SIGHTING-IN SHOTS APR 9 1941

CLLED E. WALLACE

The editor has taken some of the adolescents out to the woodshed, so to speak, and applied the paddle in a way we hope will produce wholesome results, even if we do have some immediate repercussions to the tune of weeping, wailing and gnashing of teeth. Churches may expect and be tolerant of some indiscretions on the part of some young preachers and look on them as growing pains, but it outrages all reason when one of them suddenly swells up to where he feels qualified to bawl out churches and preachers throughout a whole section and shocks conservative and well-informed brethren by his prancing and ranting. We believe in applying drastic treatment to drastic needs but disapprove a campaign of wholesale butchery by blood-thirsty boys because, perhaps, a bit of surgery may be needed here and there. These youngsters will have to be more sensible in the way they crusade around with their swords, or they are likely to be taken from them. Brethren have a very effective way, sometimes a very quiet way, of disciplining fanatics who do not know any better than to prance around and croak insults at everybody they meet. Here is a case in point. The Gospel Broadcast, which our editor threatens to rename the Gospel Beggar, features a lengthy and bitter tirade against churches and preachers generally, written by Ira Y. Rice, Jr. The theme song of the Gospel Broadcast appears to be: “Just sit down right now and send your contribution whether it is one dollar or ten dollars. Whatever it is will help.” Its constantly “pressing need” is more money quick. Getting back to the case in point, Ira has all of a sudden been made aware of the great sin of “pastorating” for a church. He has “dissolved my relationship with the church at … as pastor” and recognizes “the depravity of our twentieth century ‘One-Man Pastor’ system.” If reports are to be credited, Ira has caused so much trouble in that church trying to be a “One-Man Pastor,” that there wasn’t much left about his “relationship” to be “dissolved” when he quit and decided to “evangelize.” If he had been “evangelizing” all along and let the church run its own business, in all probability the ‘relationship’ would have been both more permanent and satisfactory. He is now no longer a “pastor” but proposes to be a broadcaster or a crusader. He is going to help editor Eugene Smith, another broadcaster, “to bestir these pastoral hirelings out of their evangelistic stupor.” He calls them “bread-and-butter jackals.” He freely accuses “most of the preachers” employed by churches of Christ as being “little more than hirelings” and interested in nothing but their bread and meat. Some-body ought to catch this little fledgling and slip him in to Noah Cowan’s coop, before he grows up and really does some harm. Such a wholesale slandering of the preachers of the churches of Christ is inexcusable and would be tragic if Ira had not already about ruined his influence with his big mouth and his irresponsible pen. One thing may be said in defense of “most of the preachers” Ira is ranting at. They may be paid too little for their work but they are not crying loud enough to be heard all over two nations: “Just sit down right now and send me one dollar, or ten dollars, please.” Most of them can behave themselves and keep a civil tongue in their heads, something Ira has not been able to do that I have heard of.

He has no more respect for the elders as a rule than he does the preachers. He refers in his article to “the alleged ‘Elders and Deacons’ of the modern day churches of Christ” as men who do not know “what it’s all about” and care less. He thinks, however, that when he teaches them better, they will all do better. One thing about Ira, he is not lacking in self-confidence and optimism. If he could only swap it all off for a little modesty and start over it would be nearly as miraculous as a new birth, and would be as much of an improvement as changing a caterpillar into a butterfly.

W. Wallace Layton, another one of the wild boys who merits a trip to the woodshed, attempts to rebuke the editor of the Bible Banner. He is “sorely disappointed in Bro. Foy E. Wallace, Jr.” Why, pray? Because Foy rebuked the begging campaign being carried on by Eugene Smith in the name of the churches of Christ. So Layton in his naper, the Christian Crusader, “rebukes Bro. Wallace for his high handed criticism.” He does “not know of any preacher in the brotherhood accomplishing as much good as Eugene S. Smith.” He thinks Ira Y. Rice, Jr. is “one of God’s most zealous soldiers” while some of the sensible brethren who are disgusted with Ira’s antics are “the meaneast and sneakingest people on earth.” He left Texas and went to New Mexico, which he had a right to do if he wanted to. Now he thinks it is “their stubbornness and slothful indifference” that keeps the churches of Texas, which he calls “pastorate organizations of Texas,” from sending their preachers out to help him do missionary work. “Come on out of Texas, you preachers, into the harvest fields of the great West.” He says that “hell becomes their abiding place” if they don’t listen to him. It never occurs to him that maybe the churches and preachers have the right to exercise their own judgment in the selection of “harvest fields.” I recall that he spent some time in Texas (Continued On Page 16)
WELL DONE, BROTHER KURFEES, WELL DONE

The Gospel Advocate, as our readers know, and its readers, too, has been acting strangely. In the thick of the Davidson-Leader fight, though the movement was directed as much against the Advocate as it was anything or anybody else, and though the life or death of the Advocate was at stake in the victory or defeat of Davidson’s announced objectives not withstanding this, the Gospel Advocate maintained a lay-low policy. The Advocate let others bear the brunt of battle, knowing all of the time that they would reap the rewards of Davidson’s defeat. Personally I can think of nothing quite so ignoble, except the course the Advocate has pursued since the knock-out blow has put Davidson and his Leader out of the war. That course has been, all at once, to direct a series of cuts and criticisms at those who fought the battle that saved the Advocate itself. The Advocate was afraid of Davidson and would not fight him, but it will fight those who did fight Davidson.

The strategem of the Advocate was to quote excerpts from the writings of such men as M. C. Kurfees and F. W. Smith, selecting certain mild articles or passages from their articles that would leave the impression that these men were of the same non-combatant, non-militant, editorial attitude of the Advocate now. Of course, there are too many people living who know the manner and method of these men in dealing with these same issues for the Advocate to get by with it.

It so happens that J. F. Kurfees, of Louisville, Kentucky the worthy brother of the late and illustrious M. C. Kurfees, called the Advocate’s hand on their misrepresentation of the attitude of Kurfees, Smith and others, including J. C. McQuiddy, and he “urged and insisted” that the Advocate reproduce certain articles from the pen of those men when they were dealing with the issues with a severity that the Advocate now with much severity criticises. This demand was published in the February issue of the Bible Banner. Coming from J. F. Kurfees, this did put the editor of the Advocate on the spot. So he decides to ante-up, even if it does cancel out the very thing he has been doing and saying in the Advocate. The March 13 issue of the Advocate reproduces the J. C. McQuiddy article castigating E. L. Jorgenson and his Louisville church for their action in withdrawing from the brethren who opposed their false teaching. Brother McQuiddy, in this article, called for the withdrawal from and the complete cutting off of E. L. Jorgenson and his element by all loyal churches. There is no doubt that his advice was right and had it been done the church would have been spared the present fight.

The editor of the Advocate says that he endorses the “scriptural principles” set forth in the J. C. McQuiddy article. Does he endorse the action urged, namely that every faithful church in the brotherhood should withdraw all fellowship from the E. L. Jorgenson as stated in the second paragraph of the article? Does Brother Goopasture mean by his endorsement of the “scriptural principles” that we should do, actually do, what J. C. McQuiddy urged? If so, why does he not just say so, tell everybody that this is what the Gospel Advocate “urges” now that all the churches should do, namely, withdraw from the E. L. Jorgenson-R. H. Boll group, and say to all the brethren that it is high time they were practicing what he reluctantly and mildly concedes to be the scriptural “principle.” The plain truth is, the editor of the Advocate apparently did his best to say as little as he could and to evade the main point. J. F. Kurfees (not a preacher, but business man and elder) has tied the editor of the Advocate in knot, and left no loop-hole for him. It serves the Advocate right.

So the editor of the Advocate reproduces this article, but it stands out that it was done under duress and with a feeling of resentment. He never would have done it if J. F. Kurfees had not forced the issue upon him. Well done, Brother Kurfees. It reminds me of the effort F. B. Srygley made to force E. Gaston Collins to take a stand on the same thing-the Boll-Jorgenson party-while he was in the Advocate office, but Brother Srygley failed. Brother Kurfees touched a sore spot and got a rise out of the editor of the Advocate, even to the point of causing him to reverse himself completely.

But the Advocate’s bad spirit is seen even in this. First, they quote a statement from David Lipscomb representing him at one time, long ago, as being in doubt on a phase of the Boll issue. While it is mildly explained that Brother Lipscomb finally made up his mind on the right side, still the purpose in the Advocate’s reference to it is obviously—a slap at those who are contending for the right side of these issues now, and making an easier place for these men to fall, a softer bed in which to lie, who have been cut down on these issues and has the effect of taking back what he endorsed in the other article. Why publish what Lipscomb said before he made up his mind on the subject? More than ever the editor of the Advocate is revealing his hand and his heart in these things. It is doing the Gospel Advocate no good with brethren over a wide area who have stood for the truth.

Second, the attitude of the Advocate toward J. F. Kurfees, a giant in the church in Louisville, now past his three score years and ten, is one of the most unworthy examples ever seen in the experience to observe. For instance, the editor of the Advocate closes his comments, on the articles mentioned, by a remark that if the one who prodded him into publishing the articles were still not satisfied, he would “be compelled to leave him in Jericho until his beard grows out. (1 Chron. 19:5).” Since Brother Kurfees is the one who “urged and insisted” that the Advocate should be fair to his own brother, M. C. Kurfees, and to Leon McQuiddy’s own father, J. C. McQuiddy, the remark is obviously intended for him. And it so happens that Jericho (N. C.) was the home of the Kurfees’—but J. F. Kurfees had already grown a beard before the present editor of the Gospel Advocate knew that there was a Jericho either in the land of Palestine or in the United States of America. Or does he mean that the (not a preacher, but business man and elder) has tied the editor of the Advocate in this pantomime has succeeded in shaving the beard or stripping off the garments of Brother Kurfees, as the reference to the story of 1 Chron. 19 would imply. Read it and see the unenviable position in which the editor of the Advocate has placed himself in making himself Hanun while trying to humiliate J. F. Kurfees.

