"Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of truth."—(Psalm 60:4.)

"Lift ye up a banner upon the high mountain, exalt the voice unto them."—(Isa. 13:2.)
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THE MOPPING UP CAMPAIGN

CLED E. WALLACE

The story goes that a little boy visited his grandpa out on the farm. As little boys are wont to do, he was running about curiously prying into this and that, all of which was new and interesting to him. He decided that a flock of geese in the barn-yard must be hungry and threw them out some hay. He ran in and told his grandpa that he had been feeding his geese. "Oh, you did? What did you feed them?" "I fed 'em a pile of hay" said the little boy proudly. "Well, bless my soul, did they eat it?" "Not yet" exclaimed the little lad. "but they are all standing around talking about it."

Brother Witty and Brother Murch have been throwing out whole piles of hay on the unity question. With all due apologies to the geese, whole flocks of "them," liberals, and conservatives, have stood around talking about it, but at last report the hay was unconsumed. Brother Witty and Brother Murch, who appear to be head ganders in this business, have done little more to the hay than push it around with their bills. They ought to eat some of it and show the rest of the geese how good it is. They need the guidance of an example. Let the head ganders begin by exchanging pulpits, enjoy a practical, rather than a talkative, fellowship, either "with or without" as you might say. Then if the hay doesn't scratch as it goes downward, who knows but that hay may become a staple diet on our goosey menu? It is more than a current rumor that Brother Witty has some designs on our editor's goose. I am wondering what he would do with it if he had it. He has nothing to feed it on. It won't eat hay. . . .

It is reported on good authority that a very interesting thing happened at a recent meeting in San Antonio, interesting to me, at least. Brother E. R. Harper of Little Rock in a discussion of current problems launched an attack on premillennialism, compromise and the like, which would be calculated to make even the editor of the Bible Banner envious, had he any leanings toward that vice. He is said to have excoriated Clinton Davidson and his kind by name and in a manner calculated to give a timid soul a permanent wave. Now, sit up and open your eyes. Here is the interesting thing. Brother Jesse P. Sewell was sitting in the audience. He arose out of his seat and strode toward Brother Harper. Harper took one look at the redoubtable Jesse and cocked his gun for self-defense. Incidentally, Harper is about twice as big as Sewell, but their mouths are about the same size. It looked as though the crowd were going to get its money's worth. Sewell took the show and furnished the surprise. He endorsed Harper's speech without over-looking even a comma or a gesture. He even put a cracker on it by declaring that Clinton Davidson had "lied" to him, deceived him, imposed upon him, and we may conclude added him to his long string of suckers. Sewell vowed with that long finger of his giving characteristic emphasis, that henceforth Davidson was out of his religious life, and he will not even accept a further penny from him in the promotion of his literary projects. My impression is that he got a divorce on the ground of fraud aggravated by mental cruelty. I'm not after Brother Sewell's goose, but I think I am entitled to a feather for a souvenir. While he was on his honey-moon with Davidson, and under the spell of his tongue, which he now says was false and deceiving, he freely and publicly accused us of lying, at least he seemed to enjoy calling the editor of the Bible Banner a liar, and we are the same as one. I'm backing him up to the crossing of the last "I" and the dotting of the last "L." If he told the truth in San Antonio, and for once I am not inclined to doubt it, then he owes us an apology.

I heartily commend to any and all an article by Brother H. Leo Boles on "A Forgotten Unity Proposal" appearing in the Gospel Advocate of January 30th. You will find it both timely and spicy. Often the spice lends emphasis to the timeliness and it does in this case. This is his closing sentence: "It is as clear as sunshine now that brethren who encourage these 'unity meetings' are encouraging the uniting with the Christian Church as it stubbornly and persistently holds to its innovations." What he does to De- Forest Murch reminds me of what Gideon did when he taught the men of Succoth with the thorns of the wilderness. Brother Witty may be picking some of the thorns but of an impressive part of his own anatomy as Brother Boles calls Brother Murch a "co-worker with Claud F. Witty." He got the job done and called some names in the process. While I'm pinning this nose-gay on Brother Boles, a report reaches me that somebody asked him publicly at the Freed-Hardeman lectureship, what he thought of the Bible Banner and its work. His reply exploded right in the face of a full auditorium to the effect that he thought the Bible Banner had done about the finest piece of work in our generation and that he was for us, about ninety-nine and ninety-four hundredths per cent, according to my impression. Thanks, Brother Boles, that sort of support warms the cockles of our heart. We are so pleased, we think you're tops. Now, if Brother Witty decides he wants your goose, too, and you think you need any help, call on us and we'll uncock a load of birdshot at the old fox.
“SOUND AND UNSOUND MEN IN THE PRESENT CRISIS”

On pages six and seven of this issue will be found an article by Doctor G. C. Brewer, which appeared in the Firm Foundation of recent date, under the above caption, and a reply to it by Cled E. Wallace, which appeared in a later issue of the Firm Foundation under the caption, "Howling For Profit."

The purpose of this article is to answer a question which was intended for the editor of the Bible Banner. Doctor Brewer wants to know when these men (referring mostly to himself) became unsound. He thinks the editor of the Bible Banner is trying to make out a case of unsoundness against him in order to galvanize himself into prominence.

The readers are told that "it is a notable fact that some of the men who are now being accused of unsoundness have been faithfully preaching for them from thirty to forty-five years," which fact, it is assumed, should exonerate them, and him, from all suspicion. Yet he had just finished saying that men in politics and denominational religion, who had been in perfectly good standing thirty or forty years in their respective fields, have become politically and religiously unsound in the "definite" crisis through which the world is passing, a crisis which has, he says, "unsettled the minds of our most responsible and conservative men." In politics there are men who, he says, "are bending their efforts toward sweeping from beneath us the foundations" of our political doctrines. And in religion, "leaders in big denominations are no longer loyal to their own creeds and even worse, they are not loyal to the religion that their creeds profess to represent." Thus he builds up for a conclusion that he does not reach. It was a fine place to show how and why these same conditions have produced unsoundness in the church, but instead of that, forsaking his purpose-entirely he is angered because the soundness of our political doctrines. And in religion, "leaders in big denominations are no longer loyal to their own creeds and even worse, they are not loyal to the religion that their creeds profess to represent." Thus he builds up for a conclusion that he does not reach. It was a fine place to show how and why these same conditions have produced unsoundness in the church, but instead of that, forsaking his purpose-entirely he is angered because the soundness of our political doctrines.

The demands that we tell them when these men became unsound. Not having known them always, we may not be able to do that, but I can certainly tell everybody when I began to find out.

We will just begin on a certain Abilene Christian College lecture delivered by G. C. Brewer in 1934. The following insertions are editorials in the Gospel Advocate in March 1934. The following insertions are editorials in the Gospel Advocate in March 1934, one by the editor, and the other by the much loved and lamented F. B. Strygley. They will be of interest to many now who did not read them then.

It reveals the fact that the Neal-Wallace Debate was the turning point in relations that existed between G. C. Brewer and some of the rest of us. In fact, the very day that the Gospel Advocate took up the fight against R. H. Boll, when I was the editor, G. C. Brewer and S. H. Hall began their protests. They were both opposed to the debate with Neal. They opposed the editorials in the Gospel Advocate against Boll and his party. They did not want them exposed. Brewer admits that he tried to "dis-suade" me on the debate with Neal, but has since claimed that he helped me to prepare for the debate!

It was while our brother was so irked about the Neal-Wallace Debate and so upset because the Gospel Advocate was exposing R. H. Boll that he went to Abilene and delivered the lecture criticizing the opposition to the Boll group.

If it is thought by some to be a mere personal matter with me, let them read the comments of the late and lamented F. B. Strygley on this matter, reprinted below. Both of the following articles appeared in the Gospel Advocate at the same time, in the same opening. Here they are:

BROTHER G. C. BREWER’S ABILENE LECTURE (Foy E. Wallace, Jr., in Gospel Advocate, March 1934)

In an editorial report of the Abilene Christian College Lectureship, the Firm Foundation gives a brief resume of a speech made by Brother G. C. Brewer on 'Things Which Can Be Done to Cause Division in the Church.'

Brother Showalter describes and commends the speech in part, as follows:

I heard but one of the speeches. I reached the auditorium just in time to hear the opening address on Thursday. It was scheduled to be delivered by Brother Foy E. Wallace, editor of the Gospel Advocate of Nashville, Tennessee, but as Brother Wallace could not arrange his plans to be on hand the speech was made by Brother G. C. Brewer of Memphis, Tennessee, a staff writer for the Gospel Advocate. Brother Brewer has preached a great deal in Texas where he has many friends and admirers many of them in the large audience assembled at that time—and he made a good line address. The subject was 'Things We Can Do to Cause Division in the Church.' The speaker stated candidly that the speech he was about to make in lieu of the one that should have been made by Brother Wallace would not be as Wallace would have made it—that he and Wallace differed widely on some things—among them so-called 'Bollism'—that he did not regard that issue as of sufficient significance to justify the division it had occasioned or other much pronouncedly peculiar views on the 'Millennium' were—nevertheless, pureminded men, with strong faith and deep reverence for the word of God—that particularly Brother R. H. Boll had entered his own life at a crucial period and he believed had been the actual means of his salvation—that he tried to keen Brother Wallace from having the debate with Brother Neal—and thought the debate had not helped a division already existing but on the contrary had widened the breach. He thought debates were sometimes a good thing but many times not—preachers could distinguish themselves—though unwittingly—and that the least attention to many things that are nonessential and inconsequential, the better for the cause of Christ and all parties concerned. Brewer seemed to many fine things that ought to be considered and remembered by all—especially preachers. In regard to differences of judgment and of opinion as mentioned above, Brother Brewer added emphatically that he and Brother Wallace, though they differed widely in judgment on those matters were, nevertheless, on very cordial terms, and that they loved each other as brethren should. This is just fine, he said, but I would say some one remarked that the Gospel Advocate was exceedingly well represented on the program—more than half of the speeches as the program was originally to be delivered were delivered by editor and staff. So even so—the intention was undoubtedly good.

