The Pioneers Under Fire

CLED E. WALLACE

The style men should use in their preaching and writing, sometimes called the "method of approach," comes often under discussion. It is not a new issue. Men differ in ability, depth of conviction, power of expression and natural disposition. Some are soft, some are hard, some use language that soothes even when it carries the faint aroma of rebuke, while others wield words that cut like a knife. Different hearts react differently to the same words. A discussion of the theme can easily become a logomache, a mere war of words. Stern speech is sometimes used spiced with most uncharitable insinuations in rebuking the supposed fault in others. Humorous angles often appear to tickle the visibles of a thoughtful observer. The late J. W. McGarvey wielded a pointed and critical pen. By common consent he had a kindly heart, but he has come under fire for the "vitriol" in his writings by some of the more progressive of the progressives. The Christian Standard, very properly I think, speaks up in defense of Brother McGarvey. For years I have read with delight McGarvey's spicy criticisms of scholars who took unwarranted liberties with the Holy Scriptures and handled the word of God deceitfully. He really undressed them and was none too tender in the process. Naturally, he drew howls of resentment, and even some of the timid faithful must have piously shivered with consternation. Dr. Morro in his biography of McGarvey offers the following apology for him:

"Why it will be asked, need he be so sharp and lacking in courtesy? Two things may be said to soften the offense, and if these are not satisfactory there is nothing to be added. First, it was characteristic of the men of his generation to use language of this type and they did not expect their opponents to take offense. McGarvey was scarcely more than extreme in this respect. ... The second point is that McGarvey deliberately made choice of this manner of speech because, as he said, it lent piquancy and interest to the discussion. The language of McGarvey was not the gauge of his kindly heart.

Prof. R. C. Foster in his review of Dr. Morro's book in the Christian Standard takes some exception to this. In the course of his remarks we gather some interesting facts. It appears that some, of Brother McGarvey's colleagues, "members of the faculty at The College of the Bible," requested President McGarvey to change his style of writing. They thought that his method of calling names "was most exasperating" to his critics and some of his friends. Professor Foster takes sides with McGarvey and takes thishumorous crack at Dr. Morro.

"If Dr. Morro had omitted President McGarvey's name and the name of every one else he criticizes in this biography, just how intelligent and forceful would the book be? The fact that Dr. Morro grows so bitter in criticizing what he considers the bitterness of McGarvey shows again that the question as to who is talking about whom has a tremendous amount of significance in human estimates as to what is severe, but just, and what is bitter and vitriolic."

This adds up to an interesting and informative side-show and draws some editorial comment from the Christian Standard to which I am inclined to wholly agree.

"There is no reason that a writer may not differ most forcefully with a true friend and retain him as such. Only an attack upon personal character—an argumentum ad hominem—need spoil such a situation and no really able debater descends to that sort of argument: we know of no evidence that Brother McGarvey did so. He simply forced the argument so strongly that he revealed that the teachings of the radicals were inconsistent with Christianity and really represented enmity to the Scriptures. Naturally, those who were trying to be classified as Christian scholars resented this, but it was the fault of their position, not of their opponent."

Dr. Morro cites a specimen from McGarvey pointed at a scholarly opponent which horrified some of his readers. "Criticisms more arbitrary, more antagonistic to right reason, can scarcely be imagined; yet in it Professor Moore is but blindly following his German teachers." We have it from Professor Foster that Dr. Morro considers this "as a sort of climax of vituperation, at which he holds up his hands in holy horror."

We have some pious hands among us, set to hair-triggers, and the slightest touch of direct criticism sends them reaching for heaven in tremors of horror. They need to be exposed to the writings of the pioneers, men who lived back with and wrote like McGarvey. "It was characteristic of the men of his generation to use language of this type and they did not expect their opponents to take offense." If they did take offense, they usually got a liberal dose of the same sort of language to cool them off or add a few more degrees of heat. I cannot entertain a friendly feeling for any policy or style or pronouncement which directly or indirectly upbraids such men as David Lipscomb, F. B. and F. D. Srygley, T. R. Burnett, F. W. Smith, J. C. McQuiddy, M. C. Kurfees and many others like them for the manner of fight they made that the old paths might continue to be clear paths. Some of our generation who have been so tenderly brought up, might well spend enough time with their writings to learn that some of the best writing is done with a pencil that is kept sharp.
THE “CERTIFIED AUDIT” OF DOCTOR JEKLL AND MR. HYDE

The publisher of Word & Work (R. H. Boll’s Word of discord) and Work (of division) also publishes Great Songs Of The (?) Church under the blind of Great Songs Press—Doctor Jekll and Mr. Hyde. When the Bible Banner exposed the premillennial connections of this song book and its publisher, and pointed out to all the brethren that their money went into the assets of the Boll party at Louisville to promote their party tenets and foster their divisions, the statement was countered by the assertions that though many thousands of the book were being sold the publishers of it had actually made less than $10.00 profit on the cost of the past year! This is but a shifting of the money— but mainly, a juggling of figures and a shifting about of the money from the pocket of one Dr. Jekll to the pocket of one Mr. Hyde, both of whom or which are Elmer L. Jorgenson.

Now comes splashing ads and elaborate circulars of an “official” and “certified” audit to confirm the “no profit” claim of the publisher of Great Songs of Any Church that will buy them, trade for them or just take them free! Brother C. A. Taylor, of Louisville, who knows more about the schemes of the Boll-Jorgenson Party in Louisville than any other man there except J. F. Kurfees, has the following to say about this widely publicized audit:

The enclosed “official-audit” reached me, by mail, a few days ago. It is “shot through and through” with characteristic Jorgenson trick statements. The most noticeable one is the use of the words “publication or organization.” This expression is used to avoid the use of Jorgenson’s name and I notice no mention is made of moneys paid to Boll and Jorgenson and Company. The channels through which Word and Work could have, and in the ordinary conduct of business, would have benefitted. I would like to see a real financial statement, showing all receipts and disbursements. That would show how much was paid to Jennes for “press work” and to Jorgenson for loans, etc. Had Jorgenson wanted to be candid, he would have published all details. That would have been more satisfactory and would have cost but little, if any more. I notice no figures are given to show Assets and Liabilities. A m'wondering if total cost of books on hand was charged as expense. It is evident that they are willing to make known only the usual figures furnished by auditors. Such as requested and that they give no real information. No business man would attach any importance to such an “official audit.” Humphery, Robinson and Company are a high grade auditing company but admittedly they have not shown all the facts certified. One member of that auditing firm, and his mother, are members of Jorgenson’s church, have been members there for 25 years. The mother has always been a most devout convert to R. H. Boll’s theories. It will take some real figures and facts to convince me that Jorgenson and Janes have handled nearly $182,500.00 gross sales in song books and that neither they nor their pet Word and Work received any of the money.

-C. A. Taylor, Louisville, Ky.

In the same elaborate circular it is claimed that this Great Songs of What Church reached the peak of all of its sales, and its publisher vaunted himself. But that, if true, is likely due to the fact that the Christian Standard adopted his book last year and made it a “symbol” in the Christian Churches of the “unity” which is being promoted in the National Unity Meetings—“a symbol of unity” between all the churches using it, Christian Churches and & Churches of Christ! We have charged all of the time that the Jorgenson songbook was used as a link in the chain to connect the churches with this movement. They first
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denied it but now they have admitted it! That alone is a sufficient symbol for any loyal church to junk it. "A noble symbol of unity," indeed! Imagine digressives, premillennialists and Bollites chattering platitudinous phrases on the nobility of unity which they desire this Jorgenson songbook to "symbolize," when the chief stock in trade with all of them has been division, and their trail of church-splitting goes back to where they all started!

The broadcast of the Oak Cliff Church of Christ announced the Jorgenson meeting. E. L. Jorgenson and R. H. Boll are not identified with the loyal churches of Christ in Louisville, and in Kentucky. They are wholly out of the fellowship of these churches. The line of cleavage is as definite between them as it is between Christian Churches and Churches of Christ anywhere. The minister of the Oak Cliff Church and the speaker over this broadcast is not ignorant of that fact, for he has held meetings in Louisville. His action in announcing Jorgenson's meeting over his program is a direct slap in the face to the Haldeman Avenue Church in Louisville-the church that called him for a meeting-and to the Bardstown Road church of the same city composed of the fine people who were mistreated, withdrawn from, and driven away by the Jorgenson-Janes-Boll combination in Louisville. Yet-in Dallas-E. L. Jorgenson, the Louisville divider of churches, who is not even in fellowship with the loyal churches of Christ is given state-wide recognition by a radio announcement over the program of the Oak Cliff Church of Christ.

The fact that the speaker disclaimed belief of Premillennialism in the announcement, while he was inviting them to go hear Jorgenson preach the "gospel," means nothing. G. C. Brewer disclaims belief of Premillennialism in all the wabbling he has done on these issues. Clinton Davidsson disclaimed belief of Premillennialism. Harding College disclaims belief of Premillennialism. R. H. Boll would welcome such a disclaimer any time in order to get the recognition, for it is recognition that any faction wants and must have in order to live. The attitude toward these issues and the promoters of them, not the actual belief of them, is the for or against test now. For just where is the preacher or teacher or school or church that will admit being one! That much of the fight has been made effective, but men who are not Premillennialists in belief can by their attitude do the Cause more harm than if they were.

I have been told that announcement of my meeting in Houston, Texas, was also made over this same radio broadcast. Under the circumstances, I cannot consider it an honor and would really appreciate it if they would just "skip" me.

