There are entirely too many disturbances in the churches of the Lord. One such congregation torn by strife is one too many but inasmuch as even Christians are human and stumble in many things, a universal reign of peace is not to be expected even by the most optimistic. Strife is an ideal condition did not exist even in the days of the apostles. Paul carried a burden in his heart which he expressed in these words: “Besides those things that are without, there is that which presseth upon me daily, anxiety for all the churches.” Local troubles can become so numerous and bitter as to outrage all reason, not to mention the Holy Scriptures. In all such matters, the only appeal we have to make is to the teaching of the Holy Spirit found in the New Testament and to what little reason bitter contenders may have left after they have devoured one another in party strife. It usually turns out that when such carnally-minded brethren stop their ears to what the Holy Spirit says, an appeal to reason is about as effective as waiting verbal persuasion on a mad dog. In view of the internal strife that exists in some of the churches, about the only influence they have left is the fact that they stand as a horrible example to other congregations of what strife can do to a church. The thoughtless and the vicious are exerting a baneful influence in many places on the cause of Christ. A church torn by strife is not a fit habitation of God in the Spirit” and when God leaves one it becomes a synagogue of Satan. The Spirit of Jehovah can depart from a Christian or a church even as he departed from Saul. When the spirit of the devil comes in, the Spirit of God goes out.

Let our first appeal be to the scriptures. The church is the body of Christ, the family of God and includes all the children of God. A local congregation is the body of Christ in that locality. Paul addressed a letter to “the church of God which is at Corinth” and reminded them that “ye are the body of Christ and severally members thereof.” Further, “there should be no schism in the body; but the members should have the same care one for another.” A factious, unruly member insults the Lord and wounds his body: This is a grievous sin that cannot be righteously condoned in any member of the body. The consequences of such conduct are tragic beyond words. “For ye, brethren, were called for freedom; only use not your freedom for an occasion to the flesh, but through love be servants one to another. For the whole law is fulfilled in this one word, even in this: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself: But if ye bite and devour one another, take heed that ye be not consumed one of another.” (Gal. 5:13-15)

“Who is wise and understanding among you? Let him shew by his good life his works in meekness of wisdom. But if ye have bitter jealousy and faction in your heart, glory not and lie not against the truth. This wisdom is not a wisdom that cometh down from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish. For where jealousy and faction are, there is confusion and every vile deed.” (James 3:13-16) Unruly disturbers of the peace in a congregation of disciples are guilty of desecrating the temple of God and stand rebuked by the Holy Spirit in biting terms. “Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, and such are ye.” (I Cor. 3:16-17) Obviously, many who think they are on the road to heaven, are badly turned around and have pointed their chariots in the wrong direction, under the delusion that down is up. In their present state of spiritual chaos, they might as well throw away their New Testaments, and call in a band like the one Cornwallis had at Yorktown which is reputed to have played “The World's Turned Upside Down.” Of course God would not accept it in his worship, but neither will he accept the song “I love Jesus” from a liar.

The simple plan of congregational government is beautifully and peculiarly adapted “to the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” The members are children of God in the family of God. His law is revealed in the New Testament and it is assumed that they are diligent students seeking to do his will. The oversight of the congregation is divinely intrusted to elders, men who by reason of age and experience are better qualified than others to instruct and direct all who are anxious to please the Lord while they live and go to heaven when they die. The qualifications of such leaders are plainly stated in the divine handbook which disciples are pledged to follow, the New Testament. These men are not perfect, for perfection does not belong to men, even elders, and when they make mistakes they should be exhorted as fathers by somebody qualified to do it, and not rebuked by mote-hunters and fault-finders. Selfish, factious men who have unholy ends to serve often charge that elders are not qualified, and too often they have plausible grounds to base some criticisms, but their conclusions do not follow. The alternative they usually suggest is that the direction of the affairs of the church be determined by a majority vote of the congregation. The majority is less qualified than the allegedly unqualified eldership. The obvious reason for the factionist's prefer-

(Cont. On Page 16)
THE EVILS OF GOD’S PEOPLE

If history repeats itself in the rise and the fall of empires and in the destinies of nations, it is none the less true in the development and the declension of the church. This antecedent thought dates back to Israel, God’s Old Testament church, whose mistakes have been repeated in the history of the church of his Son through the ages of its existence. Israel’s was a history of gradual departure, the end of which was rebellion against God’s way. Moses lifted up his voice of tearful warning against any deviation from the Oracles of Sinai, but the feet of Israel wandered from the way. God raised up prophet after prophet to guide their wayward feet, yet Israel wandered. The end of the story was national decline, captivity and exile, forfeited promises-and rejection.

This Biblical record is not mere ancient history. It was written for the learning and the admonition of those upon whom the ends of the ages are come. The lesson is aptly put in the words of Jeremiah: “My people have committed two evils; they have forsaken me, the fountain of living waters, and hewed them out cisterns, broken cisterns, that can hold no water” (Jer. 2:13).

Forsaking the Right Way

Jeremiah, the weeping but brave, lion-hearted prophet, struck the vital cause of Israel’s exile. God touched the prophet’s mouth and his message flamed forth: “My people have committed two evils.” In their idolatry Israel had not committed one evil merely, like the heathen idol devotees who know no better. Besides the evil of idolatry Israel added the sin of forsaking the Living God whom they had known. Forsaking God, “the fountain of living waters,” for idol nonentities was like taking cracked and leaky cisterns hewn out by men in preference to the everflowing supply of fresh waters that a natural fountain could give. In turning from God to idols, Israel had abandoned fountains for tanks-man-made, broken cisterns that could hold no water.

How readest thou? Can we not see the application in our own deviations? The denominations, like the heathen idolaters, know no better: but in our departures from the way, the church like Israel commits two evils: first, the evil of the thing done; second, the evil of forsaking what we have known in the doing of it.

Wise and just Samuel was *ejected for young and handsome Saul. The choice seems to have been made on looks-?-mere appearances. Today, many are more concerned about how the church looks to the world-outside appearances-than about what God wants the church to be. The result of such will prove sadder and far more fatal than with Israel, who rejected not Samuel, but God. There are many such problems before the church today.

The Preaching Problem

There is a marked reticence in preaching today that did not exist a generation ago. The church grew when our pioneers waged relentless war on error. The doors of public buildings were closed against them, and persecution was bitter, but that did not deter them. Then courage was an essential quality of the man who preached the gospel.

We would not assume (far be it) a hyper-critical, holier, wiser, better-than-thou attitude, but there has been too much Qf the “method-of-approach” preaching, and not enough of the Stephen, Paul, Peter and John sort. In a Sunday morning Bible Class in a certain church it was remarked that if Stephen had used the right method of approach, those Jews would not have killed him and he, perhaps, would have baptized many if not the most of them. Attention was called to the fact that Stephen was “full of the Holy Spirit” when he did that preaching and the criticism was against the Holy Spirit. It was learned that a Bible teacher in one of the colleges had made a like statement to his class.

Another instance of the same sort is a statement which has been heard from the pulpit of a church of Christ that John, the apostle, was called “son of thunder” when he was a young man, full of zeal, but in the maturity of his age he toned down and wrote his epistles on love!

It is also being talked that no apostle ever “took baptism for a subject.” Neither did any apostle ever take repentance “for a subject.” But when they said anything on faith, repentance, baptism, heaven or hell-it was decidedly on the subject. Such statements can be taken only as an apology for plain Bible preaching and as an effort to court the favor of an element in the church and out of it in whose mouths such preaching leaves an unsavory taste. But such preaching never converts anybody-though it may bring a few responses.

These instances, out of many like them, are mentioned as examples of the fact that much preaching is headed in the wrong direction, with a definite trend away from the boldness of apostolic and pioneer preaching. When a young preacher once asked the veteran A. J. McCarty how to preach effectively, fearless Jack McCarty replied: “Young man, get brim full and running over with the word of God and it will come out.” Yea, verily. God touched the mouth of the modest Jeremiah, and said: “I have put my words in thy mouth.” They were words afame with a message of vehemence. Some preachers today need their lips touched by the hand of God.

When God touched the mouth of Jeremiah, He said, “I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, to pluck up, to throw down, to destroy, to build and to establish church as its “minister,” do many “enter the ministry” today. It can hardly be denied that when a youthful John, full of zeal, but in the maturity of his age he toned down and wrote his epistles on love, Christ that John, the apostle, was called “son of thunder” when he was a young man, full of zeal, but in the maturity of his age he toned down and wrote his epistles on love, Christ that John, the apostle, was called “son of thunder” when he was a young man, full of zeal, but in the maturity of his age he toned down and wrote his epistles on love, Christ that John, the apostle, was called “son of thunder” when he was a young man, full of zeal, but in the maturity of his age he toned down and wrote his epistles on love, Christ that John, the apostle, was called “son of thunder” when he was a young man, full of zeal, but in the maturity of his age he toned down and wrote his epistles on love, Christ that John, the apostle, was called “son of thunder” when he was a young man, full of zeal, but in the maturity of his age he toned down and wrote his epistles on love, Christ that John, the apostle, was called “son of thunder” when he was a young man, full of zeal, but in the maturity of his age he toned down and wrote his epistles on love, Christ that John, the apostle, was called “son of thunder” when he was a young man, full of zeal, but in the maturity of his age he toned down and wrote his epistles on love, Christ that John, the apostle, was called “son of thunder” when he was a young man, full of zeal, but in the maturity of his age he toned down and wrote his epistles on love, Christ that John, the apostle, was called “son of thunder” when he was a young man, full of zeal, but in the maturity of his age he toned down and wrote his epistles on love.

If the noncombative policy some brethren urge in the Pulpit and press should be generally adopted-where would the church drift within a single generation? The Christian Church furnishes a good example. They got where they are by pursuing that very course. And who wants to be where they are?

Another preacher problem is the tendency toward professionalism. Certain colleges of business, guarantee those who graduate from them a position within a certain length of time. There is a sentiment in our schools among those “preparing for the ministry” somewhat akin to that. Not with the idea of doing “the work of an evangelist,” such as Paul commanded Timothy to do, but rather with the idea of obtaining a “position” with some established church as its “minister,” do many “enter the ministry” today. It can hardly be denied that when a New Testament preacher established a church, and set it in order, he went to his next field. Whether that practice is regarded as obligatory, expedient or inexpedient, now, we certainly should not get so far away from it as
to destroy the evangelistic spirit possessed by the New Testament church, and let a clergy grow up in our midst out of our located ministry.

