heb. 12:23; (6) the church of the Lord, Acts 20:28; (7) House of the living God; 1 Tim. 3:15, 16, (8) and the church; Eph. 3:10.

The individual members are called (1) disciples, Acts 6:1, 19-30; (2) saints, Rom. 1:7 and 1 Cor. 1:2; (3) brethren, 1 Cor. 15:6; James 1:2; (4) priests, 1 Pet. 29; Rev. 16; (5) believers, Acts 514; II Cor. 6:15; (6) the people of God, Heb. 4:9; (7) the children of God. 1 John 3:1; (8) Christians, Acts 11:26, 26:28, 29; 1 Pet. 4:16.
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THE LOVELL TIME CHART

Harvey Childress

If a congregation and a preacher agree on a certain way to do their work it is their business. If a brother wants to commend them for such action, it is his business. But, if in the course of such commendation said brother cannot refrain from casting aspersions against preachers in general, and I'm a preacher, that's my business, and I have the right to tend to it.

In the November West Coast Christian Brother Jimmy Love11 was not content with stating the agreement of the Park Hill church with Brother Wilson, and commending them, but he could not end his statement without first charging preachers in general of being lazy, sly and deceitful. He says it will be obvious why preachers will object to keeping a record of their work to turn in to the elders. It is obvious that Brother Love11 has a bad taste in his craw for preachers. It is against three charges, and other misstatements in his articles, that I make reply.

Here is the charge of laziness: 'They (preachers) have been taking it too easy, getting up when they got ready and working or playing up to their own fit.' This insinuation is made for the purpose of destroying the confidence of congregations in the men they are using. Such has no right to go unnoticed. For ten years I have preached the gospel and associated with gospel preachers. In all my observation I'm the only lazy preacher I know. If Brother Love11 knew half as much as he puts on the front of knowing about preachers he would know a preacher cannot run his work by the time clock. The reason is people don't get sick by the clock, die during a preacher's hours on the job, nor get into trouble or need help in that way. A preacher is on the job twenty-four hours a day, and does not quit by the factory whistle. There is no time he can feel is really his own. Some preachers go to bed at an early hour (if possible) and get up with the chickens to study early in the morning. Others study late at night, up to one, two or three o'clock in the morning, then sleep later in the morning (if he can).

Next he says: 'They should hit the ball like a preacher of the gospel who is able to follow the Bible he will. He will not be interested in "eye-service as men pleasers," but will give genuine service at whatever job he is doing. I'm afraid Brother Lovell generalized on preachers from observing himself, he surely included himself in his statement!

After these accusations, now think! Would Jimmie's preacher's time table help any at all? Just suppose that his accusations are true: couldn't a lazy preacher fill in two hours in the morning for study that he spent reading a magazine? or taking a nap? Couldn't he pad the report with visiting some outsiders the elders never heard of while he actually had a good round of golf? The time table would only add another sin to the lazy preacher's accumulation, lying, and 95 per cent of the preachers would go on with their work as they have always been doing, observed or unobserved.

God's record of the way a Christian uses his time should be all the incentive a preacher or a gun powder salesman needs to cause him to work with all diligence.

Brother Love11 let his knowledge about supporting preachers out of the bag, and we had to look twice to see he had-nothing. "I believe in paying preachers what they are worth and then seeing that they earn it." Brother Lovell would do well to answer this, how much is a hundred dollars worth of preacher's work? and how much is two hundred dollars worth? Should a preacher who is capable of doing two hundred dollars worth, do only one hundred dollars worth because that is all the congregation can pay him? His statement is nonsense. When I am responsible for saving a soul, it is worth more than all the world. Who is going to pay off for that? My idea has always been that churches supported preachers so they could devote their full time to the work. That a preacher was to do all the good he was able whether he was paid one hundred dollars or two. I think more than 3,000 preachers will resent Brother Lovell's aspersions, and congregations are going to loath his false idea.

The church is in a bad state of affairs if it has no better class of preachers than Brother Love11 has indicated. However, I'm satisfied he formed his opinion on the "fly."

The above excellent and timely article from Brother Harvey Childress, of San Francisco, will reveal to all those readers a feeling that exists in the hearts of a great many, who are never heard from, in regard to Jimmie Lovell's continual pointless palavering. His suggestions about the preacher's time clock were directed at Yater Tant, who resigned his work with a Denver congregation after one or two of the elders demanded that he make a written report of the hours he had put in visiting, studying, teaching, preaching, and maybe, praying. This is the church that Jimmie Love11 rules by remote control. Since Yater Tant had self-respect enough to decline such a demand, they now have a preacher whom Jimmie can indorse, and who is said to have given Jimmie Love11 and the editor of the New Christian Leader, as references when he applied for the place! It shows definitely the sentiment of the leaders of the congregation.