If perchance the editor of the Advocate meant the remark for me, I will add that if I must tarry in Jericho until he grows editorial beard, at the pace he is going now my wait will be longer than Rip Van Winkle’s nap!—F. E. W.
A NEW WIND OF DOCTRINE

In a "sighting-in" paragraph, brother Cled has made reference to a sudden decision reached by the editor of a little paper soldier down in the Rio Grande Valley, that "pastorating" for a church is wrong. Reference was also made to the fact that the Begging Broadcast is featuring this young fellow and allowing him to rant and rave against gospel preachers who are working with local churches, calling them "pastoral hirelings" and "bread-and-butter jackals" and other stereotyped names borrowed from the vocabulary of some who years ago opposed what was called the "located preacher." The language is not new. It is just a rehashing of matters that were thrashed out by the brethren through the Firm Foundation years ago along with other phases of the anti-Sunday-school defection. But young Ira Rice claims to have recently and suddenly discovered the sin of pastorating for the church at Mercedes, Texas, and represents that in the travail of his conscience he up and resigned, severed his connections or "dissolved relationships with the church at Mercedes as pastor," quite a confession, indeed! But the plain truth is, as every body in the valley knows, that this young fellow had torn the church asunder and "dissolved relationship with the church at Mercedes as pastor" only after it was in a state of hopeless division over him and his wild conduct.

A few weeks later John O'Dowd was sent for, by the group who were helping Ira to divide this church, to help them reinstate Ira as their preacher, thus restoring his "relationship with the church at Mercedes as pastor," evidently. So John O'Dowd came down from Houston, Texas, to help a faction in the church force Ira on an already divided church as their preacher.

It is said by some mighty good people who were present and heard it, that O'Dowd told them that it was "customary" for a church to keep a preacher a full one-year term, and that Ira had only served seven months and therefore should be retained another five, after which time it would be open to further consideration. How does that harmonize with the confession that this young fellow "dissolved relationship with the church at Mercedes as pastor" because he had come to recognize the awful depravity of being "a twentieth century 'one-man-pastor'"? Perhaps the pangs of his conscience in the meantime were transformed into packs in the stomach and under the temptation he rejoined the pack of "bread and butter jackals" he so recently deserted.

But there was opposition, bitter opposition, to taking him back as preacher for the church. Here is where "a new wind of doctrine" was heard to breeze in. Our informant says that O'Dowd preached long and loud trying to convince the audience that the elders of the church have no jurisdiction over a preacher, that the preacher and his work are not subject to the elders. His reason (?) seems to have been that elders are given a certain charge in the New Testament and that the preachers are also given a certain charge, and therefore the preacher is not subject to the elders! They can only employ him and nay him, I suppose, and he in turn can oust them. at his will!

Another phase of the argument (?) seems to have been that whether the preacher should stay or go should be decided by the majority vote of the men of the congregation. Since Paul said, "Let your women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto them to speak," it must have been presumed, I suppose, that Paul including voting and should have concluded that "it is a shame for Women to vote in the church!" So O'Dowd insisted that a male vote be cast (knowing that many of the best brethren were not there, and would not have voted if they had been) to determine whether Ira should be reinstated to his former post which he so conscientiously resigned "as pastor," and he remarked that this was the way they did it at the Wayside & Sherman Church in Houston, where he is the preacher.

Paul commanded the elders to "feed the church of God" (Acts 20:28) and Peter commanded the elders to "feed the flock of God" (1 Pet. 5:2). Wonder if preaching to the church is feeding it? If so, then the elders must either do the preaching or have it done, in which case the preacher who does it must be subject to the elders who are commanded to have it done.

It must be plain to everybody that such an argument is designed only to set the preacher free to do what he pleases in a church, backed by the mis-informed and misguided element which can always be mustered to the support of a designing preacher, in his utter disregard for elders in the church.

As a new wind of doctrine, I can think of nothing that could be more destructive of the church. Yet these young men who are saying and doing these things are protesting their own soundness and denouncing older and better men in the valley as being unsound. The man who has been "preaching" lately by these young renegades, Brother Steve Williams, has the indorsement of the elders of every church in the Rio Grande Valley, while Ira Rice cannot get the indorsement of the elders of any church in the valley. Yet Ira is sound and Brother Steve is unsound! Even J. D. Tant has become unsound in the eyes of these goslings. I'm told. But Brother Tant's slant on the situation, as related to me by Brother Tant himself, is that Brother Steve Williams preaches in a mild, conversational tone of voice, but is sound, while these boys scream and yell and pace and prance and are not sound! That is J. D. Tant's version of the Ira Rice-John O'Dowd set-up in the Valley.

Premillennialism is a bad doctrine and has had to be determinedly opposed. But the doctrine being advocated by the click of young fellows is as bad, and its immediate effects on the church can even be worse. They will disrupt every church they enter. Already Ira has several disrupted churches to his credit in the valley region.

The Gospel Broadcast is furnishing a medium and an encouragement to these obstreperous adolescents, and it, too, has begun harping on the old issue of the "one-man-pastor-system." When asked for distinctions, these brethren will invariably back up, concede the argument, and admit that the local preacher idea is all right, but that he shouldn't be a pastor. To this all will agree. Yet they hurl "one-man-pastor" and "pastoral hirelings" and "bread and butter jackals" at all the local preachers. If this is what the would-be crusader out in New Mexico means when he says that he does "not know of any preacher in the brotherhood accomplishing as much good" as the Del Rio broadcaster, I can only say that I do not know of any preacher in anybody's brotherhood who is doing as much begging, nor any preacher in "the brotherhood" that is doing as much harm to the churches than he is doing with his begging, over the whole country, together with the local harm these young incorrigibles are doing in the area of their work.

The actual facts show that they disturb to the point of disruption every church they enter. When this becomes generally known, our purpose in giving them this much attention will have been accomplished, and a sensible brotherhood will apply the remedy. Silent but effective will be that remedy.

Let it be understood that this is not intended as a castigation of young preachers. Some of the finest preachers in the church today are young men, and some of the staunchest friends this editor has, are young preachers. And

(Cont. on page 9)
THE “MILLENNIUM” IN “WHAT JESUS TAUGHT”

Much has been and is being said pro and con concerning the premillennialism taught in Brother Charles H. Roberson’s book, “What Jesus Taught,” in the chapter entitled “Millennium.” Brother Roberson, as most of the readers know, is head of the Bible Department in Abilene Christian College. Brother Roberson has been under fire lately because of the fact that the Millennium chapter in his book is rankly premillennial, not merely in import and interpretation, but in the actual letter of the statements therein of his opinions and beliefs.

Since his promotion to the presidency of Abilene Christian College, Brother Don Morris has been making a commendable effort to correct a number of situations that have existed for long in the college, which have brought upon the school the disapproval of a very large, loyal and respectable element of brethren in Texas and elsewhere.

In the December issue of the Bible Banner appeared an article from Brother J. L. Hines in criticism of the premillennial passages in Brother Roberson’s book, and challenging the consistency of retaining men as teachers of the Bible in the college who so belittle teach, in the light of the pledges that have been made to free the college of all such influence in the faculty or any part of it. In reply to the Hines article, Brother Don Morris makes a clear-cut statement of his own stand on these issues, and commits the entire faculty of the college to his stated views. The article included a statement signed by All Bible teachers on the faculty repudiating premillennialism in all forms and phases. As Brother Hines’ article had appeared in the December issue of the Bible Banner, the statement of Brother Morris was inserted in the January issue, with editorial comments reserved for later issues. The next Bible Banner (February) carried some editorial comments under the caption: “Concerning The Colleges.” It will not be amiss for the readers to refer to all of the above-mentioned articles in order to make an accurate mental note of these matters in their proper connections.

Inasmuch as Brother Roberson has conceded that “the language of this essay (in his book) is susceptible of being understood as teaching premillennialism” and that “some have so understood it,” and inasmuch as these various statements have been given space in the Bible Banner, it seems obviously right that all should have the privilege of seeing for themselves the entire “essay.” It is therefore given here in full, as it appears in “What Jesus Taught.” To assist the reader in identifying certain passages that have been quoted, they appear in blackface type below:

MILLENNIUM

Jesus commissioned his apostles: “Go ye therefore, and make the disciples of all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always,” even unto the end of the world” (Matt. 28:19). “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. The earth is the Lord’s, and the fullness thereof. For he has said, ‘The whole earth is mine’” (Acts 14:22). “And it came to pass when he was come back from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations.” (Acts 8:25). “And thirdly, he commands us to sow the good seed of the Word in the hearts of all who will receive it” (2 Cor. 4:14). “The parable gives no place for a millennium between Jesus’ ascension and his return; therefore there is no universal righteousness and knowledge of the Lord is impossible until the separation takes place at the harvest.”