When the attitude of the preachers and the churches becomes consistent with the truth they profess to hold, and the practice is measured by the preaching, our fight on these essential issues will have become effective. Till then, those men who disclaim any belief of any part of premillennialism, but who nevertheless maintain an attitude toward the promoters of the premillennial party, do themselves, every one of them, lend aid to error and actually hinder the truth. God forbid that I shall ever be guilty of doing it. I should rather my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth and my right arm fall limp by my side and fall to lift the quill that I should ever side-step an issue or lend my influence in act or in attitude, to the promoters of this "pernicious teaching," so inimical to the church of Christ. So help me God.

WHO WROTE THAT ARTICLE?

The suave editor of the Gospel Advocate is having a hard time with the question of policy and how to apply it. He appears now to think that he has done something clever. He quoted an editorial from the Gospel Advocate of 1912, without giving the name of the author. Of course, we all knew that he did not write it. But when his application of it was criticised, his hidden card was pulled out of his sleeve, and with an air of exuberance he ask, in a sort of a wily way, "Yes, who wrote that article?" Shame on you, Brother Goodpasture, for getting anybody into such a dire trap and then closing up on them that way. Is that ethical?

Now that he has demonstrated his sagacity, got us all in a trap and closed us in, he tells us that it was M. C. Kurfees who wrote that article. Why not tell us now to whom he was replying when he wrote it? And also tell us to whom the present editor, Brother Goodpasture, was replying when he quoted it. Yes, who is he talking about? Has he heard from some of his own staff writers who do not indorse his editorials? There is more than one who does not. Is he by any chance replying to some of them in the paper, whose criticisms he has not made public? Pardon my curiosity, I would just like, to know.

Referring to the comment on his editorial which was, he said, on the order of yes and no, mostly yes, he quotes the indorsement of our mutual friend P. W. Stonestreet, a nephew of M. C. Kurfees. Brother Goodpasture pays a compliment to Brother Stonestreet for having an "observant eye and an alert mind" in his commendation of the article. We are all glad to know that Brother Goodpas-
ture has found this out about Brother Stonestreet. Sometime ago when the editor of the Gospel Advocate wrote that “ill-chosen” and “untimely” editorial on Abraham and Lot, it was P. W. Stonestreet whose “observant eye and alert mind” saw the fallacy of it and he asked the editor of the Bible Banner to reply to it. Brother Stonestreet’s criticism of Brother Goodpasture’s misapplication of the Abraham and Lot episode was published in the Bible Banner along with the editorial reply which he requested. Later, referring back to it, Brother Goodpasture said that “the veriest tyro” should be able to see the application that he had made of that example. Now, what do we have? When P. W. Stonestreet pointed out the fallacy of one of Brother Goodpasture’s articles he was classed as “the veriest tyro,” but when P. W. Stonestreet “appreciated” the “restatement of policy” editorial, he all at once ceased to be among the “veriest tyro” class and became a man with a very “alert mind”! So it depends on what you think of Brother Goodpasture’s editorial as to how smart you are. He is liable to flunk you for being dumb one week and graduate you with honors for being a genus the next! So much for the trap which was admittedly laid ti ensnare others. They usually turn out to be boomerangs.

As for the reprint from M. C. Kurfees, Brother Goodpasture and the entire Advocate staff know, as we all know, that the man who wrote it, and who has passed to his reward, did not direct the editorial at those against whom Brother Goodpasture attempts to use it for he was one of the class of controversialists that Brother Goodpasture is now opposing and condemning. Why does he not reprint a few of the editorials that M. C. Kurfees and F. W. Smith wrote against R. H. Boll, and others, from 1912 through 1925, and let the readers see if the policy of the Gospel Advocate now can be “stated in their language” then. They were charged then with recriminations, personalities and abusive treatment of those whom they exposed. Nobody knows this better than the present editor of the Advocate and his associates. Yet he will seek to take a single article in 1912, written by M. C. Kurfees, and direct it against the men who are waging the fight that M. C. Kurfees himself started in Louisville, Kentucky, and with whom he would be standing now if he were living. The same is true of F. W. Smith and J. C. McQuiddy.

It was E. L. Jorgenson who appropriated M. C. Kurfees song, “May All Of God’s People Be One,” at the pseudo-unity meeting farce at Detroit, when he attempted to capitalize on the name of M. C. Kurfees. It is nothing short of profaning the name and influence of men who are in their graves. The Advocate’s tactics are identical. F. W. Smith and M. C. Kurfees would turn over in their graves if they knew their names were being used to bolster up the present wavering policy of the Gospel Advocate on the very issues on which they themselves led the fight. Ask R. H. Boll if their writings contained recriminations and personalities, and he will reply in about the same language Brother Goodpasture has used. He did so then, and it is in the record.

It will be interesting to the reader to know what J. F. Kurfees, an elder in the church, the flesh and blood brother of M. C. Kurfees, who was with him through the thick of the fight with the Boll Party in those days, thinks of the Goodpasture-Advocate attitude. Read his words:

“One thing has occurred to me about Brother Goodpasture, and that is that you or any other writer would have to “go some” in the use of bitter, harsh and ugly language to beat the language he used in describing those who are righting error. For instance, “distorting facts”; “suppressing the truth,” “more interested in carrying a point than telling the truth;” “that truth and facts are secondary;” “concealing the facts,” etc. etc.

Now my idea is that any guilty of any such is unworthy of the respect and fellowship of brethren—yes, such a man is absolutely unreliable, untruthful, and if Brother Goodpasture, or any other editor knows of such a brother, especially a writer or preacher, it is certainly his duty to expose yes, call his name and warn brethren against him. We certainly don’t want such men to preach for us. Keep up the fight; you are doing a fine job.”

Fraternally, J. F. Kurfees.

That is precisely what M. C. Kurfees did. He called the names of such men and warned the brethren against them, and there are too many brethren living now who know the type of writing that characterized F. W. Smith and M. C. Kurfees for the Gospel Advocate to get by with the thing they are trying to do.

In the Advocate editor’s present attitude, one thing stands out: They are willing to employ sarcasm, scorn and irony against those who have been defending the truth against these insidious movements in the church, but it is a notable fact that since Brother Goodpasture has been the editor, not once has he lifted the pen to write against Davidsonism, Murch-Witty Unityism, or any other major error in a straightforward, forthright manner. Now that Davidsonism has been exposed, and the organ of the movement, The Christian Leader, has been destroyed, the Gospel Advocate takes up where the Davidson personnel left off in criticising men who have waged the fight. Faithful brethren can see that, and they do see it. It will make no friends for the Advocate, as this fact becomes apparent, except among the same element that acclaimed Davidson and his Leader.

We expected better things of Brother Goodpasture and the Gospel Advocate. But if that is where they wish to pitch battle, let them choose weapons, and we will meet them. The Gospel Advocate’s attitude is a challenge to every man who has fought to uphold the truth on the issues before the church today. The battle has been too hard fought to let a conciliation, appeasement policy, neutralize the victory. They shall not pass!”—F. E. W. Jr.
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THE INNER THREAT OF SOFTNESS

HOMER HAILEY

The October issue of the Reader’s Digest carried an article entitled, “The Inner Threat: Our Own Softness.” In this article the author brings certain charges against the nation today, which threaten its strength and endurance. The writer charged our national softness to three things: feminine domination, luxury, and the desire for things without the willingness to pay for them. All such luxury, dispositions, and the like having led to a general softness which threatens the national strength and resistance.

Most of the things said of the nation might have as aptly been said of the church. Since, however, he was writing about things secular, I shall simply borrow the title to his article and make a similar observation concerning the church: our real threat is that of softness within.

In charging that the inner threat of the church is softness, some at once think of aversion to firm, positive preaching. Aversion to so-called “hard” preaching is but one of the symptoms. Other symptoms of internal softness are: Lack of force or power in waging a relentlessly uncompromising war against the enemies of truth; no resistance with which to withstand the inroads of evil; error and sin too often slipping in with little or no resistance against them; no concern about the consequences. These three conditions are strong symptoms of internal softness, which present a decided threat to the life of the church.

It is no sin to face facts squarely, nor is it criminal to publicly declare things that are true. When the church at Corinth was endangered, Paul was specific. Having introduced his subject, he said, “Now this I mean.” No one was left doubting or questioning what he had in mind, what he was discussing. Did he do wrong in squarely facing the issue of the day? Would it have been better to have bragged on them a little and left the matter there? There was a threat from within, he was challenging the church there to recognize and face it. The church today should have the disposition to face any threat to its life, either from without or within.

LUXURY

Luxury has ever been a curse to man. Nationally, it tends to rob him of that ruggedness so essential to life; it develops softness that results in decay and death. Among the ancient Romans, the Empire was a paradise of luxury; among the moderns, France was a prey to its curse. Religiously, luxury tends to spiritual sloth, laziness, and general inertia. The description of Israel given by Hosea and Amos is that of a religion robbed of its power by luxury. The church at Philadelphia (Rev. 3) was lukewarm and indifferent, the victim of plenty; “I am rich, and have gotten riches, and have need of nothing,” she said, not knowing her wretchedness and poverty. With our good meeting houses today, comfort too often becomes the prime order, the victim of swelling self and the victim of the wolf that lurks in the folds of luxury.

LUXURY is a curse. It robs men of strength, of vigor, of spirit. It appeases the aspersions of the world and lulls into a false sense of security. We become like newborn infants, without self-reliance, and with the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, which is the worship of comfort and of self.

LUXURY in religion leads to a false sense of security; presumptuous self-reliance which tends to forget God and trust in things. The rulers in Jerusalem said, “We have made a covenant with death, and with Sheol are we at agreement; when the overflowing scourge shall pass through, it shall not come unto us; for we have made lies our refuge, and under falsehood have we hid ourselves.”

They had become soft, luxury was reaping its wage: internal rottenness. They sought alliances with Egypt, and ran to Assyria, but when the scourge came through, they went down. Our comfortable religious surroundings today lead to softness, softness leads to decay, and decay to destruction.