Possibly it will kindle with that periodical a better interest in a great educational institution.

Since it is understood that Brother Brewer was pinch hitting for me, I feel compelled to state that I had nothing to do with his selection, and certainly nothing to do with his speech. I feel an inexpressible regret that my absence should have been a source of such a speech. It was a failure that I may have made in meeting the expectancy in the demands of such a vital subject could not approximate to the harm Brother Brewer's speech will do. The
It is Brother Brewer himself who has now "widened the breach." His speech, as it stands, represents a challenge of the Gospel Advocate's policy. The Gospel Advocate can do nothing less than to meet it. We are set for the defense of the truth.

BROTHER BREWER'S CRITICISM

F. B. Suggs, Editor, Gospel Advocate (March 1943)

If Brother Brewer said the things reported in the Firm Foundation, it was poor taste to take a-brother's place to make a speech and criticize him in his absence. In this the brother runs true to form. These brethren who admit that the Firm Foundation is wrong and stand behind them, usually do it by criticizing those who take the stand for the truth and defending those who are wrong on the stand for which Brother Brewer is getting against. How then, could he know what significance there is in the subject? His indifferent attitude and admitted ignorance of the issue disqualifies him to pass judgment on those of us who have studied the question. If his recommendations should be adopted and all opposition to the Boll teaching suspended, the church, having no defense, would become the prey of these false teachers, and henceforth exposed to all of the lurking errors of premillennialism.

If Brother Brewer is right in his position that Wallace should not have debated with Neal, Wallace will not have it to do any more. According to Brother Brewer's logic, Wallace had it correct right, for he stopped that thing which Brother Brewer says should not be done. How long would it take Brother Brewer, in his apologies for these brethren, to do as much? The brother said that often those who entered the last debate were "pronouncedly peculiar" for the personal reason that they, usually, do not make it very public.

There was no danger of Brother Wallace causing division in Winchester. As Neal and his copartners in their foolishness were usually doingsomething to insinuate that Brother Wallace had such an idea. I believe that Brother Brewer could come as near doing things unwittingly to distinguish himself as Brother Wallace. This was an unfortunate thing to say in that connection, but Brother Brewer can say about as many unfortunate things in print as most of us.

If Brother Brewer know it is an inconsequential thing for any to hold to a theory that contradicts Peter and the oath of God? This they do when they say that Christ will not occupy David's throne until return, God swore that David would never fail in his house, and Peter said that he spoke it concerning the resurrection of Christ, and added: "Therefore, being at the right hand of God exalted." The theory connects this conclusion with the oath of God. Still, it is an inconsequential thing! Who said so? Neither Peter nor God did.

If it is wrong to debate with Boll and Neal, Wallace has taken the right course to stop it. Neal has quit for good, and Boll has a good chance to try it, but he will not do so. Brewer can give the credit for saving him; why can he not give Wallace the credit for stopping those debates which he says ought never to have been? He tried to keep Wallace from debating with Neal. I wonder how much effort he put forth to keep Neal from debating with Wallace? He was the aggressor in this thing. But Brother Wallace must be criticized for the truth. This is the price that many have paid to defend the word of God. Brother Wallace seemed willing to pay the price, and I, for one, honor him for doing it.

It is this attitude toward these errors and teachers of error that becomes Brewer's sore spot. It is the point he always ignores. He is ever and always denying that he is what nobody has ever accused him of being—a premillennialist. But he is charged with an attitude which makes his influence more dangerous than the actual premillennialist, because he is placed in a position to do the church more harm.

Doctor Brewer goes to record by virtually saying that he does not think there are "any unsound preachers among
us today." Perhaps that is the explanation of his apologies for R. H. Boll and his caustic criticisms of those who have opposed him. Perhaps that is also the explanation for his repeated affiliations with avowed Premillennialists and known Bollites such as H. L. Olmstead in meetings, and of his recent action in bringing E. Gaston Collins, a known premillennial sympathizer, to the Lubbock church as his co-minister.

If Doctor Brewer does believe that there are some unsound men “among us today” it would be interesting, indeed, to have him tell us who, in his opinion, they are. Is Olmstead sound? Is Jorgenson sound? Is R. H. Boll sound? Is J. N. Armstrong sound? Is D. C. Janes sound? Is Clinton Davidson sound? Are these men “among us today”? Really, “are there any unsound preachers among us today?” If they are unsound, what constitutes a sound attitude toward them? Is the Brewer attitude toward them sound?

Referring to the matter of calling on denominational preachers to lead in prayer, Doctor Brewer admits that “he has, a few times in his life, done such a thing.” But he says that it was a long time ago, and of the past even when “his present accuser was his colleague,” and he wants to know why “this man” waited until the “present moment” to bring this accusation. Now since he says all of this, let him explain what recently happened at Enterprise, Alabama, where denominational preachers were repeatedly called on to lead the prayers in his meetings after the song leader had refused to call on them. Was this while or since his “present accuser” was his “colleague”? He might also explain the case, about the same time at Horse Cave, Kentucky, in S. H. Hall's meeting with the premillennial church that has gone digestive. If that is not enough he can use the time explaining such cases as Oneonta, Alabama, also about the same time, where the president of David Lipscomb College called on a Presbyterian preacher to lead in the prayer service. All of these are of recent date, including the one which occurred in Brother Brewer’s meeting, as related by the man who lead the singing. Nor did we wait until the “present moment” to bring these accusations, they have been brought forth all along as they became known.

Since Doctor Brewer has so much to say about “colleagues” and “co-editors” some may wonder why I placed him on the staff of the Gospel Advocate when I was editor of that paper. My answer is that it was one of the mistakes I made. I was advised by F. W. Smith, F. B. Srygley, and H. Leo Boles, not to put him on the Gospel Advocate staff. But I believed in him. I later learned that they were right and I was wrong. When he made the A. C. C. lecture, his department was immediately suspended, and it never appeared again until after my connection with the Advocate was terminated. The new management restored his department. That is their responsibility. I corrected my mistake, as far as I could.

It may also be asked why I am referring to him as Doctor Brewer. My answer is because he is a Doctor, and has invited it. George S. Benson, president of Harding College, gave him an honorary (onyry) Doctor's Degree: he accepted it, has been advertised at Lubbock, Texas, as Doctor G. C. Brewer, and furthermore he has, or did have, a book on his shelf entitled “Who's Who Among The Clergy” which lists G. C. Brewer, with data that must have been furnished if not written by himself. If he is actually “Among The Clergy” and holds a George S. Benson LL. D. degree from that college, why is he lecturing at Searcy, Arkansas—why not call him Doctor Brewer?

If there be those who think that this is written in personal spite and who, therefore, will net regard anything I may say, let them ponder the statements of F. B. Srygley, “who being dead yet speaketh.” He knew whereof he spake. Brother Brewer’s effort to explain his attitudes compares with poor Brother George A. Klingman’s efforts a few years ago to explain his attitudes on instrumental music and other things, and with Clinton Davidson’s present effort to explain his attitudes toward the premillennialist. 

THE DOCTORS THAT ARE AMONG US

Doctor C. B. F. Young, of New York, erstwhile president of the defunct Davidson Christian Leader, demurs that the Bible Banner has minimized his calling by referring to him as a chemist. “You err,” he says, “I am an electrometallurgist—a far cry from a chemist.” Now don’t ask me how to pronounce it—just name it and take it. He also tells me in detail how he became a Ph. D. I heard C. R. Nichol say one time that he had never seen a Ph. D. that had good sense. I think I know now what he meant.

The Doctor complains that I have addressed him only through the Bible Banner, to which he does not subscribe, and that he therefore did not see the suggestion that he might come down to Nashville, Tennessee, while I was there last fall, with the “information” from that place that would “ruin” me, “it” he would tell it. But he saw the Bible Banner issue of June 10 at which he read his telephone conversation from New York to Birmingham, in time to demand an immediate correction. And he saw the next issue in time to inform us immediately that the correction had not been made. As for addressing him, and them, only through the Bible Banner, that is the only way I aim to address them, so he had better subscribe for it and quit borrowing it from someone else like he has been doing.

He proposes now that I come to some distant point to meet him. But I have nothing to see the, Doctor about. He is the one who peddled Davidson's files down to Birmingham as an extension agent of Davidson's campaign of calumny. I merely informed him when I would be in Nashville where he said he had information that would “ruin” me, and told him to bring it down. Now he wants me to get some brethren together, go somewhere, and make a convention out of it. That was not the proposition, and besides I wouldn't go that far to see the Doctor about anything. However, since he went all the way from New York to Birmingham to tell John T. Lewis that he could ruin me in Nashville, I thought that he might just stop off there while I was in town and proceed.

Finally, the Doctor suggests that I publish in the Bible Banner his extra long, rambling letter. There are two reasons why I am not disposed to do so. First, he does not hesitate to say that he believes everything he has been told; I am certainly under no obligation to furnish a medium to any man who at the outset calls me a thief and a crook. Second, the Doctor recently went on record that he is conscientiously opposed to that kind of journalism. He thinks it is a sin to engage in controversies through the papers. Now he wants to help me run the kind of a paper that he helped start the Christian Leader to stop. If he should do this thing now, by his own confessions, he would be violating his conscience, and if I should furnish him the medium to do it, I would guilty of causing a weak brother to stumble, a thing I am commanded in the New Testament not to do.

It does occur to me that the New York electrometallurgist is going considerably out of his way to put himself to a lot of trouble about something that does not concern him. These brethren have been unable to meet the issues and have therefore had to resort to something else.
FROM BROTHER J. F. KURFEES
TO THE EDITOR

(Note: J. F. Kurfees, business man of Louisville, Kentucky is a brother of the late M. C. Kurfees. If any man knows what M. C. Kurfees stood for, J. F. Kurfees does; he was a member of the congregation in Louisville for which his brother preached for 45 years, and is still a member of it. In the January Bible Banner, I note your fine comments on “What About Calling Names?” and “Who Wrote That Article?”