The need of the hour is straight live-coals-from-the-altar gospel preaching, with the fire of Stephen, the boldness of Peter and John note, the boldness of Peter and John (John still had thunder then) and with the invisible spirit of Paul, preaching that will start people to talking, even arguing. The people will hear it, if the brethren will bear it. Let us do it.

The Institutional Problem

We get the organize bee in our bonnets. The institutional idea is no longer a trend—we are institutionalized already. No week passes that churches are not circularized by “our institutions.” True, “we” did not start them but they were left on our doorstep for adoption, tagged, “your institution, support it.” As a doorstep child, the only alternative is adoption or death. Too kindhearted to let any of them die, the “brotherhood” adopts them all.

Stress needs to be put on the independency of the local church, with its own individual program, as being better than to become a mere subscriber, willing or unwilling, to a number of institutions. Some sober thinking is needed here. And some efficient figuring will reveal that the institutional way is more expensive and less effective.

Institutions are inclined to assume power as they grow and, consciously or unconsciously, to control preachers and churches. From the schools into the churches young people go as potential leaders and it is easy to see how churches in the future may become what the schools have in their power to make them. And it is reasonable that most young preachers will be formed into the mold of the college they attend. The Colleges are now conferring the title “Doctor” on certain gospel preachers, through the avenue of the LL.D. “Doctor’s degree.” Harding College conferred this degree upon a missionary in “recognition” of his “distinguished” service in China as a missionary, and then made him the president of the school that made him a doctor. Later this same school “conferred” the LL.D on others. Now Abilene Christian College is “confering” the LL.D on gospel preachers. Where are we headed? Aside from its being positively ridiculous for a school that can barely give a recognized B.A. degree, to confer on anybody a doctor’s degree; aside from the cheapness of it, which will make a laughing stock out of the colleges, and, consciously or unconsciously, to control preachers and churches.

Meetings, the night service, the morning service; these and a hundred kindred problems are ever under a cloud over some congregations is the erring inclination to settle church problems by division. Instead of congregational trouble being handled by the elders of the church the members resort to a sort of referendum and recall vote, take matters into their own hands under a revolutionary leadership, and the sequel is division—hateful, fateful division! Later when the parties to it become worn out by the grind, and time heals an element of the bitterness, the white flag is raised, a truce is declared, hostilities cease, and the announcement comes that an “understanding” has been reach—but why not have understanding before the division and spare the plight?

It is all in a lack of respect for the word of God. The divine will is ignored and the human passion rules.

Other Practical Problems

Their name is legion. Preacher’s problems and the problem of preachers; the striving for place and the swapping of jobs; preachers meetings. Young People’s Meetings; all kinds of meetings; the night service, the song service; missionary work, women’s work, and no work; and in the kindred problems are ever before a congregation. They can be amicably and scripturally settled, or handled, only by a sober, thinking prayerful, Bible-guided eldership, with the cooperation of a consecrated, obedient, subservient membership.

Denominations may thrive on it—but a wild democracy will wreck any church of Christ on earth.

To reject God’s way and substitute our own in anything is but to abandon the everflowing fountain for the broken cisterns that can hold no water. The fearful consequences of forsaking God and turning from his way in the history of Israel should serve as a perpetual warning to us, for “by their unbelief they were broken off and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded but fear.” F. E. W.
THE CHURCH-RAIDERS RANT AND RAGE

The article on page 6 in reference to the maledictory edition of a paper published in the Rio Grande Valley expresses my sentiments better than I can write them. The long, hard fight the Bible Banner has waged against the Clinton Davidson and Murch-Witty movements is justified because the issues of those movements involve the entire church. But there is nothing to justify a personal fight with a man who is so beside himself as to use language too vile to repeat, much less reply to.

It is not the personal attacks on me that constitute the most serious sin that Claud Nance and Ira Rice and those who aid them are committing. It is the attack upon the church and its time honored and long beloved elders-A. W. Lee and L. E. Diamond. Under their godly guidance and diligent direction the Tenth & Francis church has established a record of unimpeachable soundness. Several other excellent congregations have been formed out of it, and still it has a membership of between seven and eight hundred, composed of men and women of highest quality. From its beginning Brother Lee and Brother Diamond have been members of it, and for many years they have been elders of it. The article, too wicked to quote, is a criminal assault upon the church, and is a sin that requires evidence of repentance to be forgiven.

Not satisfied with the attack on the elders and members, the article proceeds to attack our good preacher, C. E. McGaughey, sound in teaching, pure in life and efficient in service.

To further satiate the depraved passion for slaughter, the article descends so low as to attack the moral character of a fine body of young people-our sons and our daughters-in-charges the vileness of which could hardly obtain rightful passage through the mails. I have never believed the doctrine of total depravity, but this article comes as near being an example of it as anything I have ever seen or read.

The aim, of course, was to down me but in poor strategy they have included me in a mass attack upon a fine old faithful church, with its godly elders and its worthy preacher. They are mad at the Bible Banner because it criticised what they are doing, and this particular one of them is mad at the whole church in Oklahoma City because he was defeated in his attempt to bust up a congregation. There is not a recognized congregation in Oklahoma City that will endorse him, nor in the Rio Grande Valley that will endorse his colleague down there.

Further exposure is unnecessary. They have exposed themselves. As for the Tenth & Francis church, I feel a just pride in being one of their number. Its walls are not apt to tumble before the exotica onslaught of a mad man. The sensible brotherhood will apply the remedy to the other members of the group as effectively as it has been applied to other men who have a record of elder-outing and church-busting, and as rapidly as the fact becomes known.

ANOTHER RISE FROM JAMES D. MURCH

The Bible Banner is evidently having its effect. The evidence is in the fact that about once a month we get a letter from James Defrosted Murch, the Christian Standard member of the Unity Conference, in which he assures us that the Bible Banner is not having any effect. That only proves that it is, else he would not write us an angry letter every time he reads it.

This time he writes me to turn down John T. Lewis' offer to make a speech to the Unity Conference one hour long in which he would read, without comment, what the pioneers said on instrumental music and missionary societies. He says the meetings are not open to "publicity-loving demagogues" who only want to "strut their stuff," but only to brethren of "intellectual honesty" and "Christian spirit." In that superb Christian spirit (?) he continues in that vein.

Furthermore, he declares there will be no public discussions or debates on the questions that divide-these will be confined to the few and will be "studies in exegesis." When the "conference" decides the issue, I suppose they will then let us all know that it is decided and the unity question will be settled!

This exposes the spirit of the thing. These digressive leaders have no respect whatever for those who oppose their innovations, nor for the preachers of the churches of Christ who participate in these meetings. Eyewitnesses have reported that while S. H. Hall was trying to match them in dramatics and voice tremors that the Christian Church leaders would turn and wink at each other.

That among themselves they make all manner of fun of Claud F. Witty, S. H. Hall, and other men among us who are playing into their hands, there is little doubt. And they should. The strange thing is that any gospel preacher will participate in the thing.

These same eye and ear witnesses say that the speech published in the Gospel Advocate, purporting to be S. H. Hall's speech, was not the speech that he made at Unity meeting, but one that he fixed up afterwards.

No debates, Defrosted Murch says. No, indeed! They are not far enough removed from the memories of the Hardernan-Boswell debate in Nashville. And I am persuaded that echoes from the Ozarks of the two debates at Bentonville, Arkansas, are still heard. They know about them out in California where Homer Strong is trying to coax our weak brethren into a Unity Meeting. But one debate cured Strong.

Why no debates? Because they cannot stand up in debate. Why the "Unity meeting?" Because they can select the men they know they can handle either around a conference table or in public meetings.

The "Christian spirit," indeed! A little more of that and I'll be persuaded to tell on Claud F. Witt-about that recent trip he made as a representative of Clinton Davidson & F. L. Rice with a proposition to finance him in a new paper for a few months solely for the purpose of a personal "exposure" of the editor of the Bible Banner. The reason stated was because of our opposition to Witty, and others, o nthis Unity Meeting and the Davidson Movement. But Mr. Murch says the Bible Banner has no effect!

How intelligent brethren can be so gullible as to be led along by James DeForest Murch and other digressive leaders who are employing the same strategy of years ago, and whose utterances breathe the same venom of hate for any and all who stand in their way-against their unscriptural innovations-is an enigma, indeed. The faithful brethren see through it. Those preachers who persist in participating in the Witty-Murch meetings are only separating themselves from the loyal churches and will find themselves in a dilemma that they have not anticipated. The brethren have a way of applying a silent remedy to some things and some men.

We are sending the Murch letter to Brother Lewis for whatever further attention he may think it deserves— but those who think will wonder: If it is a "study" that Mr. Murch and his colleagues really want by "brethren who have demonstrated their sincerity, intellectual honesty, Christian spirit and love for the truth," why did he become
so irritated over Bro. Lewis' offer to read without comment what Campbell, McGarvey, Lard, Milligan, and a mighty host of pioneers like them, who were undoubtedly men of that character, had to say on the question? We are about to see who is "demonstrating sincerity, intellectual honesty, Christian spirit, and love for the truth" and who is not.

Let it be understood that when Mr. Murch gets ready to debate, our propositions await signature for any of their number they may wish to put forth, whether W. R. Walker, S. S. Lappin, F. D. Kershner, Edwin Errett, or James De Forest Murch himself. We would really like to Defrost the gentleman in "a Christian spirit and love for the truth."

THE BREWER BOOK

Brother Brewer thinks there is a great demand for his articles in the papers of years past to be put in a book. Fearing the publishers may not later see the importance of doing so, he has announced that he will collate and compile his own articles into a book that "will have to sell for about two dollars, but," he adds, "it will be a large book." All of which reminds us that Bro. C. H. Roberson's large book was published "to sell for about $4.00." Besides wishing now that he had never published it, he can hardly give them away. That could be Brother Brewer's experience. The publisher seems to realize this, so he is having to write to "some fifty preachers" asking them to become advance agents of the book to underwrite its initial production. "Can you dispose of five copies?" he asks. "If not, will you take a smaller number?" he entreats. And, "What assurance can you give me?" he pleads. I was not one of the "some fifty preachers" he wrote, but one of them whom he "felt" he could "count on" gave me his letter.

Appearing to realize that there must be prestige back of his book other than his own, he states in the letter that "the book may contain a photostatic copy of letters endorsing his articles from the editor-Foy E. Wallace, Jr.," and "by John T. Hinds and by N. B. Hardeman." That ought to sell it without the help of the "some fifty preachers."