WORLDLINESS

Worldliness also weakens and softens the spiritual fibre and muscle of individuals and congregations. Covetousness makes men compromise truth for gain, which God calls idolatry. Fleshly lusts which war against the soul, rob the Christian of his force and power, when gratified and indulged; it is impossible to support the world with one’s compromising endorsement and at the same time fight it vigorously. Jesus said something about the folly of trying to serve two masters, yet many never get the point.

Selfishness, which looks only at individual interests; or the interest, comfort, and well being of the immediate congregation, but never beyond that, leads to inner decay. The very heart of Christian strength is self denial and cross bearing with Christ. Sacrifice seeks the neighbor’s good; it bears the burdens of others; it looks to the evangelizing of the uttermost parts of the earth. Selfishness has produced softness in many congregations. The sacrifice of money, time, and life for principles strengthen and toughen one for the defense of those principles.

The unequal yoking of believers with unbelievers, contrary to the admonition of the Bible, leads men to change their attitude toward principles once held dear. Once the Christian who has become unequally yoked with an unbeliever in marriage, business partnership, or social alliance, compromises principle for person, he must witness a gradual softening on his part, and ultimate death to those principles.

SKEPTICISM

The last factor I mention contributing to the inner threat, softness, is skepticism. Skepticism of God’s power and assured promises made the Christian lead to doubt of victory, weakening the effort. Skepticism of God’s declared attitude toward sin, thinking that somehow men in rebellion to Him can get by even in the face of what He has said, weakens resistance. But His promises to bless, His threats to punish, cannot be annulled, they will be kept.

A skeptical attitude toward humanity, doubting the integrity of all men both within and without the church, leads to the attitude of Elijah, who concluded he was the only one left who was faithful, so he might as well quit. There must be faith in God to give the faithful the victory; there must be faith in humanity to recognize and accept the right when it is presented. This believed, the strength and integrity of the church can be preserved, and the inner threat checked.

These contributing factors to internal softness pave the way for false teachers, and false doctrine, to the ultimate overthrow of an institution. False teachers thrive in a period of degeneracy, when fight has ceased, and softness and decay have set in. Unto the elders of the church at Ephesus, Paul said “I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock, and from among your own selves shall men arise teaching perverse things”; but it should be “after” his departure. So long as Paul was there there was a restraining power; the progress of error was impossible while vigilance was kept. The same principle holds today. Internal softness and decay begins when vigilance ceases, and comfort, worldliness, and skepticism become the order of the day. As the fifth column works in a decaying nation, so do false teachers in a soft and slack congregation. Aversion to firm, militant preaching and error-exposing journalism are simply symptoms of internal decay; the causes for it must be found back of the symptoms.
Dear Brother Armstrong:

I have read your article—"Free Speech and Fearless Teachers," published in Christian Leader Oct. 15, 1940. Considering the namby-pamby sentimentalism sweeping through the churches, and "our" religious journals today, coupled with the character assassinating, scurrilous, anonymous letters with which the brotherhood has been deluged in recent months, I think your articles timely, indeed. I am, therefore, publishing your article by paragraphs in the Bible Banner, and following one of the effective methods that our Savior used in teaching, I am asking you some questions, and feel sure that you will practice what you believe and teach by having my questions and your replies published in the Christian Leader.* The first paragraph of your article follows:

"There is great need to stress the importance of maintaining freedom of speech in the kingdom of God. Intolerance is dangerous to the future growth of the church. Most of us have an aversion to anything except what we ourselves believe and teach, and, as a consequence, we are intolerant of the teaching of anything that antagonizes 'our doctrine'. All progress of truth—scientific truth, political truth, or religious truth—has always depended on free speech and progressive teachers, men and women who were not afraid to teach their honest convictions even though it cost life. In other words, fearless teachers of any cause are the essential factors of the growth of that cause, while intolerance is always a chief factor of hindrance to that growth."

In this paragraph you state the principles that made the nineteenth century restoration movement possible, and the only principles which will keep the movement from the swamps of denominationalism. If the New Testament church is to survive the wreck and crash of nations, and the indifference and ungodliness of many of its members, we must have "fearless teachers." We have twelve white and several colored congregations in the Birmingham district. If more than two thirds of the white congregations here should invite you to come and deliver some sermons or lectures on some living issues that were disturbing the peace and harmony of the congregations, and if the majority of the elders where I preach should pass a resolution and put it on record forbidding me to announce your meeting, would that be "intolerance"? If not, name it.

"But free speech, fearless teaching, always precipitates discussion. For the fearless teacher is always a progressive teacher. It takes no courage to teach the things one's audience already believes. If one has confidence in the audience's acceptance of his lesson, what need has he for special courage. Anybody has courage enough to teach the commonly accepted truths. It is the man that dares to go beyond the accepted teaching, that must gather special courage, yet he is the teacher who pulls the crowd upward and onward to more glorious victory for the cause.""* This article was written by Bro. Lewis before the Christian Leader ceased publication. The "belated" appearance is not any fault of Bro. Lewis' but a failure of the editor to get the article in an earlier issue. But we will give Bro. Armstrong equal space in Bible Banner with Bro. Lewis.

Brother Armstrong, the two questions at the close of this paragraph are the flies in the ointment, and I am asking you to help me get them out. Of course, it would be a mere guess upon your part; but, what do you think the "truths to be fought through," which will call for "martyrs" to bring them "through," will be when they are "delivered"? Do you think we may have a different church, different laws of initiation into the church, a different system of worship, and a different system of Christian living, when these supposed new "truths" have been "fought through," and delivered by "martyrs"? It took "teachers of special courage," and "martyrs" to deliver and defend "the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." We need "teachers of special courage" to defend that faith today, and the time may soon come when "more martyrs" will be "needed" in its defense, I think these revealers of new truths (?) should go to Joe Smith’s "Kith and Kin," or to the camps of Ellen G. White, or Mary Baker Eddy—they are all revealers (?) of new truths. That would leave the church, and gospel preachers to preach and defend the gospel Paul preached. (Read Gal. 1:6-9.)

"I am well aware of the fact that free speech has its dangers and that progressive and fearless teachers have given the world no little trouble. But are we ready to surrender free speech and to deny ourselves of the teachers that are not afraid? Even our deliverance from these possibilities comes. We must come; through free speech and courageous teachers. There is nothing so dangerous to the truths we now love, as the doing away with free speech and the disposing of the progressive teachers who are not afraid to teach any conviction they have. If our great-great-grandchildren enjoy the truth we hold dear, it will be due to free speech and courageous teachers."

I believe in "free speech," and in "progressive and fearless teachers," both in the temporal and spiritual kingdoms; but I do not believe that "free speech" should be used as license to overthrow either kingdom. When aliens come to our country and are not satisfied with our government, and begin to advocate its overthrow by force, I believe their mouths should not only be stopped; but, figuratively speaking, they should be put in a cannon and shot back across the ocean where they came from. Even so in the kingdom of Christ. Paul says: "For there are many unruly men, vain talkers and deceivers, specially they of
the circumcision, whose mouths must be stopped; men who overthrow whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre’s sake.” (Titus 1:11, 12) Is this the kind, and use, of “free speech” you believe in, Brother Armstrong? It is the kind I believe in, and it is the only kind that will save the church from the doctrines and commandments of man.

“But with the blessing of free speech we must accept the inevitable; namely, free, open-handed, and fair discussion of every great truth that lives. Our deliverance from our own errors as well as from the errors of other errant or our enemies will come only through free and unhampere debate. We are hopeless without it. How could the teaching of “one side” of a great question be called “free” when both sides are not heard? I believe that the man who holds the opposite must be heard with equal fairness, or it is not free speech. Every paper or journal today that discusses only its side of great issues opposes free speech, and becomes, in so far as it goes, a protector of every error and false doctrine it or its writers hold. Every journal to be safe from its own errors and false teaching must be an open forum.”

Brother Armstrong, I believe your statements in this paragraph are absolutely invulnerable, and contain the only cure for our ills today. When I hear a man say he does not believe in elders, I know he would elder any congregation to death that he had any voice in, and it would be as impossible for the Cause of Christ to grow under his influence, as it was for grass to grow under the feet of Attila’s horse. When you hear brethren say they do not believe in debates, the chances are that they will flood the country with scurrilous, anonymous letters, and carry on a whispering campaign against those who “debate” or discuss, all living issues in the open. And when a paper announces it is not going to have any discussions in its columns, it is about like announcing a running bull fight with one bull in the pen. I have never had any sympathy with the move to oust you from Harding College. I believe the College is the culmination of your life’s work, that without your efforts and influence there would be no Harding College. Therefore, my conception of honor, and fair play, would be for those who are out of harmony with your ideas on the millennium, to resign, get out and start them a school of their own. If I understand, the difference between your position and R. H. Boll’s position on the millennium, is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee.

Since you and I believe in “free and unhampere debate,” I would suggest that you invite Foy E. Wallace, Jr. to meet either you, or R. H. Boll, at Harding College in a “free, open-handed, and fair discussion” of this subject. I suggest Wallace for two reasons, first, he was the one that accepted Brother Neal’s challenge for the Winchester, Ky., and the Chattanooga, Tenn., debates. Second, the brethren in Texas selected him to meet J. Frank Norris in the great Fort Worth debate. Therefore, there could be no question about him being a representative man. R. H. Boll is the father of the premillennial theories that have caused so much trouble and alienation, in the church, during the last few years, and you are in full sympathy with his efforts, and no one could question the ability of either of you to represent this “new truth” that must be fought through.

Perhaps in discussions nothing is ever undertaken that is so difficult as the effort to state another man’s position or to tell what another believes. In all fair debates and discussions a man is allowed to state his own position and to explain his own language. When this is done the readers may be trusted to decide for themselves what is truth in the discussion.