Now I admit that I don’t know so very much about this “Policy thing,” I suppose, of course, that it was taught a way back in the schools I attended, but I do not remember that it was one of the chief subjects; however, since my nephew, P. W. Stonestreet, has now stood his examination, made the grade and actually graduated from “the veriest tyro” class into the class of the “alert minded,” there may be some hope for me yet.

I don’t suppose any one would object (am sure I don’t) to the editorials Brother Goodpasture has been selecting and reprinting in an effort to prove his point; they are very fine, but the impression he seems bent on making by his comments and endorsement he gives to these editorials is that the men from whom he quotes never wrote any other kind or character of editorials; that they were (I suppose he would call it) too ‘dignified,’ ‘ethical’ or something, to write like present day writers, which he so severely condemns. But he can’t put that over, for many now living know that those men did write many articles of an entirely different character, but in spite of that, he selects only those which he seems to think will prove his point, and he has been at this selecting and reprinting business for quite a while. Certainly it is true that the men from whom he quotes were dignified, ethical and all that, but I am sure it is neither dignified, ethical, nor even true and fair to attempt to make it appear that they were simply men of a ‘one track mind,’ for indeed and in truth the men from whom he quotes pattern after Christ and Paul—they were neither ashamed nor afraid to go so far as to call names when and where necessary to persecutors, slanderers, scribes, Pharisees, false brethren, etc.

If Brother Goodpasture ever successfully proves that no change has been made in the policy of the Advocate, I am sure he would make better progress if he would follow the hints and suggestions set forth in your editorial.

For instance, you say: “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?” Now I am sure if he would do that and support those editorials with his unqualified endorsement, as he has been giving the ones he has used, he would meet with real success in getting his objective over to his readers.

Now to give Brother Goodpasture a wider range for making his selection of editorials on that subject during that period of years, I suggest that he also include the editorials of the late Brother J. C. McQuiddy, and to save him a bit of time in his search through his files, if he will just turn to the Gospel Advocate of August 14, 1919, page 789, he will find an article by Brother McQuiddy that will serve his purpose nicely. Yes, indeed, if he will reprint that McQuiddy article and back it up with his unqualified endorsement, urge and insist that brethren everywhere do exactly what Brother McQuiddy in that article urged them to do, he need have no fears or doubts about proving to his readers that the Advocate speaks the same language and maintains the same policy as it did in the long years past! There can be no question about the McQuiddy article, as well that the very same conditions prevail now as in 1919—same congregation, same preacher and the same division still present.

I don’t know what excuse, if any, Brother Goodpasture would or could offer, should he refuse to try out these suggestions. I do, however, call to mind that not so long ago he offered as an excuse for refusing to publish a certain article that the “ground had been covered,” but that can’t be so, for the simple reason that that very same ground is still bearing the same weeds, briars, thistles, etc., which shows that the “covering,” if any, applied was too thin, and so far as I know, the Agricultural Department has thrown no restrictions around the cultivation of that particular soil. So Brother Goodpasture would not, I am sure, be hampered in any effort he might attempt to plow up and remove this undesirable matter from this ground.

I also recall that at one time Brother Goodpasture said something about “Dignified Journalism,” and due, I suppose, to my inexperience in the field of journalism, I didn’t at the time know just what all that might include. But Brother Goodpasture is a good teacher, and especially so if we dumb bells will not only read the lines, but a bit between the lines. Even “the veriest tyro” can easily see and understand the designing use he is endeavoring to make of the editorials he reprints from men who are in their graves and the added attempt to capitalize on the name of these men who have gone to their reward. Now I suppose we are to understand that at least Brother Goodpasture puts such tactics in the class of “Dignified Journalism.” If he does not so classify it, he can, of course, set us right.

Now with reference to his “Ethics,” “Dignity,” or whatever he calls it, in the use he attempts to make of the dead, it is comforting to know just as you state, namely: “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.” Fraternally,—J. F. Kurfees.

“So let Baptist and Reflecto and its editor be classified as doctrinal. We admit it and esteem it an honor. And it seems to us that we remember reading somewhere in some old book the instruction: “Preach the word and do it.” Now let’s see, where did we read this? Oh yes, it was in the New Testament, and the Holy Spirit caused it to be written!”

(Editor Taylor)

“Oh yes,” that is “in the New Testament, and the Holy Spirit caused it to be written.” But Editor Taylor is preaching Baptist doctrine “in season out of season” and “With all lona suffering and doctrine.” Now I don’t know what excuse, if any, Brother Goodpasture would or could offer, should he refuse to try out these suggestions. I do, however, call to mind that not so long ago he offered as an excuse for refusing to publish a certain article that the “ground had been covered,” but that can’t be so, for the simple reason that that very same ground is still bearing the same weeds, briars, thistles, etc., which shows that the “covering,” if any, applied was too thin, and so far as I know, the Agricultural Department has thrown no restrictions around the cultivation of that particular soil. So Brother Goodpasture would not, I am sure, be hampered in any effort he might attempt to plow up and remove this undesirable matter from this ground.

Now I don’t know what excuse, if any, Brother Goodpasture would or could offer, should he refuse to try out these suggestions. I do, however, call to mind that not so long ago he offered as an excuse for refusing to publish a certain article that the “ground had been covered,” but that can’t be so, for the simple reason that that very same ground is still bearing the same weeds, briars, thistles, etc., which shows that the “covering,” if any, applied was too thin, and so far as I know, the Agricultural Department has thrown no restrictions around the cultivation of that particular soil. So Brother Goodpasture would not, I am sure, be hampered in any effort he might attempt to plow up and remove this undesirable matter from this ground.

Now with reference to his “Ethics,” “Dignity,” or whatever he calls it, in the use he attempts to make of the dead, it is comforting to know just as you state, namely: “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.” Fraternally,—J. F. Kurfees.

So let Baptist and Reflecto and its editor be classified as doctrinal. We admit it and esteem it an honor. And it seems to us that we remember reading somewhere in some old book the instruction: “Preach the word and do it.” Now let’s see, where did we read this? Oh yes, it was in the New Testament, and the Holy Spirit caused it to be written!”

(Editor Taylor)

“Oh yes,” that is “in the New Testament, and the Holy Spirit caused it to be written.” But Editor Taylor is preaching Baptist doctrine “in season and out of season” and that is not what the Holy Spirit caused to be written in the New Testament. If he can “remember reading somewhere in some old book” which was written before the seventeenth century, any specific reference to “The Baptist Church” even as “an institution,” we will put it in the Bible Banner and accord him the full credit his discovery warrants, if he will favor us with the reference. We will not confine him to the New Testament. We give him the range of the whole field. We wonder if he “remembers reading somewhere in some old book” that “Baptists ought to be Baptists and know why.” “Oh yes, it was” not “in the new Testament, and the Holy Spirit” did not “cause it to be written.”—Cled E. Wallace.
SOUND AND UNSOUND MEN IN PRESENT CRISIS

G. C. BREWER

In a recent issue of the Firm Foundation, Brother G. C. Brewer becomes near hysterical in voicing his opinion that some of us are howling for profit. Whether for profit, or some other reason, he lets out some howls about it. I can’t see that a man who does as much howling as he does should deny some of the rest of us the right to howl a little if we want to. This is a free country and we have our own paper to do our howling in. Besides nobody is forced to read it if he doesn’t want to.

1. The crisis to which reference is made in the heading of this article does not refer to any situation that may exist in the church. There are conditions among the brethren today that are not entirely hopeful, but these do not constitute a crisis. But the world itself is definitely passing through a crisis. There are wars and rumors of wars in different parts of this world. There is confusion in every branch of study and in even the practical things of life. This confusion has existed among philosophers, scientists, and sociologists for many years, but it has only recently reached into the world and left the men of finance and even men of small foundations upon which civilization rests. These incendiaries are so subtle, so ubiquitous and so persistent that they have unsettled the minds of our most responsible and conservative men. These propagandists are so false in their protestations and such deceivers in their character that they may be found marching under colors that do not at all represent them. These causes many men to be suspected who are not at all deserving of suspicion. But distrust and suspicion and the questioning of motives is the order of the day.

2. In the religious world, we are again confronted with a state of confusion. Leaders in the big denominations are no longer loyal to their own creeds and even worse, they are not loyal even to the religion that their creeds profess to represent. They have denied the very basic principles upon which Christianity rests. The Federal Council of Churches, which is supposed to represent the largest and most influential Protestant denominations, no longer stands for vital faith even in God to say nothing of the Bible. Many of these religious leaders are out spoken in their unbelief, others of them have “stolen the livery of heaven to serve the devil in.” They may profess to be faithful to Christ and at the same time deny him.

3. In the midst of this confusion, it would be great wonder if even denominational Christians, members of the body of Christ, were not influenced in the wrong way. It is impossible for us to live in the midst of the world and not be impressed by the things that are about us. And, unless we go back to the Bible view, which caused the early Christians to know that the world was antagonistic to them and they had to separate themselves from it and live lives entirely different from those about them and even to endure persecution and death at the hands of the world, we cannot be faithful in this age. In foretelling the destruction of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the Jews, which was a time of great tribulation, Jesus said that the disciples would not only be persecuted, afflicted and killed, but he said that many of them would be offended and that, because iniquity abounded, the love of many would wax cold. He also said that these disciples, some of them, would hate one another and betray one another (Matt. 24:9-12). When a time of tribulation comes upon us, we need not, therefore, be surprised if these conditions exist again.

In fact, we are now hearing men charge their brethren in Christ with some very ugly things. Not only do they charge their brethren and their fellow preachers with immoral conduct and of unsoundness in doctrine, but they make these charges for the purpose of inciting the brethren against those who are accused. If any brother is found to be unsound, it should be a cause of grief to all right thinking men and women. And they should not speak of it lightly to say nothing of bitterly. If a brother has fallen a victim of the flesh and has committed deeds contrary to his profession, this too should bring about mourning. The apostle Paul severely rebuked the church at Corinth because that church was not mourning over the brother who had taken his father’s wife (1 Cor. 5:2). If the conditions are as bad among the brethren as some hysterical preachers are trying to make us believe, then there should be a season of mourning throughout the church.