But a question of ethics is involved. I have heard G. C. Brewer say some of the most uncomplimentary things about N. B. Hardeman and his school that one man ever said about another. He remembers it, but just in case he does not, I can remind him when and where and what it was. Yet, he would now use the confidence the public has in Hardeman, but which they lack in him, by publishing letters written ten years ago, to recommend his proposed book! How is that for ethics?

He refers to articles that were written by "assignment from the editor-Foy E. Wallace, Jr." which will appear in the book, if and when it is published, with photostatic copies of letters showing that they were "indorsed and commended by the editor" (meaning me). Let me suggest that he print along with such letters of "indorsement" that fourteen page article of his which the papers refused to publish-an attack on "the editor-Foy E. Wallace, Jr.," whose "indorsement" of some of his old articles he would now publish to recommend his book. And how is that for ethics?

There are other letters that would seem quite appropriate for him to print beside these "indorsements." For instance, the correspondence that afterward passed between him and S. H. Hall revealing their private plans to dis-pose of "the editor-Foy E. Wallace, Jr.," after he debated with Neal on Premillennialism and began exposing the "some fifty" party through the Gospel Advocate. If he happens not to have this correspondence in his files, I can furnish it, as I have the complete exchange in my files. They would look good beside the letters of "indorsement!" consistency, where art thou? Ethics, 0 ethics, come hither! There are also other articles of his own than those indicated in his "index" that he really should publish. For instance, the articles on the expression "Christian Church" in which he contended that the regular designation "Church or Christ" is sectarian and unscriptural but the expression "Christian Church" is quite non-sectarian and scriptural! Of course, he should also publish Cled Wallace's reply to these articles in which brother Cled cornered him so completely that he called off the discussion. If he will publish these articles in full in his proposed book, I will be one of "the some fifty preachers" who will subscribe for five copies at $2.00 each, cash in advance.

In case he gets a favorable response, and does "bring it out," in the chapter on "Premillennialism" he should not forget to add a P. S. to it and tell us what the attitude should be toward those who teach the doctrine and if Rom. 16:17 applies to them. Our issue with Brewer is on the consequences of the doctrine, and the attitude toward those who teach it. When trying to convince the brethren of his soundness, this is what he always ignores. Until he gets right on these issues, quits wabbling and wavering, stops complimenting Premillennialists and criticizing those who fight it, and ceases to hold meetings with Premillennial preachers and for Premillennial churches, it would be better for him to stay out of print on these and other issues on which his attitude is so weak, for the more he writes the more trouble he gets into.

As a final caution, when it comes to publishing letters, two could play at that game.

FROM M. KEEBLE

"Dear Sir and Brother in Christ:

For over thirty years I have tried to conduct my work just as your article in the "Bible Banner" of March suggested. Taking advice from such friends as you have been for years has been a blessing to my work. So I take the privilege to thank you for that instructive and encouraging article. I hope I can conduct myself in my last days so that you and none of my friends will have to take back nothing they have said complimentary about my work or regret it. Please continue to encourage me in my work and pray for me. Fraternally yours, M. Keeble."

This letter is characteristic of the humility of M. Keeble. It is the reason why he is the greatest colored preacher that has ever lived. Luke Miller was brought up under his teaching and has imbibed the same spirit of meekness and humility. These men know their work and do it. They know their place and stay in it, even when some white brethren try to take them out of it. I have seen Luke Miller refuse to accept places among white people that were offered to him. This is because he knows what his relationships are in the church in the light of his relationships in society.

I am still for Keeble and Miller or any other colored preacher of the gospel who has their idea of things. But I am against trying to make white folks out of the negroes or negroes out of the white folks.
I BEG TO BE EXCUSED

CLED E. WALLACE

The Bible Banner recently made a little detour from the main line to warn the brethren against "the ridiculous antics" of some of our wild boys who do not know the difference between fanaticism and faith, and think that "wild hallowho" is sound doctrine. The outcome was about as I expected, only a little more so. The young apostle of irresponsible ranting in the Rio Grande Valley has filled an issue of his paper with an abusive attack on the personal character of the editor of the Bible Banner. For sheer extravagance and venom I do not believe it has ever been equalled by any paper that carried the name "Christian" at its masthead. We supplied the spark that set these boys ablaze and I think we can now return to the main line. They are in the process of revealing themselves to the brethren without further help from us. They are not overlooking anything, not even my pipe, and if smelling it caused my friends to act up like Ira's do when they read his paper, I'd give it up and spend the rest of my days chewing gum. What they say about me and my pipe is a lot nearer the truth than what they say about the editor. What they have to say about him is a strange mixture of falsehood and rancor. It will create more widespread resentment than acceptance. If such attacks could hurt the editor he would already have been ruined. These new attacks differ from the former ones. The former ones were more restrained and anonymous. There is little, if anything, more we need to tell the brethren about this all-out campaign of insult.

One of them confesses the exact truth in these words: "This article has been written just as sarcastic and insulting as we could make it." That is the spirit of these boys in both their writing and their preaching. The issue is right there. It is the thing we oppose and are warning the brethren against. It is not only against the Bible Banner that they employ such methods. They go at everybody and everything the same way. They divide churches, depose elders, stir up strife and hate and appeal to the elemental instincts of the shallow and thoughtless. Fist fights in the pulpit on Lord's day are not unknown where some of them go. An appeal to reason is in order. We believe there are enough people in possession of this useful commodity to put these religious anarchists in their places.

One of them expresses a surging desire to "match adjectives" with me. He feels entirely capable of taking care of us "as a sideline" although he represents himself as being a very busy man. I beg to be excused. I am wholly unqualified. He used more mean adjectives in one article than I ever thought of in my whole life and I wouldn't use some of them if I were debating with the devil. Intemperate railing is not in my line. "But Michael the archangel, when contending with the devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing judgment, but said, "The Lord rebuke thee."

Even if it were not against my principles, I'm not mad enough at these irresponsible young zealots to bandy insults with them. If I could say something to prevent or undo the harm they are doing, that would be worthwhile. Since they seem determined to ride the tide of intemperate utterance to its finish there seems little left for us to do about the matter except pray "that the word of the Lord may run and be glorified...and that we may be delivered from unreasonable and evil men." Matching adjectives with a fanatic in a state of tantrums is some business even as "a sideline."

Come to think of it, I must be a softie. It is one of those things which eludes a definite classification and the definition depends too much on the disposition of the man who is doing the defining. I have never been ambitious to be generally known as hard-boiled. Neither of these terms fits in with my idea of what a humble gospel preacher should be. My natural disposition is to like people, I like to be with them and I like to get along with them. I cannot go as far as Will Rogers did, who claimed that he never saw a man he disliked. Of all the people I know, criticize, laugh at and otherwise stick my tongue out at, or my pen into, the ones I wholly dislike are so scarce it would not add much if they were counted. I do not hate them. I would feed them if they were hungry and hand them a cup of cold water if they were thirsty, and the number is so small it would not add much to my grocery bill.

One of these "hard-boiled" boys boasts that he is not a coward and tells us how he has taken some elders "so-called" to a cleaning, or for a ride, or whatever it is that hard-boiled preachers do to "so-called" elders, and is fairly itching to add the editor of the Bible Banner to his casually list as a sort of "sideline." His two-page provocation to get the editor on "the dotted line" is a classic-in abuse. I was surprised at myself for not being mad when I finished reading it. I found my self rather admiring the thoroughness of it-it was the completest job of hard cussin' I ever saw in print written by a preacher. He goes at it whole-hog style. Even when he decides to be mean, he is surpassing. My admiration is somewhat like that of the bystander who listened to a teamster swear when a horse stepped on his foot. It was the most magnificent performance in profanity he had ever witnessed. This hard-boiled brother wants me to "match adjectives" with him. Why, bless you, no. In the first place I'm not as mad as you are and if I were I do not have a vocabulary in profanity anything like equal to yours. I can't cuss like you can. I guess there is not much doubt about my being a softie. I have sometimes back a little and wondered if maybe so the editor and I were not a little too hard in the way we cracked down on some things and some people. The editor has had more personal provocation to talk back than I have and he just naturally has more spunk than I have anyhow. I am a coward at heart and not nearly so fearless when cornered up as this hard-boiled brother up in Oklahoma is who avows that the editor of the Bible Banner is a softie and that he is not the least bit afraid of him or anybody else, even with his hands tied, if they'll let his tongue stay loose. If our editor is a softie, there's not a thing I can think of that can be said in my defense.

I do not know that anything at all can be done about my case. It is possibly chronic and incurable. I'm so soft that I think the common run of religious people even in error are honest and can be more wholesomely influenced by Bible teaching than by personal abuse. Now, just what can be done about a preacher who feels that way? Worse, still, I think a preacher in the pulpit and out should act and talk like a gentleman instead of like a ward politician in the midst of a corrupt political campaign. It gets worse the further it goes. Even when I call the names of religious sects and expose their false teaching, and I sometimes do, I try to be respectful enough and honest enough in representing their views, to merit their respect. And I nearly always succeed. I have never found it necessary to divide a church in order to teach the brethren what the Bible says about the qualifications and duties of elders. Some of the adolescents have the advantage of me here. I have never even had a "so-called elder" to take me on for a fist-fight in the pulpit on Lord's day morning when the fight was made together to break through these hard-boiled young brethren who propose to crush us with adjectives must be matched to be met, then I'll have to be counted out. My training has not been rough enough. I'm not mean enough, hard enough, or something.
STANDING UP
HOMER HALEY

Sometimes in the refining or manufacture of a product, there is produced a "by-product" in no wise inferior to the main item itself. This thought from Acts 2 may be considered simply a "by-product" of the chapter; the purpose of the chapter being to relate the beginning of the church, and the first declaration of the Lord's law of pardon under the Gospel.

"But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice, and spake forth unto them, saying, "With the eleven," a mere handful of men, who only a few days before had fled when the mob came out to arrest Jesus; and then later refused to believe those who told them of the resurrection. Certainly, not an imposing group, and not the most popular one in the city.

Not only did he stand up with the eleven, but he stood up in the presence of those before whom he had a few days earlier denied even an acquaintance with Jesus. He likewise stood up before the mob that had called for His blood, and demanded His crucifixion. This demanded courage, it was the very expression of a firm and unshakable conviction in matters now to be put to the test.