Jesus explicitly announces the character and consummation of the gospel age in the parable of the Tares and the Pounds. The parable of the Tares is given in Matt. 13:24-30; the parable of the Pounds is recorded in Luke 19:11-27. Jesus was near the city of Jerusalem on His last journey to it. The people were in great expectancy, for they supposed that the kingdom of God was at hand. So Jesus gave the parable to correct this mistake and to reveal certain vital features connected with the kingdom. “A certain nobleman went into a far country, to receive kingdom, and to return thereunto. And he said unto his servant, care of his servants, unto whom he had given money, to be watchful in the time of his return.”

The parable spans the whole of time between His ascension and his second advent. It tells of Jesus’ going away of the conduct of His servants and of the citizens during His absence; it foretells the return and the reason that is to follow. It is quite important that our minds grasp the words, “And it came to pass when he was come back again, having received the kingdom, that he commanded the servants, unto whom he had given money, to be watchful in the time of his return.”

Jesus explicitly announces the character and consummation of the gospel age in the parable of the Tares and the Pounds. The parable of the Tares is given in Matt. 13:24-30; the parable of the Pounds is recorded in Matthew 25:24-28. Mark 13: Luke 21. foretells wars, disturbances among the nations’ Jerusalem’s fall and destruction of the temple, the exile of Israel. The nature of this parable is brought out in the following: “And it came to pass when he was come back again, having received the kingdom, that he commanded the servants, unto whom he had given money, to be watchful in the time of his return.”

The parable spans the whole of time between His ascension and his second advent. It tells of Jesus’ going away of the conduct of His servants and of the citizens during His absence; it foretells the return and the reason that is to follow. It is quite important that our minds grasp the words, “And it came to pass when he was come back again, having received the kingdom, that he commanded the servants, unto whom he had given money, to be watchful in the time of his return.”

To say that the above “language in this essay is susceptible of being understood as teaching premillennialism” is not a fair and forthright statement of its status before intelligent and informed readers. The “essay” is premillennialism-just outright premillennialism—ad R. H. Boll could not have done a better job stating it. In reality, it reads very much like R. H. Boll’s book on “The Kingdom of God,” and uses language almost identical.

The book, “What Jesus Taught,” was published in 1930. It is presumed that the chapter on the Millennium was written some months before its publication. Brother Roberson was nearly fifty years old. He has long been a college professor. He is educated. If he did not believe
premillennialism when he wrote his book, it is a strange enigma that he could use such strong language, and even repeat it, teaching what he declares he never believed. The very men among us today who, by reason of their education, attainments, and high degree of scholarship conferred, ought to be able to use the words of our language to make us poor mortals understand them, are the very men who are always "misunderstood," and are never understood, on important issues. There is something strange about it. To speak with perfect frankness, "there's a nigger in the woodpile" somewhere

Personally, I have had considerable respect for Brother C. H. Roberson's scholarship and integrity, and far be it from me now to deprive him or any other man the privilege of denying what he does not believe or of declaring what he does believe. But that still does not explain how he could have written an essay committing both himself and Jesus Christ to premillennialism in a book purporting to be "What Jesus Taught." When a man is setting forth what Jesus taught he ought not to use language "susceptible of being understood as teaching" what Jesus did not teach. That is far more serious than merely placing an interpretation on what Brother Roberson's opinion might be in the premises. The thing that makes the whole thing so inexcusable is that "the language of this essay" is not susceptible of any other understanding or, by the most charitable construction, of any other interpretation than the premillennial doctrine of a dispensation of time and a kingdom on earth after the second coming of Christ.

In order that the matter may be seen as it stands, let us view these statements in "What Jesus Taught" and the statements that have been made recently by Brother Roberson, side by side.

**WHAT JESUS TAUGHT THEN**

1. "There is a time to come when the knowledge of the Lord shall cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. Hence, it must be that our dispensation is not the last, for the effects stated in that are not contemplated in the instructions and results of this. So there is no millennium prior to the second advent of Jesus.

2. "A millennium of universal righteousness and knowledge of the Lord is impossible until the separation takes place at the harvest" ("the end of the world," or "the end of the age").

3. The scripture warrants the belief that there will be the blessedness of universal righteousness and prosperity that shall fill the earth, and if so, it must be after Jesus returns to this earth.

4. "From the day this parable was spoken to the hour of his coming again. He offers no place for a thousand years of blessedness for men on earth."

5. "That the Jew will be delivered from all their enemies, recover Palestine, and reign literally there with their Messiah in unequalled splendor."

6. "That the preaching of the gospel will result in world conversion." That is the fifth item of his statements, he says that "the preaching of the gospel will not result in world conversion." It sounds very much like men will have an "opportunity" after this age, after Jesus comes. It smacks of several kinds of theories we have been hearing about. It is not the language of men who are teaching the plain truth free of the tincture of millennium theories.

If it be said that Brother Roberson has repudiated these statements, we can only say that he has not repudiated them, but has only attempted to shift the blame to "some" who, he says, "have so interpreted" his language. But in the statement that he makes in place of his old statements, he says that "the preaching of the gospel will not result in world conversion." That is the fifth item of his new statement. His old statement says that a "universal knowledge of the Lord is impossible" under the influence and effects of the gospel. But his old essay says that "there is a time to come" when there will be a universal knowledge of the Lord. But this is "impossible" in this dispensation, Brother Roberson says, and "must be after Jesus returns to this earth." If this does not teach that there will be other means of bringing men to the knowledge of God than the gospel of Christ in this dispensation, his words have no meaning at all. And it seems that Brother Roberson has not changed his view of that point, for in the item of his new statement he says that he does not now believe, and never did believe that "the preaching of the gospel will result in the conversion of the world." It sounds like a hold-over from his old essay that it is "impossible" in this age and "must be after Jesus returns to this earth."

We are not trying to embarrass Brother Roberson or anybody else, but these statements are too hazy to be
clear, unless they mean what they say. The reason ordinary people cannot see through some men’s thinking and writing is not necessarily because they are “deep.” I have seen shallow holes in the ground filled with water through which I could not see the bottom—because it was muddy. It is not depth in this case that keeps us from understanding Brother Roberson—his water is just muddy. If this is a sample of what young preachers at the college are getting it does not speak much for what the church in the future is going to get if this is all they depend on for the source of supply.

Brother Don Morris has pledged to give the loyal brethren a school and a faculty that can be trusted on all questions. They are looking to him to keep his pledges. He has made some clear-cut strong, straightforward statements, but “actions speak louder than words.” As the matter stands, Brother Morris has made no changes and the school has made no changes, except to change presidents. Brother Roberson is Head of Bible. There has been no unprovoked fight made on him at all, but rather his own writings, and statements, have caused the brethren to doubt him. Brother Bell remains on the faculty as Bible instructor with his long record of weakness and wavering on various vital questions. Brother Cox is retained as Bible teacher, with unreserved endorsesments of Clinton Davidson personally, and his movement bodily, even to the point of falling out with everybody who opposed Davidson and his machinations. It is Brother Cox who brought Davidson to Abilene, promoted him there, and furnished him the opportunity to plant himself and his ideology in the minds of the student body of Abilene Christian College. Had the parents actually known the real danger to which their children were being subjected in the issues involved many of them would have called them home. That is what I would have done. Brother Paul Southern, though doubtless a fine man, has not made a reputation as a Bible scholar and teacher. The strongest thing that can be said in favor of the Bible Department at Abilene is that it is weak. There is one exception to this. Homer Hailey has the unqualified confidence of loyal brethren in and out of Abilene, wherever he is known, but he is only a part time teacher, restricted to two classes. Even so, he is making his influence felt among the young preachers and already they are distinguished for their sound ideas.

Brother Morris has the personal confidence of a very large group of brethren, including me, who have wanted to see conditions at Abilene changed. They sympathize with him in the task he faces as he now assumes a position over men who formerly were over him. The only question in the minds of these brethren seems to be whether Brother Morris will have the initiative, courage and determination to carry out his own convictions. They wait for him to rise to this task, show his faith by his works, and make the changes required for the good of the Cause and the soundness of the college. When he does this the support of that vast element in the church who stand right on these issues will be worth far more to him and to the school than the favor of those who have allowed the school to become what it has been in the past.

We still contend that the only remedy for the situation existing in the churches and in the colleges is to reject false teaching, renounce false teachers, and renovate the schools, all of them, from the attic to the cellar, of all such influences, thus returning them to the confidence of thousands of loyal brethren whose confidence they should covet.-F. E. W.

WORK OF JAMES E. WHITE

HOMER HAILEY

Recently brother White, the Indian Evangelist of Oneida, Wisconsin, paid the Highland Avenue congregation here in Abilene, a visit, acquainting us with his work. The entire church was greatly stimulated by his visit, and resolved to uphold his hand while he labors among his people, in every possible way. It seemed to the whole church that the opportunity among the Indians offers one of the most promising and fruitful fields of labor to be found anywhere today.

Brother White is a splendid speaker, with a thorough knowledge of the Bible, and sound doctrinally and morally. We appreciate an opportunity to have fellowship with such a worker in the Lord’s vineyard.

The support of brother White has never been sufficient for him to do the most efficient work among his people. The Highland congregation is now assisting brother White as his overseer and helper, whereas the Murray Hill church of Flint, Michigan, formerly rendered him this service. We earnestly solicit the aid of any and all congregations in this matter. There are over half million Indians in this country, and only one evangelist of the gospel among them.

We should remember that this was once their land. We came in and took it from them by one way and another. Be that as it may, the fact that we are here places upon us an obligation of carrying them the gospel story, and an unadulterated faith. Will you help us in this work?

Brother Wallace has offered space in the Bible Banner for monthly reports. The following is a report of moneys received by us, and sent to brother White, for January and February. Please address all communications to G. G. Henry, 1018 Sayles Blvd., Abilene, Tex.