As for Jimmie's time-clock for the preachers-it is about as ridiculous as everything else he writes. Does Jimmie advocate putting them on the 40-hour-a-week basis? If so, when they go out at night on duties, preach at night, and work over time, shall they demand of the elders overtime time pay-say, time and a half? Or will Jimmie make the ruling for the elders to go by in that case? Its just some more of Jimmie Lovell's endless popping off. He says pop-e-thing, or nothing, and then thinks, or doesn't. By the way, does Jimmie report to the DuPont gunpowder company the time that he puts in banqueting the preachers, publishing his sheet, and promoting himself among the churches while "flying" around over the country on DuPont time and expense?—F. E. W. Jr.
Pulling Down Strongholds

GILBERT E. SHAFFER

The thought for this article is taken from 2 Cor. 10: C: “For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds.” There are three thoughts included in this quotation: (1) we have weapons for our warfare, but they are not carnal; (2) they are mighty weapons; (3) they are to be used in pulling down strongholds.

Perhaps, the one outstanding stronghold is that of denominationalism. Every church, with the exception of the body of Christ, makes up this denominational stronghold. Most of them think they are right. However, I never could believe that a preacher who is so expert in dodging the scripture is sincere. Are we to call upon denominational preachers to take part in the service, when one happens to be in the audience? Some brethren do that. Rather, are we not to stage an open warfare upon every denomination and never let up? Take for example, Christ in the temple. He found in a sacred place a corrupt people. Did he sympathize with them for their lack of knowledge, and say brethren you are not altogether responsible? The answer is this: “And found in the temple those that sold oxen and sheep and doves, and the changers of money sitting: And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen; and poured out the changers’ money, and overthrew the tables.” (John 2: 14-15) The words of Christ to the Pharisees shows how plainly Christ spoke of sin and the sinner. “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lust of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar and the father of it.” (John 8: 44) Christ would not be classed as an ethical preacher today, but he made the people understand what he was saying.

The digressive church comes under the head of denominationalism. There was a time when one came from the Christian church to the body of Christ he came only as an erring child of God. Since the preachers of the Christian church now will sprinkle, pour, or receive people into their fellowship from any church, there is another problem. To receive a member from the Christian Church as an erring brother today might mean that one has been received into the fellowship that was sprinkled.

Perhaps, the most deceitful of all religious organizations today is the Christian Church. What should be our attitude toward them? The “unity meetings” being held would lead one to believe that we should court their favor, and tell them we do not think they have done so very badly.

We hear a great deal today about the “Fifth Columnist” in different countries. They are the enemies who know the secrets of the country. They are the ones that can not be counted on in the time of a crisis. No doubt the church has many nominal members who are enemies to the church. There is a tide of worldliness sweeping into the church that is doing more harm than all the forces outside the church. The real danger to which the church is exposed now is within our ranks. Jesus said: “A man’s foes shall be they of his own household.” (Matt. 10: 36) In the few short years that I have been preaching the gospel I have seen worldliness grow by leaps and bounds. It is nothing out of the ordinary for the children of members of the church to take in the dances given. And even more than that the preacher’s children are not immune to such indulgences. If the preacher condemns such practices he is met with an outburst of criticism, and the cry, “What can we do about it?”

SPECIAL COURSES

Jan. 14-23, 1941
Freed-Hardeman College
Henderson, Tenn.

The Special Courses of instruction offered by Freed-Hardeman College annually for the past several years will be given this time, January 14-23, 1941. In addition to the usual class instruction, given this year by Bro. H. Leo Boles and John T. Lewis, there will be eight public debates on living issues conducted by some of the best preachers and debaters in the brotherhood. It has been arranged for each speaker to appear on two questions in the affirmative on one and in the negative on the other: on the side he believes, on one question, and the side he believes-not, on the other. Two hour’s discussion will be devoted to each question, four speeches of thirty minutes each. These discussions will be held from 7:00 to 9:00 each evening. Thorough study of these propositions will be made by these speakers and you may be sure that the strongest arguments that can be made for and against will be presented. This feature alone will be worth all the trouble and expense of attendance.

Another new feature this year will be two half-hour periods each day devoted to the discussion of a variety of five subjects. The selection of both subjects and speakers will be left to the visiting brethren after they arrive.

The program worked out thus far is as follows:

Courses
1. Inspiration, Credibility and Canonicity of the Bible-H. Leo Boles.

Discussions
1. Does the Holy Spirit operate directly upon the heart of the sinner in conversion? Tuesday—(C. D. Plum, Aff., Gus Nichols, Neg.)
2. Is instrumental music in the worship scriptural? Wednesday—(G. A. Dunn, Aff., C. D. Plum, Neg.)
3. Is Baptism essential to salvation? Thursday—(B. L. Douthitt, Aff., Gus Nichols, Neg.)
4. Can a man be saved in a Denomination? Friday—(B. L. Douthitt, Aff., John T. Lewis, Neg.)
5. Is the teaching of Premillennialism scriptural? Monday—(W. C. Cooke, Aff., B. C. Goodpasture, Neg.)
8. Is the present system of the located preacher scriptural? Thursday—(G. K. Wallace, Aff., G. A. Dunn, Neg.)