But more than that, he "stood up" for Jesus, to testify for Him, the most unpopular thing he could possibly have done. He couldn't have charged a more unpopular crime than when he charged the Jews with crucifying their Lord, nor could he have affirmed a more unpopular doctrine than when he affirmed the resurrection. This was the work of men, not sissies. It called for an unwavering faith in the cause for which he stood.

Here is another point. In standing up for Jesus, and preaching what he did, Peter was confessing that he had been woefully wrong when he had denied Him. He was confessing moral weakness when he fled from Him, to follow afar off. To take a position which confesses that one has previously been wrong is one of the most difficult things an individual is called upon to do. But though it may be hard, it is the only honorable and manly thing for him to do; and the Christian who actually loves truth, and seeks the glory of God, will not hesitate to do it.

Peter not only stood up with the eleven, in the presence of those before whom he had denied Jesus, and before the mob that had crucified Him, but he stood up and told them exactly what they had done, and what they now must do. "Ye by the hand of lawless men did crucify and slay" Jesus. There was no effort to soften the deep stain of their crime, nor tone of apology in the charge. But what should they now do? "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ." There was no effort to make their own part easier; there was no alternative; there was no hint of compromise; there was only one thing they could do, or perish.

All of this took courage, it took conviction, it required an unselfish devotion to Truth. It seems that a little "standing up" might be perfectly in order today. Would it not be fine if, instead of Brother Witty spending his time in so called "unity meetings," he would just, "standing up with the eleven," in the presence of the instrumental music People, who have crucified Christ afresh by dividing the church, tell them what they have done, and what they must do? If he and a few with him had the courage of Peter, and the conviction of those with whom he stood, he could stand up and say, "ye by the hand of lawless and unscriptural innovations did crucify the church and stand solely responsible for the division that exists." That would get the job done. Then, if they showed any semblance of being bothered about it, and showed any genuine desire for the restoration of unity, he could continue, "Repent ye, and put out the music, the societies, the modernism, and your many other innovations which separate us, that unity of a Bible order might be restored." This would put brother Witty in good company, would it? But the thing God wants done, and it would clearly draw the line. Brother Witty, why not "stand up" and do what a Christian ought to do?

But Brother Witty isn't alone in his failure to "stand." The brethren who loudly acclaim their loyalty, yet apologize for Boll and his followers; or who condemn Boll's work, are also in the same group. Maybe, it is asking too much to ask them to openly admit they have been wrong in their apologies; but if they will just "stand up" and boldly condemn the work of Boll, and expose his sophistries, at the same time telling him what he should and must do to restore harmony in the church, will to confess they were mistaken, and wrong in defending him. Then, to encourage those who made the fight against the doctrine, would be to put them in the right group. Of course, it is always best simply to stand up and say, "I have been wrong in this matter;" but to stand up and condemn in no uncertain manner a false doctrine, and encourage those who have condemned it, is to admit a former course erroneous.

Some months ago I suggested through the columns of this magazine, that it seemed the Christian thing for those who had so enthusiastically espoused the Clinton Davidson movement, to simply confess that the whole affair had been unwholesome for the welfare of the church, and that the move had been mistaken in it and in him. Well, it seems that one did "stand up" in a certain Preacher's Meeting and acknowledge that he had been mistaken, and was now through. That not only admitted that the move had been a mistake, but that those who opposed the men who exposed it, were also wrong in their fight against them. Now, why not others "stand up" in a firm, positive manner, and do the same? It takes courage, to be sure; and may make one unpopular with a certain group, but popularity with the Lord is worth more than anything else in the world, so what is lost?

It is human to err, no one denies that. Peter made a mistake when he fled from the Lord, when he followed afar off, and when he denied Him. But the mistake was not fatal; a mistake is fatal only when it is never corrected. When the opportunity came to "stand up..." and speak" he did that very thing, irrespective of the cost to his pride or popularity. Men oftentimes write things, speak things, and do things, which they learn later to have been erroneous. What shall be done about it? There is just one thing to do: Stand up, and say so. It takes courage, but it is honorable. To apologize and try to defend an action that is wrong, is to defend error.

The church won the fight in those early days because men had the courage to stand up and speak the truth, charge the sinners with their sins, and tell them what to do about it. It won because men were not ashamed to confess by a new course that they had a pursued a wrong one previously. This course will add power to the church to-day.

It is said of Gideon's 300, when placed about the army of the Midianites, "And they stood every man in his place round about the camp." (Judges 7:21) That is one of the basic things needed in the church today, every man standing in his place preaching straight, humbly, and with conviction; challenging sin in the high places, and telling those in error the thing to do to bring peace between themselves and God; and consequently peace, harmony, and a united front in the church.
NOT SO LONG AGO I HAPPENED TO BE IN CONVERSATION WITH TWO LADIES ON THE TRAIN. WHEN THEY LEARNED I WAS A PREACHER ONE OF THEM REMARKED, "THERE ARE TWO THINGS I DO NOT BELIEVE PEOPLE SHOULD EVER ARGUE ABOUT: THEY ARE RELIGION AND POLITICS." THE OTHER IMMEDIATELY AGREED. APPARENTLY THEY THOUGHT I WOULD AT ONCE ASSENT TO THE SAME. WHEN THEY LEARNED WE ALL WERE MEMBERS OF DIFFERENT BODIES THIS WAS THEIR APOLOGY FOR OUR DIVISIONS. I ASKED, "IF YOU BELIEVE IT ALL RIGHT TO ARGUE ABOUT OTHER THINGS WHY DO YOU THINK IT WRONG TO ARGUE ABOUT RELIGION AND POLITICS?" TO THIS THEY REPLIED THAT PEOPLE GET TOO STIRRED UP AND EXCITED ABOUT THESE MATTERS. I SUGGESTED THEN IF I WERE TO MAKE SOME CATTY REMARK ABOUT SOME MEMBER OF THEIR FAMILIES THEY WOULD AT ONCE TAKE ME TO TASK, REGARDLESS OF HOW BITTER THE ARGUMENT. I THEN WENT ON TO EXPLAIN THE REASON SOME PEOPLE BECAME SO WORKED UP IN THEIR ARGUMENTS ABOUT RELIGION IS BECAUSE THEY TAKE IT SERIOUSLY; WHILE OTHERS NEVER BECOME WORKED UP OVER RELIGION BECAUSE THEY DO NOT TAKE IT SERIOUSLY.

ANYTHING WE LOVE AND TAKE SERIOUSLY WE CAN BE WORKED UP ABOUT. I MUST ADMIT THAT I NEVER ENGAGE IN ARGUMENTS ABOUT POLITICALS. THE REASON IS I HAVE NEVER TAKEN MY POLITICS VERY SERIOUSLY. IF A MAN WANTS TO SHOUT VEHEMENTLY FOR THE NEW DEAL PARTY OR THE REPUBLICAN PARTY I HAVE NO OBJECTION; I NEVER BECOME WORKED UP, NEITHER DO I TAKE SUCH INDIVIDUALS TO TASK FOR THEIR STATEMENTS. THE REASON IS I AM NOT MUCH CONCERNED AS TO WHETHER A MAN IS A DEMOCRAT, A "NEW DEALER," OR A REPUBLICAN. ON THE OTHER HAND IF A MAN STARTS TALKING ABOUT "AMERICA," AND SPEAKING IN A DEROGATORY MANNER OF IT, I AT ONCE BECOME CONCERNED, AND TAKE HIM RIGIDLY TO TASK. I LOVE AMERICA, AND AM WILLING TO "WRANGLE" OVER IT. IN THE SAME WAY CAN I BECOME WORKED UP ABOUT THE RELIGION OF JESUS CHRIST. I LOVE THE BIBLE, AND I LOVE THE RELIGION WHICH IT SETS FORTH. WHEN ANY MAN BEGINS TO SPEAK IN A DEROGATORY MANNER OF THE BIBLE, OR WHEN ANY MAN ATTEMPTS TO "SABOTAGE" THE PRINCIPLES WHICH ARE THEREIN TAUGHT, I AM EASILY AROUSED AND READY TO CALL HIS HAND.

IN GERMANY PEOPLE DO NOT ARGUE ABOUT POLITICS. THE REASON IS NAZISM IS CONTROLLED BY ONE MAN. THE GERMAN PEOPLE ARE NOT PERMITTED TO ARGUE OVER IT. THEY ARE AFRAID TO DO SO. MANY OF THEM ARE DISSATISFIED WITH THE EXISTING REGIME BUT THEY ARE HELPLESS TO DO ANYTHING ABOUT IT. THERE ARE NO WRANGLES (OF ANY SIGNIFICANCE) AMONG THE CATHOLICS. THE REASON IS ONE MAN GIVES ALL THE ORDERS AND COMPELS ALL OTHERS TO OBEY HIM. CATHOLICS ARE SIMPLY NOT PERMITTED TO ARGUE WITH THEIR SUPERIORS. IT IS NOT THEIRS TO "ASK THE REASON WHY," IT IS THEIRS ONLY "TO DO AND DIE." WRANGLING AMONG THE METHODISTS AND EPISCOPALIAN CHURCHES IS CONSTRAINED TO THE BISHOPS WHEN THEY MEET IN CONFERENCE. THERE THEY ARE MORE NEARLY ON AN EQUALITY. AS FOR THE PEOPLE WRANGLING OVER MATTERS OF DOCTRINE, THIS IS NOT PERMITTED. THEY TAKE THEIR ORDERS FROM A SUPERIOR AUTHORITY AND ARE FORBIDDEN ANY SAY WHATSOEVER IN SUCH MATTERS. SHOULD THE DAY EVER COME IN WHICH WE ARE DEPRIVED OF THE RIGHT TO "WRANGLE" AMONG OURSELVES, OR SHOULD THE TIME EVER COME WHEN WE ARE NOT ENOUGH CONCERNED ABOUT THE BIBLE AND THE RELIGION TAUGHT THEREIN TO "WRANGLE" IT WILL BE A BAD DAY FOR THE CHURCH OF OUR LORD.