The fact that these men who think they have discovered these calamitous conditions among us are not mourning but rather are using these conditions to bring themselves into prominence and to convince the unsuspecting that they are reformers,-almost suffering martyrdom,-in order to gather around them a group of followers, should lead sober minded men to wonder if these conditions really exist or if they have not been created in the imagination, of the men who’ are profiting by this howling.

If there are any unsound preachers among us today, why could not the evidence of their unsoundness be pointed out? Why can they not be found preaching something that is unscriptural? When and where did these men become unsound? Can the time and the place be indicated? Can the thing preached or written that is unsound be produced?

It is a notable fact that some of the men who are now being accused of unsoundness have been faithfully preaching for them for 30 to 45 years. They have had the indorsement of the entire brotherhood during these years. They have been co-editors, colleagues and companions of the men who are now accusing them of being unsound. And yet these men who were formerly indorsed by our would-be reformers, but who are now condemned, have not changed in any respect during the years except to grow older. They preach, practice, debate, and contend for exactly the same points and the same positions that they have always held through all the years and that they did hold when their present traducers indorsed them. Will not those brethren who are becoming excited and following off after these hysterical and schismatic preachers, consider this point? Take this. as an illustration: A certain brother who has been honored by the entire brotherhood for 30 years, who has been indorsed by the traducers, and the cantankerous crowd for many years, was recently charged with being unsound. One brother asked the accuser to say when this preacher became unsound and to show what it was that he had done or said that justified the charge that he is unsound. The traducer at once offered his evidence. What was it? Why, he said, the accused preacher had called on a denominational preacher to lead the prayer. In fact, he said, “he calls on,” which implies that this was a general practice. Now the fact is that the accused preacher never practiced calling on denominational preachers to take any
part in religious service. But he admits that he has, a few times in his life, done such a thing, but-and here is the astounding point—the only time he ever did call on any denominationally preacher were in the long ago and were matters of the past when his present accuser was his colleague, co-editor and loyal supporter. Why did this man wait until the present moment to bring this accusation against his brother? Let echo answer. Why? If anyone should want a better answer than echo can give, let him search the record, not of the man who is accused of unsoundness, but of the man who is doing the accusing. That is where the change has taken place and the cause of the change wouldn't be far out of sight.

Lubbock, Texas.

Knowing Brother Brewer as I do, I was somewhat suspicious when I read the heading of his howl. "Sound and Unsound Men in Our Present Crisis" led me to believe that he was about to pull the trigger in the general direction of some of us he hasn't loved as much as he ought to right lately. I decided it would be safe to delay a drive into a bomb shelter when I read his opening sentence and resisted the impulse to duck. He started out with: "The crisis to which reference is made in the heading of this article does not refer to any situation that may exist in the church." Heart-beats resumed their normal rate and I settled back with a feeling of relief to review this crisis which "does not refer to any situation that may exist in the church." I made a mistake. I should have ducked. I might have known that there was a bug under a chip somewhere. I'm not asking for sympathy for I do not deserve any. Before I got half way through this crisis which "does not refer to any situation that may exist in the church" I ran into this, or it smacked right into me.

"In fact, we are now hearing men charge their brethren in Christ with some very ugly things. Not only do they charge their brethren and their fellow preachers with immoral conduct and of unsoundness in doctrine, but they make these charges for the purpose of inciting the brethren against those who are accused. If any brother is found to be unsound, it should be a cause of grief to all right thinking men and women. And they should not speak of it lightly to say nothing of bitterly."

I am wondering if the facts in the case sufficiently exonerate Brother Brewer from a charge of personal bitterness to qualify him to criticize any of the rest of us. He appears to me to be pretty much upset and out of humor, plain sore in fact. Time was when I liked Brother Brewer a lot better than I do now, and I do not dislike him now as much as some of the brethren do. Some brethren for whom I have a high regard are frankly disgusted with his attitude in "our present crisis." I would like to like him better than I do and I think I could if he would get some of the acid out of his system. A dose of alka-seltzer might help him, if it is all its sponsors claim for it, but I doubt it. I do not know of anybody who is more out of humor with some of the brethren who were his former "colleagues and companions" than Brother Brewer is, or who can be uglier about it. According to my information, he circulated a document concerning at least one of them which was so bitter, he could not or did not, get it in any of the papers. Some of the brethren, including myself, are still fighting subverting influences which threaten the doctrinal integrity of the church. Such outbursts from Brother Brewer do not deter us as much as we would wish them to.

We, the editor of the Bible Banner and I, have had recent inquiries from elders in the Lubbock church demanding that we justify our attacks upon Brother Brewer. They may consider this an accommodation. Probably it will now be in order for them to demand that he justify his attacks upon us. He has accused us of dishonesty, ambition for unholy notoriety and other nice things like that. Of course he is a much nicer man than we are!

Does anybody, or doesn't everybody know what is the matter with our sad brother? I see in the papers where he has preached a very strong sermon in the Lubbock church against premillennialism. Wonder if anybody asked him to? Maybe that one is beside the point. Since he is with us in the pulpit, by request I hear, and against us in the Firm Foundation, what is ailing the brother? I'm not a doctor but were his case in my hands, I believe I would start him off on a box of Carter's little liver pills.

He describes himself as "a certain brother who has been honored by the entire brotherhood for thirty years" and refers to some of the rest of us "our would-be reformers," hysterical and schismatic preachers," "the traducers and the cantankerous crowd." He is against saying "bitter" and "howling." Somebody should rub him on the back, gently, and whisper "kitty, kitty, kitty."

JIMMIE LOVELL'S WHIRLWIND

CLED E. WALLACE

If you don't know my friend, Jimmie, and get hold of his paper, you may conclude that he is a modern St. George whose business is slaying dragons. Don't be too sure of it.

Others think he suffers from illusions and rides over the country swinging ink at windmills. He has zeal and can use lurid language. Outside of that, I am not ready to venture too far with a diagnosis. Here are a few hot coals he drops here and there from the burning furnace of his zeal.

He is suffering from "harsh condemnation from brethren whom I feel are unjust." Since he went that far, he should name them and specify some items of injustice.
Some modern Nero has evidently built a fire under the saintly Jimmie, or has he? If so why? It would make interesting reading in Jimmie's paper.

He refers to some of the brethren as "fighting dogs beside the road." Jimmie can be bitter without calling names. All he has to do now to be personal is to call some names. Are these dogs curs or thorough-breds? What are they fighting about? Or is Jimmie just seeing things? He will have to be more specific if he gets very far in "cleaning up our mess."

He displays symptoms of shell-shock over a "whirlwind of personalities." He might tell us when and where the storm struck and what damage it did. It would make good reading and might increase the circulation of his paper. He might tell his readers who ducked into the storm cellar. Whirl-winds sometimes blow papers about. He could write a whole page about this.

"We" are a sorry lot, according to Jimmie. "We want to argue, fight, and fuss. We want to be elders, big-shots and popes. We want to dictate where we buy our Bibles and to what school we send our children." Who are the "we?" Somebody must be guilty or else Jimmie has a whirlwind up in his attic. If he thinks it is wrong to "argue, fight and fuss," he ought to practice quitting it. He is doing more of it than anybody I know, unless it is Brother Grover&Brewer. He can leave me out of this. I usually say what I think ought to be said in the interest of truth and justice, and have no apologies to offer unless I change my mind. I disavow any ambition to be an elder. a big-shot or a pope and entertain not the slightest inclination to dictate to anybody where he shall buy a Bible or send his child to school. He can even take Jimmie's paper and read his fussing and fighting, if he wants to, as far as I am concerned. However, I cannot be blamed in that case for entertaining some private opinions of his choice in reading matter. But I won't "dictate" to him. Jimmie might tell us who is stirring up whirl-winds among his brain cells and causing them to collide so violently.

Jimmie thinks more of his business associates than he does his "religious associates." This is not a good sign. "My officials may not be Christians as we know Christians, but they are Gentlemen.. They appreciate my efforts to live a clean life and demand more fairness and uprightness than the majority of my religious associates." In all "fairness and uprightness" if Jimmie tries to persuade any of them to be Christians "as we know Christians," whatever that means, he should be frank with them and tell them that they will have to descend to the fellowship of men far below their level as "gentlemen." They probably won't want such men for their religious playmates and will choose to stay in the world. If Jimmie thinks so little of his brethren, he should quit running around with them. Somebody has had a bad influence over him and tipped his tongue with acid. Who of the brethren are such bad company? Their conduct should be brought to the attention of the elders of their congregations and they should be disciplined. Personally, I do not run with people like that. My "religious associates," including Jimmie, might improve their conduct in spots, but I'm a charitable sort and can make as much allowance for them as I hope the Lord will. It would help Jimmie to "pack up your troubles in your old kit-bag and smile, smile, smile."

Page Murch and Witty!

Cled E. Wallace

"Instead of putting His disciples in a strait-jacket of legalism, Jesus deliberately challenged them to become free from superstition through His teachings. What right have we to make tests of fellowship where He did not make them? We defeat the purpose of such ordinances as Baptism and Communion by dividing His Body into mutually hostile factions over them. What right have we to make even a so-called scriptural form or mode of baptism a test of fellowship? Yet, we (Disciples of Christ) who originally hoped to unite all Christian-minded people into one vast universal fellowship of freedom by refusing to make tests of fellowship which Jesus did not make, are now so hopelessly divided among ourselves over such things as instrumental music in the worship, mission-methods, the use of literature, and even the test of individual communion cups that we are the laughing stock of Protestantism."