On account of the dormitories of Freed-Hardeman College being full and overflowing, living accommodations will have to be arranged for in private homes. Room and board will cost about $1.50 per day—an amount as small as families can afford for just a few days. The best places available will be secured in advance. Visitors may report to the college for information and assistance.

Already inquiries are coming in and indications are that the largest group of visitors we have ever had will be present.

Just as soon as you know you are coming, drop us a card so we may know something of the number to arrange for. There will be no other expense besides board.

N. B. Hardeman.
Paul says that Christians should "be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive." (Eph. 4:14) The advocates of religious error, as they did in Paul's day, still misrepresent facts, misconstrue evidence, and shroud their teaching in crafty terms—"they lie in wait to deceive!"

Let us consider some examples.

Modernism

A chief task of the modernist is to discredit the fact that Jesus is the Son of God. Oh, how plain facts are garbled in this vain attempt! Before us lies a copy of a well recognized textbook on the history of the Middle Ages, which is used in representative colleges. On page 46 is this statement about Jesus: "Did he believe himself to be the Messiah? He never openly gave himself that title."

We wonder if the author ever read Jno. 4:15, 26 where the woman of Samaria said to Jesus, "I know that Messiah, which is called Christ," and Jesus answered, "I that speak unto thee am he." The woman was looking for the Messiah, and Jesus informed her that he was the one— the Messiah—whom she was expecting. Still, the man says that Jesus did not give himself that title! What do words mean?

Worse still! The statement continues: "And he did not call himself the Son of God." Again we wonder if this author ever read Jno. 9:35-37 where Jesus said to the man whose sight he had restored, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" When the man inquired who the Son of God was that he might believe on him, Jesus said, "It is he that talketh with thee." No indirect reference; Jesus used the term "Son of God"—spoke the words—and said that he was talking about himself.

It is impossible to say whether such misrepresentations are the result of dishonesty, or due to ignorance of the facts in the case. In either instance they are not to be excused, for the results are the same—they are deceptive and misleading.

To meet the issue fairly the critic should take the facts (every critic ought to be sure he knows them), and argue that Jesus made a false claim. By saying that Jesus made no such claims, is not the critic admitting his inability to meet the issue and trying to disparage the evidence against him? He either shows a brazen and malicious effort to deceive or disqualifies himself as a scholar by virtue of the lack of information. Be not deceived by this craftiness!

Denominationalism

Any attempt to amplify the defense of the truth in the Hardeman-Bogard debate would be presumption on my part; the debate needs no amplification except for some of Mr. Board's arguments! I am merely writing on some deceptive tactics, and the information from the debate serves well the task at hand.

For some reason-seemingly to escape unpleasant consequences-Mr. Bogard, in the Little Rock discussion, argued that his proposition did not require the commonly accepted idea of an independent, direct, and immediate action of the Holy Spirit—that is, the pre-regeneration idea. It was shown that a previous statement of his from his "Baptist Waybook" taught this position. Mr. Board denied this—not the statement, but that it required pre-regeneration. The statement, however, plainly requires the idea, as we shall show; and why Mr. Bogard changed his position in the debate, we are at a loss to say. If, however, he felt that he could lessen his difficulties by changing, we can hardly blame him for doing so; for he had plenty of them as it was! His cobweb of inconsistencies and contradictions is amusing, as well as perplexing.

Here are some of his statements:

1. "We believe that in order to be saved, sinners must repent and believe, before you do anything. That is Hardshell Baptist doctrine... I will take the scriptural position, not the Hardshell position." P. 28.

From this statement this is evident: (1) Regeneration (the influence of Spirit in addition to word) does not precede (or secure) repentance and faith and "doing something" hence it follows (2) that repentance and faith can come before regeneration, or that the sinner can do something before the additional influence of the Spirit. But note this next statement.

3. "His (God's) drawing is to enable the sinner to act, and on their own free will." P. 13-14.

From this we know: (1) This drawing is considered the additional influence of the Spirit, for this is what he was arguing. (2) This drawing equals regeneration; he designated the additional influence "regeneration" as we have seen. (3) If this drawing enables the sinner to act, it must precede that action; for that which enables must precede the thing enabled.

4. "...but he (God) draws him (the sinner) enough to enable him to accept freely Jesus as Saviour." P. 13.

Note the order: (1) God draws (regeneration or the additional influence of the Spirit). (2) If this drawing enables the sinner to accept Christ, it must precede that acceptance; for that which enables must precede the thing enabled.

Remember this: According to Mr. Bogard, the additional influence of the Spirit-regeneration-God's drawing. Now we are ready to summarize some conclusions.

1. Some Absurd Contradictions of Baptist Teaching

1. Regeneration secures (precedes) voluntary obedience to the gospel.-Bogard.
2. Regeneration does not precede repentance and faith.