Of course, in arranging the discussion, each man would be allowed “to state his own position,” and in the debate, each man would have the right “to explain his own language.”

“It is to be deplored, deeply regretted, that in the past some very ugly things have occurred in discussions among us. This is a part of the cost of free speech, maybe. It is not possible, I think, to be free in discussing truth and keep our discussion really free from objectionable things. There is so much good and safety in discussions, even-handed discussions, that I believe in their worth, though we may have some things occur that should not.”

I agree with what you say about what has happened in the past; but with the high type men that would be engaged in this debate, we would not expect any “very ugly things to occur.” And an interested and appreciative audience would certainly overlook any little “objectionable thing” that might slip in, in the heat of discussion.

“Let the teachers and writers in discussions be wise; and above all, good, as far as in them lies; let them divest themselves of all cocksureness, egotism, and desire for victory, and instead let them be fitted with humility and a feeling that so long as faithful brethren disagree as to what the Bible teaches on the subject, some errors may be they, let them studiously keep themselves free from ugly personalities; let each count his brother better than himself and let all esteem one another highly as brethren in Christ, and let the spirit of brotherly love be magnified in and throughout all such discussions. The elimination of error from the holdings of every individual and of every church depends upon this course. The truth that a church needs, but hasn’t got, depends much upon such a course. In other words, true advancement depends upon free, unhampered, even-handed discussion of truth.

Our ideas are identical in this matter, Brother Armstrong, so let us have a “free, unhampered, even-handed discussion of truth,” on the premillennial question. I feel sure if the debate is held at Harding College there will be more brethren interested and more would attend the discussion than any other place in the United States.

“Like young married people that disagree in religion enter into an agreement never to discuss their differences in religion, churches have an unwritten agreement not to disturb the good working order of the congregation by discussions. They almost demand that the preacher, or speakers, of any meeting “teach the truth and let our differences alone.” We are really opposed to fair discussion, or to the presentation of both sides of an issue.”

You got to the milk in the coconut in this paragraph, Brother Armstrong. The stand-for-nothing, noncombative policy of the churches today, is the very core of the ignorance that is brooding, over the members, on all living issues and this ignorance is absolutely withering in many places. So let us show to the world that we at least have one college among us that is not “really opposed to fair discussion, or to the presentation of both sides of an issue.”

“In the good old days in that old school over at Nashville we “threw out” a subject as thoroughly as we could by the use of students and teachers, and then often Brother Sewell, Brother G. G. Taylor, Brother Brents, and others would be legal to “drafted” to continue the discussion. Indeed we were in no way afraid of discussions. A better taught body of students I have never seen than those students and I never knew any party spirit to grow from this open discussion of all sides of all questions.”
This paragraph carries my mind back to the halcyon day of youth. Well do I remember "the good old days in that old school over at Nashville"—the like of which we do not have today, as you and I both know. All living issues were not only "threshed out;" but every effort was made to keep the chaff out of the wheat after it was winnowed. I remember a speech you made against societies doing the work of the church. After using the story of Tabitha as related in Acts 9:36-39, to show how Christian women helped widows and orphans in the apostolic age, you declared with emphasis "women today cannot make an apron without a Dorcas Society." If that speech was made today, you could add Sister So and So's Class to the "Dorcas Society."

I also remember, in January 1900, Brother T. B. Larimore came to Nashville and held a three month's meeting in the old South College Street Church. During the meeting he had the digressives preachers of Nashville lead in prayer. One morning in our Bible Class Brother J. A. Harding said: "Some one has suggested that Brother Larimore come over and deliver some lectures to the school." The suggestion seemed to come from Heaven. I knew you and I knew it, and he said: "Larimore will never come here to lecture to these boys, as long as I am superintendent, until he takes a stand on the music question; he has had those digressive preachers leading his prayers, and I had just as soon call on the devil himself."

I grew up on the farm, and followed a thresher for several years, and it was easy for me to understand why you and Brother Harding wanted to keep the chaff out of the wheat, after the "threshing" was over. That is one of the greatest needs for "fearless teachers" today. Such meetings as the "Murch-Witty" unity meetings seem to be an effort, upon the part of some, to mix the wheat and chaff after more than a half century separation. That would call for a "threshing" over the same old straw. Let us "thresh out" every issue that comes up to disturb the church, and pray for "fearless teachers" to keep truth and error separated after the threshing is over.

A CLEAR-CUT STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT OF ABILENE CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

The recent article in the Bible Banner by Brother J. L. Hines headed "The Free-For-All at Abilene Christian College" gives opportunity for statements to the brotherhood which I am glad to make at this time.

The meeting of visitors, including some hundred preachers, called at the 1940 Bible lecturership was one of several such meetings held in different cities and states, some before and some since the lecturership meeting. In these meetings it has been stated again and again that the work and policies of Abilene Christian College are open to its friends, to any who are interested and especially to all of those whom we ask to support the school with their money and patronage. At every one of these meetings a definite statement of the stand the college takes for New Testament Christianity has been made and suggestions concerning the college have been asked for. We have promised that suggestions and even criticisms will be taken in the right spirit by officials of the school. We shall continue to follow such a course of making everything at Abilene Christian College open and above-board, because we believe it is the only right principle to follow.

Now as to pre-millennialism. This doctrine is nothing more than rank materialism and is totally out of harmony with the teaching of the New Testament. The doctrine is a result of the same type of thinking that caused the Jews to reject the Master 1,900 years ago, and I assure all that Abilene Christian College is not and will not be permitted to assist in the teaching of such or to make compromises with this error. Brother Charles H. Roberson, head of the Bible Department at the college, is as much opposed to pre-millennialism as anyone in the church. In his classes or in the pulpit he shows the fallacy of such doctrine at every opportunity, and with regard to the essay in his book, "What Jesus Taught," page 470, written some fifteen years ago, is making the following statement:

"The language in this essay is susceptible of being understood as teaching pre-millennialism. Since some have understood it so, I am withdrawing the essay and writing in its stead:

"The doctrine of a future era of righteous government upon the earth, to last a thousand years, is nowhere taught in the Scripture."

Almost daily in my classes I set forth in some form or other the fallacy of the heresy of pre-millennialism. I shall be glad to furnish this statement to anyone who has the book."

Signed, Charles H. Roberson.

It should be known, too, that the entire staff of the Bible department of Abilene Christian College—those who teach one or more classes in Bible—are opposed to pre-millennialism and teach against it in their classes. I would not have it otherwise, and again I want to assure all interested that Abilene Christian College does and will use its influences in defeating this doctrine, which has so many times threatened the life and the purity of the church. I am glad also to make known the following statement which has been signed by all those who teach Bible in the college.

"Each of us whose names appear below does not believe in premillennialism, has no sympathy for the doctrine, and is glad at every opportunity to teach against this false and unscriptural doctrine."

Signed, Charles H. Roberson, R. C. Bell, Paul Southern, James F. Cox, and Homer Hailey.

The same statement is signed by every member of the entire faculty of the college.

This article is written and these statements given so that all may know how those of us at Abilene Christian College stand on this question, which from time to time raises its ugly head to the world. The purpose of the college is to give young men and young women an opportunity to prepare themselves for life in an educational way and at the same time give them the advantages of Christian teaching and associations. We ask for your prayers and help as we attempt to carry on this great work.

Don H. Morris, Jan. 18, 1941.

"MILLENNIUM" IN WHAT JESUS TAUGHT

Since the language in the essay "Millennium" in What Jesus Taught, taken by itself, may be susceptible of being interpreted as teaching Millennial doctrine, and since some have so interpreted it, I withdraw the essay and state in its stead:

The doctrine of a future era of righteous government upon the earth, to last a thousand years, is nowhere taught in the Scripture.

My religious life and experience now approach a half century, and I do avow and assert that at no time have I ever believed or taught:

That the Jews will be delivered from all their enemies, recover Palestine, and reign literally there with their Messiah in unequalled splendor; that the Jewish conception stated above is correct with the exception that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Messiah;
That there will be two resurrections, the first separated from the second by a period of a thousand years.

That Jesus Christ will reign literally on earth for a period of a thousand years.

That "the preaching of the gospel will result in the conversion of the world and usher in a golden era of righteousness and a government of justice and peace to last a thousand years, after which the Lord will return for a 'general judgment' and introduction of an eternal state."

Chas. H. Roberson

THE HIGHLAND CHURCH (ABILENE) AND THE INDIAN WORK

For some time the Highland Church of Christ, Abilene, Texas, has been considering the possibilities of the work among the Indians by James E. White, and the expediency of assuming the oversight of this work. After satisfying themselves fully as to the merits of this work, Brother Homer Hailey, minister of the Highland Church, writes as follows:

Dear Brother Wallace:

It has been by a long process, and over a long period of time, that finally we have details and arrangements worked out for the looking after of Brother White's work. We are anxious to get the work before the brotherhood in as fine a way as possible.

Brother G. G. Henry is acting as correspondent and treasurer of the work for the church. His address is 1018 Sayles Blvd. We should appreciate any space and commendation you might give the work in the Bible Banner. I am writing the Firm Foundation and Gospel Advocate also about the work, briefly stating our part in it, and inviting any who are interested in the work to correspond with Brother Henry.

Now that we are definitely behind the work, we want it to be the very best possible.

Yours in the Christ, Homer Hailey.

It is known to all of our readers that the Bible Banner has been especially interested in James E. White's work in the Indian Reservation at Oneida, Wisconsin, and we are glad that such a congregation as the Highland church has decided to look after the interests of Brother White and his work. No better church could be found to look after Brother White and his work. G. G. Henry is among the most capable men in the church, a man of deep convictions and absolute loyalty to the church in word and deed. He is experienced in all the details of financial management and I consider Brother White fortunate in having Brother Henry as his associate in this work.