Jesus made the keeping of his commandments the test of our love for him. "If ye love me, ye will keep my commandments." "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me." "He that loveth me not keepeth not my words." "Ye are my friends, if ye do the things which I command you." It seems to me that "tests of fellowship" are involved in this. If loyalty to the commandments and ordinances of the Lord make me "the laughing stock of Protestantism." I propose to stick to the Lord and let the Protestants have all the fun out of it they can get. I am not trying to please the Protestants anyhow. I'm trying to serve the Lord as it is written, regardless of what Protestants think or do, whether they laugh or cry. This liberal brother is not original, he is a mimic. There is nothing new in dubbing the commandments of God "a strait-jacket of legalism" and calling them "superstition." He might well heed the warning of Paul. "Let no man deceive himself. If any man thinketh that he is wise among you in this world, let him become a fool, that he may become wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He that taketh the wisdom of this world, and is baptized shall be saved" (I Cor. 3:18-20)

According to him, it is not even necessary to insist on "even a so-called scriptural form or mode of baptism" and those of us who insist that men should do as Jesus commanded "defeat the purpose of such ordinances as Baptism and Communion" and are guilty of "dividing His Body into mutually hostile factions over them." Well, Jesus did say: "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law: and a man's foes shall be they of his own household." (Matt. 10:34-36) Jesus knew that the keeping of his commandments would not only be a test of fellowship but an occasion for division between those who keep his commandments and those who do not.

The Bible does not say anything about "a so-called scriptural form or mode of baptism." That is not the language of Jesus. He commanded baptism, a specific act, a so-called scriptural form or mode of baptism," and calling them "superstition." He might well heed the warning of Paul. "Let no man deceive himself. If any man thinketh that he is wise among you in this world, let him become a fool, that he may become wise. For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written, He that taketh the wisdom of this world, and is baptized shall be saved." (I Cor. 3:18-20)

According to him, it is not even necessary to insist on "even a so-called scriptural form or mode of baptism" and those of us who insist that men should do as Jesus commanded "defeat the purpose of such ordinances as Baptism and Communion" and are guilty of "dividing His Body into mutually hostile factions over them." Well, Jesus did say: "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law: and a man's foes shall be they of his own household." (Matt. 10:34-36) Jesus knew that the keeping of his commandments would not only be a test of fellowship but an occasion for division between those who keep his commandments and those who do not.

The Bible does not say anything about "a so-called scriptural form or mode of baptism." That is not the language of Jesus. He commanded baptism, a specific act, and said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ." This is neither "superstition" nor "a strait-jacket of legalism." If Jesus does not regard them as his friends who refuse to obey his commandments, the sneers of Charles Christopher Klingman, will not cause me to do so. I propose to go along with Jesus. Immersion is not "a so-called scriptural form or mode of baptism." It is baptism. If it isn't, then what is?

Brother Klingman seems to be as much interested in unity as Brother Witty and Brother Murch are. They should take him into their conferences. He might give some interesting angles on the question.
CAMPAIGNING FOR THE CAUSE

As a matter of choice, and because it was regarded profitable for the Cause the Bible Banner espouses, the editor has at several weeks during the months of January and February to an itinerary in Texas and Oklahoma. One night services have been held over a wide area from Central Oklahoma to South and West Texas, extending South to the Rio Grande Valley and West to Carlsbad, New Mexico. The personal reception given to me by many brethren and friends in all of these places has been heartening and the response given to the Bible Banner has been beyond expectations and gratifying, indeed.

In Corpus Christi it was my privilege to visit my father, whom I do not see as often as I crave to see him, and I was made happy to find him apparently unabated in physical, mental and spiritual vigor as he approaches his three-score and ten. I sat at his feet when I was a boy and heard him preach and debate, and I learned within to one day do it as he did. He was my inspiration then, and has not ceased to be the preacher of the Firm Foundation. He has a full decade of useful years of preaching yet before him, and we pray that it may be so.

In Austin the pleasure and profit, which also comes altogether too seldom, of visiting my brother Cled was also mine. The readers of the Bible Banner know full well my indebtedness to this big brother of mine. It is not family pride nor fraternal loyalty that causes me to say it he is the ace writer of the combined staffs of all papers published by the brethren today, a formidable foe of error and heresy. He speaks with his pen, and no less so in his preaching. I say this because I believe it and have a right to say it in the Bible Banner or anywhere else I may choose to do so, and I dare say it will not be disputed.

I was my good fortune also, in Austin, to see and visit Brother J. D. Tant said, Cled and I were "raised" in the front yard of the Firm Foundation, or the back yard, as the case might be. Brother Showalter has been a long time friend of our family. He spoke words of comfort to us in 1913 at our mother's grave. I still have the piece he wrote in the Firm Foundation, praising her life and warming our hearts.

Though a very busy man Brother Showalter took time out to entertain me and in social vein and detail, to talk on things of mutual interest pertaining to the kingdom of God.

The following editorial from the Firm Foundation will, I think, be appreciated by the readers of the Bible Banner, and for that reason I pass it on to them.

To sit in 'the editor's easy chair,' read what others write in the papers, and what little they leave out is not always there is for an editor to do—no a busy editor. True he is expected to learn wisdom from others if they have any, correct all their mistakes and make none himself. Of course the editor is supposed to be able easily to solve all the problems, dissolve all the difficulties and answer all the questions of an inquisitive constituency but these common place engagements are not half of his pleasures nor half that is expected of him. Answer all the questions? Yes, why else do they take his paper, any-
The recent statement of the Christian Leader Board is clearly an after-thought, conceived in the death throes of an expiring movement. In the taking over of their paper, Brother Showalter has it in his hands to do with in the future as he pleases, but he has let them save their faces. In the “Statement of Clinton Davidson,” which is being circulated as a leaflet, he assumes the attitude of injured innocence and refers to the “subtle” influences against him. He is, of course, the last man to refer to anything sinister or subtle. His whole scheme has been of that nature. He says he does not believe in the use of instrumental music now, and has never believed in its use. Yet he worshipped with an ultra-modern Christian Church, and with the Baptists, many years all the time he says he did not believe in instrumental music! “Whatsoever is not of faith is sin,” and if instrumental music were right, if he worshipped with an ultra-modern Christian Church, and with the Baptists, many years all the time he says he did not believe in instrumental music! “Whatsoever is not of faith is sin,” and if instrumental music were right, if he is telling the truth, he sinned anyway by doing what he says he did not believe! He says that he does not believe premillennialism and has not tried to promote it. Yet we have reliable information that on a recent trip to Louisville, Kentucky, he attended the R. H. Boll church and did not go around the loyal brethren! It seems to me that brethren should be able to see through such as this—and I think they do.

The Davidson statement therefore is purely a front. The effect of their statements on some, perhaps on themselves mostly, will be this: We started a paper to serve the same ends and purposes of the Gospel Proclaimer. We have shown the Brotherhood how to do it. We have convinced them on ethical journalism, and now we are willing to retire from the field in favor of the Gospel Proclaimer which is our kind of a paper anyway. So Davidson saves his face at the expense of The Gospel Proclaimer. Brother Showalter knows his business, but if I were in his place I’d never let them do that to me or any paper of mine.—F. E. W.

CONCERNING THE COLLEGES

There have been remarkable developments in the controversies over the colleges and what is being taught and who is doing the teaching. There have been various statements issued from time to time by the presidents and the faculties on various occasions, usually short of the demands. It cannot be truthfully alleged that those who have turned the light and the heat on certain conditions prevailing are the enemies of the schools. This certainly is not true of the editor of the Bible Banner and I do not believe it is true of other men who have fought to save the schools from certain influences and preserve their purity.

The presidents of David Lipscomb College and Harding College have at various intervals disclaimed belief of premillennial teaching, yet they retain on their faculties men of that persuasion and sympathy. This voids their disclaimers.

Brother Don Morris, president of Abilene Christian College, has likewise made what appears to be a clear-cut statement on the Premillennial question. I believe him to be sincere in his statement, but if he retains men on his faculty whose record is wrong on the questions involved, or whose attitude is wrong toward the men involved, it will kill the effect of Brother Morris’ statements, just as it did in the other cases, and will place Abilene Christian College in the same light as other schools which have done the same thing.

It has become known to all that the chapter on the Millennium in Brother Roberson’s book, “What Jesus Taught,” teaches premillennialism. In fact it is premillennialism. This will be conceded by all who know what premillennialism is. Brother Roberson has made a statement regarding this chapter in his book and has taken steps to take out the objectionable passages in the book and insert another statement. But in doing this Brother Roberson merely states that the language in his book is “susceptible” of that interpretation. This infers that the language does not actually teach it but that it may be so interpreted. Hence, someone has mis-interpreted his language. Now this is not true. The truth is that his language is not susceptible of any other interpretation, and the blame in the case should not be shifted, even by inference, to those who have exposed the teaching in this book.

Brother Roberson was not a boy ten or twelve years ago when he wrote the book. He is a scholar, and he was able to say what he believed then, and he is able to say what he believes now. To say that he may have unconsiously taught Premillennialism only weakens him as a teacher of Bible in Abilene College for he might unconsiously teach that or something else again. And to say that his words were susceptible of a certain interpretation is an inference that others have forced an interpretation upon him. This is not the forthright manner of making a retraction or of correcting errors.

These remarks also apply to Brother R. C. Bell’s attitude. I was in school under him at old Thorp Spring College. I love him and admire him for his many fine traits. But such traits only give a man greater power and influence over his students. It is known that Brother Bell’s attitude if not his belief has been that of sympathy for the premillennial group. This was true at old Thorp Spring before these issues became so well defined. But there are other issues than premillennialism that are important. The general attitude of weakness and uncertainty on many issues effecting the church today is as harmful as sympathy with premillennial teaching and teachers. This of late has been called softness. And this has always been Brother Bell’s weakness. This is not an attack on these good men nor on Abilene Christian College. It is simply a plea to Brother Morris to make his reformation in the College complete by removing the past and present known weaknesses in the school. To do this requires much courage. But not to do it falls short of duty and responsibility, and nullifies statements and assurances.