—Bogard.

3. Therefore, repentance and faith are not prats of voluntary obedience to the gospel!

Will Baptists accept that?

1. God's drawing (regeneration) precedes action by sinner.-Bogard.
2. Regeneration does not precede repentance and faith.

—Bogard.

3. Therefore, repentance and faith are not acts on the part of the sinner.
How absurd; who believes it!
1. God’s drawing (regeneration) precedes acceptance of Christ by the sinner.-Bogard.
2. Regeneration does not precede repentance and faith.-Bogard.
3. Therefore repentance and faith are not part of accepting Christ.
   This is a hard saying; can Baptists hear it!
2. A Plain Contradiction of Statements
1. “If I will not accept” the position that one is “regenerated before you repent or believe, before you do anything.”—Bogard.
   It follows then that the sinner can do something—act—before regeneration (God’s drawing).
2. But God’s drawing is to enable the sinner to act.—Bogard.
3. The statement from his “Waybook” requires regeneration before repentance and faith (Pre-regeneration idea, which he denied).
   1. Regeneration secures (precedes) voluntary obedience.—Bogard
   2. Repentance and faith are party of voluntary obedience.
   3. Therefore, regeneration precedes repentance and faith.
4. His arguments in the debate demand pre-regeneration.
   1. God’s drawing (regeneration) precedes acceptance of Christ by the sinner.—Bogard
   2. Repentance and faith are part of accepting Christ.
   3. Therefore, regeneration precedes repentance and faith.
   1. God’s drawing (regeneration) precedes action by the sinner.—Bogard
   2. Repentance and faith are acts by the sinner.
   3. Therefore, regeneration precedes repentance and faith.
   “It takes enabling grace to get the attention of such a man (sinner),”—Bogard, P. 13.
   This enabling grace is the additional influence of the Spirit, for this was what he was arguing. Therefore, according to him: Enabling grace-God’s drawing-regeneration.
   1. Attention precedes hearing, repenting, and believing.—common sense.
   2. Enabling grace (regeneration) gets the attention.—Bogard
   3. Therefore, regeneration precedes repentance and faith.
   How the man contradicts himself! After giving these arguments, he had the temerity to say that he would not accept the position that regeneration comes before one repents and believes.
5. He denied his own proposition
   1. Repentance and faith make one a Christian-Baptist teaching.
   2. Repentance and faith can come before regeneration (the additional influence).—Bogard. See comment on “Quotation” No. 2 above.
   3. Therefore, one is a Christian-is converted-before (or without) the influence of the Spirit in addition to the word.
   We see that the man contradicted himself, contradicted Baptist teaching, and denied his own proposition. Deliberately? Perhaps not—just an inevitable dilemma when one resorts to deception and subterfuge in an effort to uphold false teaching!

**Premillennialism**

A prominent issue in the Church today in fact, among all religious groups is the teaching on the second coming of Christ called premillennialism. There is abundant scriptural proof against this theory, but we do not propose to study that in this article. We want to consider another phase which is suggested in our theme.

If we had no direct proof at hand, we would be a little suspicious about the teaching; because some of its adherations in trying to defend it. It just doesn’t beget confidence when one starts using the methods which are employed by the advocates of nearly every other false doctrine!

One misleading contention is that it doesn’t matter if one wants to believe premillennialism; and if one desires to teach it, there is no reason why anybody should object and cause trouble. Sounds familiar! Where did I ever hear it before? Oh yes, now I remember that Mr. Sectarian and Mr. Christian Church man have always been past masters at the game. For example: “It doesn’t make any difference about instruments; so why oppose them and cause trouble?” “Why quibble over sprinkling? It makes no difference if a person wants to be sprinkled instead of immersed; therefore we ought to let him do it if he wants to.”

When someone forces the issue, the premillenialsists (at least some of them) resort to more drastic means of camouflage and deception. Plain facts have been misrepresented in trying to sustain their beliefs and practices by the teaching of the pioneers. In the Neal-Wallace discussion and in the Oliphant-Rice debate writings of the pioneers were marshalled in defense of the theory, and in each case it was shown that their teachings were being misrepresented. The teachings of the pioneers? There is a difference in the claims of the two. One referred to the Lord; the other, to man. The principle, however, is the same; it is deception in favor of one’s teaching.

Everybody agrees that we should condemn the infidel and sectarian in their attempts to deceive—everybody except those who have about decided that we shouldn’t condemn anything—but when a brother is rebuked because of his divisive theories and deceitful tactics, someone is ready to plead that it is wrong to expose him. Question: What is the difference between the critic who said that Christ did not claim to be the Son of God and the brother who misrepresented the teachings of the pioneers? There is a difference in the claims of the two. One referred to the Lord; the other, to man. The principle, however, is the same; it is deception in favor of one’s teaching.