Shelby, Michigan, Miss Bertha Hawley and mother$ 2.00
Springfield, Mo., South National Ave. Church of Christ 5.00
Pauls Valley, Okla., Church of Christ 5.00
Coleman, Texas, Church of Christ 6.00
Amarillo, Texas, Central Church of Christ 6.00
Abilene, Texas, Highland Church of Christ 25.00
Urbana, Ill., Main St. Church of Christ 5.00
Wichita, Kansas, Douglas Ave. Church of Christ 10.00
Pauls Valley, Oklahoma, Church of Christ 2.50
Paris, Tenn., Church of Christ 2.00
Coleman, Texas, Church of Christ 1.50
Elk City, Okla., Church of Christ 5.00
Shelby, Michigan, Miss Bertha Hawley and mother 2.00
Amarillo, Texas, Central Church of Christ 6.00
Trenton, Tenn., Church of Christ 5.00
Urbana, Ill., Main St. Church of Christ 5.00
Trenton, Tenn., Church of Christ 5.00
Balance transferred from Murray Hill Church of Christ 2.45
Flint, Michigan, Murray Hill Church of Christ 15.67
Abilene, Texas, Highland Church of Christ 75.00
Big Spring, Texas, Church of Christ, January, February and March 15.00

$199.12

DISBURSEMENTS

James E. White  $168.00
W. L. Kohn, payment on church building at Oneida 15.67 183.67
Balance 15.45

175.12
NEGO MEETINGS FOR WHITE PEOPLE

The manner in which the brethren in some quarters are going in for the negro meetings leads one to wonder whether they are trying to make white folks out of the negroes or negroes out of the white folks. The trend of the general mix-up seems to be toward the latter. Reliable reports have come to me of white women, members of the church, becoming so animated over a certain colored preacher as to go up to him after a sermon and shake hands with him holding his hand in both of theirs. That kind of thing will turn the head of most white preachers, and sometimes affect their conduct, and anybody ought to know that it will make fools out of the negroes. For any woman in the church to so far forget her dignity, and lower herself so, just because a negro has learned enough about the gospel to preach it to his race, is pitiable indeed. Her husband should take her in charge unless he has gone crazy, too. In that case somebody ought to take both of them in charge.

Reliable brethren in the Valley have reported the definite inclinations of the negro man and his wife in charge of the orphan home for colored children at Combes toward social equality. They are supposed to be members of the church, and some of the white brethren are apparently encouraging them. It is said that these two negroes have privately stated that they favor social equality and are working for it. The young editor of “Christian Soldier,” in the valley, admits that he roomed with the negro preacher, R. N. Hogan, and slept in the same bed with him two nights! And he seemed to be proud of it! Aside from being an infringement on the Jim Crow law, it is a violation of Christianity itself, and of all common decency. Such conduct forfeits the respect of right-thinking people, and would be calculated to stir up demonstrations in most any community if it should become generally known.

It has gained considerable currency that the colored preacher Hogan has been too much inclined to mix with the white people and to favor, in attitude, a social equality. Hogan should have had too much sense, if not self-respect, to have permitted the young white preacher to sleep with him, if the young preacher did not have that much sense or self-respect. But Hogan has been under the sponsorship of Jimmie Love11 and cannot be expected to have any too much sense about anything. I have always said that Marshall Keeble and Luke Miller could not be spoiled, but if I ever hear of them doing anything akin to such as this I will take back every good thing I have ever said of them. Keeble should teach these negro preachers better than that, even if we cannot teach some young upstarts among the white preachers. Their practices will degrade the negroes themselves. It is abominable.

When N. B. Hardeman held the valley-wide meeting at Harlingen, Texas, some misguided brethren brought a group of negroes up to the front to be introduced to and shake hands with him. Brother Hardeman told them publicly that he could see all of the colored brethren he cared to see on the outside after services, and that he could say everything to them that he wanted to say without the formality of shaking hands. I think he was right. He told of a prominent brother in the church who went wild over the negroes and showed them such social courtesies that one day one of the negroes asked him if he might marry his daughter. That gave the brother a jolt and he changed his attitude!

In one of my own meetings a young negro preacher was engaged by the church as janitor. He made it a point to stand out in the vestibule of the church-building to shake hands with the white people. When I insisted that it be discontinued some of the white brethren were offended. Such as this proves that the white brethren are ruining the negroes and defeating the very work they should be sent to do, that is, preach the gospel to the negroes, their own race.

I saw a letter the other day from the colored preacher, R. N. Hogan, to a certain white brother stating that there were very few negroes in the section where he was preaching at the time, and that he was holding the meeting for the white brethren! When negro meetings are held in most of the places now, the white brethren over-run the premises. They herald these negro preachers as the greatest preachers in the world, when as a matter of fact if any of the white preachers should say everything they say to a word, it would sound so common that the brethren would stop it. But when a negro says it, in negro manner, the brethren paw the ground over it.

I was preaching in a certain city where Marshall Keeble had held a successful meeting. In usual style he had poured it on the negroes and it had run on the white people. One brother who was against hard preaching went wild over Keeble’s hard preaching. Keeble preached it hard, calling names, and giving the sectarians Hail Columbia! His brother thought it was the greatest stuff he had ever heard. Later, when I was preaching in the same city, he squirmed until he polished the seat of a good pair of trousers because I drew the line on denominationalism. One night while he was squirming, I diverted attention by referring to one of Keeble’s hard sayings. Immediately this brother sat erect, smiled and nodded in approval of Keeble’s hard saying. I smiled back at him and said: Get yourself a negro preacher!

I am very much in favor of negro meetings for the negroes, but I am just as much opposed to negro meetings for white people, and I am against white brethren taking the meetings away from the negroes and the general mixing that has become entirely too much of a practice in these negro meetings. Such a thing not only lowers the church in the eyes of the world but it is definitely against the interest of the negroes. If any negro preacher says that this is not true, that will be the evidence that it is true, and that he has been spoiled by the white brethren and wants to preach to white audiences. And if any of the white brethren get worked up over what I have said, and want to accuse me of being jealous of the negro preachers, I will just tell them now that I don’t even want to hold a meeting for any bunch of brethren who think that any negro is a better preacher than I am! So we can just call that argument off before it starts—and the meeting, too.—F. E. W.

COMPLETE CHRISTIAN HYMNAL

Compiled and Edited by MARION DAVIS
It is SPIRITUAL and SCRIPTURAL. The compiler was assisted in this work by Foy E. Wallace, Jr., and we believe all vital errors have been eliminated from these songs. It contains——

THE MOST POPULAR OLD SONGS AND THE MOST POPULAR NEW SONGS

BINDING: Limp Covers and Cloth-board backs.
PRICES: Limp, 35c the copy, $2.50.00 per hundred.
        Cloth, 50c the copy, $4.00.00 per hundred.
SEND YOUR ORDER TO

THE MARION DAVIS COMPANY
Box 162 Fayette, Ala.
“WHAT IS THIS UNITY MOVEMENT?”

JOHN T. LEWIS

Under the above question Claud F. Witty and James DeForest Murch had a five column article in the Christian Standard February 22, 1941. I will not reply to their arguments (?) because they made none; but I will notice their sophistry. They began the article by saying:

The movement to bring about unity among brethren of the “Churches of Christ” and “Disciples of Christ” is slowly, but surely, winning the confidence and support of thinking Christians. Too long we have neglected this opportunity to practice what we preach.

When we gather in Indianola Church of Christ, Columbus, T., May 13 and 14, in our fourth “National Unity Meeting” certain signs of definite progress should be evident.

The above is a mere assertion, possibly based upon wishful thinking. If they said, “Winning the confidence and support of non thinking Christians,” I would not challenge their statement. I will predict that brethren S. H. Hall and H. H. Adamson who were the chief actors in Witty’s end of the cage at the Lexington Kentucky fiasco will be conspicuous, at the coming Columbus, Ohio meeting by their absence. We will see what we will see. After quoting 1 Cor. 1:10, they say:

In studying this Scripture in the light of the Restoration movement, as inaugurated by Thomas and Alexander Campbell and their colaborers, we saw plainly that something was seriously wrong. The very people who came before the world a century ago with the great plea for Christian unity now present the sad spectacle of a house divided against itself.

A gash, deep and wide, has been cut through the body of Christ. This terrible wound has paralyzed our tongue, so that we can no longer speak intelligently to the denominational world on the subject of Christian unity. At best, we can only mutter our own inconsistencies. W e I 11 might it be said of us. Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? Thou that preachest that the churches should not be divided, dost thou divide?

Thou that sayest division in the church is sinful, dost thou practice division?

Thou that makest thy boast of Christian unity, through division. Through schisms, dishonorest thou God, for the name of God is blasphemed among the denominational churches through you.

For a plea for Christian unity verily profiteth, if thou remain unmuted, but if thou thyself dividest thy plea for unity becomes a mockery.

Could anything be more self-evident than that we of the Restoration movement stand guilty and condemned before both man and God while we preach Christian unity and practice sectarian division?

For years, many people have been conscious of this inconsistency and have prayed God that in some way this reproach might be taken away.

If they really want to “study the scriptures in the light of the Restoration Movement,” if Claud F. Witty and James DeForest Murch will invite me to attend the Columbus, Ohio meeting, and promise to give me one hour on the evening of May 13, to read quotations from Campbell, Lard, Pendleton, McGarvey, Loos, Grubbs, and other pioneers on instrumental music in the worship, I will be glad to correlate what the pioneers said on the subject, go to the “Unity Meeting” read the paper, and make but one comment, and that will be to tell the meeting to proceed to “study the scriptures in the light of the Restoration Movement.”