Attention should be called to one thing, however, with considerable emphasis, namely that the Highland Church, has not agreed to fully support Brother White. This would be more than the average congregation could undertake with its other work. But this congregation has accepted the responsibility of directing the work, keeping in touch with its needs and what is being done, and will receive and disburse the funds through Brother Henry, who is their servant in this cause. This will give assurance to all everywhere that the work will be properly guarded and overseen, and will stimulate the contributions to it.

We wish to urge individuals and churches all over the country to communicate with G. G. Henry at once and let him know what the amount of your regular contribution to the work among the Indians will be.

Brother James White has proved himself, by hard tests, to be a faithful man of God and a true preacher of the Word. He is a native Indian, knows the Indian people just as Keeble knows the colored people, and he is the right man in the right place.

Brother White's work has formerly been directed by the Murray Hill Church of Christ at Flint, Michigan. The following statement of the Flint church relinquishes this responsibility to the Highland church.

"Churches of Christ Everywhere.

Greeting:

This is to inform you that sponsorship of the Indian Mission, Oneida, Wisconsin, James E. White, Missionary, has been transferred from Murray Hill Church of Christ, Flint, Michigan to Highland Avenue Church of Christ, Abilene, Texas. This change is made because it is felt that the latter is able to reach those who are able to contribute to the work more successfully than has been the case during the last year. The transfer is made in the spirit of Brotherly love and with the greatest interest in the saving of the souls of the Indians.

Henceforth all correspondence and contributions should be addressed to G. G. Henry, 1018 Sayles Blvd., Abilene, Texas.

Murray Hill Church wishes to thank all those who have so generously helped to keep Brother White at Oneida during the last three years. We have been very grateful for the opportunity to serve the Lord through serving our Indian brethren and have great hopes for the spread of the Gospel among them. We shall continue our interest in the work and our contributions to the extent of making all payments on the property at Oneida.

May God bless Brother White, the Indian brethren, those who will hear the Gospel in the future and the Highland Avenue Church which has undertaken this great work.

For the Cause of Christ, Ellis Nail, James O'Winn, Lester P. L'Hommedien, Fred Cutler, Forrest B. Stwalley, Alvin E. Hawley, and Harold E. Hawley."

In this connection the Bible Banner wishes to correct the erroneous report, that the Flint church had solicited or received contributions from the Don Carlos Janes Agency, in Louisville. The elders have made a correction of this report, stating that they have never had any connections whatsoever with the Janes agency either by solicitation or voluntary contributions of funds from that source. Since this report was made through the Bible Banner, we are glad to withdraw it upon the advice of the elders that it was a false impression.

The Bible Banner commends the Indian work to brethren everywhere, and urges all who are interested in helping it to communicate with Brother G. G. Henry, Abilene, Texas.

---

Special Renewal Offer

The Bible Banner offers the Neal-Wallace Debate ($2.00) for $1.00 or the Bible Banner and the N. W. Debate for $2.00. Renew Now.
WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT? THAT NATIONAL (?) UNITY (3) MEETING!

What the Bible Banner did to this Clinton Copyright Davidson's questionnaire, survey, and New Christian Leader Movement, it now proposes to do this so-called National Unity Meeting. The Murch-Witty movement claims the sympathy of a large element of brethren, and the Christian Standard boasts of the great success of these meetings in favor of the Christian Church and its innovations. We simply do not believe that any considerable percent of gospel preachers indorse the Murch-Witty National (?) Unity (?) Meeting, therefore, under the heading, "WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT?" we are making an entire section of the Bible Banner available for gospel preachers throughout the nation to say what they think of this National Unity farce.

Preachers of the gospel-you who stand for the truth without compromise, who love the unity of the church, its real unity such as it possessed when Jesus established, it and such as it possesses now in every Testament congregation-send the Bible Banner your card. Let the Christian Standard, the exulting digressive preachers who believe what they have read, and all the softies in the churches of Christ, know definitely that there are seven times seven thousand who have not bowed to their Baal. Watchman, what of the night? Address The Bible Banner, P. O. Box 1804, Oklahoma City.

I am against that boastful Murch-Witty Unity Movement, now and forever. Do not slaken. Truth will prevail.-E. R. Watson, Asher, Okla.

I believe in being as charitable as truth will allow, but it is hard to believe that H. F. Hall and Claude Witty, as well as several others whose names have been conspicuous in the meetings down at "Ono," are entirely "up" on the history of digression. Murch and his crowd never have intended to give up their innovations. Most, if not all the preachers in this part of the country feel that same way.-Luther Blackmon, Houston, Texas.

The Witty-Murch unity movement I contempt! I have approached Baptist, Adventists, Methodists, and members of Christian Church here, all on the same basis, to-wit: back to God's word and do away with man's schemes. I will haul down the flag of Christ as quickly for one party as for another. Christianity has about as much in common with any church as with the Christian Church.-Reginald Rogers, Tallahassee, Fla.

May I too speak fully regarding, "The National Unity Meeting." So far, it seems a victory to the Digressives, a weak cause for "The Church." A compromising of the truth, a closing of discussion and a display of make believe. Let it be shown up also.-H. M. Phillips, Murfreesboro, Tenn.

Our Lord said, "By their fruits ye shall know them." We may readily evaluate the results of unity endeavors under two questions: (1) How many have been brought out of error through the "Unity Meetings?" (2) How many have been turned from digression, during the same period, by plain gospel preaching in the good old fashioned way?-J. Emmett Wainwright, Hollywood, California.

Count me as one who favors unity, but also count me as one who believes the so-called "Unity Meetings" are unscriptural, therefore I do not attend.-C. D. Plum, Wheeling, W. Va.

I have never taken any stock in those so-called "Unity Meetings." I think the term is a misnomer; "Compromise Meetings" would come nearer expressing their purpose. "But if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another."-Fred E. Denis, Wellsburg, W. Va.

I do not know of anyone in Muskogee who believes there can be any good come from the "Unity Meetings," if they can be called such. Unity can come but one way and that by the Christian Church coming back to the Bible. This can be accomplished without wasting time in these meetings. Cleon Lyles, Muskogee, Okla.

Would Murch affirm that missionary societies and instrumental music are scriptural? Would Witty deny? Let them give us the real and only basis of unity and we will listen. Otherwise, I am not interested.-R. L. Yancey, Fort Worth, Texas.

As to that Murch-Witty affair, I had given it but little serious consideration inasmuch as I looked upon it as the work of men that cared but little for the Truth. When any one begins to lobby with that Digressive crowd I at once decide that he is not loyal to the Truth. You can do nothing with them as a class. It has been tried since 1849. They can not be reformed. The only thing that can be done is to teach as many among them as possible. It is a joy to me to see that you are weakening on no point of the truth with the many that you are battling. Never think of a compromise on any thing.-G. A. Dunn, Dallas, Texas.

I am against all this Unity meeting business, Christians will not engage in such. I want to help keep the Bible Banner unfurled in the breeze.-W. G. Bass, Orange, Texas.

Anyone who knows anything about the Bible will have nothing to do with such a movement, unless it be with a view to promote himself. Friends and "sponsor of this movement should be marked" deep with the 'Sword of the Spirit."-Horace A. Holt, Andalusia, Ala.

I have not written you relative to my position on the "Unity Meetings," but I have no doubt that you know where I stand. To me they are about the biggest joke of the century. Why not extend such "love feasts" to the Methodists, Pentecostals, and all others and call them "unity meetings?" I was a little surprised at the stand T. C. Wilcox has taken about them, as revealed in his appearance on their program and in the exchange of letters published recently in the Banner. This surprise came because I knew that he obtained unity with Floyd A. Decker through a debate on the question, and having won Decker from the Digestives through a debate, it seems strange that he would now occupy the position that he does. I appreciate the fine work you continue to do in exposing the efforts of Premillennialists and their sympath-
izers. And your exposition of the beginning crusade from the Del Rio station was neither “untimely nor ill-chosen.”-W. Curtis Porter, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

* * *

For two men who cannot agree between themselves to undertake to lead two groups to agreement is a rather silly thing to try. Before joining Murch in a “unity movement” Witty should get Murch to give up instrumental music in worship, if he expects to accomplish anything at all. Has Brother Witty ever told the preachers of the Christian Church that their practice is sinful and there can be no fellowship till they abandon their instrumental music in worship? Until he does, he can always get them to join him in a conference. They are the “conferring-est” people I know of. They are either in a conference or on the way to one nearly all the time. If anything good has ever resulted from these conferences, I do not know what it is. Some say it has helped to bridge the gap between the two groups; but I deny a bridge across the gap is a good work. We need no bridges between truth and error. The gap must be removed, not bridged. If the Christian Church will abandon its unscriptural practices, the gap will vanish.-Cecil B. Douthitt.-Louisville, Ky. * * *

I think it wise for the brethren to speak out against the so-called “Unity Meetings.” Such meetings have not Bible authority. They are possible because a “common ground” in error has been found on some other question. In this case, most, if not all of them, hold in common the false doctrine of the kingdom. I find no sympathy among our faithful brethren toward the Unity Meetings.-M. C. Cuthbertson, Clovis, New Mexico.

The Murch-Witty Unity Meetings have already proved one thing, and that is that they are not going to result in unity. This seems to me to be an attempt on the part of Murch to gain some of the neutrals among us for the Christian Church without giving up any of the unscriptural practices in the caid church. Brother F. B. Syrgley advanced on unity always appealed to me, that was for each individual to get united to Christ and there would be unity with each other, every Christian would be united with every other Christian because each was united to Christ.-Luther G. Roberts, Amarillo, Texas.

* * *

What the Christian Church means, and what our brethren (who patronize such gatherings) mean is, that we may all be “won.” (Won to the world and sectarianism, as the Christian Church is.) I, for one, do not intend to have or approve by my presence, this kind of “won-ness.”-W. L. Wharton, Jr., Plainview, Texas.