Some of us younger preachers, who want to carry out II Tim. 4:2, can’t see but that they are in about the same class (in this one respect), and we are inclined to give them similar treatment. We plead guilty, however, to the limitations of youth and covet the virtues of broader experience and more mature wisdom. Maybe the powers of discrimination which come with riper age and increased study will some day enable us to see why one is included and the other excluded when Paul said, “Reprove, rebuke and exhort.”

Until that time (if it ever comes) we will just go along, unable to see very little difference in false teaching and deception, whether it is in the modernist, the sectarian, or the premillenialist. Even if we are wrong in our attitude, this is still good advice: he not deceived by their craftiness!
The Firm Foundation of December 10, carries an announcement, that Brother G. H. P. Showalter has acquired the Christian Leader and in so doing assumes full responsibility for what it will be until it is merged with the Gospel Proclaimer, as contemplated, with the February issue of that paper. Brother Showalter says: "I crave the good-will, confidence and support of all who read and love the paper and love the whole truth of God." Brother Showalter has all of that from me. We who are of the Great West have had in G. H. P. Showalter during the past generation an almost unbounded and unlimited confidence, and the brethren all over this broad area accepted, his leadership unanimously, through the Firm Foundation, in the fight that he made in earlier days against all forms of error and digression. While some of us have thought that the Firm Foundation has not been as militant and outspoken against the menace of the Davidson movement, promoted by the Leader, as the importance of it demanded, yet the positions of the Firm Foundation and the integrity of its editor on any question never have been questioned. Whether the Christian Leader is merged with the Gospel Proclaimer or is issued as a separate periodical by the Firm Foundation under Brother Showalter's management, we wish for Brother Showalter the comfort and consolation of doing the Cause of Christ a service by taking over this added burden, for there will be no financial gain in it to him. We believe that Brother Showalter's loyalty to the truth will be the safeguard against the former false policies and promotions of the Leader.

It is not untimely to say here that "two years ago the Christian Leader passed into the hands of a new management" in the person of Clinton Davidson. It became his instrument, medium and tool to accomplish the invasion of the church with his schemes. He is said to have made the boast that he would have 50,000 subscribers, 30,000 in the South around Nashville, Tennessee. But after two years his dreams of conquest have come to an ignominious end. But some phases of the Davidson campaign apparently have not ended. C. B. F. Young, of New York, sometimes called "Doctor C. B. F. Young" (he is a chemist), appears to have succeeded him in the campaign of calumny, which Davidson waged against certain of us who opposed him. In the Bible Banner sometime back I quoted John T. Lewis as saying that "Doctor" Young had made a statement over long distance telephone from New York to Birmingham that he had "enough information" on the editor of the Bible Banner in Nashville to ruin him "if" he would tell it. The readers will remember that we promptly invited Doc Young to come right on down to Nashville while I was there in a meeting and tell it. He did not do so. He would not do so. He could not do so. But we have heard from him. First he says that he did not make the statement over the telephone, but he did make it through another medium to the same party. He wants Bro. Lewis to correct the mistake. A slight mistake it is, involving only the medium of the statement. But that does not help C. B. F. Young any for what did he do? Well, he goes to Birmingham and carries with him Clinton Davidson's "files". containing "information" on the editor of the Bible Banner and shows these "files" privately to certain parties whom he would love to turn against the Bible Banner and its editor! So the campaign of calumny continues. They would not fight in their paper, but they will fight behind it! The "Doctor" (?) would not come to Nashville upon my invitation and show me his files—but he will peddle Clinton Davidson's files around and show them to others. Of course, he does not have to show me the files, I know all that is in them, and I know that it is not any old creditors in Nashville that they care about. They would never have taken the pains to get a report on me had it not been for the fact that I debated Premillennialism with Neal & Boll, Norris & Tingley, and exposed the spirit of the Davidson movement. Nor do they care primarily any thing about the relations between me and the church in California (which have always been good and only good—it is my opposition to their diabolical schemes that has made them mad and brought down their vengeance upon my head).

So Doctor C. B. F. Young takes up where Clinton Davidson left off, with the campaign of calumny.

The obligations that were so unfortunately made through several exceedingly hazardous and trying years between 1929 and 1934 in Nashville, Tennessee, were paid several years ago. My creditors never did cut up half as much as some who were never my creditors. They, my former creditors, are satisfied— but Clinton Davidson and Doctor Clarence are not satisfied.

All financial affairs between me and the elders of the Central Church of Christ, in Los Angeles, were understood and agreed upon in business manner before I ever left there in 1930 to become editor of the Gospel Advocate, and the details were worked out accordingly, during the strenuous task of building up the church and erecting a $75,000 edifice in Los Angeles, and in trying to see it through after I left. They were satisfied. But Doctor Clarence and Clinton Copyright are not satisfied.