As the matter stands, the schools in question have all one consent disclaimed premillennialism—but they have not purged their faculties of men whose records on the issues have not been and are not now above reasonable doubt and legitimate suspicion. The obligation of the presidents of these schools is to place men in the Bible departments in whom the brethren can repose full confidence on these issues, and take those men out who cannot be trusted. They will thus show their faith by their works, and will have done their duty to their patrons and the church. Such a duty is difficult to perform, and it takes men to do it but the men at the head of the schools should be men enough to do it or else just admit that they are not and step aside for men who can and will.

This is not written in the spirit of antagonism, but simply a fair and frank statement of The Bible Banner’s impartial view of conditions as they exist in all of the schools involved in these controversies.—F. E. W.
IN CULLINGS--COMMENTS
AND CORRESPONDENCE

WATCHMAN, WHAT OF THE NIGHT? THAT NATIONAL (?) UNITY (?) 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 March-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 March-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 watched with interest, at first, the so-called Witty-Murch unity meeting but when other meetings were booked and the issue left out and no progress made toward discussing the real differences and the N. T. teachings on the same; I did not believe and do not yet believe any good will be derived from them. The leaders in the Christian Church know these differences so let the line be drawn and issue come in the front. If they do not want to discuss them, then it is impossible to have unity. I believe we should keep at work on the walls and stay away from Ono.

V. T. Smith, Goldendale, Wash.

As for the Witty-Murch appeasement conferences; there can be about as much good come from them as from a union meeting with the Digressives. I am certain that the kind of “unity” they are promoting is not even remotely akin to the unity for which Jesus prayed. We have no Digressive Church here, they gave up their innovations and came over preacher and all. If Murch and his following will follow their example we will have unity according to the New Testament-W. S. Boyett, Brownfield, Texas.

I am with you in your fearless determination to stand for the truth one hundred percent. May you live long to hold aloft the banner of pure unadulterated Christianity. Command me when I can serve you in any way.-Guy N. Woods, Wellington, Texas.

I enjoy the Bible Banner, second to none. A man was riding the train on a long run through the West. The porter came through and the man said, “What is the average tip on this run?” The negro thought for a minute and said $2.00. After a while he came through again and the man gave him $2.00. “Thank you, boss, you are the first man to come up to the average.” From what the Banner purports to be, it certainly is the first to come up to the average. I especially appreciate the impartiality with which you take error down. I’m sure that this is a sacrifice of their friendship, if such may be called a sacrifice, but it makes many more that are of value and “in the world to come eternal life,” all things else being equally right.

Questionnaire: 1. If 95% liked the Leader’s handshake, 2. What percent wouldn’t pay for the subscription? 3. Reckon that will mean more “odorous” letters? 4. Maybe they were all complimentary subscribers. May you reap with joy from the seed you’ve sown in tears.-Edd Holt, Port Arthur, Texas.

I am intensely interested in helping to lead all men to the one faith, but count me out of any group of compromising men who are holding trysts with the Christian Church. Denominationalism does not need unity: it needs destruction.-Thomas G. Butler, Beaumont, Texas.

I do want to say, that if it had not been for the fight the Bible Banner has put up for the Truth, that the Cause would have suffered much. I thank God that he always sends a “deliverer” in time of need.-R. W. Comer, Nashville, Tenn.

We are indeed made sad that your “goose is cooked,” so we are today by Railway Express forwarding you the place of the one that was inadvertently cooked by your anonymous friends. We found this goose wandering around the verdant hills of Northwest Arkansas, and noticing her august maine and her confident demeanor, we decided that she was a natural mate of that sanguine gander that robbed that foolish parrot of his tail feathers in an encounter in Fort Worth some few years ago. (Said parrot has hardly been heard from since.)

In thinking over your dire condition, as reported by the Bible Banner, I am reminded of the following advice given by the Apostle Paul in his second letter to his son Timothy, “This know also that in these last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemous,-, unthankful, unholy, without naturally affections, truce breakers, false accusers, fierce, incontinent, despiser of those that are good, traitors, and etc.

I am persuaded that these characters who hide behind anonymity may be guilty of all the above appellations, and I do know that they evidently have a verbal incontinence with at least a poor elimination of ideas, if you know what I mean. If you are surrounded as completely as a Dago Army in Libya,” your false accusers are evidently not modern Englishmen or Greeks, for they fight in the open. •••

Allow me to join hands with you, small as I am, to help fill that gap in the first line of defense against all error in and out of the church, and subscribe to that slogan, “They shall not pass.”-Dr. C. B. Billingsley, Fort Smith, Arkansas.

(Note: The goose is in my backyard, a living symbol that my goose is not cooked! Thank you, Doctor.-Editor.)
From the very beginning of the Witty-Murch movement it seems there has been a wave of gestures toward the letting up of the stand taken by brethren over the country of speaking "where the Bible speaks, and being silent where the Bible is silent." Very definitely the fight is long made by the "digressives" to get something for nothing without too much of a protest by loyal brethren who love the Lord and the cause of simple New Testament Christianity more than their very lives. I never read an announced meeting of this group of appeasers that I do not think of the conference at Munich. There is no authority higher than the local congregation through which its voice may be heard and if some sort of an agreement could be reached under their arrangement of things, it would not and could not represent the wish of brethren who were not in attendance and whose expressions were not had. With the past behind us, I hardly see how any loyal disciple of our Lord can hope for anything but unfair representations, underhandedness, and utter disregard for individual consciences, with an open departure from the veritable truth of God on every hand, when necessary, to carry their ungodly schemes through to completion. This has been the doings of the "digressives," and I am persuaded, according to some very recent observations, that the picture has not changed in nature or character.

When these appeasers get ready to dwell with loyal brethren in the peace and liberty characteristic of former years, they have that opportunity to bring about the desired (?) result. Let them leave off the things that stand between us and return to the stand ever-held by the church and their plea and prayer for unity will be heard and enjoyed. But such cannot be so until this, and only this, is done. -Glenn A. Parks, Haynesville, Louisiana.

I have intended to write you ever since you threw the columns of your paper open for comments on the Inglorious Farce or the National Unity Meetings. I thank God for the opportunity to say to the world that I have absolutely no use for such meetings, and I do not believe they have served absolutely no use for such meetings, and I do not believe they have served any man, especially a Gospel preacher, can endorse such meetings is more than I can comprehend.

For some time I have also had good intentions of commenting upon the fight in general that you have made in the Bible Banner. Perhaps because of my own ignorance, I have not always agreed with the methods you have used at all times, but I have never had a moments doubt but that the church of future generations will have you, and your co-laborers to thank for saving the church from digression. So with me it is truth first, and let method be forgotten, if, indeed, the truth is defended. I say, keep up the good work, and keep the banner of truth unfurled. If there is ever an opportunity to help I shall be glad to do so. -A. E. Emmons, Jr., Springfield, Missouri.

Concerning the With-Murty Yum-Yum Association, since we never won conference nor lost a battle (as Will Rogers said) why not turn the thing into an honest-to-goodness scrap against all rabbit hearts, straddlers on Bible principles, and assorted sneak character assassins in and out of the Church and win the day for the Lord? -Price Billingsley, Fort Worth, Texas.

It is passing strange to me that any Christian preacher or not cannot become exercised over such a proposed meeting; much less take part in it. Read the 6th chapter of Nehemiah. Notice how Nehemiah handled the situation. "These things were written of our learning." (Romans 15:4) It is not man's prerogative to legislate in Divine matters. The Christian Church has long since ceased to speak where the Bible speaks, and be silent where it is silent. It is no longer content with the simplicity of the Divine Economy, but both add to and take from the Divine order with impunity. The very fact that they propose a unity meeting, implies compromise on their part. If they will give up in teaching and practice everything for which they cannot give scriptural authority—"the perfect law of liberty"—unity will exist between them and the church of Christ; between all who conform their lives and teaching to the perfect pattern. There will be no necessity or excuse for a get-together meeting of any kind. -F. C. Crews, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

I would like to know where these self-appointed preachers got their authority to hold unity meeting for the Church of Christ? And who would be bound by any agreement that they might make? Would all of us little fellows "way down south" have to abide by their decision? When did this Ecclesiastical Body originate? Is it possible that Murch and others of the Digressive order do not know that they will have to give up the Instrumental Music with all the Denominational machinery before unity can be effected? Do Witty, Hall, Wilcox and others think to slip up on the blind side of the Digressives and get them to sign on the "dotted line" before they are aware of their purpose? Why is it that some of the brethren who are invited to those meetings have not the gall to name the only conditions on which unity can be had? It seems to me that preachers could find far better employment of their time preaching the gospel to those who know it not than hobnobbing with Digressive preachers. You have done a splendid work so far, much success to you. Am enclosing subscription for Bible Banner another year. -W. Herron, Jacksonville, Florida.

"In Amos 3:3 the question is asked, "Can two walk together, except they be agreed?" One man and God make two, but they cannot walk together, except they be agreed. Therefore, the only way to have unity among men, and men with God, is for each individual to bring himself into agreement with God, then all will be walking together with God. God does not deal with the human family in masses now, but individually. "So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." (Romans 14:12)—C. B. Thomas, Corpus Christi, Texas.

May the Lord bless you for the good work you are doing. Peace and harmony will reign supreme when all come back to the Word of God. Keep fighting the good fight of Faith, maybe some if not all will come to a knowledge of the Truth through your untiring efforts. -Ray McCormick, Huntington, Tennessee.

Certainly all faithful gospel preachers believe in Unity and are pleading for unity. Oneness of God's people was a burden uppermost in Christ's heart, even in the shadow of the cross, but not union at the sacrifice of the whole foundation, Truth. Even Satan would welcome "unity" on his terms! -V. E. Howard, Greenville, Texas.

Extremely interested in "Watchman, What of the Night?" Just want to voice against the usurpers of unity, whether national or less. In the north section of this state we can see the result of such compromise and the Truth nearly excluded. May God grant you power to force this issue. -Virgil L. Collins, Muncie, Indiana.
I am glad to express myself relative to the sham “Unity (?) Movement” launched by Claud F. Witty and James DeForest Murch, who have proven that they are simply seeking notoriety.