* * *

Compromise is not God’s plan of bringing about religious unity. The Christian Church has sinned exceedingly. Let those of its members who realize this step out boldly to the right and admit that they have sinned. The only way this will be accomplished is by the faithful preachers of the church loudly proclaiming the fact that the very existence and position occupied by the Christian Church is wrong. The “Unity Meetings” are “a lot of bunk.”-James M. Tolle, Winter Haven, Fla.

* * *

Deliberative gatherings and institutional. No congregation has any righteous jurisdiction beyond its membership. “Unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace” is an individual matter with each Christian in relationship to his or her local congregation.-James L. Neal, Springdale, Arkansas.

* * *

The digressives well know what the division is and who caused it. What the Bible Banner has done to premillennialism, “can do to the so-called ‘Unity’ meetings.” Now is the time for the Bible Banner to nip this thing in the bud.-W. C. Graves, Birmingham, Ala.

* * *

What I think of the National Unity Meeting, the Murch-Witty Movement is this. Its a conglomeration of the speculations on the word of God. By such men as Charles T. Russell, Rutherford, and Boll, dying hard, with Murch-Witty and all of the sympathy that can be accorded them by the softies.-B. P. Upton, Hilham, Tennessee.

* * *

I indorse the Bible Banner from A to Z. The enemies have been successfully met and exposed and are on the retreat. This has been accomplished very largely by your personal work and through the “Bible Banner.”-J. Frank Chambers, San Diego, Calif.

* * *

Every issue is enjoyed. Bro. Wallace, don’t let them pass! Success to the Banner.-Allen Killom, St. Catherines, Ontario.

* * *

Thanks very much for room in your paper to express our disapproval of these, hokus-pokus parties, so called “National Unity Meetings.” I believe they commit a sin against both God and men. When the first these meetings began, there was much talk.-Harry E. Johnson, Lewiston, Idaho.

* * *

I do not indorse the unity meetings of brethren (?) Murch and Witty, the reformation of Davidson, the premillennialists, nor the attitude of softness toward these errors held by some of the preachers of the church. You are making a great fight for the church and the truth. Do not let them pass.—R. L. Roberts, Cleburne, Texas.

* * *

I am for you 100% and if it were not for some one to expose the error among our preachers where would we end? We do not want to merge the church with the Christian Church. I, for one, don’t think we should receive one of them for membership until he has repented of his wrongs and confessed before the congregation as any other erring member.-J. J. Whitlock, O‘Frt Worth, Texas.

* * *

We appreciate the work you are trying to do in the Bible Banner. One of the greatest compromises of this century is “Witty-Murch’s” combination. If the church of Christ and the digressives can work together, then I have been wrong all these years. Until the Lord provides us with a new Bible, I am holding to the old course. I did not give up the church of my mother, and all my friends and associates of the Christian church, when I was boy, for nothing . . . Two or three real sound sermons, would about put an end to this unholy alliance, between the church’s most bitter enemy, and some “Sampson’s” who delight to flirt with Delilah.-C. G. McPhee, Beamsville, Ont., Canada.

* * *

Central Kentucky has been the scene of many religious battles. It was in this section that “Raccoon” John Smith, Barton W. Stone and others planted so many churches during the Restoration Movement. They exposed innovations and debated the truth at every opportunity. The church has never grown more rapidly except during the Apostolic days. In 1832 there was a great unity meeting in Lexington, Ky. “Raccoon” John Smith delivered a forceful sermon. He showed that there could be unity by everyone following the last Will and Testament of Jesus Christ. Hence, the Stone and Campbell movement united on the Bible, “Speaking where the Bible speaks and being silent where the Bible is silent.” There was perfect unity in the Body of Christ until the Missionary Society was introduced in 1849. It was followed later by Instrumental Music and many other innovations. Digression swept the country but its deadly effect was especially felt in the “Blue Grass” of Ky. Just when the church
was recovering from this blow, old Satan again reached down into his bag of tricks and pulled out another false doctrine; namely, the R. H. Boll, Premillennial Movement. Its *poisonous fangs spread* from Louisville into all parts of Central Kentucky. The leaders have used deception and every other instrument of Satan in order to get control of churches. Their latest effort has been the so called “Unity Meeting” in Lexington last May. It was supposed to have been between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church but was properly between the Premillennialists and Digressives. A spirit of softness and compromise characterized most of the meeting. I would, be in favor of a meeting like the one in 1832 but it has already been proven that Murch and Witty do not want very many speakers like “Raccoon” John Smith and H. Leo Boles.-A. J. Kerr, Lancaster, Kentucky.

If “The National Unity Meetings” are so wonderful as they are stid to be, why are the results so disappointing? These meetings are places to hear the “good words and fair speeches” of those “which cause divisions contrary to the doctrine.” Keep the Banner waving! John Williams, Beamsville, Ont., Canada.

* * *

What has the Church of Christ to give up in the way of teaching and practice I norder to unite the two groups? Is there a point of truth that may be compromised and yet meet divine approval? Is it divine approval that is wanted, or is it approval of men who hold the truth in error? Will Murch admit the Christian Church is and has been in error on that point? Will Witty admit the Church of Christ is and has been in error on that point? Whose is it to make the point of compromise? What will it be?—LeRoy W. Thompson, Allen, Okla.

* * *

National unity farce? Yes, I guess that is a good name for it. The Christian church is but a denomination among denominations and I had just as soon unite with one as the other. I don’t have time for man made unity meetings with a human program made up of compromise, weakness, and sin. I am working full time in God’s unity program, preaching the gospel and persuading men to obey it so that we will be ‘one in Christ.’—John H. Gerrard, Chattanooga, Tenn.

* * *

When literature was sent to me about the “National Unity Meeting.” by Murch-Witty, I showed it to the leaders of the church where I was preaching and said, “looks like the spirit of inferiority doth already begin to work.” With all the information that you and others have published about these compromisers it appears to me that this tribe will be few indeed, so far as brethren from the church of Christ are concerned.—Lloyd Smith, Grants Pass, Oregon.

* * *

“The Bible Banner,” without doubt, is fighting the good fight of faith. As Nathan of old it is not afraid, nor ashamed to say “Thou art the man.” One of faith and loyalty can and does, as I see the matter, appreciate the *faithfulness* of “The Bible Banner.” May it live long on the earth, I am praying.—A. F. Thurman, Eastland, Texas.

* * *

As someone has said, these Murch-Witty unity conferences are the silliest things imaginable. Can Murch and his associates speak for all congregations of the Christian church? Can Witty and those associated with him speak for the church? Can any one of these men answer for the congregation of which he is a member? If I am wrong, although the whole world should cast over me the mantle of approval, unity with God, which is the necessary thing, would be lacking. The problem of unity is one that has to be settled by individuals, as each brings himself into harmony with the law of God.—Lyle Bonner, Keller ville, Texas.

* * *

The most treacherous foes of the Church of Christ are the digressive of various brands, including the premillennialists and those who are seeking to effect a unity with digressives on digressive grounds. I know little about the “National Unity Meetings.” except what I have read in the Banner. But I can see the marks of the cloven hoof in what is pictured there, and it corresponds with experiences that I and all other faithful preachers have had with digressives.—L. J. Keffer, Hamilton, Ont., Canada.

* * *

You are doing the finest work yet in the fight you are waging. But for you and those who have worked with you, the church would not have been saved from the Boll movement, and the sham Unity effort. You cannot fight these things too hard and I assure you that I am with you every mile of the way.—J. C. Dawson, Conway, Ark.

* * *

Anent that National Unity Meeting will state that I am unequivocally opposed to all Wittyism, Bollism, Lovelism, Leaderism, Davidsonism and through the medium and through the columns of my paper intend to attempt to overcome such digressive elements that have leeched themselves onto the churches of these states. Why these men among us, knowing the truth as they do, will court the attentions and favors of the avowed enemies of the cross is more than I can understand. More power to Bible Banner. May it endure. Always count me as a co-laborer in the fight you’re waging against the forces evil.—W. Wallace Layton, Silver City, N. Mex.

Unity Meeting or Barking In the Air? I have known of dogs barking into the air. You could tell by their bark what they had treed. Now, in connection with this “unity” business, the “bark” does not sound right. I suggest the following to determine what is up the tree: 1. Unity of God’s people depends on faith in God. 2. The innovations, practiced by the digressives, are not of faith. 3. To have unity the digressives must by faith overthrow their innovations. Is it possible to get these propositions discussed in the next Unity Meeting? If so that will be the last one. There is too much stage play for any good to come from such meetings anyway. Let them end with an understanding—A. H. Maner, Mobile, Alabama.

* * *

**POSTSCRIPTS**

I appreciate you and the work you are doing and hope you can be permitted to carry on and keep your health.—Mrs. J. F. McPhail, Lubbock, Texas.

* * *

I am enjoying the Banner more and more. Think you are doing a grand job. The good you are doing is generally acknowledged. With kindest personal regards for you and yours. N. Z. Crass, Dallas, Texas.

* * *

Now, I wish to say amen to each and every article in the November issue of the Banner. I would place emphasis upon that of Bro. Hadwin, Bro. Foy W. and Bro. Cled W. because of my personal acquaintance with them and can see their special emphasis as they speak.—Jonathan Moore, Paden City, W. Va.

* * *

I really appreciate the work you are doing and always look forward to the coming of The Banner each month. We had the pleasure of having Bro. Cled in our home during two meetings here in Adalusia and therefore we read his articles almost as we would personal message.—J. Uptagraff, Andalusia, Alabama.