Even in the matter of getting a disagreement adjusted between the Gospel Guardian and the firm that printed it, these meddlers have shown their hand. Property rights were involved in this settlement. An adjustment was due. One of the elders of the church in Oklahoma City, a business man, who knew all the d-tails assisted me. The matter was settled out of court amicably, and the adjusted account was paid in full exactly as I had agreed to do in the beginning. But the attorney assisting us said that it was apparent that an outside party was urging this concern to get a judgment against me and that apparently someone had offered to buy the judgment in order to induce this concern to file the suit. Can anybody imagine who it was that wanted to hold a judgment against me? But this matter was honorably adjusted, and this concern gave me a written statement that the
matter was settled justly and satisfactorily. They are satisfied. But Clarence and Clinton are not satisfied! So it is with everything they think they have against me. While all parties concerned are satisfied and have been for several years, Davidson, Young et al., who are not concerned, are not satisfied. Like Brother Crawford's wife, they are very unhappy!

If the New York chemist, who appears to be so pious, insists on peddling the Clinton Davidson "files" around among the brethren, I propose to have a photostatic copy made of the documents in my possession bearing on these matters and print them in the Bible Banner, showing the original statements and signatures, to put these scandal-mongers where they belong—in the corner. I could put them in jail, if that were my way of fighting. I have in my possession, and have had for ten years, the positive evidence to refute their charges, every one, in detail. Some of my friends have urged me to print them all—but I have not wanted to enter into a discussion of my character which with me is not a debatable question.

C. B. F. Young says that Clinton Davidson denies threatening to sue me. Is that so? Well, ask J. W. Akin if he understood the letter he received as a threat. Ask J. E. Williams if he understood the letter he received as a threat. Ask George W. Birchfield if he took the letter he received as a threat. Ask Austin Taylor if he interpreted the letter he received as a threat. Ask Leon B. McQuiddy why he met me in Memphis, Tennessee, to inform me that Davidson had said that he would sue me, and to talk the Bible Banner situation over. Brother McQuiddy thought he meant to do it, and withdrew from the proposed organization of the Bible Banner Company, leaving it up to me. The difference between him and me was that he was scared and I was not. Davidson ought to repent and apologize for such conduct instead of denying it, thus adding to my burden and responsibility with a determination to talk the Bible Banner, showing the original statements and signatures, to put these scandal-mongers where they belong—in the corner. I could put them in jail, if that were my way of fighting. I have in my possession, and have had for ten years, the positive evidence to refute their charges, every one, in detail. Some of my friends have urged me to print them all—but I have not wanted to enter into a discussion of my character which with me is not a debatable question.

C. B. F. Young says that Clinton Davidson denies threatening to sue me. Is that so? Well, ask J. W. Akin if he understood the letter he received as a threat. Ask J. E. Williams if he understood the letter he received as a threat. Ask George W. Birchfield if he took the letter he received as a threat. Ask Austin Taylor if he interpreted the letter he received as a threat. Ask Leon B. McQuiddy why he met me in Memphis, Tennessee, to inform me that Davidson had said that he would sue me, and to talk the Bible Banner situation over. Brother McQuiddy thought he meant to do it, and withdrew from the proposed organization of the Bible Banner Company, leaving it up to me. The difference between him and me was that he was scared and I was not. Davidson ought to repent and apologize for such conduct instead of denying it, thus adding another sin to what he has already done.

This has been the spirit of these men who were so much in favor of promoting a sweet-spirited journal—the New Christian Leader. We hope that Brother Showalter, now that he has acquired the Leader, will not give them the medium through which to feed us sugar in his paper and throw acid in our eyes out of it.

In "taking over this increased labor and responsibility with a determination to make the Christian Leader of just as much help to each individual Christian as possible" we wish Brother Showalter the highest success, in such a cause, and proffer our assistance and encouragement as it serves that end, with the hope that the added burden and responsibility may not add to his accumulating years.—F. E. W. Jr.

If Other Papers Would Fight-Victory Now:

I wish I had words to express to you and others on the Banner staff my sincere appreciation for the fight you are waging and the results thus far accomplished and no doubt even greater and more distinct ones lie just ahead. Your courage, wisdom, knowledge and ability are marvelous. The God of heaven has certainly endowed you with much power and I am happy that you have the courage to use it to his honor and glory. If some of the other papers would have joined in with you in the fight in the beginning the battle would have already been won, but I believe victory is sure even if you do have to fight singlehanded. You are putting out the sort of food I feasted on twenty-nine years ago when I was a babe in Christ. It set me right then and it will have the same influence on truth loving God fearing souls today. I wish I were able with my pen to help you, but I guess I will have to be content to do what I can otherwise.—Thos. H. Burton, Nashville, Tennessee.

Victory For Digressive And Pre-Mils:

I attended the recent Unity Meeting held in Lexington, Kentucky, and have never seen the Truth trampled under foot more than there. It's more sectarian than any thing I've ever seen among the Sects. The Truth was compromised on every hand and by every speaker. However, it was a great victory for the Digressives and Premillennialists. Those of our supposed loyal brethren who undertook to offer an argument for the Truth had it taken from them by the next speaker of the Digressives. I gained one good from it. It impressed me more than I have ever been with the folly of thinking that the fight is over. More than ever, since I've been preaching, do we need to make the fight.—Frank D. Young, Hartsville, Tennessee.