WHEN I WAS A BOY I HAD MORE FIGHTS WITH MY BROTHER THAN ANYBODY ELSE. YET ANY TIME SOMEONE ELSE JUMPED ON HIM HE HAD TO SCRAPPY AND WHEN ANYONE JUMPED ON ME HE HAD MY BROTHER TO FIGHT. WE Fought WITH ONE ANOTHER YET WE LOVED ONE ANOTHER BETTER THAN ANYBODY ELSE. THERE ARE MORE SQUABBLES IN THE FAMILY THAN ANYWHERE ELSE. IF A MEMBER OF MY FAMILY DOES SOMETHING WHICH I DISAPPROVE I AT ONCE REGISTER MY DISAPPROVAL. I MIGHT SEE STRANGERS DOING MANY THINGS THAT I DISAPPROVE WITHOUT SAYING ANYTHING, BUT IF I SEE MY WIFE AND CHILDREN DO SOMETHING I DISAPPROVE I IMMEDIATELY TRY TO CORRECT THEM. MY WIFE OFTEN COMPLIMENTS OTHER PREACHERS ON THEIR SERMONS WITHOUT EVEN TRYING TO SUGGEST A CORRECTION OR ANY IMPROVEMENT UPON THEM. ON THE OTHER HAND SHE MORE OFTEN CRITICIZES MY SERMONS THAN SHE PRaises THEM. THE REASON IS SHE WANTS TO HELP ME CORRECT MY FAULTS AND IMPROVE MY METHODS AND MANNER.

SIMPLY BECAUSE WE WRANGLE AMONG OURSELVES AS BRETHREN DOES NOT MEAN THAT WE ARE REPROBATES. INDEED, IT IS A HOPEFUL SIGN. AS LONG AS WE CONTINUE TO ARGUE ABOUT MATTERS OF RELIGION WE ARE ON OUR GUARD AGAINST DEPARTURE. SOME BRETHREN HAVE THE NOTION THAT AN ARGUMENT IS A SIGN THAT WE ARE NOT POSSESSED BY THE SPIRIT OF CHRIST. JESUS AND THE APOSTLES WERE ALWAYS ON THEIR GUARD AGAINST ERRONEOUS TEACHING. IT IS TRUE, WE OUGHT NOT TO BECOME SO WRAPPED UP IN OUR ARGUMENTS THAT WE MAKE FALSE STATEMENTS. SOME PEOPLE CANNOT ENGAGE IN AN ARGUMENT WITHOUT LOSING THEIR SELF CONTROL AND MAKING IT A PERSONAL MATTER RATHER THAN A MATTER OF PRINCIPLES. THIS STATEMENT MAY CALL FOR AN EXPLANATION. SOME HAVE THE NOTION THAT WHEN WE CALL A MAN'S NAME, OR THE NAME OF A RELIGIOUS GROUP IT THEN CEASES TO BE A MATTER OF PRINCIPLE AND BECOMES PERSONAL. THIS IS A MISTAKE. IF A MAN IS TEACHING A DOCTRINE CONTRARY TO THE WORD OF GOD IT IS NO MORE A CRIME TO POINT OUT THE INDIVIDUAL WHO TEACHES THE ERRONEOUS DOCTRINE THAN IT IS TO POINT OUT THE ERRORS IN THE DOCTRINE. INDEED, IF A DOCTRINE BE FALSE THE MAN WHO TEACHES IT SHOULD BE EXPOSED ALONG WITH HIS TEACHING. THIS DOES NOT MEAN THAT WE HAVE BECOME AN ENEMY TO THE MAN WHO TEACHES THE DOCTRINE. IT OUGHT TO MEAN THAT WE ARE TRYING TO SAVE HIM FROM THE FOLLY OF HIS ERROR. WHEN PAUL POINTED OUT THE ERRORS AMONG THE GALATIANS HE ASKED, "AM I BECOME YOUR ENEMY BECAUSE I TELL YOU THE TRUTH?" (GAL. 3:18). IT IS QUITE UNFORTUNATE THAT SOME OF US REGARD PEOPLE AS OUR ENEMIES WHEN THEY POINT OUT OUR MISTAKES. WE THEN SAY AND DO THINGS WHICH WE OUGHT NOT. BRETHREN SHOULD NEVER BECOME PERSONAL ENEMIES BECAUSE OF DISAGREEMENT. PAUL AND BARNABAS HAD "A SHARP CONTENTION" (ACTS 15:39); BUT THEY NEVER BECAME PERSONAL ENEMIES AS A RESULT. IT IS ONLY WHEN OUR WRANGLINGS MAKE PERSONAL ENEMIES OUT OF US THAT WE BECOME DANGEROUSLY INVOLVED. USUALLY IT FLOWS THAT THE MAN WHO IS UNABLE TO SUSTAIN HIS
position is that man who swells up and sulks or else plays the martyr role in an effort to gain sympathy for himself. The man who stands up and fights valiantly for what he believes to be right is to be commended, but I have never had any patience with grow up individuals who play the baby act of crying for sympathy or pouting around and refusing to play with other children.

Let no one suppose that I "love" squabbles. It would be much better if all the members of my family could so act and conduct themselves that we would never have anything but praise for one another. However, I doubt the possibility of our ever reaching this point. I have heard of some families wherein it is said a cross word was never spoken. There may have been a few such families, but if so it is my conviction that they never had enough "get-up" in them to start an argument, or else never had enough concern about one another and the affairs of life to say anything. If we were living in a world of perfect individuals then we might expect perfect peace, but as long as we live among imperfect beings we may expect our wranglings to continue in our efforts to attain to the standard of perfection. It has been said that fires and storms are about the best things that can happen to some cities and communities. They get rid of all the dead limbs and de-lapidated buildings and renovate things in general. Maybe the same thing is true in the kingdom of God. Through the violent storms which rage among us and the fires of purification we often get rid of dead material which serves to hinder our growth. It is regretted, of course, that such things are ever needed but there seems to be no way of preventing such as long as we live in an imperfect world. God's Divine plan is a perfect plan, intended to save imperfect individuals and fit and prepare them for a perfect place when the period of regeneration is over-when the battles of life have all been fought and the triumph comes.

**A Songbook Hint**

*Do not purchase new songbooks until you have sent for a copy of Complete Christian Hymnal for examination.*

*The second edition now off the press. Three hundred eighty two songs — old and new. Two bindings: Limp, $35c; heavy cloth, unbreakable backs, red edges, $50c. Write for price per hundred.*

Marion Davis Co.
Box 162
Fayette, Ala.

**APPEASEMENT POLICIES**

**W. CLARENCE COOKE**

The ethics of present day journalism, according to some of our editors and writers, calls for an occasional re-statement of policy so that the readers will understand that the battle against "error in multiform" is still in progress. But recounting what a paper has done in the past will not suffice for what it should do now. A re-statement of policy, or even a reprint of articles written before the church had reached the crisis through which it is now passing, cannot be logically and consistently applied to present needs; they only serve as a sort of self-defense plea for lack of courage on the part of those who are in position to render the church a real service, but whose journalistic aspirations are subjugated to an appeasement policy bolstered by editorial committees that are never invited to commit. When it becomes necessary for a journal to give the sum total of times it has condemned error over a given period and multiply that by the number of words used in its condemnations, it is evident that there is a consciousness that its policy has not been so impressive. The most effective and destructive teaching against error is not delivered in multiplicity of words, lines and phrases which circumscribe the error, but by a direct hit delivered in few words and aimed at the seat and source of the error. This course and policy needs no editorial committee; neither does it need a restatement of policy-its policy stays stated.

Over-emphasis given to a policy tending to avoid a dignified discussion of preachers and their sympathizers and a thorough exposition of their speculative theories, which are menacing the peace and unity of the church, will destroy rather than build a defense against their hurtful heresies. The only consistent and scriptural course for papers, editors and preachers is one that unequivocally exposes the teachers, along with the error they teach both in the church and out. The pioneers who uprooted sectarianism and established the truth upon its ruins were not the tred-easy, soft-pedaling kind. Every well-informed man among us knows where such men as Lipscomb, Sewell, Kurfees, McQuiddy and others stood on the divisive theories of their day, and we all know where they would stand on present tendencies that threaten the aggressive spirit and work of the church were they here now. If those of the present day who "sat where they sat" would stand where they stood against the speculative, man-inflating theories, it would not be necessary for a few men of courage among us to be sacrificed upon the altar of popular public opinion in their work of condemning false brethren and their peace-destroying speculations. This false theory under the guise of ”a better policy in religious journalism and pulpit preaching," if followed to its logical conclusion, will completely destroy the aggressive and uncompromising spirit of the New Testament church and make it appear to the general public as "just another denomination" in the religious struggle for prominence before a wandering, a wayward world of scepticism, atheism and pantheism. Personalities timely and clearly stated, so that all may know where certain of these "new method" prophets can be found, if indeed they may be located, are rather to be preferred than insinuations cunningly clothed in soft-spoken verbiage and directed against the men who are personating these fellows and destroying their influence, methods and doctrines which are so destructive to the peace and influence of the church.

The primary purpose in the minds and hearts of those who were instrumental in publishing the Bible Banner was that it might be dedicated to the service of the church in acquainting the brethren with the dangers of all isms and schisms in the one body and most especially to expose, oppose and depose premillennialism and those men who teach it, together with the more dangerous group that "does not believe it" (?) but who will not oppose those who are dividing the church by teaching it. The "policy" of the Bible Banner is stated in understandable language by the kind of articles it carries in its columns. The editor and those who are associated with him know what to say and how to say it. When conditions arise which demand the use of the sword of the Spirit, it is used without respect of persons. Such a course in religious journalism does not need a "statement of policy" or the enumeration of articles, lines and words used against the errors it has oposed, in order for its readers to know what it has done in waging "a relentless warfare against" false doctrine. The readers of the Bible Banner are not left to make an interpretation or application of the articles it carries. These are made with clarity and without apology and they stay such because beyond the reach of those who have given little thought to the real cause of so much softness from pulpit and press.
Adjoining the campus of the University of Oklahoma is nearly a square block of some of the most valuable property in Norman. It is valued at several thousand dollars. There is a mortgage on the property, but is in the process of being lifted. This property is owned by the Oklahoma School of Religion, the affairs of which are controlled by a Board of Trustees, who are interested in providing religious instruction for students attending the University of Oklahoma. There is a dean, whose salary the School of Religion pays, if there is anything left after current running expenses are paid. The state in no way supports the School of Religion. Some announcements may be seen in University publications concerning the School of Religion and its work for the information of the students, such as would be made concern of the churches in the town. However, the State does not provide public funds to teach religion. If such is done it must be supported by sources other than public revenue.