* * *

May I praise you for the excellent work you are doing in publishing a paper which it for the truth, nothing but
the truth and all the truth. A church will never grow as it should until its members become a peculiar people, a people that are fearless in proclaiming error, division, or anything sympathetic to a divided order of things. I think much more of the man and his religious demeanor if he unhesitatingly condemns premillennialism whenever the opportunity presents itself. I am afraid of the man who says: "Oh well, I am opposed to it, but I don't see anything to be gained by knocking it." So keep up the good work.—O. J. Henley, Tuscaloosa, Ala.* * *

I enjoy your paper more than any that is published and I do not intend to go delinquent so don't miss me. I know you are waging a valiant fight, one that has been needed a long time. I traveled for about five years among the churches over several states, and wife and I often wondered if some one would come along and have the nerve to tell the church about conditions. You and Cled are certainly doing a good job.—L. F. Martin, San Diego, Calif. * * *

I know you are doing a great work and I pray God to give you length of time to do the work you are doing. I feel like we have drifted too far, and fear for the reaction.—Jno. A. Thompson, Colorado City, Texas.* * *

Enclosing the price of my renewal for the Bible Banner. There is certainly a place for it in my reading and in the church today. Such corrections as you are making are timely. Keep it up.—J. D. Harvey, Paducah, Ky.* * *

That was a mighty good expose you gave of the Gospel Broadcast shooting forth from Del Rie, Texas. I have thought for some time that somebody ought to get hold of that thing and put it out or straighten it out. I have two brothers living in Del-Rie, one a member of the church, that I baptized about four years ago. The other an elder in the Presbyterian church. I have been trying to teach them both the difference in New Testament Christianity and sectarianism. But all of this begging over the radio to support the gospel is sectarianism, too. I am just wondering what they think about such. Don't let up on this until you have stopped it.—W. C. Graves, Birmingham, Alabama.* * *

I appreciate your editorial on Del Rio Broadcast.—Dr. O. E. Puckett, Carlsbad, New Mexico.* * *

You are certainly doing some fine work in the Banner, I hope it will continue its fine work, for many years to come. Let the good work continue. Best regards.—Archie Neal, Nashville, Tenn.* * *

Eible Banner is doing a work the other papers refuse to do. May God bless your continued efforts.—Stoy Patc, Cressville, Tennessee.* * *

I commend your timely article, in the last issue, on "radio begging." Perhaps it will serve to convince that the church is not a religious leach. I have never found you, or the Banner, on what I regard as the wrong side of any question. There are hundreds of us who feel grateful for your defense, that have not so expressed. You are doing a good work. So, don't let old Sanballat get you down off of the wall.—Sterl A. Watson.* * *

You have a lot of staunch friends here in Springfield. As far as I have been able to determine they are behind you to a man. You are undoubtedly staging the greatest fight for truth and right that has been fought since the days of David Lipscomb. I thank God for you.—Maurice A. Meredith, Springfield, Missouri.* * *

Continue to publish the Truth. Let the conditions of any situation be made known, keeping in mind the salvation of souls. Error must be exposed. The church of Jesus Christ must be made to stand out in bold relief, if some of our near great appear slightly faded.—W. H. Nelson, Daytona Beach, Fla.* * *

The Banner is a welcome "bracer"—the proper amount of tart when one sick of the popular "honey" most papers are serving the brotherhood now.—Robert F. Turner, Indianapolis, Ind. The more I read your magazine the more I become impressed with it.—Charles L. Dean, Indianapolis, Ind. I would not do without the Banner at all. The editorial is worth the price of the Banner alone.—W. P. Scroggin, Amarillo, Texas.* * *

The Banner is a wonderful help to me.—J. C. Ollis, Indianapolis, Ind.* * *

In defending the gospel the Bible Banner is a wonderful help to me.—G. C. Ollis, Indianapolis, Ind.* * *

I think that the Bible Banner is serving in a field that is needed, and one that has been neglected. Every issue is excellent. Anyone who can see at all, knows that the conditions presented in the Bible Banner are true.—J. Louis Langston, Italy, Texas.* * *

We still love you and pray that you are spared many years yet to fight the good fight of faith.—Dr. J. W. Pruett, St. Louis, Mo.* * *

Your paper is a welcome visitor at our home. From its pages we learn the facts about many things the other papers will not, or at least, have not published. The cause of truth has been strengthened. The gospel defended by your efforts. Some brethren like soft preaching, and easy writing so well, they think the Bible Banner is too harsh and too hard, but I am glad we have men who will speak boldly even as they ought to speak. Long live the Bible Banner.—John Williams, Beamsville, Ont., Canada.* * *

I enjoy reading it very much. Be sure you are right and go ahead. I am with you. May God bless you and my prayer.—D. C. Riley, Lubbock, Texas.* * *

Please accept my humble congratulations for the courageous and able manner in which the Bible Banner delivers its polemic for the truth. Apologies may have their place, but the need and place and time for polemics is as wamten and acute as at any time since 30 A. D. More power to you. If I can serve you command me.—E. C. Koltenbah, Moundsville, West Va.* * *

Quite by accident I saw a copy of the "Bible Banner" and I want to subscribe for it.—W. J. Butler, Houston, Texas.* * *

I am enjoying every issue and am for the policy "Teeth and Toe nail."—Max R. Crumley, Braman, Okla.* * *

T am still a constant reader (not a subscriber) and I do laud it for its real value—I am acquainted with Cled and think you two make the Banner spicy a-plenty. Thanks.—Flo and Rose Compton, Memphis, Tenn.
It makes me so happy to learn that it is growing in circulation. May it continue. I never want to miss a single copy of your good paper, for it is getting better all the time.—Mary E. Hedden, Louisville, Ky.

The paper seems to get better with every issue. I imagine people do fan when they read it.—Glendon W. Walker, Van Alstyne, Texas.

I don’t want to miss any number of the magazine.—J. W. Girdley, Burns City, Ind.

I still enjoy the Banner and hope the good work continues. It is having a telling effect. May the Lord bless you in good health and long life as well as material blessings sufficient for your needs.—E. C. Detherage, Lexington, Ky.

I’m always looking forward to receiving paper as one certainly get information from it that you could not get any other way. Hope you will continue with the good work.—Arthur Grainger, Toronto, Ont., Canada.

There is not a paper in the brotherhood that equals yours in my opinion.—Roy E. Stephens, Roaring Springs, Texas.

I certainly would not have the Bible Banner stop, as I enjoy reading it very much and certainly admire and endorse the courageous stand for the truth that you are taking on the pages of this fine paper. May you continue to enjoy success and good health and may your work continue to prosper.—Sam L. Youree, Nashville, Tenn.

Recently while preaching in a meeting in an Alabama town some back copies of the Bible Banner came into my possession. I read them with interest. I am convinced that I have been so busy fighting the denominations that I have been silent about some things in our own midst that should be fought. My Prayer to God is that he will bless you as you continue the fight to keep the church pure.

It is the duty of every Christian to fight any error that would cause people to stray from the New Testament.—Farris J. Smith, Florence, Ala.

There is no paper that will do more good than the Banner is doing, and will do in the future.—George M. Prosser, Nashville, Tenn.

I do not want to miss a copy. For I know that such men as Cled E. Wallace, John T. Lewis, Austin Taylor and the Editor will keep up the fight.—John B. Odom, Parrish, Ala.

I appreciate the Bible Banner and commend it for its bold stand against all innovations. May it live long to fight error and encourage loyalty to the truth as it is in Christ Jesus.—O. B. Anthony, Bessemer, Ala.

The Banner supplies a real need, and you are doing a great work. I rejoice with you in the splendid growth of your subscription list.—D. H. Hadwin, Belpre, Ohio.

The brotherhood ought to appreciate the fight you are making against false teachers.—J. L. Weirick, Springfield, Mo.

We appreciate the work this paper is doing. We would have been practically helpless without its aid in countering these subversive teachings.—P. B. Purcell, Coleman, Texas.

Just received Banners of late editions, thanks! Was wondering if your “socks had been sued off you.” We are enjoying all of the paper, but especially Bro. Cled’s “Shots,” they never miss the spot. Bro. Oscar Smith’s article deserves much more than honorable mention. We are wishing continued progress for the Bible Banner.—Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Thompson, Houston, Texas.

The Memories Of An Old Friend

I recall now an incident which you will remember. When you were in my home in San Angelo several years ago, toward the close of your meeting, I handed to you a picture of a group of preachers and a few of their wives. That picture was made on an occasion of a number of the outstanding men in the church of Christ in Texas at that time. Your father and mother are in that picture, and I had no other use for it, except that I had become acquainted with your father and mother, and while I had met some of the other preachers in that group, your father and mother were the only ones I really had an acquaintance with that would justify a school boy buying a group of people in whom he had no earthly interest, except a strange something which he did not want memory to let die. Now: That all happened before your recollection days, at least, so early in the years of your youth, that they might be called the days of unlettered faith and ambition.

The years have been multiplied into three decades. I have seen you rise from those days of unrecognized aptitude and ability, to the place you now have and occupy. Through the intervening years, I have heard the shouts of unrest and discontent. I have seen “harpers hanging on the willows,” I have heard the “weeping over the desolations of Zion.” I have heard the shout of the victor, I have listened to the wail of the vanquished. I have seen the victor of today become the vanquished of tomorrow. Yet there are still prophets which climb the heights and announce to the world “Watchman what of the night?” ...

I rode several leagues of miles to hear you debate with the celebrated (?) J. Frank Norris. Your job was as complete as the victory won by Jacob, after wrestling with an angel all night. So, when it comes to memories I’ve got ‘em; when it comes to happy recollections, I’ve got ‘em; strung like pearls, and hung up like festoons. I live on ‘em. I even feed ‘em to my children if they are grown. I’m like Cled was by you: “I nussed ‘em when they wuz babies;” that’s what I had then; that’s what I’ve got now. So long boy, and may every success be yours. I am sir, as I have been for so many years.—Warren E. Starnes, Ardmore, Oklahoma.