The mail is full of expressions from many preachers from everywhere on the National Unity Meeting. The January Bible Banner will carry these statements. The heart of the preachers as a whole is right on this important issue. Let us hear from you.
February 21st, 1940, during Abilene Christian College Lectureship, president-elect Don Morris came to the rostrum in the auditorium of the College, threw down the bars, opened up the flood-gates, took off the bridles and asked for criticisms for A. C. C. Brother G. A. Dunn, Sr., of Dallas, arose and asked Brother Morris the following question: "Brother Morris, do you mean what you say or are you just playing to the galleries?" Brother Morris, smilingly said: "Yes, Brother Dunn, I mean what I said." Brother Dunn, then asked about the following: "This school is under a shadow. "This is what I mean: at one time you had a teacher in the Bible Department who was not outspoken against instrumental music in the worship, at another time you had a teacher here who was an evolutionist, and at another time you had a teacher who finally went to the Scofield Memorial bunch—why did he undertake to justify his use of the book, stating that he believed that he advises, but that he saw nothing wrong in that. (In a letter to Brother J. B. McGinty, of Terrell, Brother Roberson suggested that our brethren are too rigid and are not broadminded enough in dealing with the denominations.) As I pressed Brother Roberson with reference to this matter, he became very much excited, shouted at me and pounded me on the chest with a great deal of force. Many of the young preachers and some of the older one's condemned me for calling in question the doings and sayings of Brother Roberson. Brother Dunn argued with some, Brother M. S. Phillips (an elder of the Sunset church in Dallas) argued with some, and I took on others; but it seemed that the whole multitude was against us. This happened at an afternoon session.

I next asked Brother Harvey Sewell's study and asked him for the book: "What Jesus Taught," but was told that I may have it "tomorrow provided it is not in use." Brother Dunn then sent John O'Dowd to the library to get the book. John got it and sent it to me. From then on, I carried the book with me, shoved it all who attacked me, but it seemed that few could see that that chapter on the "Millennium" taught premillenialism; yet Robert H. Boll could not have written a plainer chapter upon the subject.

The Evening Session

At the evening session Brother Athens Clay Pullias gave a lecture on the subject: "Christ on David's Throne." No sooner had brother Pullias departed from the auditorium for his train for Nashville, Tennessee, than brother Roberson requested of Brother Morris (who was presiding) permission to say something (I learned from Brother Morris later that he had no idea what Brother Roberson had in mind to say and do), whereupon Brother Morris, after making some announcements, invited Brother Roberson to the rostrum by the side of Brother Morris, and became seated while I proceeded.

I then pointed out, "This school is under a shadow. It must be that a world-wide mission will result in world-wide conversion, or that hereby the longed-for Millennium will be ushered in. But there is a time to come when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea, hence, it must be that our denunciation is not the last, and the effects stated in that are not contemplated in the instructions and results of this. So there is no Millennium prior to the second advent of Jesus." (pages 470, 471)

"But the scripture warrants the belief that there will be the blessedness of universal righteousness and prosperity that shall fill the earth, and if so, it must be after Jesus returns to this earth. (page 472)

From the day this prophecy was spoken to the hour of his coming again, He offers no place for a millennium, no place for a thousand years of blessedness for men on earth." (page 473 emphasis mine JLI.

There it is, ladles and gentlemen, as plainly as R. H. Boll could put it.

While I was reading, many people left the building, whereupon I reminded them of denominationalism and its unwillingness to hear both sides of a question. When I had finished, Brother Roberson arose and said: "I meant by millennium, that period of time between Pentecost and the second coming of Christ; and by the blessedness of universal righteousness and prosperity that takes hold of the hearts and lives of men in conversion and gains..."
momentum until one is ushered into that eternal kingdom." At the conclusion of Brother Roberson's explanation, I arose and said: "My dear man, you wrote in your book, page 471, "So there is no millennium prior to the second advent of Jesus." How can you reconcile that statement with what you have just said?" At this juncture Brother Roberson came forward and again tried to explain his position by using the twisting and turning method of the modern professor. Again, I came back, but was interrupted by Brother Paul Southern, who arose and said: "Let's sing." The audience rose and joined in the singing and thus came to an end a stormy session in the auditorium of Abilene Christian College. I knew that I had been run over by a politico-religio steam roller; but I was determined to carry the fight to the floor the very next day, although it became necessary for us (M. S. Phillips and me) to spend the night in a hotel at our own expense.

Midnight Conference

It developed that president-elect Don Morris, Walter Adams, Harvey Scott, Homer Hailey and some others, went to Brother Roberson's home for a conference, which I am told went into morning hours. They told Roberson that something had to be done, for the College was suffering and would suffer more, so Brother Roberson finally dictated a statement to the effect that he did not believe premillennialism, but that his unfortunate use of language caused some to so interpret his article on "Millennium" as it appears in "What Jesus Taught."