At present there are seven instructors on the faculty. Each one is classified under one of each of the following heads: Dean (Presbyterian), History of Religion (Jew), Old Testament (Methodist), Hymnology (Methodist and General Secretary of Y. C. A.), Church History (Disciple and General Secretary of Y. M. C. A.), New Testament (Church of Christ), and Philosophy of Religion (Presbyterian). This is how each instructor was listed in the School of Religion class schedule for the Spring semester. Each student, therefore, can see who the instructor is, the subject on which he specializes, and the church of which he is a member.

There is "not the slightest theological strings on any instructor in the School of Religion." This is an official statement of the dean. For more than five years, I have taught classes in the New Testament in the School of Religion. No pressure has ever been exerted to coerce for or against any kind of teaching during this time. So far as the authorities are concerned, I can teach Modernism, Protestantism, Primitivism, or any other "ism." The following will illustrate the academic and theological liberty of the instructors: Each Thursday afternoon during the current semester there are two different courses taught from 3:00 to 5:00 o'clock. The University gives credit toward a degree on both. One course is listed as Religion 8 and deals with the history of the Jews. It is taught by a Jewish Rabbi from Oklahoma City. At the same hour in the room above, another course, Religion 32, in the Life and Letters of Paul, is taught by me. A few days ago I was teaching the book of Galatians. About two hours were spent showing the students that Christians are not under the law of Moses or the Jew's religion. "The Law is become our tutor to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But now that faith is come, we are no longer under a tutor" (Gal. 3:24-25).

I do not know what the Jewish instructor was teaching, but I feel fairly sure that he was not teaching that the Jewish religion had served its purpose and passed away. Whatever theological views each had, we were free to express and discuss them at length. No outside pressure was, or is, exercised in any case. Whether this is as it should be, some may doubt but this is how it is.

During this present semester I am teaching six different classes in the New Testament—two sections of a three hour course in the Introduction to the New Testament, two sections of a two hour course in the Life and Letters of Paul, and two sections of a two hour course in the Non-Pauline New Testament writers. In all of these classes there are students enrolled, taking the work for credit toward a degree in the University. The New Testament is the text used. These classes are taught in the School of Religion building. In addition there are couple of special classes—a kind of extension work—for which no credit is given. One of these is in the Life and Letters of Paul and the other is a training class for young preachers in which practically all the time is spent in studying and debating points of doctrinal controversy. These two classes are conducted in the education building at the Tenth and Frances Church of Christ in Oklahoma City.

Another phase of his University work offers an opportunity to use the University radio. At 4:00 P. M. daily from April 21 to May 3, I will be given twelve different 15 minute periods over WNAD, the University radio station, operating on a frequency of 640 kilocycles. In two weeks, I will have another two weeks' period. There is no cost for this time. The aim is to cover the Bible in a year. If no more came from this radio work than advertising the Churches of Christ over the state, that would be worth the effort. Some students think of the Church of Christ as being in the back part of town "down across the railroad." We should not cater to popularity, but that is no reason why we show not merit the highest type of respect.

As to the support of this work, so far as Churches of Christ are concerned, there are but two ways—as individuals or as congregations. For more than two years all contributions have been sent to me directly. Once every two or three months a financial report is sent to each contributor and such others as should be interested in this work, showing the name of each contributor, the amount, and the day of the month received. Every contributor can check the report for himself. He can also see the total. For the first 31 months the monthly average was $71.72. Since September 1, 1940, the monthly average has been 76.98. For the first three months of 1941, it has averaged $86.90.

There are about a half dozen teachers in the University who are members of the Church of Christ. If all of these instructors were to move across the street and be joined with my Bible teaching, we could have a kind of "Church of Christ" Bible College. But how much more religious instruction would be given in chemistry, economics, education, English, et cetera than is now being given? It is difficult for small colleges to compete with large state institutions—and it will very likely become more difficult in the future. If small colleges can scarcely compete with larger state schools, how can we hope to build one in Oklahoma? If we cannot build a Christian College in this state, and many Church of Christ students cannot go to other states to get religious instruction, it follows that we should continue what we are trying to do at the University of Oklahoma. It is the next best thing to the Christian college.

Almost as many Church of Christ students attended the University as attend the College department of any of our Christian colleges. Besides those of our own young people, there are thousands that are not members of the Church of Christ. Many of these also need an opportunity to study the New Testament. About 80% of those attending my classes since I have been here were not members of the Church of Christ.

Many other aspects of this work would be of general interest but space forbids extended discussion. Whether this is the proper solution of the problem of religious education in a state
THE OKLAHOMA CITY MEETING

C. E. McGaughey

Foy E. Wallace, Jr. (of Oklahoma City) and Marion Davis (of Fayette, Ala.) recently conducted a successful meeting with the Tenth and Francis Streets church in Oklahoma City, during which eight were baptized and nine placed membership. Many preachers, leaders and members from over the state and some from out of the state, were present for the services.

The second Sunday night of the meeting we held the service in the Municipal Auditorium, and Brother Wallace preached a great sermon on the subject, "Why Believe The Bible." It was estimated by those who have charge of the auditorium that not less than three thousand were present for the service. The other congregations in the city cooperated in a very fine way throughout the meeting. The church feels that much good was accomplished, and we are confident that the seed sown will continue to bring forth good in the days to come. This is the second meeting in which Brother Wallace has done the preaching since the new church auditorium was opened two years ago. This was the first visit to Oklahoma City for Brother Davis. He made many friends and the church was well pleased with his good work in directing the worship in song.
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SHALL A YOUNG MAN?

HUGO McCORD

"Wherewith shall a young man cleanse his way?" David asked that three millennia back; many young men are asking it in the present distress. Shall a young man bear arms? or stay at home and be called a slacker?

It won't do for him to inquire of parents, for their answers will vary. Some will say, "Shoot all the enmies." Some, "Don't even salute the flag." Others, "You should not kill."

It won't do to inquire what the "rest of the fellows" are doing. Majorities are hardly ever right. What the "rest" do is all right for a crowd-follower.

He that is built of more than bone and sinew will, in directing his way, do as David said: "taking heed thereto according to thy word." "Thy word have I hid in mine heart, that I might not sin against thee."

David had in mind the Old Testament. We are not under it in 1941. The Lord was a God of war in those days, and a God of animal sacrifice and incense offering. Now He has abrogated all of those things. A carnal kingdom He had once, with David, a man of blood, at its head. Now He has a spiritual kingdom, with David's Son, the Prince of Peace, on the throne, whose weapons are not fleshly.

A young man today then must inquire of the heavenly King what to do, of Him whose laws are perfect, far superior to the faulty, moon-lit Old Testament. Whereas the Old said, If a man hits you, hit him back (Ex. 21:24), the New decrees, "That ye resist not evil" (Matt. 5:39), turning the other cheek. While the Old allowed God's people to smash their enemies, the New ordains, "Do good to them" (Matt. 5:44), Thus a Christian, if so be he is Christian, would not do bodily harm to Hitler himself, contemptible and anti-Christ tho he is.

Do we owe any obligations to our Government? Emphatically, and no Christian will shirk them. We should be thankful we live under such a benevolent flag, under such rulers who want us to live quiet and peaceful lives. I am happy my wife and baby are under the Stars and Stripes, and I am happy my wife and baby are under the Stars and Stripes, and I am happy my wife and baby are under the Stars and Stripes, and I am happy my wife and baby are under the Stars and Stripes, and I am happy my wife and baby are under the Stars and Stripes.

But, some have objected, you do not resist not evil! I'd just as soon pull a trigger as to peel a potato for the man who kills. That kind of reasoning condemns the farmer who raises the potatoes and sells to the Government. He tatoes and sells to the Government.

When the bands play, and the boys are uniformed, it takes no courage to go to war. It takes courage to stay at home and take "Yellow" slapped in the face. In Babylon the men of courage were not they who bowed to Nebuchadnezzar's image, but those few who stood alone — Shadrach, Meshach, Abednego. In the last war a Baltimore brother refused to take a gun, was ridiculed; assigned to other work, he was decorated for bravery under fire, bringing in the wounded. An English brother, refusing arms in 1916, was verbally lacerated, dismissed from his job. He moved to Canada to set up life anew. Today he is an upright elder of the church in Hamilton, Ontario. I have heard of two young men with hands raised, backs against wall, at Leavenworth in 1917, yet were unmoved and unmoveable. There are many others, some known but to God. Only to Him, though, were they living anyway, walking by faith. Castigated by the rabble, sometimes snickered at by their brethren, they pressed resolutely to the mark of the prize of no low calling. They had vowed the principles of a kingdom of heaven.
DIFFICULTIES OF PREMILLENNIALISM

A. B. KEENAN

The Rev. J. B. Hunley, commentator on the International Sunday School lessons for the Christian Standard, has a penchant for premillennial ideas and seldom overlooks an opportunity for dragging them into his weekly discussions. In this he shows a camaraderie with the Louisville lights and that Square-Bale-Baiter No. 1, the pundit of a penchant for premillennial ideas and lessons for the Christian Standard, which he is Fort Worth's First Baptist Church.

He travels a miry road beset with sinkholes, into which he topples with regularity. With eyes commencing with the skies, he takes no heed of his steps, nor of the grievous way with which he is bedaubed with the dirt.

Sinkhole the first: He affirms, but is too busy to prove, that the judgment mentioned in II Cor. 5:10 is for Christians only. True, Paul is addressing members of the church, but in so doing he frequently lays down principles which are as applicable to the unimmersed as well. "Be not deceived, God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that also shall he reap." Does this truth find an application limited to believers? I twow not. The verse in II Corinthians refers to the judgment of everyone at the end of the world. The Reverend is discussing Ezekiel 33.

If this chapter teaches anything, it declares to all that a sinful man may finally be saved and that a church member may finally be lost. It all depends on his final attitude toward Christ (and I believe "attitude" is broad enough to embrace obedience) when he dies. Yet our writer declares that John 5:24 ("He that heareth my word, and believeth him that sent me, hath eternal life? and cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of death into life.") eliminates any final review for the Christian, and that the judgment of II Cor. 5:10 is merely for the purpose of determining the degree of reward. If this isn't Once-in-grace-always-in-grace, what is it?

He alleges further that the throne in Rev. 4:2, 3 represents the Christian's welcome home, that it corresponds to II Corinthians 5:10, and that it must be kept distinct from the judgment of Rev. 20: 11-15 which is reserved only for the condemnation of the wicked. The deponent saith in addition: "This writer has decided before which throne he is to appear. He has chosen to stand before the throne encircled by the rainbow, not before the great white throne."