No, I have never attended any of their meetings—have been too busy in the work of the Lord. It is a well known fact that every preacher among “us” who has supported and defended this farce is either a “Bollite,” a compromiser, premillennial sympathizer, or a fence straddler. Not one of them can be listed as a New Testament, a New Covenant defender of the one faith. And what I can’t quite understand is this: Why the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation are almost as silent as the grave this foolishness. If this Witty-Murch combination is not definitely exposed, many innocent brethren and even churches will be deceived. Why not “cry aloud and spare not?”—E. G. Creacy, Horse Cave, Ky.

First, I want to say concerning the Witty-Murch fiascos, I am one preacher that is opposed to every single thing about them with my whole heart and soul. I was invited to one. I did not go.

Second, I pray fervently that you may succeed in your effort to awaken the churches against the Jorgenson songbook to where there will not be another one of the misnamed, misrepresented implemenets of Bollism found in all the churches of the land.

I am with you in my heart, my spirit, my prayers, and had I the money I would be with you in purse, in every phase of your fight. I want you to know this. You will not publish it, nor do I complain at that. But others will, and I am going to say this to the brotherhood through other papers. I only want you to know. If you want to print what I say, print it; if you don’t want my name to appear in your paper, say it is from “an old crank in New Mexico.” But you go to bed at night; rise up at dawn; eat, drink and pray with the knowledge in your heart that I try as hard as any man on God’s earth to live a Christian life, preach the whole truth, fight as hard as you do against these devilish destroyers of the church, and that I pray for you every day.—Tice Elkins, Alamogordo, N. M.

The “Unity Meetings” with the Christian Church are but a compromise with Satan. If the “Unity” supporters practice things which are wrong let them give them up of themselves. It is child’s play to say, “I’ll give it up if you will, but I won’t unless you do.” The Lord’s way is, “Turn away from evil and do good.” A compromise with the error makes bad matters worse. The “Unity Meetings” will accomplish one thing—mark the “Unity” supporters as compromisers and warn loyal churches of their danger. “By their fruit ye shall know them.”—Buford Holt, Enid, Oklahoma.

Based upon the report of brethren who know about these “Unity Meetings,” I can have no confidence in them to accomplish New Testament Unity. It seems that compromisers and premillenialists especially like such meetings. Further, the report as to what is done at the meetings is that real issues are dodged and camouflaged by irrelevant talk and pleasantries. The Christian Church has plainly shown that it does not want any real handling of the issues, as in the case of its criticism of H. Lee Boles when he did that very thing. Again, it is not my conception of New Testament teaching that unity is to be sought or can be gained by such methods. An earnest, kind, but non-compromising preaching of the gospel will bring all of God’s true children to real Scriptural unity. This unity is reached by personal decision in the individual, not by conference of the few for lo, Texas.

The Murch-Witty Unity Movement can only lead to confusion. Every body knows that the Christian Church is not going to give up their novations. Like Ephraim of old, they are joined to their idols. Brother Witty ought to know that they will be happy to have full fellowship with us and to have free access to all pulpits in the church of Christ. They are perfectly willing to let us alone if we will let them alone. They will recognize us if we will only recognize them. Let those in the Christian Church who want to come back to New Testament principles, come, but let them come as they ought to come. I have not heard of one preacher in the Christian Church offering to give up his additions in order to have unity. Brethren stay out of the plains of Ono. As for me, I am doing a great work on the walls and will not find time to come down. I do not think there is a preacher in the church of Christ in all this section that wants a Unity Meeting in Houston now or at any other time. Boll and Jorgenson can have all such meetings so far as I am concerned. Of course, Neal and Cauble might want a few.—Thornton Crews, Houston, Tex.

After reading the December Banner, I have compiled all 1940 copies in book form which makes a very nice book as well as a valuable one.

I wish all elders and potential leaders in the Church had the Bible Banner in book form as I have it—this church would be in safer hands in years to come. I shall do the same with 1941 copies.—W. D. Scroggins, Amarillo, Tex.

I certainly am enjoying the “Bible Banner.” I do not believe there is any paper in the brotherhood to compare to it. I rejoice that we still have a few brethren who have the courage and determination to fight error to the finish.—J. 0. Hill, Birmingham, Alabama.

“Can two walk together except they be agreed?” The Digressives do not agree with those walking in the truth. Therefore we cannot unite with them. Repentance and prayer is still the Lord’s way for the erring child to come back. The Digressives should join our fellowship in the truth in only this way.—Hulen L. Jackson, Shawnee, Oklahoma.

I take this means of letting you know that I want to be one of the “seven times seven thousand” who have not bowed to knee to Baal! I am diametrically opposed to such Unity (?) meetings. When I see a man dabbling in such I always know where to place him. I think of what Jesus said in Matt. 12:30, “He that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.” I am set for the defense of the Gospel. May God bless you in your work of defending the cause of our Lord.—W. D. Black, Sanderson, Texas.

I can see no good can come from these Unity Meetings unless they be turned into wide open debates of the issues, with our strongest defenders of the Faith there to plead for the old paths.—C. A. Buchanan, Gainesville, Texas.

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

SPECIAL RENEWAL OFFER
PROFESSED PIETY AND MISSIONARY ZEAL

G. K. WALLACE

We are told that “actions” speak louder than “words.” But in regard to “piety” and “missionary zeal” we have many words and little action. Too, those who do the most talking do the least work. “Be ye doers of the word and not hearers only.” (Jas. 23). He who hears the word is required to do it. Does it not also follow that he who preaches it is to do it too? If not why not? Our “missionary loud speakers” spend little if any time in mission work? In what foreign field have they spent their time? To what field do they now plak to go? ‘Yea they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men’s shoulders but they themselves will not move them with their finger.” (Matt. 23:4).

There is an effort among us today to weaken the fight against false doctrine. A new and “ethical” type of Journalism edited and published by men who are great “psychologists”, and who always know the “right approach,” is now among us. An effort is being made to get control of the churches by a new series Sunday School Literature. This effort of a few men to control the church and weaken the fight against denominationalism has gained great strength because these leaders profess great piety and missionary zeal. In this way they disguise their real motive and many fine Christians are lead away after them.

However, you will note that the zeal of these “zealots” is not directed toward the “field white unto harvest” but toward the church that has the money. That is, these men do not go into the field to save souls but to raise money. No, no, they must raise the money. “Let John do it” should be their slogan. “I’ll raise the money and you do the work. You go and I’ll stay.”

Too. the “little sheet” published by High Explosive Jimmie Lovell is very zealous for missionary work. Jimmie is “so anxious” to see missionary work done! That is what I meant to say—see missionary work done. It is easier to see than to do. He works “so” hard to get some one into a field but he himself does not go. Again, we wonder! You say, “He is not a preacher.” It seems to me that any man who can talk as much as he does could preach. A man who can sell gun powder could preach the gospel. Yet I suspect it is much easier to go back and forth from the East to the West at the expense of Mr. Du Pont, and tell the brethren how the gospel ought to be preached and how missionary work ought to be done than to do it. Paul not only told how to preach the gospel but also gave them an example. Paul was not afraid to give up his salary and good job to do it.

When Lovell, Janes and Morehead get out into the field and really become missionaries, I will be prepared to believe that their missionary zeal is directed toward saving souls and not toward personal gain and the advancement of the cause of premillennialism and a spirit of compromise in the church.

If any one hears of Lovell having such great zeal for missionary work giving up a job of six hundred dollars per month to become a missionary, please break the news to me gently.

MUSINGS FROM THE MOTOR CITY

A. R. KEENAN

They do us wrong who say we (who preach not premillennialism) have lost our hope. It’s easy to assert: it’s hard to prove. In the absence of evidence, right-minded people will cheerfully withdraw their charges. (Are you listening, W. & W.?) We open our Bibles in hope; we close them gently in hope. We fall to our knees in hope; we arise with more hope. We make our way to the meeting house at the appointed hour in hope; we enter it in hope; greet those gathered there in hope. We sing in hope, give in hope, preach and listen in hope. We break the bread and drink the wine in hope. In short, we hope in hope. Where are those who say there can be no hope apart from let’s see, was it nine hundred and ninety nine calendar years plus one?

“Hearken, my beloved brethren, Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he hath promised to them that love him?” (Jas. 2:5.)

There it is again! We are now heirs, not recipients, of the kingdom. God promises it (not “gives”) it to them that love him. A parallel construing of these verses must then “prove” that most of us have unluckily been born too late. Notice the working: “Hath chosen” (not “is choosing”, or “will continue to choose”). “We’ve got some rich folks in this neck of the woods called Dodg. They are heirs of the lamented John and Horace, of alcoholic memory, and are still heirs of the money which these two master mechanics and convivial companions bequeathed them despite the fact that they already have it firmly in hand. In that sense, too, we Christians are heirs of the present kingdom of God, the church, which now is—which began on Pentecost and must endure until the last day.

I opine that one or two premillenialists around are good for us on the first theory that a few gadflies are necessary to keep us from lethargic inattention to what the Bible actually says on the nature of Christ’s kingdom part by part and detail by detail; and on the second theory that a couple of fleas are good for any dog, lest he brood in his excess leisure on the fact that he’s a dog. Cheer up, brethren, and be not terrified, nor amazed with any amazement. But when ye hear of circulars and unsigned brochures, know that these are the inevitable accompaniments of unscriptural positions. When the gentleman himself won’t fight, he sends his man in such guises.