I am sure that what I would read would be a revelation to the majority of those attending the meeting on both sides of the question. It might inject some gospel serum into the spines of Witty and Murch. At least they would know how to “study the scriptures in the light of the Restoration Movement.” To encourage Witty and Murch to accept my offer to furnish valuable information, so their unity meeting could proceed to study intelligibly “the scriptures in the light of the Restoration Movement,” I will give a few quotations from the “Pioneers.”

Alexander Campbell said, in Millennial Harbinger 1851, page 582, “So to those who have no real devotion or spirituality in them, and whose animal nature flags under the oppression of church discipline, I talk with the Christian Standard, or some such organization, would be not only a desideratum, but an essential prerequisite to fire up their souls to even animal devotion. But I presume, to all spiritual-minded Christians, such aids would be as a cowbell in a concert.” To all honest conscientious brethren who attend the “Unity Meeting,” at Columbus, Ohio, next May, desiring “to study the scriptures in the light of the Restoration Movement,” this quotation would be like a gush of water from the rock that followed Israel in the Wilderness. Will brethren Witty, and Murch allow their “Unity” brethren to drink of it?

W. K. Pendleton, twice son-in-law of Alexander Campbell, who succeeded Mr. Campbell both as editor of the Millennial Harbinger, and president of Bethany College, said in the Millennial Harbinger 1868, page 41, two years after the death of Mr. Campbell: “It has been said, that nothing is so absurd but that some one will be found foolish enough to embrace it. It would seem especially true in matters of religion. This folly of elevating organ-grinding and accompaniments into the place of apostolic worship illustrates it. Who could have thought that with the Bible in their hands, the American people could ever have drifted into such idolatry?” Now, if Brother James DeForest Murch, will get out his surveying instruments again, establish a corner in the office of “The Christian Standard Publishing Company,” get Edwin R. Errett to carry his chain, and survey a line back to where the “restoration movement” was in 1849 when the pleas of the pioneers for the oneness of God’s people, based upon scriptural arguments, were shaking the very foundations of denominationalism, he will find that the Christian Standard has never been very far from the “lunatic fringe” of denominational swamps. Indeed, “gash, deep and wide, has been cut through the body of Christ” by “this folly of elevating organ-grinding and accompaniments into the place of apostolic worship.” For seventy-five years the Christian Standard has been wet-nurse to this species of “idolatry” kidnapped from the theatre by the Roman Catholic hierarchy about the middle of the sixth century, nursed by this mother of harlots through the dark ages, till it finally over-ran the frontiers of protestantism, and in 1859, it was for the first time in the history of the church, “elevated into the place of apostolic worship” in the Church of Christ at Midway, Kentucky. If the Christian Standard wants to “speak intelligently to the denominational world on the subject of Christian Unity,” it will have to get on the original ground of the “restoration movement,” and speak the language of the pioneers. This is also true of the Witty-Murch unity meetings, if they want to accomplish anything. Yet Brother Witty told me last fall that he and Brother Murch had never discussed the question of instrumental music. If you can conceive of a hog wallowing in a spring, muddying the water, and two men in the neighborhood calling the people of the community together, and talking about how bad the water was, and how they hoped it would clear up thus presenting a united front against the muddy water; but doing nothing about the hog, not even mention the brute, you will have the right conception of the Witty-Murch unity meeting (?). J. W. McGarvey, replying to A. S. Hayden on “Expendiency and Progress,” said in the Millennial Harbinger, 1868, page 217: “There is a view of this question which I wish to
present directly to Brother Hayden, and all conscientious men who stand with him for the use of organs (Fiddles, horns, and orchestras had not been thought of then) J. T. L.) It is said: You know that such are the convictions of a very large number of the best and most intelligent class of your brethren (emphasis mine J. T. L.) that they will resist to the very last extremity the introduction of instrumental music in the worship, and that they will never, while they live, (They are dead, but there are plenty more standing where they stood J. T. L.) permit it to rest any where in peace. Such being the case, how can you, in the light of apostolic teaching, press the innovations in the manner you do? Do you say the opposition is unreasonable, and that they are wrong, and would you have us please, and they have no right to dictate? You cannot say this; for you know that neither you nor I have any right do as we please touching matters which affect the peace and fellowship of the churches. Do you say that you are under no more obligation to yield than they? You cannot, because you are using an innovation, one which you confess the Scriptures do not authorize, and which, you cannot feel bound in conscience to maintain. Your only ground of defense, is the expediency of it, and the assumption that our religion is flexible enough to receive it. If your religion is thus flexible why must it all the time bend toward those corrupt parties who invented and have hitherto exclusively used the organ, yet remain as stiff as a crowbar against your own brethren who oppose it? Why is it so expedient to conciliate a sectarianized veneration, and vitiuated public taste, but so inexpedient to conciliate your own conscientious brethren, whose heart's desire and prayer to God is for the restoration of the simple worship instituted by the apostles? I can understand why James DeForest Murch's "tongue is paralyzed" on the instrumental music question; but I cannot understand Brother Witty, unless he has turned into a Janns, with his original face veering toward the "organ grinders." After quoting several passages of scripture to show that "God wants all His children to live in peace, to be of one mind, and one judgment." Witty and Murch had the duplicity to ask the following questions.

Now, brethren, is there anything wrong with these Scriptures? Should they be ignored? Should preachers and writers oppose the things here taught? Did the Holy Spirit make a mistake when He placed them in the sacred record? Should they have been left out of the Bible, so that we could continue in our divided state, without being condemned? These are questions we should consider before we either oppose or ignore this unity movement.

After reading these namby-pamby questions, I will let you read some real logic from the pen of Moses E. Lard.

In settling any question, whether theoretic or practical, the first thing to be agreed upon is the standard of final appeal. Without this our discussions are mere endless wranglings, and our arguments little else than mere circular talk. Neither error in thought nor error in practice is corrected. Strife is engendered and issue joined, but neither that nor this ever finds an end. Positions are taken which are untenable and replies are made which are illogical and gratuitous; while parties are formed seemingly without the hope of remedy; and all this for the want of some standard to which appeal can be at once and decisively made. Now that we as a people have agreed to accept the New Testament as that standard is a fact too notorious to admit of question. To this we have consented to bring the smallest point of doctrine, and the most trivial feature in practice. And furthermore, we have solemnly covenant ed that whatever cannot be clearly shown to have the sanction of this standard shall be held as not doctrine, and shall not be practiced." After amplifying these statements with several illustrations, Mr. Lard says: "Now in the light of the foregoing principles what defense can be urged for the introduction into some of our congregations of instrumental music? The answer which thunders into my ear from every page of the New Testament is, None. Did Christ ever appoint it? Did the apostles ever sanction it? Or did any one of the primitive churches ever use it? Never. In what light then must we view him who attempts to introduce it into the Churches of Christ of the present day? I answer, as an insulter of the authority of Christ, and a defiant and impious innovator on the simplicity and purity of the ancient worship. In no other light can we view him, in no other light should he be viewed." Lard's Quar terly July 1939, page 239.

I have been a laborer, we saw plainly that something was seriously wrong." I am sure they "saw that something was seriously wrong," and when (? I), at their invitation read before their next unity meeting what Campbell and his collaborators said, they will see just as "plainly" what "cut the gash, deep and wide, through the body of Christ." I shall expect the invitation to read from the pioneers before their unity meeting, to be extended me through the Christian Standard so Brother Errett and his collaborators will not think that I am abusing courtesies extended to me. I will quote the following, from the same issue of the Christian Standard that the Witty-Murch article was in, that they may see what usually follows in the wake of "organ-grinding" in the worship.

The Order of the Communion

Please allow me to say Amen to the article of Mrs. Katharine Scott Higbee on the manner of communion, in the Standard of January 18. We are sticklers for the exact form of baptism, but communion does not matter. We would not know that it was communion of the Bible description. There is no sacredness about it. We pass the loaf and cup at the same time and play such music as "American Cadets," and "Southern Waltz," and "Sarandic Song." Then as soon as church is dismissed the officers go out and pass the devil's emblems (tobacco). When we carry on communion in such a manner, we are just as much a denomination as any church in the world.

Marion, Benjamin.

Waterloo, Ind.

I will close this article with a quotation from J. W. McGarvey, and wait for my invitation to the Columbus, Ohio, unity meeting. "The loudest call that comes from heaven to the men of this generation is for warfare stern, relentless, merciless, exterminating-against everything not expressly or by necessary implication authorized in the New Testament. Such is my unwavering convictions; and my only regret is, that I cannot fight this fight as it should be fought" Millennial Harbinger 1868, page 129. These are my sentiments, expressed to a nicey.
I cannot see how any good can be accomplished by the Murch-Witty Unity Meetings. The church here is interested in unity and for thirty-five years has been pleading with the Digressives to renounce their erroneous practices and to take a firm stand for the truth. But the idea of these brethren is that error should be exposed and the truth exalted; consequently they have sponsored the preaching of such men as A. J. McCarty, W. A. Schultz, and others who would not receive a warm welcome in a modern Unity Meeting. May God help us to avoid all appearances of compromise! Leonard Bankhead, Colorado City, Texas.