Sinkhole the second: The Standard's premillennial man Friday descants more on Rev. 4, 2, 3—but still off the point: "This is the judgment seat of Christ which is to be set at the close of this dispensation, and before the Golden Age appears." The Cincinnati journal has much to say about the Restoration Movement, but this is a departure from a Restoration fundamental: "Bible names for Bible things." (But, dear reader, don't get the impression that this is the only one.) A search of Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible discloses not one reference to the expression "Golden Age." We may dismiss the idea as a figment of H's imagination. This present dispensation began on Pentecost; it will end when Christ comes to wind things up, not start something.

Hunley's construction of John 5:24 cancels out and tears to pieces I Cor. 10:12, Heb. 3:12, Heb. 4:1, Heb. 6:4-6, I Cor. 10:8, Acts 1:25, Jas. 5:12, II Pet. 3:17, Rev. 2:5, II Pet. 1:10, Gal. 5:4 and a host of others. John 5:24 is conditional and prophetic. It must agree with, no nullify, all other teaching of the New Testament on the dangers of apostasy and the certainty of a final judgment for all, saint and sinner. But in the words of another great Seer, if the no-chance-for-apostasy interpretation of John 5:24 "be felt a difficulty, leave that to God.”
PROTECTING CHURCH PROPERTY

R. O. Kenley

For several years I have been preparing deeds and charters for congregations, with the sole purpose of protecting those who desire to worship and serve God in the New Testament way, in the use, possession, enjoyment and ownership of their Church property. This precaution is necessary, due wholly to “weak,” “affected pious,” “truth in love,” “compromising” preachers and elders. If the truth was taught and practiced by preachers and elders, all “fence breaks,” “innovators,” “premillenialists,” and “ism carriers” would find themselves so lonesome in a faithful congregation, that they would either learn the truth or cast their lot with those of their belief. Lack of respect for the silence of God’s word, in most cases, is responsible for defections and divisions in the family of God.

The Campbells, more than a century ago from a very careful and diligent study of the New Testament, gave birth to the slogan, “Where The Bible Speaks, We Speak; Where The Bible Is Silent, We Are Silent” (1 Peter 4:11). This slogan was recognized by all members of the New Testament church for something like 25 or 30 years as the correct rule by which to interpret the New Testament. Many very able and prominent men, including James A. Garfield, who afterwards became a president of the United States, accepted the plain Bible teaching as interpreted by the Campbells, Stone, Smith and others; however, these newly added men and women, many of whom were leaders in worldly affairs, were not taught, “Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God” (2 John 9). They were not taught to completely substitute God’s “righteousness” for the “righteousness” they had known before accepting the truth. God’s “righteousness” in many congregations is now being badly choked by the “righteousness” of the world or by the “righteousness” of the Roman Catholic Church. As the result of lack of New Testament teaching the ultra worldly wise, the untaught, and many women and children some seventy five years back, under and by force of the majority rule, took charge of most congregations throughout the United States, and adopted themselves a slogan, which is the antithesis of the slogan promulgated by the Campbells, and which likewise contravenes New Testament teaching, and which is, “Where The Bible speaks, we are silent; where the Bible is silent, we speak.” This deflection is now the Christian Church in the United States. The slogan and doctrine of this religious body is so broad that it will permit the doing of most anything as acts of worship. This deflection placed mechanical musical instruments in the worship, adopted and approved missionary societies and other organizations as adjuncts of the Church, in fact have done everything and gone to every extreme to which sectarian religious bodies have gone. Some of its congregations receive as members unbaptized persons. Another principle practiced by this body for many years after it gained numerical supremacy (which principle all now condemn in Hitler) was that “might makes right,” actuated by this principle, those who held to the slogan of the Campbells (being in the minority), were “kicked out,” and deprived of the use and possession of their church property. The result being that David Lipscomb, Tolbert Fanning, E. G. Sewell, the Sryelevs, A. McGary, J. W. Denton, J. W. Chism, A. J. McCarty, G. H. P. Sho Walter, Chas. R. Nichol and others had to revive anew the restoration movement theretofore set in motion by the Campbells, and flight from the “grass roots” up: this they did without pay, fear or favor: the numerous congregations now throughout the United States are due directly and indirectly to the faith, zeal, courage, and sacrifice of these pioneers for the truth: they are examples of “truth in love” (love for the word of truth). The so called Christian Church is a living monument to soft, compromising preachers and elders in the Church seventy five years ago. The necessity for restrictions in deeds and charters of congregations in this age is a monument to the fact that we now have preachers and elders who will preach and who will not pervert and, or demand to be preached the truth as to religious error and “isms.”

Restrictions against “termites” could be placed in a deed, but the restrictions alone would prove futile, unless when termites show up they are promptly attacked and eradicated. Just so with “inovations” and “isms” in the church. If you go to collaborating and playing with them, before you realize, they have aligned the doctrinally weak members with themselves and are in such numerical number as to cause trouble or destroy a congregation.

My observation is that when a member of the church loses respect for the “silence” of the Bible, he will soon lose respect for the express and affirmative teaching of the word, and when once he “jumps the fence” he will go all the way to “Sodom” before stopping.

By the adoption of the 18th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, National Prohibition against the manufacture, sale and use of intoxicating liquors became a part of the fundamental law of this nation. The drys, prohibitionists, temperance unions, preachers and church members, upon the adoption of this amendment blasted out an “Amen,” that was heard throughout the civilized world; then went to sleep, depending upon the Constitutional Amendment and the laws enacted to carry it out to make sober citizens. After it was too late we discovered that the legal provisions made were not self operative and that instead of making total abstainers of our children, it had made drunkards of many of them. There is no substitute for affirmative and strong teaching against doctrinal or moral error. Restrictive clauses in deeds and charters to the property of congregations will not dispense with strong teaching and the making of strong fights against “innovations” and “isms.” Lovers of the truth should not be afraid of incurring any one by “contending for the faith.”

In the sheep raising areas of Texas many ranchers in the past few years, in order to prevent predations to their flocks from wolves, have enclosed their ranches with “wolf proof” woven wire fences; however, now and then a wolf gets on the inside. When he is discovered the owner gives the alarm, and all neighbors with their dogs come and join in the hunt and caise until the wolf is captured and destroyed. Elders, preachers and Christians should keep a close lookout for doctrinal “wolves,” and when one is found in the congregation, do not begin “petting” and trying to “appease” him by giving him a class, calling upon him to lead in prayer, lead the songs, and, or wait upon the Lord’s table, but on the contrary he should be handled in such way that he would do no harm to others. The preacher and elders should at once commence definite teaching so as to enlighten him, if he will permit, if not, then the truth will drive him to other parts. In most cases he will go to the Christian Church or to some sectarian church.
REMOVE THE THORN

JOHN D. COX

One evening, recently, I was reading from the book, “Choice Selections From Benjamin Franklin.” As I read many of the piercing statements that came from the pen of that great defender of the faith, I found myself thinking over and over: “How much this is needed today! If many preachers and other members of the church would only read this and think!” One of the statements which caused me to react thus is found on page 53. I give it below:

“It may seem strange that a human body weighing one hundred and fifty pounds, would be disturbed by a little thorn in it, not an eighth of an inch long! But strange as it may appear, it is a fact. And you cannot accus- tom the body to it by piercing the thorn in deener and deener, till the body will become easy and comfortable: but you can in that way produce irritation, then inflammation, then mortification, and then death. Death has been pro- duced in this way many times. He is no friend to the body who continues to push the thorn in deeper and deeper, nor is he who would excuse him in so doing, or encourage him in it. There is but one remedy, and that is to re- move the thorn. Even if you have to make the wound much larger than it is, the thorn must be removed, or the end will be death.”

The above paragraph was written not later than 1879. The author applied the thought to the proper treatment of anything that is a transgression of God’s word. He insists, and rightly so, that any error, no matter how little it may seem to man, should be rooted up before it has time to cause “irrita- tion, inflammation, mortification, and death.” Near the close of the article, as though he had turned prophet, Bro- ther Franklin said: ‘Some of the little matters now among us will be found sufficient to stop the ark of God, and cause more than three thousand to be defeated. If Moses were to address some of our men, he would say to them as he did to Aaron: What has this people done to thee that thou hast brought so great a sin upon them? Or, as Joshua said to Achan: Why hast thou troubled us? The Lord will trouble thee this day.”

While reading Benjamin Franklin’s treatment of the proper way to deal with a thorn in the body, I thought of some thorns that have been thrust into the body of our Lord during the last fifty years. At the first these thorns appeared to be small and harmless—they merely pricked the skin. As time went on, however, the holders of the thorns pressed them harder and they made their way deeper into the body. When some of the members, already feeling the painful tremor of the nerves of unity and fearing the safety of the body, flinched and suggested that the thorn must be removed, oth- er members raised strenuous objection to this method of dealing with it. Said they: “Leave it alone and it will do no harm. If you try to remove it a larger wound will be made! If you allow it to remain undisturbed, the body will soon become accustomed to its presence and there will be no danger of dis- ease.” But, alas, in sections where the thorn was not removed, it was forc- ed with increasing power into the vitals of the body. The result: “Irrita- tion, inflammation, mortification, death!”

This, briefly, is the history of missiona- ry societies and instrumental music and their effect upon the body of Christ in many localities. Those who are today promoting a so-called “uni- ty movement” between the Christian Church and the churches of Christ should think of this. The leaders of the Christian Church have clearly indicat- ed that they are not interested in dis- carding the thorns of error with which they afflicted the body before the divi- sion came. What, then, is the desire of the brethren among us who press this “unity meeting” idea? Do they want the Lord’s body to take a thorn back into its bosom that once caused pain and anguish and resulted in the death of many of its members? Do they love the thorn-pressers more than they love the body of Christ? Can it be that they do not real- ize what they wouId do to the cause of our Lord if they but had their way?

This is also the history of the thorn of Premillennialism and its irritating, mortifying effects upon many congrega- tions. And yet, there are still those who cry: “Let it alone! If you re- move the thorn, a greater wound will be made.” If this principle is true, what need have we for surgeons? When the body becomes the victim of some foreign matter, whether it be a thorn, a bullet, or something else that causes irritation, do not allow the sur- geon to touch it lest he make a worse wound! Just let it alone. The body will finally become accustomed to its presence and no harm will be done. En- dure the irritation and inflammation until the body finally becomes perfect- ly easy. Who believes this? Do we not know that when the body becomes painless and indifferent to such a condition it is because the body no longer lives? Thus it is with a congregation. If a congregation is indifferent to the presence of thorns, whether Premillen- nialism, instrumental music, or some other thorn of error, it is not be- cause the body has become custom- ed to the presence of the thorn, but rather, the thorn has killed the body! Which is better, a dead body with a thorn or a live body with a wound that will soon heal?