TELEGRAM OF CONGRATULATIONS TO JOHN T. LEWIS

Congratulations on this thirty-third anniversary of the beginning of your Birmingham work. Preachers of Birmingham’s churches of Christ join in sincere and unreserved appreciation of your labors. We consider an honor and pleasure to share in the unexcelled fellowship close unity of stand on issues and rapid progress of the church here under the leadership and on the solid foundation that you have laid. Our appreciation likewise for your faithful and sacrificing companion, Sister Lewis, we wish for you both many years of usefulness and happiness here and for many years of the pleasure of your association. We are confident that we speak the sentiment of all the congregations of the Birmingham District.—G. E. Clayton; John D. Cox; J. R. Essell; W. C. Graves; Elliott Hill; Floyd Horton; Howard Horton; E. S. McKenzie; Jack McLane; Jack Meyer; J. G. Pruett; H. H. Snow, Birmingham, Ala.
Kentucky Currents

E. G. Creacy

Classifies Himself

In the recent past, S. H. Hall, of Nashville, Tennessee, came to Horse Cave to aid and defend Kenneth Spaulding, and conducted a meeting. Denominational preachers were called on to lead prayers and otherwise aid in this meeting. Brother Hall was criticized for being a party to such a denominational set-up, and he had the audacity to deny through the columns of the Gospel Advocate that sectarian preachers were called on to lead their prayers, "after the first service," whereas they were called on throughout the entire meeting. In his Gospel Advocate tirade, he defended Spaulding, who has always wavered and is now a digressive. In his speech at the "National Unity (?) Convention" in Lexington, recently, Brother Hall declared that he would never engage in another debate. He has raised the white flag and signed an armistice with the forces of error. He has classified himself on the side with the enemies of the Church. During a recent meeting in Nashville, this writer, in charge of the church where D. H. Friend is Minister, announced this Sunday afternoon service to his Bible class, and a Brother asked what the Boll-Premillennial theory is, saying that he had asked Brother Hall the question, and that Hall replied by saying that he did not know and had never seen any body who believes it! A young preacher in the class stated that when a preacher in the church of Christ makes a statement like that, it shows that he is friendly to the theory and in love with the Boll party. The young preacher had correctly diagnosed Bro. Hall's case.

A Major Issue

There is a distinct party movement with headquarters at Louisville, Kentucky. It is the Boll party, and the theories of Premillennialism are featured. Lipscomb College recently published and circulated some pamphlets on the Premillennial question by the President and some members of the faculty, but none of them take a stand or show conviction the question of following the Boll party. Innocent brethren are deceived by these pamphlets, thinking that the school is sound and safe on the Boll question. G. C. Brewer in his speech on Premillennialism, published by Lipscomb College apologizes for Boll and belittles the fight that is being made by good brethren against the R. H. Boll movement. The fact that the Presidents and faculty members of some of the schools were conspicuous in the pages of the (defunct) Christian (?) Leader was too suspicious to be ignored.

Birds of a Feather

The Louisville daily carries an announcement that R. R. Brooks of Chattanooga, Tennessee, is engaged in a "revival" at Horse Cave last November, in which Baptist, Methodist and Presbyterian preachers were used in a very noted way. Kenneth Spaulding, the preacher "in charge" of the Horse Cave group and who was the leader in stealing the church house that was built years ago by loyal Christians, whose bodies now slumber amid the dust of the dead, published that in the Gospel Advocate that the Brooks' Meeting was the best in the history of the Horse Cave Church. The truth is, Brooks, Spaulding and Friend are like peas in the same pod. "Birds of a feather flock together." Why does R. R. Brooks shy at the Hoover-Boll group in Chattanooga, and come to Louisville and swallow the hook, bait, cork and line? Is he dealing fair with his Chattanooga brethren?

A Question

G. C. Brewer has again assisted H. L. Olmstead at Gallatin, Tennessee, in a meeting. Will H. L. Olmstead and the Word and Work praise Brewer and his high class preaching again? We will give our readers the benefit of Word and Work's report. Why does the Gospel Advocate fail to report Brewer's "love feasts" with Olmstead and other Bollites, since Brewer is a "staff writer"? What I can't quite understand is this: If G. C. Brewer is safe and sound on the Boll question, why is he so gracefully received by the Bollites?
Brother S. S. Lappin of Bedford, Indiana is the weekly expositor of the Bible school lesson in the Christian Standard. He says many excellent and practical things in the regular course of this work. However, candor compels me to say that, according to my judgment, he displays a large degree of prejudice and lack of discrimination when he classifies objectors to instrumental music in worship with Jewish quibblers who criticized Jesus for healing a lame man on the sabbath day. After properly and effectively excoriating these tradition-bound Jewish leaders he says this end some more on the subject of "Quibblers and Quibbling."

Shall we have one cup or more than one; and if more than one how many, at the communion service? Mere quibbling. Pharisaism bald and unashamed.

Shall we have the exact order of service named in Acts 2:42, "apostles' doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread and prayer" and no other? Quibble, quibble, quibble.

Must we always "sing a hymn and go out"? Is it a sin to eat in the church, or to serve food for money in the church? May we use a baptistery or use only running water? Must all our giving be secret giving? May a church make use of instrumental music in worship? Must there be a "thus saith the Lord" for every detail of our church life? Quibble, quibble, quibble. God forgive us-Jesus taught better.

It appears that some "quibble, quibble, quibble" while some others, like Brother Lappin, take advantage of their quibbling to dodge, dodge, dodge. I think both the quibblers and the dodgers ought to quit it and ask the Lord to forgive them. A consecrated quibbler could sing less in need of grace than an artful dodger. The brother is not making either an intelligent or scriptural effort to justify the use of instrumental music in worship. He is merely stirring up prejudice against and pouring out scorn upon those of us who decline his instruments and demand authority for the use of them in the worship of God. His dodge behind quibblers to cover the fact that an unautho-

ized innovation has been introduced into the worship of God may not prove to be as concealing as he supposes. It is nothing new for those who insist on going beyond the word of God in religious practice to assume a superior attitude toward those who stand for "what is written" and accuse them of being quibblers. We are "quibblers" for form if we insist on immersion as the one and only baptism, or object to infant baptism. It is not even a decent way to answer the sort of objections we are able to offer against the digressive use of instrumental music.

He has somewhat to say about "a set principle of the Restoration Movement." I prefer to take my stand on "a set principle" of the New Testament, but since he seems satisfied to squat at "the Restoration Movement," I could mention a rather long list of illustrious names connected with it, who stood higher in it than Brother Lappin now does, who spoke out boldly against instrumental music in worship. It would be rather difficult to make anybody believe, who knows anything or does any thinking, that J. W. McGarvey, Tolbert Fanning, Moses E. Lard, or David Lipscomb were mere quibblers to be compared to a man who opposes the use of a baptistery. If Brother Lappin doesn't know better, he should pause for his information to catch up with his pen.

Suppose we can "have one cup or more than one at the communion service" does that argue that a worshipper who objects to water or milk in either or any of them is a mere quibbler? Because baptism, an act specifically commanded, may be performed in a baptistery, a river or a pond, in still water or running water, it does not at all follow that the disciples may add instrumental music, God has not commanded or in any way authorized, to the singing of spiritual songs which is commanded. The brother does not justify the innovation by producing any scriptural authority, he seeks to justify it by a course of reasoning which breaks down the very principle that requires loyalty to the revealed will of God in worship. We cannot allow the legitimacy of any such procedure. The Catholic or the Episcopalian can justify his incense and candles by the same tactics. He and they are wrong in adding to the word of God. There is nothing in the New Testament that even hints that "all our giving be secret giving." There are clear examples that some gifts were otherwise. Let him show as clear authority for his instrumental music as we can show for singing spiritual songs. It is a strange conclusion that because we do not have and do not need "a thus saith the Lord" for every incidental "detail of our church life" that therefore the servants of God can add anything they like to the worship of God without any revealed authority. This effort of Brother Lappin should result in some more fence-sitters jumping off on the right side of this question. "Jesus taught better" than to encourage any disciple of his in dodging an issue, or begging a question, as has been done in this case. Whether or not "the exact order of service named in Acts 2:42" is or is not followed it does not follow that disciples are authorized to practice an act of worship that is not named at all. If the promoters of "The Restoration Movement" the brother glorifies, had adopted his line of reasoning, the movement would have been still-born. He caps the climax as a beggar of the question:

"For every essential, every fundamental, a thus saith the Lord; these things are binding. But for every expedient—the stoves that warm us when it is cold in the house, the songbooks we use, the means to gather monies, the way the church book is kept—for all this, full freedom and no disturbance by any. This is a set principle of the Restoration Movement. If it is a "set principle of the Restoration Movement" that a man may sit by a stove to make himself comfortable, or use a songbook, in doing something God has not commanded, it is one "principle of the Restoration Movement," I refuse to be bound by. It ought to be repudiated along with all other false principles in religion. Stoves and song-books are true expedients and are used by both those who sing and those who play. They are used by those who do what God commands and by those who do something else. We object to something else, with or without stoves and song-books.

By the way, he, unintentionally no doubt, takes a direct slap at his fellow-worker on the Standard, Brother James DeForest Murch. Brother Murch is, according to Brother Lappin, bidding for unity with a set of quibblers and trouble-makers.

It may be that Brother Murch is convinced that Brethren Witty, Jorgenson, Janes and Hall can be depended on not to quibble too much or create much confusion over an "opinion" that instrumental music in worship violates a "set principle of the Restoration Movement." The further this thing goes the more interesting it becomes. Some of us shall keep our eyes open and our fingers poised to peck out further observations as developments warrant them. In the meantime we shall continue to sing as the apostle commands, while they play on their instruments because normal people need heat in cold weather. They can go to funny places for an excuse for disobeying God,