The Next Conference

The next conference was the morning of the next day, Feb. 22nd. I was called to Brother Scott's office at the front of the auditorium. Here I was presented the Roberson statement, which I read and flatly refused to accept, because it was designed to clear Roberson of the charge I had brought against him and place me before the brotherhood as one who did not know the meaning of plain unmistakable language. I contended that Roberson should sign a statement repudiating the article in question or be dismissed from the College as an unsafe teacher. Don Morris, Walter Adams, Harvey Scott and Homer Hailey, agreed with me that the article is premillennial, but, said: "Roberson does not believe premillennialism." I replied: "Then let him repudiate the article, like a man, otherwise he is stubborn and unsafe. He is trying to justify his position in the article, when everyone who knows anything about premillennialism knows that that article teaches premillennialism." While they were trying to get me to agree to an armistice, brethren G. A. Dunn and M. S. Phillips tried several times to get into the office, but every time they were turned back with a "just a minute." I became disgusted and demanded that the door be opened and admit Dunn and Phillips. As they entered the room, Brother Dunn said with authority: "I don't like the way you men are doing!" Brethren Dunn and Phillips thought I was being high-pressured into a false position; but there was nothing for a true man to do, even in the presence of a thousand college professors, but stand for repudiation.

I had no desire to be unfair to the College nor unkind to Brother Roberson, so upon the suggestion of Brother Dunn, I submitted the following to be signed by Brother Roberson and a statement from me: "Abilene, Texas, February 22, 1940. If in the past I have unconsciously taught premillennialism, I repudiate it now, and do not believe it. I have never believed such a false doctrine. (Signed) Charles H. Roberson February 22, 1940." "I accept the foregoing statement as a full explanation of the questions asked yesterday, and appreciate Brother Charles H. Roberson's attitude in the matter. (Signed) J. L. Hines. February 22, 1940." At the conclusion of the noon session of February 22, 1940, Brother Don Morris read without comment these statements. After this, I was commended for having brought this matter to light. I love the college and desire to see it grow and prosper. We came home home thinking that A. C. C. had been helped. But on February 26, 1940 I received a letter from Brother Roberson, enclosing many citations and quotations from his book, 'What Jesus Taught.' to prove I had misjudged him.

So I have come to the conclusion that a professor who would "unconsciously" teach premillennialism and who would suggest that the brethren turn over their property to the Baptist for the Baptist to have their church building, Dallas, Texas, I believe some time in May of 1940, Brother Don Morris presiding, threw the meeting open for criticisms against A. C. C. A number of preachers of Dallas, and some from out of the city were present, and without an exception all criticized A. C. C. for retaining brethren Charles H. Roberson and R. C. Bell, and it was recommended that if

Musings From The Motor City

A. B. KEENAN

E. L. Jorgenson is still trying to "blitz" the churches with his "Great Songs" of some church or other. What with his new alliance with the Christian Standard, we need now prepare for an all-out, total war. Cetainly, the good old Christian Standard fondly observes that it and Jorgenson have so-o-o-o-o-o much in common. "Where have you been all our life, hiding your musical light beneath some mossback bushel?"

"Maintaining the pitch" sans piano or organ, minus the blare of bugles and ruffle of drums is a considerably easier task than pressing the nose of the expansive editor of the S. squarely against either Col. 3:16 or Eph. 5:19. The command is to sing; that eliminates fiddling and toodling forever, however so much they may be disguised as "maintaining the pitch."

Louisville "lights" are considerably more at home with sectarian who share their I'll-take-Chicago-you-take-Miami notions about the future than they are with their own brethren who will have no truck or traffic with interpretations that weasel the life blood right out of the Gospel.

Good for Henry A. Wallace, vice-presidential nominee. He reads the Bible, has worsted Mrs. MacPherson on accurate recall of wording. His biographer says: "He left the United Presbyterian sect for the Episcopal church." Was this choice of words a deliberate bit of the pot calling the kettle black, or merely a reporter's penchant for expression? En garde, brethren!

SPECIAL RENEWAL OFFER

The Bible Banner offers the Neal-Wallace Debate ($2.00) for $1.50—or the Bible Banner and N. W. Debate for $2.00. Renew Now.

Bible Banner — Box 1804
Oklahoma City, Okla.
COMPLETE CHRISTIAN HYMNAL
-BY MARION DAVIS-

Spiritual and Scriptural

Foy E. Wallace, Jr., was requested to read every song with editorial detail in order to detect all error in teaching which is inevitably found in songs of sectarian writers and publishers. Considerable expense has been incurred by changing plates in order to make the corrections necessary in the elimination of all such errors.

No Other Book Like It Has Been Published

Bound in cloth-board backs ................................................ 50c the copy.

Bound in limp covers .......................................................... 35c the copy.
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