To you personally, it is not necessary that I speak out my views on the issues that you are so ably fighting, but I want to register my protest against the departures from the Gospel of Christ that are becoming prevalent among some of the disciples and churches. I admire you for the full-pledged defense of the "old paths." You can count on me for my full support in your stand for the defense of the faith. Keep up the good work, brother. May you live long and have strength of body to do even a greater work.-T. H. Bass, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Since we moved here in August the church attendance and contribution has been most encouraging. I have noted with some amusement your postscript to the effect that you received a goose by express from one of the Bible Banner readers in Arkansas. In looking over some issues of other papers I am forced to conclude that your activities are "cooking the geese" of others. One paper devoted about two pages, possibly more, of its edition to condemnation of the things that you have so vigorously condemned for the past few years and in a recent issue of the Bible Banner I observed that one of our colleges has found it desirable to make very definite statements as to their position concerning certain controversial questions. I am sure others will follow from time to time.

I was astounded at the attitude many of the outstanding preachers and others assumed some two or three years ago. One can hardly believe that men as intelligent as many of them are would be so gullible. Certain selfish interests apparently induced certain ones to become a catspaw, and who for awhile were very successful in the functioning. Through your efforts they have been defeated in this bold attempt, and I frankly confess that entire credit is yours. I believe the church is now headed in the right direction and in the near future there will be a much greater degree of cooperation. G. McGehee, Jacksonville, Fla.

0 LORD KILL THE SPIDER
A brother who had prayed the same public prayer, word for word, for thirty years, was called on one Wednesday night to deliver it again. The most of the members could go two words ahead of him at any place in the prayer. This is a quotation from the prayer, "0 Lord, since we last called upon thee, the cobwebs have come between us and thee; we pray that thou will remove the cobwebs that we might look upon thy face again." On this occasion, just as he got to the place, "We pray that thou will remove the cobwebs," another brother cried out, "O, Lord, kill the spider." We see in this a distinct relationship between cause and effect. You cannot get rid of the cobwebs without killing the spider. There is division between the Christian Church and churches of Christ. This is the result of a cause. Innovations were brought in and the body of Christ was split from one side of the country to the other. It is the height of folly to think there can be unity without removing the cause of division. Brother Witty and Brother Murch, in their National Unity Meetings, have been trying to get rid of the cobwebs without killing the spider. It cannot be done.-Leroy Brownlow, Fort Worth, Texas.

Both friend and foe certainly feel the weight of the campaign you have so successfully waged against error through the columns of the 'Banner, and especially have you done a complete work in opposing premillennialism, informing the 'brotherhood' as to its destructive tendencies, and above all, the fact that you have so completely put them on the run. Everyone who loves the Lord's cause, must be very grateful to you for your very fine leadership, and we pray and hope, that you may be spared to "carry the torch" for many decades yet to come.-J. W. Fincher, Weslaco, Texas.
Thanks to the teaching of such outstanding preachers of the gospel as Bro. E. R. Harper at Little Rock, and those who write in your paper, the church here has received some excellent teaching on the premillennial question. I am happy that I have had the opportunity of defending the truth from the erroneous teaching which has been prevalent in this section of the country. So far as I know, there is not a member of the congregation who is now not 100% sound so far as premillennialism is concerned. The majority of the gospel preachers in Arkansas are strongly opposed to the teaching and are doing an admirable job of exposing its error. The premillennialists are fighting a losing battle in Arkansas, and are rapidly “dying out.”

There has been some criticism from those who wished to remain neutral on the question that waging a fight against it would only stir up strife. It is interesting to note, however, that those congregations which have taken the strongest stand against this teaching and have likewise been fighting all forms of error and wickedness are those that are growing most rapidly, both in number and in spiritual strength. As in other sections of the country where this is true, there are new congregations springing up all about us. There are at least three in the near vicinity of Conway. We will never lose ground by standing steadfastly for the truth and fighting the good fight of faith, but we shall surely be lost if we compromise or tolerate error in any form.

-Frank Dunn, Conway, Ark.

These “Unity Meetings” are a joke. Of course the Christian church would be glad to have unity provided we would fellowship them while they retain their innovations and unscriptural practices. So would the Methodists and Baptists. But none of them are willing to give up their unscriptural teaching and practice that unity might come by “speaking where the Bible speaks, and being silent where the Bible is silent.” The Christian church, where in Jonesboro talked about unity-wanted unity. When I asked if they believed the Bible to be sufficient to guide us in all religious matters, my father, the late J. B. Lashlee, made the remark to me thirty years ago that “Premillennialism” was going to divide the body of Christ if there was not some care in fighting the evil. Then it was called “Russellism.” I have refrained from having any thing to say through the press for the reason that there are so many who like to write and can do so with much more ease and I have been sick for so long that I have refrained, but my heart has been in the fight all the while and I never miss an opportunity of exposing the theory. You may count on me as one that is against it for all time to come.-James P. Miller, Philadelphia, Pa.

From this point, the “Unity Meetings” show the color of some of these widely advertised conferences featuring Catholics, Protestants, and Jews.
Word comes that one of the participants (one of our brethren) remarked in private conversation that he did not believe the two groups would get together, but maybe it would create a better spirit between them.

The line between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church has not been drawn sharply enough in the north. We need preachers who will make the breach more generally recognized among the people. The church in the north is more in the minority than it is in the south. It seems that some brethren falter before this handicap and capitulate to the spirit of the day for recognition.-Frank Van Dyke, Crawfordsville, Ind.

* * *

I feel like writing you and giving you my observations in regard to the Bible Banner, after two years of its existence. First, it is in my opinion the strongest and most outstanding contender for the truth among our leading papers. It has enemies—but why? Because it contends for the truth and denounces error in the churches and in the colleges alike, and calls a halt on false brethren. We will have to acknowledge that when a cleaning up is needed, we are willing for the editor of the Bible Banner to do it. Look at the cases of Neal, Norris, Webber and Tingley. I now ask who would have undertaken the job? I am not saying that we do not have other brethren who could have handled the job, perhaps just as well, but why didn’t they? As to the papers, they have had the opportunity to take up the battle, four or five good papers that are “loyal” to the truth, but of the easy type that want to teach and preach the gospel but let other folks alone. Old Satan himself likes that policy, and that is the reason he is gaining ground in so many places.

Speaking of the Bible Banner, I have in mind hard and difficult places its editor has been called upon to fill, where members were off the track, on the denominational majority rule doctrine which has divided churches. Though correction of the evils and acknowledgement of wrongs were made, conditions have continued because of bitterness and spite which existed before and afterward.

My observation is that there is a more difficult situation in the churches today than when innovations were first forced upon us many years ago. There is more of ungodliness and sinful practices now than ever before which is doing so much damage to the church, as the false and destructive doctrines of premillennialism.-J. E. Williams, Pampa, Texas.

---

**WHY THEY FAILED**

Many of us welcome the resurrection of the old Christian Leader, and wish for Brother Rowe success in every righteous endeavor. Brother Rowe publishes that “the two principal reasons for the failure of the New Dealers was the attempt to force World Vision (B. D. Moorehead’s paper) onto the readers and their determination to make a magazine instead of a newspaper.” These things contributed to their failure all right, but they are not the principal reasons for their failure. The New Dealers launched a concerted effort to sell the church down the river, and made every mark of compromise, and the “brotherhood” was not quite ready for such a wholesale sell-out. We are indebted to the Bible Banner and its editor for pointing out to us so effectively the unscrupulous schemes of Clinton Davidson and his henchmen. The Davidson movement was a fight against God.

* * *

DESERTED THE CHURCH

“Charles M. Neal has completely deserted the church,” and gone off with the “Biblical Research Society.” Those of us who know the personnel of the Boll party are not surprised. According to reliable information, a remnant of the Main Street Church in Winchester is saved, and have published that they are through with Bollism and will stand firmly upon revealed truth. This is some of the good fruit borne as the result of Brother Wallace’s able defense of the truth in debate with Neal in Winchester a few years ago. Call the roll, and name the followers of Boll who have “completely deserted the church.” I am not a prophet nor the son of a prophet, but I predict that it will only be a matter of time till D. H. Friend and H. L. Olmstead will go to the “Christian Church,” for they have no convictions on the “music question.” They already have more in common with the digressives than they do with faithful and loyal brethren.

* * *

“ITCHING EARS”

“For the time will come when they will not endure the sound doctrine; but, having itching ears, will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts; and will turn away their ears from the truth, and turn aside unto fables” (2 Tim. 4:3, 4). This may appear to some as crude phraseology, offensive to refined (?) tastes. Nevertheless, it aptly describes a situation which exists in the church. In this epistolary passage, Paul anticipates an apostasy, and it is clearly manifest to day. Faithful preachers who would denounce sin and blast error would not enjoy popular favor. Preachers, to move with the current tide, would be required to speak “smooth” things (Isa. 30: 18). The attitude of many give rise to a type of teachers, like those who arose as false prophets in ancient Israel. Such imposters would soothe people’s itching ears. Peter adds a further description concerning this matter: “But there arose false prophets also among the people, as among you also there shall be false teachers, who shall privily bring in destructive heresies, denying even the Master that bought them, bringing upon themselves swift destruction. And many shall follow their lascivious doings; by reason of whom the way of the truth shall be evil spoken of” (2 Pet. 2:1, 2). In this present crisis, when so many are influenced by unsound teaching, compromising and soft-pedaling, we need teachers (preachers and elders) who are true and tried—who refuse to scratch itching ears. It is too common to hear that Brother so and so can preach when he is under pressure. Every gospel preacher is under pressure all the time, and should preach every sermon as if it were his last sermon. There should be no sermons that are time fillers. Every sermon should draw the line between sin and righteousness—between truth and error. Soft sermons that soothe people’s itching ears are not gospel sermons.