Our real, genuine life is in heaven. From there we look for Christ’s return, “who shall change our vile body.” (Paul, be more sweet. Some bodies may be vile, but the term is unfair to plenty of others.) “Who shall change our vile body.” “Our vile body.” Yes, of course. The word has been used by the Apostle advisedly. Even the most (Cont. On Page 15)
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THE BEGGING BROADCAST AND SOME ADOLESCENT EDITORS

An obstreperous young gosling in the Rio Grande Valley, who thinks he is an editor and an audacious young free lance out in New Mexico, who thinks he is a "crusader," have declared war on the Bible Banner. They think the editor of the Bible Banner has committed atrocious deeds in criticising the begging broadcast from Del Rio and in being too much occupied on Lord's Day, with three major services, to hold a session with the broadcaster of said begging broadcast. But this does not modify my views on nor cancel my criticisms of the broadcast which has adopted the same obnoxious methods of the general radio racketeering of those preachers whose raucous voices are daily ranting over the air to the tune of interspersed begging. Any program in the name of a gospel service which descends to the religious level of the radio programs of Webber, a Tingley, a Sam Morris and a Frank Norris, which appropriates the fair name of the churches of Christ, and commits to its sponsorship in the eyes of the public all such churches, has done, is doing and will continue to do untold harm to the church of Christ. If anybody else wishes to run me down for an argument over the matter let this serve as an advance notice that I will still be occupied. Somehow or other nearly everywhere I go there are those who feel that I am under personal obligations to have a set-to or a conference on what they seem to think are personal matters. Inasmuch as I have never conceded, and do not now concede, any of these things to be in the classification of personal differences I shall just stay out of their personal parleys and quarrels and continue to say what I believe should be said in the Bible Banner.

If these young aspirants to notoriety want to criticise the Bible Banner for criticising these radio rantings, just let them use all of the ink and paper they can buy and pay for to do it. If they want to know how to finance their programs without begging, take this tip. Just tell Clinton Davidson that he, Claude Nance, of Oklahoma City. By trade Claude pursues the honorable work of a U. S. Mail Carrier. He decided that he wanted to preach. Too much encouragement appeared to go to his head, and he undertook the task of regulating and reforming the church in Oklahoma City, even to the point of disposing of some elders. In a joint session of brethren, it became the duty of John Bannister to take Claude down a few notches which Brother John did in a most effective manner. Since then Claude has been referring to elders and leaders of the church in this city as "big-wigs." He is using the columns of the little soldier of the valley to do this brave thing! Said Claude to Ira recently (in the paper) that he (Claude) had predicted ten years ago that the so-called church of Christ would have a division, and that his prediction is now coming true, and that Ira's little paper soldier will be the organ of the "true church of Christ" when it emerges!

Imagine such a youth as Claude Nance was ten years ago delivering an oracle in the form of a prophecy about what would happen to the church in the years to come! Page Sister Ellen G. White, of the Adventists, and Prophet Joseph, of the Mormons! It would be too funny if it were not too pitiable. As a prophet, Claude is a good mail carrier!

There are no such conditions as Claude Nance represents in the church in Oklahoma City that I know of, and I think I know. And there are no conditions in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas, even to the conditions that young Ira has created, that would not cure themselves if he would go away and let the churches alone. These boys need a paddle applied on a certain locality at an angle best surveyed in the posture of being bended over somebody's knee. Ira's father ought to give him some good advice (if he knows how) or else send him home to his mother, where she can send him to bed to sleep with his brother or his Dad, instead of the colored preacher Hogan. As for Claude, his wife ought to take charge of him for awhile if she has to call in the juvenile officers to help her do it.

If this advice is received and appropriated by these young marauders it will help them, if it is not, and they all turn on the Bible Banner, it will help me. I am willing, wholly willing, for the public to know that I do not go along with their preposterous extremities. Having let this be understood, they may, if they so choose, make the Bible Banner and me their future target. I will just return to the main line and leave them to their ridiculous antics. As for the broadcast, I am permanently opposed to "reaching the whole cosmic ball" with belowing and begging over the radio in the name of the churches of Christ.

(Cont. From Page 14)

perfect specimen the world can produce, is unholy and sin-cursed, It is a good slogan, the Bible Banner, and without any quotation marks, appropriated it to himself as his own editorial, winding up with "They Shall Not Pass!" Now that is a good slogan, the Bible Banner is not copyrighted, but such parrot-like mimicry is nauseating to anybody with sense. It is obvious that these immature young zealots are trying to capitalize on the Bible Banner. So while the Bible Banner has met actual issues and opposed movements by no means imaginary, this young insubordinate attacks men who have the confidence and support of the sound brethren in their section, who stand where we stand, just because they do not keep step to their boisterous parade. He knows not who nor what nor how to attack. He therefore does harm to the issues that are being defended. While purporting to be fighting a great battle in the Valley against overwhelming odds this lad in reality is only writing and rambling at random about like Jimmie Lovell's West Coast Christian, except in a little different staccato, or key.

Another member of this "adolescent axis" (though he is some older) is Claude Nance, of Oklahoma City. By trade Claude pursues the honorable work of a U. S. Mail Carrier. He decided that he wanted to preach. Too much encouragement appeared to go to his head, and he undertook the task of regulating and reforming the church in Oklahoma City, even to the point of disposing of some elders. In a joint session of brethren, it became the duty of John Bannister to take Claude down a few notches which Brother John did in a most effective manner. Since then Claude has been referring to elders and leaders of the church in this city as "big-wigs." He is using the columns of the little soldier of the.
EDITORIAL ETHICS GONE TO SEED

C. B. DOUTHITT

King Saul of Israel claimed that he obeyed the voice of Jehovah in the destruction of the Amalekites. But the bleating of the sheep and the lowing of the oxen made it impossible for him to convince Samuel that his claim was according to facts.

The editor of the Gospel Advocate has been somewhat vociferous in his claim that he is pursuing the same editorial policy as his predecessors. But why have almost all gospel preachers been removed from the front page of the Advocate? Why has that page been turned over almost exclusively to the sentimental twaddle of sectarian preachers? Why does the Advocate refer to Sunday as the Sabbath, and that right on the front page? Why does it teach that Martin Luther was “sound in faith,” and that too, right on the front page? Why does the editor apologize for the idolatry of Confucius? When were these things done by any other editor of the Advocate? It was never done by Jim Allen, or Foy Wallace, or John T. Hinds. It was never done till B. C. Goodpasture became editor.

A few samples of the editor’s erroneous declarations taken from consecutive numbers of the Advocate are given as follows:

1. In the issue of April 4, 1940, he has an editorial under the caption; “Honor To Whom Honor Is Due.” It is an article on the heathen Confucius. The reason that he gives why the readers of the Advocate should “honor” a Chinese idolater and teacher of a false religion did not convince me any too thoroughly that Christians ought to bow down to Confucius. But let the editor speak for himself: “It is true that the religion of Confucius was largely idolatrous, and, therefore, false; yet, for one of his limited opportunities, he may have done well.” There it is, brethren, commas and all. Think of it! Goodpasture admits that the religion of Confucius was false and idolatrous; but he contends that an idolatrous teacher of a false religion “may have done well,” because of “his limited opportunities.” Cain was told that God would lift up his countenance, “if thou dost well.” (Gen. 4:7) The editor says that Confucius in a false and idolatrous religion “may have done” it. Is that sound doctrine? Is that the policy of the “committee?” Does the “committee” agree with Brother Goodpasture that an idolater is doing well, if his opportunities are “limited?”

2. In the very next number of the Advocate (April 11), the front page contains a piece from “Selected” I am not personally acquainted with this anonymous Brother Selected. But it is quite clear that Brother Selected does not know the difference between the Sabbath and the Lord’s Day. He says “Sabbaticus” is Sunday. Does the editor know the difference? Has the Advocate always referred to Sunday as the Sabbath? Mr. Foy Wallace, Mr. David Lipscomb or M. C. Kurfees knows that these men would not permit any editor’s featuring Pagans and politicians, Methodists and musicians, Sabbatarians and sectarians, on the front page of any paper with which they had a controlling voice. Why was R. H. Boll removed from the front page of the Advocate? For spreading on the front page the premillennial trash he had been reading from Blackstone. Who removed him? Some of the men now being quoted by Brother Goodpasture in defense of his “ethics.” What appears now on the front and editorial pages of the Advocate? Sectarian trash which the present editor has spent the most of his life reading, This rubbish right under the name of the paper is a travesty on the glorious title, “Gospel Advocate.”

The followers of Confucius would agree with Brother Goodpasture that it is “ethical” to “honor” Confucius with an editorial apology for his idolatry; many sectarian preachers will agree with the editor of the Advocate that it is ethical and customary to refer to Sunday as the Sabbath; John R. Clark and Ben M. Bogard will agree with the editor that it is “ethical” to say that the originator of the doctrine of “faith only” was “strong in doctrine, sound in faith;” but when he undertakes to prove by M. C. Kurfees that he is pursuing the same editorial policy as his predecessors, he is slandering the dead. I do not believe that a single member of the “committee” agrees with what the editor is teaching on the front and editorial pages of the Advocate; I know some of them do not, and they would register a protest, if Brother Goodpasture should try to prove by them that he taught the truth in the three consecutive numbers of the Advocate mentioned above, and he knows it too; therefore he tries to justify himself by quoting men who are dead - men who cannot contradict him. And he is loud and long in his claim of “ethics.” Strange ethics indeed.

“If our people are not thoroughly indoctrinated, then woe betide us in the future! Baptists ought to be Baptists and know why. Pastors and all the rest of us are obligated to help bring this about. Baptist and reflector is trying to do-its part.”

(From my reading of the New Testament, I gather that Christians ought to be Christians and know why. It seems to me that “Pastors and all the rest of us are obligated to bring this about.” I do not “know why anybody ought to be” a Baptist since the New Testament says nothing about “Baptists." As I understand the situation, Editor Taylor freely admits that a man can serve the Lord and go to heaven by being a Christian, without being a Baptist at all. This is as it “ought to be” and I am doing all I can “to help bring this about.” It seems a pity that “Baptists and reflector” is trying to do its part” to bring about something that Paul and other inspired men were not interested in enough to even mention. The early disciples continued steadfastly in “the apostles’ doctrine,” not Baptist doctrines. —Cled E. Wallace.)