* * *

“AN OASIS IN A DESERT”

Brother G. C. Brewer reports in the Gospel Advocate that “when we, in this year of politics, war, draft, and sin without, and factionalism, personal rancor, and party propaganda within, come to a place” like Tompkinsville, Kentucky, undistrubed by such conditions, it is like coming upon an oasis in a desert, and declares that he recently had such a “refreshing experience.” He pictures the Tompkinsville church as strictly sound in every way and publishes the picture of the comparatively new building of the church, but failed to tell us that the “restrictive clauses” were not inserted in the deed because of a large element in the church that favored instrumental music. To be sure, there are some loyal brethren at Tompkinsville, but Brother Brewer should not publish just half the truth. After this meeting, Brother Brewer went to Gallatin, Tennessee, and assisted H. L. Olmstead (Premillennialist) in a meeting there. I wonder if Brother Brewer found Gallatin like another oasis in a desert!
There is a cause, or there are causes for the controversy on the question of baptism. The controversy itself is an effect, and every effect has its adequate cause. It is self evident, that whatever the cause or causes for the strife, sin played its part in the origin of the strife: and sin is being perpetuated in its propagation. In a religious controversy both sides may be wrong; but it is certain that one side is therefore sinful. The subjunctive "If" in introducing the sentence above is inadequate cause. It is self evident, that in introducing the sentence above is justifiable, and is warranted as the error side is not justifiable, and is therefore sinful. The subjunctive "If" in introducing the sentence above is used in the sense of assuming that the truth side, in its contention in the controversy is making that contention apart from "strife and vain glory."

"Let nothing be done through strife or vainglory." [Phil. 2:3] "Let us not be desirous of vainglory, provoking one another, envying one another." [Gal. 5:26]

The Lord commands us to "strive," therefore we are to "strive to enter in at the strait gate." [Matt. 13:24] We are to "contend" or "strive" after we enter in at this gate for [Jude 3] tells us to "contend for the faith."

It shall be assumed therefore, that there is a contention, a strife, in this baptismal controversy, which is separate and apart from all elements of "vainglory," a "contention" as lawful, justifiable, and as warranted as the "No small dissension and disputations," which Paul and Barnabas had with those who came down from Judea and taught that "Except ye be circumcised, and that ye keep the law of Moses ye cannot be saved." [Acts 15:2-3]

Assuming therefore that in the baptismal controversy there are a people who make their contention apart from any "vainglory" element; that since the Lord's servants are commanded to "contend" and to "strive;" that since the Lord's servants are commanded: "Not to strive in [2nd Tim. 2:24] the negative "not" refers to the self-de- sirous, the vainglory element, and not make in defense of the truth; that therefore the truth side to the baptismal controversy is justifiable in its contention, and the sin which is present in the strife shall be at the door where it originated, and remain in the polluted sanctuary where it is foisted.

That there is sin in any religious contention, cannot be denied by any reasonable man. On this the Scriptures are clear as the light of day. The baptismal controversy is sinful; it had its origin in sin: and it is sin which keeps it an issue to-day.

No use to say it is no longer an issue, and that there are no debates any more on the baptismal question as in former years. If there were never another public discussion, oral debate, or written article on the subject of baptism it is a controversy just the same for anything contending the word of God is a controversy by the authority of Jehovah. Hear Him. In [Micah 6:2] the Lord calls upon the mountains to listen "for the Lord has a controversy with His people." In [Deut. 21:5] Jehovah says that by the word He had given to His priests, "every controversy shall be tried." So, if every gospel preacher were to close his eyes, ears and mouth, and lay aside his pen, as long as water is sprinkled or poured upon a weeping infant, or adult manhood, in the name of the Trinity, and called baptism, the controversy is living.

Such actions in the name of the Trinity controvert the word of God, and were the cause of the strife at the time it began, and their presence in religious life to-day keep the sin of this controversy alive, and they shall and must remain behind the threshold of the door where the affair originated.

The occasion for the debate is either inherent in the ordinance, or it is not. If it inheres in the ordinance, then the author of the ordinance is at fault. The truth side to the controversy is not willing to lay this to Him; for that would incriminate the Christ. Who said: "Go preach the gospel to every creature, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." [Mark 16:16]

If the occasion for the debate is not inherent in the ordinance, it is no less sinful, and the error side must suffer the consequences of strife, be they what they may.

Of course, every consistent believer in Christ must, and does admit that whatever Christ ordered to be preached is His doctrine. But baptism is not merely a "doctrinal," or "theoretical" question, in the modern acceptance of that, or those terms. To illustrate what is meant here, there was a time when the dogmas of Calvinism and Arminianism were the all-absorbing themes of every public religious address. Almost so. Sovereign grace, free grace, sovereign will, coerced will, limited atonement, general atonement, total depravity, etc; were the chosen pulpit themes of almost every Sunday's ministrations. While there are some vestiges of the old or-
WHY I CAN NO LONGER GO ALONG WITH HARDING COLLEGE
E. R. HARPER

There come times in our lives when we hardly know what is best and which is the best move to make that truth and not self may become the victor. In all my affairs religious, I have never tried to harm an individual because of personal hatred. I feel that I am as free from jealousy and prejudice as the average man can be. I am interested in the future of Arkansas with reference to the church of Christ. I want to see it grow. I want to see our schools everywhere growing especially here in my home state.

We need it and it could become a great source of strength to us as all our schools can. We have two fine junior colleges in Tennessee, one at Nashville, and one at Henderson. They have in the past been strong fortifications for the truth in their sections. Then we have a very fine institution in Abilene, Texas, which is one of our leading senior colleges and we wish for it a sound and prosperous future as we do for the others. Then we have the George Pepperdine College in Los Angeles, California, built by George Pepperdine of that city. He built it and endowed it then with a million dollar endowment. It can be of great value to the west if it will occupy the place of a school and not usurp power and overshadow the church, and have men looking at it instead of the church.

All schools need to notice that one thing. Build men strong for the church and not loyal to a school regardless of the church. That is the trend to day I fear. Then we have our own school here in Arkansas which is a Senior College. It could be a power of strength for us in this state if it will. We have all been working hard to get removed from it all criticism that we may all be in peace and work toward a common end. They made an offer. I accepted as a "basis" from which to work to see if we might come to such a place where all might recommend it to our fathers and mothers. Brother W. B. West, as all know, was selected by them and accepted by us to head the Bible teaching against the evils of Premillennialism.

He came and visited there for about a week and then preached here for us at Fourth and State. His way was paid here by the school. He came to look over the situation with a view to coming our way.

All are anxious to know what became of this agreement, if anything. Brother West went home and I wrote him by the request of Brother Benson to make application for Dean of Bible. I sent him two telegrams to do this as his letter to me shows. He answered me in a most polite and courteous manner and said that things out where he is are very pleasant and they wanted him to remain and that, together with "conditions at Harding College," made him think best to stay out there. He refused, therefore, to even make application for the place of Dean of Bible.

I am sorry that it is all over and that they could not carry out this agreement which was their own proposition, accepted by us. It has been thought that I was prejudiced and in favor of Freed-Hardeman College against our school here; that I was for Brother Hardeman and against the men here. But that is all over now, and can't be said, for I went to Henderson and in the auditorium of the school from which I graduated nearly twenty years ago I stood in the most outspoken defense of our "trial agreement" and under the greatest pressure in the presence of Brother Hardeman, Brother H. Leo Boles, Brother Plum of West Virginia and about one hundred other loyal gospel preachers, most of them against me in what I had done and condemning me for having made this offer. That did not phase me. I fought right on. But with all that, brethren failed. Now Why? It was not my fault. The fault lies in the truthfulness of the facts. I have told you before and that is why, one reason why, Brother West would not come.

There is but one thing to do and that is to retire those who are premillennialists and remove those who are going, since our agreement, and preaching for that crowd in Louisville that are premillennialists. Until that is done I will not back the school.

I am sorry to have to say this but I made the announcement over the radio about our proposed agreement in which we had agreed to try to help work out this matter and to that agreement I remained loyal to the very end and now I feel that I should have this opportunity to tell you that they could not carry through their own proposition to us.

Brother H. Leo Boles refused to take the place; Brother Homer Hail-ey refused to accept the place and now Brother West, the man recommended by them, refused to come. There must be something wrong and until that something is removed I shall be forced, because of my love for the truth, to part company with them. I am not a Bollite-premillennialist, not liberalist in any sense and never have I intended to compromise with either of the above mentioned. I simply intended to do all I could to bring about peace based upon truth and if that failed then to let the brotherhood know the truth of it all and now I leave it with you in Arkansas to work out your own way so far as our radio work on this one particular, affair is concerned.

I shall continue to preach against all speculations over the radio and to teach the truth concerning these questions but you understand what I mean when I say I can't discuss the school affair any more over the radio due to the rulings of the radio broadcasting company.

At the time we tried to work out our troubles here in Arkansas, with Brother West's coming here, Brother Glen E. Green was in a meeting with us at Fourth and State, and we enjoyed his meeting thoroughly. Out of this meeting grew this affair. He met Brother Benson here in the city during this meeting and Brother Benson asked him if there might be something done to stop our fight that we were making at that time. Brother Green said he would see what could be done. He talked with me about it. I told him there could be something done if Brother Benson wanted it done badly enough. Brother Green then asked me to write them a letter stating what I would do. He suggested that he had been in the fight with Brother Armstrong about fifteen or twenty years ago which fight resulted in getting Earl Smith fired from the school, and that Brother Armstrong denied that Earl was teaching certain things in the school, just as they are doing now, until Earl just admitted that he taught it every time he got a chance.

The pressure then was brought so strongly that the board was forced to let Earl Smith go. Out of this experience Brother Green said he learned that there was no use depending on what they told us they would do; if we could not get something down in "black and white" that we could not get anything done. Brother Brewe, one of the elders here, was with us in much of these discussions and he agreed that this was true from the experience they had here with Harding College before I came. So upon the suggestion of Brother Green that we could not depend upon what they merely promised, but to get it in writ-
ing, we entered into this agreement.

That brings me to this point, which I want you to see. Brother Green came back with a letter suggesting only Brother West. I asked Brother Green why just the name of one man? He said to me and Brother Brewer that Brother Benson said “If we could not agree upon West that they would not try any further for they could not find a man, maybe, who would please me and that it was West or nothing.” These are almost the very words used by Brother Green in his explanation. Well, I knew Brother West, and I thought I knew that he was against the doctrine and I still believe he is.

I thought from my former conversation with him, when no thought of his coming to Arkansas was in our minds, that he would oppose not only the teaching but the men who so teach and their coming to Harding, a thing that Brother Armstrong nor Brother Benson ever did, so far as I know. I know that since Brother Benson’s coming to Harding that crowd hangs around Harding. You know a tree by its fruits and a man by the company he keeps.

As stated in the article above, Brother West came, went back home and did not return, just as Brother Brewer has failed to do, lest we forget. Had things been as they should have been I am sure Brother West would have come and that we would have backed him in his coming. Now when he did not come, and with Brother Benson’s message to us here that if Brother West did not come, they would not go any further with it, I naturally felt as you would, that it is all off and I wrote Brother Benson a letter, a copy of which I still have, and told him that since there was trouble, and conditions there prevented our agreement being carried through, until that trouble was removed from the school, I could no longer try to work with them. I got no answer to that letter. I then went on the radio and gave the address referred to and still I got no word from them but instead they came to the radio station and threatened, as I understand, to enter court and try to get their license revoked, or some thing like that, if they allowed me to continue my plea against such practices among us. Of course the rules and regulations that had just been passed by Federal Radio Commission forbidding any religious discussions of a critical nature, caused this station to have to defend their right to operate. I was only too glad to work with the boys here because they have have been most kind to me. I had said already, what I wanted said and the cry came too late.

Now they are saying that Brother Baxter is the fulfillment of their agreement, and so is Brother Green saying that. Well, Brother Baxter came there with no such backing as was behind, West’s coming. He came there on his own initiative, without, so far as I know, trying to see if they would stop any of this affair, and leaving in there all the factors that prevented the coming of Brother West.

Brother Baxter came there after we had definitely told them both by letter and radio that we were no longer backing them until they retired the trouble in Harding College. They, without writing us or discussing it any further, without getting rid of the trouble that prevented the man’s coming upon whom we had agreed, and after knowing that we had told them definitely that we would no longer go with them until this was done, hired Brother Baxter and then wrote me that they had fulfilled their agreement both in letter and in spirit. When Brother West did not come, and their havings already sent me word that it was he or the deal was off, and then after I wrote them that we were no longer back of them until they got rid of that trouble that prevented the man’s coming upon whom we had agreed, I maintain that by all the laws of right, reason and honorable dealings, that this severed all our connections and all former agreements.

Now after this failed to go through, after I wrote them I was through, and after I told them over the radio that I could no longer go with them, and after every one in Arkansas knew that we were no longer back of them, unless they got rid of the trouble that prevented our plan’s going through, and since they did not get rid of that trouble, then whatever they did after this and whomsoever they hired after this, is in no way any affair of mine. That man, though a good man, comes later, become like that with which he once loved and still loves, but never has been done at Harding and under its present set up it never will. I pray that he will do what in his heart he wants done and come on back home to the people whom he one time loved and still loves, but will soon cease to love, because we are going to continue to fight for the truth and to oppose that “set up” and if he who remains with the “set up,” nature tells us will, sooner or later, become like that with which he constantly associates.

More later.

E. R. Harper.
himself and he should know that the taking off places for heaven are not all located "in the great West." And he is sorely disappointed in Foy E. Wallace, Jr. Well, now, that is just fine! I want to help him let the brethren know it. A little boosting like that won't do Foy any harm. When we think the brethren all know about it, we will leave these intemperate talking youngsters to the mercies of public opinion. They are a nice set of infants to be writing "open letters to Texas Elders" and then bragging in print about how it "has kicked up a little fire in certain localities" and threaten to "kick up a little more." They need the disciplinary oversight of some elders.

Some brethren, including some preachers, seem to have some peculiar and fantastic notions about evangelizing. Individual Christians, men or women, are doing it when their zeal leads them to talk to their friends, neighbors or acquaintances about Christ and the salvation he offers. There are various methods of doing it which widen the opportunities for that sort of work. Emphasis should be placed on personal zeal and congregational activity. The idea should be more thoroughly cultivated that it is the business of the congregation to choose its own field, select its own workers, raise its own money and direct its own activities. Officious dictate or interference from outside sources is presumptuous and out of order and should not be tolerated by any church. Immodest young squirts who write open, denunciatory letters to the elders of the churches should be contemptuously ignored. They are meddling where they have no business. If a man wants to go to "the great West" to do some evangelizing, that's his business and he should keep busy attending to it. If I want to work in some other field, that's my business, and I feel capable of attending to it.

Some of our missionary experts never miss an opportunity to plead with "our young people" to volunteer "for foreign fields." I recently heard two such appeals and both appealeders had been there and back and enough evidence is in to confidently predict that they are back to stay. According to my judgment, some of the trouble lies here. These men are amazed, or seem to be, over the fact that few workers are available for efforts abroad. For one thing they seem not to have heard of the unsettled, even chaotic conditions, throughout large sections of the world due to the present conflict. The main point is that there are too many casualties among those who went in normal times and for one reason or another resigned to stay. One of them spent a little time in Japan and came back to appoint himself a promoter of such work, a promoter he has travelled over forty-five states, he says, and is almost paralyzed over the verbal indifference towards his plea. Another prefers to attend a college over here than a missionary over there. Young people may wonder why these men and others who prepared themselves for work over there did not stay. If they prefer to stay over here, it is not a cause for wonder that others prefer to do so also. It is entirely possible that these expert promoters are doing their own cause more harm than good, if that cause is designed to stimulate interest in gospel work abroad. We may draw a lesson from the "ole swimmin' hole." When the first one took a trial dive early in the season and others stood on the bank with some tremulous misgivings, the sure way to create a big splash was for the pioneer to paddle around and say: "Come on in fellers, the water is fine." Had he come out gasping and hastened to get some clothes on his shivering form, it would not have produced sensational results had he with chattering teeth said: "Go on in fellers, the water is fine." These returned missionaries, turned the promoters, are not saying: "Come over and help us." They have a decided preference for this country and are saying: "You go, we'll stay." If I know anything about the temperament of the brethren and churches, they could spare the absence of the professional promoters who eternally talk about missionary work and never do any. They could spare them with more of a feeling of relief than loss. This is especially true since most of them are all the way from tainted to plain spoiled in their premillennial leanings.

Mrs. Walter Ferguson, a popular columnist who writes many things worth the reading, is in favor of streamlining the Scriptures. She thinks that "our Bible...is still the hardest book for the common man's understanding" even though it "has been translated into a thousand tongues." She agrees with the opinion that "our St. James version is out of date and therefore not read by twentieth century Americans."

Americans might become interested in the American Standard Version of comparatively recent date, which represents the best effort at translation by a coterie of the ripest scholars of both England and America. Its style is simple and the thought is clearly and forcibly expressed. Our English Bible sets a standard of purity in English style. Mrs. Ferguson is properly shocked over the fact that the Bible is unfamiliar to a vast number of people in our country. I do not agree with her that the fault is with the Bible, or in it. She thinks something ought to be done to it so that the average newspaper reader will be able to understand it at least half as well as he does his snort page. If he were as interested in it as he is "his sport page" and would spend as much time on it as he does that, he would have no great difficulty in absorbing its message. Priests and preachers are partly responsible for the popular impression that the Bible is so difficult of understanding. The priest thinks he is the sole interpreter of it, while many preachers preach that ordinary mortals cannot understand its profound truths without special spiritual guidance of some sort. If an average reader should read it sensibly as he does any other book, he could get more out of it than Mrs. Ferguson, and most of the preachers, think he could.

It is suggested that "perhaps modernizing the Scriptures would help to Christianize our world." I entertain the view that it should not be modernized to any greater extent than giving us a clear translation in the language we use. It should not be degraded to the level of modern slang. Mrs. Ferguson suggests that "The decline of Christianity is due partly to the archaic manner in which the lessons of the Bible are presented to a generation which expresses itself in current idioms and slang." I do not believe that "current idioms and slang" set a high enough standard for a revelation of the will of God. Slingers of slang could add no glory to the Golden Rule or the Sermon on the Mount. They could shock me plenty by attempting to revise Shakespeare and Robert Browning and if they ever mess up the Bible to compete with "the comic strips" Young America pokes over on Sunday "just leave me out when you call that "Our Bible." You can imagine with appropriate shivers what a modernist would do to Daniel in the lions' den, or the three Hebrew children, with an eye on "a generation which expresses itself in current idioms and slang." Ugh!