When the doctor makes an incision in the body of his patient to remove some foreign substance that has caused inflammation, he knows a wound will be left. He knows that the patient will suffer for several days. He also knows that to refuse to make the inci- sion would mean death to the patient. The wound that will be made by the surgeons knife is not the important thing. The incision will heal and leave the patient once more in good health. The important thing is to remove the cause of the trouble. With the surgeon, the operation is a matter of necessity.

When a preacher takes the “sword of the Spirit” and cuts a thorn of er- ror out of the church, he knows some may be left with wounded feelings. He knows that he will be accused of being cruel and heartless. He also knows that to refuse to remove the error by the use of God’s word will mean death to the cause of Christ in any community. The feelings of a few who symp- pathize with thorn-pressers is not the important thing. Time will heal this in the hearts of honest children of God and they will be made stronger. The important thing is to remove the cause of the trouble.
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lieves whole-heartedly. This scribe does not object in the least to brethren meeting together to discuss their differences, any where, any time. He would make it even broader than that by including any who are not brethren doing so. He would gladly accept an invitation to take part in such a discussion, if it were possible. And his sole effort would be to learn the will of the Lord on the question discussed.

When quite a young preacher I was invited to appear on a program sponsored by the Christian Church, purportedly for the same purpose that I was invited to appear in the public address system where the individual in the program was to make a full hour-long appeal to the listeners. I was to have replied to it, but the Chairman’s wife replied to it publicly enough to be heard all over the house, in one sentence. She said, with emphasis, “That man is a self-made ignoramus.” On several other occasions he has made similar invitations. I have sought to speak to paper-reading audiences, and they have always accepted. Our of such came as from a good a friend as I have ever had. He said he did it in the hope that he could teach me the truth. When it was over, we were still good friends—and I was still ignorant! But none of these meetings were held behind closed doors.

After nearly a century of prayerful study of the questions to be “studied” in this meeting, which have been open to the public, how may we expect better things to come from discussion? Mission and church in the plains of Ono. As many of the brethren, after having been given the opportunity to study prayerfully, Brethren, the road of broken fellowship is still visible. You must know what broke the fellowship, and exhort you to stay the blood of others.

Union is sweet, far sweeter to those who have possessed it and lost it, than it is to those who have never tasted its sweetness. But its sweetness could not be restored by a “negotiated peace.” It must come by the individual surrender of self and the claims of the flesh and the devil and the devil. The fellowship which the Christian Church has traveled is still visible. You must know what broke the fellowship, and knowing it, you also know what will re-weld it into a glorious whole again.

Unions are always to be congratulated. And as one who wants to preach the gospel of Christ to the unredeemed world. And as one who wants to be salt and light from the hill of Christ, I review the story of the brethren, the road of broken fellowships, the fellowship of the body of Christ, were of no avail. Their prayers went unheard, and their fellowship unemployed. The prayer for the Lord’s Church is a prayer that is demanded by god and of men. The fellowship which the Christian Church has traveled is still visible. You must know what broke the fellowship, and knowing it, you also know what will re-weld it into a glorious whole again.

A FACTION OF DIGRESSIVE DISCIPLES

Just recently I read the February Bible Banner with your gracious invitation for any and all true Christians—not passiveweeders—to have our say concerning the Murch-Witty milk-and-water compromise movement for unity of a faction of the Digressive Disciples with Christians who have not broken away from God’s Word. At first their promotional arguments sounded plausible, since we were encouraged to believe that the New Testament would be studied as the basis of unity; but, in most cases, “our self-appointed spokesmen who were not brethren” had argued for a basis of unity which is the only kind of religious unity that should interest us. It might have been different if their sneakers had not been so small. But in the present day it is too late to establish confidence on our part toward those who would entice us away from our great work of rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem to attend a conference with crafty opponents in the plains of Ono. As many of the “progressives” as are genuinely sincere in wanting to help rebuild the walls of spiritual Zion can and will do so personally, in man-to-man talks with loyal gospel preachers in their own localities, and will not need any sort of “catholic council” to interpret the Word of God to them. We do not ask them to “join us,” but only to respect His authority, ascribing all the glory to Him. The Murch-Witty fiasco has not done this, but clouded the issue with ceremonial unity in pious platitudes that did not begin to remove the cause of division of the spirit of God. We are to analyze its open and objectively in the light of Scripture. What has been man innovation have the Digressives offered to give up for the sake of unity?

The history of the Christian Standard and Christian Register shows that unrepentant members of the Unificationist, the Christian Missionary Society’s modernistic dictatorship over the Disciples is revealing. I saw personally in 1926 and 1927 and read from papers of various groups after I came clean from even passive acceptance of human innovations in 1928, that the selfprofessed “new loyalists” of the Memphis “theatre meeting” at the International Convention of 1926 and of the anti-U. C. M. S. North American Christian Convention in Indianapolis in 1927, were lacking in genuine loyalty to God’s Word or else they would have severed all relations with that atheistic U. C. M. S. and accepted a &d softies, M. Witty fiasco a long time; but not until 1941. I have stultified themselves by clinging to the fiction of unity inside the International Convention while fighting like cats and dogs for twenty years or more, having numerous local churches split over the issue.

I assure you of my whole-hearted agreement with you in your announced objectives in the great fight you are making for doctrinal purity of the true churches of Christ. I have lost many personal friends in the past by following God’s Word above all human relationships and will continue to “obey God rather than men,” not letting any man or group of men have “strings” on me religiously. During my five years as Bible teacher and evangelist in the Philippines, I went out of my way to be friends with Carlos Joves, who was to prepare me to speak to paper-reading audiences, and have always accepted. On one occasion, I have had similar invitations to speak to paper-reading audiences, and have always accepted. My work in the southern Philippines was located about five hundred miles distant and in a different language from that of the Cassells around Manila. I had no part in or sympathy for the errors with which they were charged in a previous issue of the Banner. They are able to speak for themselves, being answerable under God to the Southwest church at Los Angeles, as we were to the church at Graton. Cassells, and you are to your home congregation in Oklahoma City while preaching in various parts of the great world wide field where the only foreigners are alien sinners without regard to race, color, national residence.

Therefore, as one who wants to “new to the line and let the chips fall where they may,” I wish to congratulate you and other stalwarts who are upholding positive truth and opposing the errors of various isms, hobbies, human innovations, worldliness, compromise and softism in general. The truth must be told, even if it hurts. True Christian love in preaching the truth seeks to save people out of their sins and errors—not to coddle or appease them in their wrong-doing for fear of hurting their feelings. I thank God for many brethren who continue to wield the Sword of the Spirit in a man’s strife to remove harmful growths from the body of Christ so skillfully as to save the various members that have spiritual life enough to be saved by any means. I want to do all I can in this great week to be wise and faithful and enduring for many years of soul-saving labor yet to come. Orville T. Rodman, Oklahoma City, Okla.

APPROVED BY PRACTICE

In the 12th chapter of the Roman letter, verse two, we have this statement: “And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may demonstrate in your lives what is the good, perfect will of God.” There is a valuable lesson to be learned from this plea of the great Apostle.
AN APPEAL TO REASON

(Cont. From Page 1)

ence for the majority is that the number of thoughtless and uninformed is great enough that he can use it to serve his own plans for controlling the situation. Such a situation is so tragic that it well-nigh destroys the identity of the congregation as the body of Christ where it thus functions. Even if a qualified leadership stands in the way of the schemes of a factionist, the sun will cease to rise about the time he fails to make an effort to disqualify it on technical grounds. Majority rule is more to his liking, for he is adept at making and controlling majorities because of their very nature. He in fact and act impeaches the wisdom of the Holy Spirit in making elders shepherds of the flock. These things are said with full knowledge of the fact that some unholy and domineering men assume authority as elders of churches, seek to Lord it over the heritage of God and become modern mimics of Diotrephes. Leaders in the churches should not be self-willed, but seek to teach and guide the disciples in doing the will of God. They are solicitous both of the welfare and the pleasure of those under their oversight. They should have a fatherly interest in all the members. They are within their rights and exercising their duties when they resist the efforts of a factionist muscle in and build up a majority by flattering speech and smooth ways to use for his own ends. A qualified leadership will always oppose such men and warn the church against them. The factionist is often supported by noisy partisans who shout charges of popery at the leaders. Their partisanship cancels out what little love for the cause of Christ they ever had in their hearts, for there is plenty of good sense in this inspired advice. It should commend itself to the reason of all who have any reason to be appealed to. "Faithful is the saying, and concerning those things I desire that thou affirm confidently, to the end that they who have believed God may be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men: but shun foolish questionings, and genealogies, and strifes, and fightings about the law; for they are apt to be carried away for they are unprofitable and vain. A factious man after a first and second admonition refuse; knowing that such a one is perverted, and sinneth, being self-condemned." (Titus 3:8-11)

Any number of members in a church who support and encourage a factionist, are factionists themselves and stand condemned in the sight of God and all right-thinking people. They should be refused. A quarantine sign should be hung on them by all lovers of peace and order in the churches. They are afflicted with a deadly, carnal disease and should be avoided. Such treatment is designed to shame them and bring them to their senses, or leave them to their fate. The head of the church is the final avenger in all such matters.

Some twenty years ago my father did the preaching in a tent meeting, the first meeting that was ever held in a certain Texas town. A church was started and in the course of time a good house was built on a well located lot. Some two years ago a young preacher about twenty years of age or thereabouts breezed in and nominated himself as "minister" for that church. Older members, some of whom were there when the church was started and when the young preacher was wearing diapers expressed oposition. He went in over protest by a majority vote, or something equivalent to it. It caused trouble. He had been an issue elsewhere. In fact preachers and other brethren throughout that whole section of the country express themselves as being outraged over his conduct. They are older, more experienced men. They recognize that a congregation is independent and not subject to outside dictation. The young man "resigned," whatever that is, a few months ago, announced that he was through "pastorating" and that he was going to show a lot of "bread and butter hirelings" how to evangelize. He did not stay gone long. His partisan supporters, many of them talkative women and novices in the faith, brought him back and voted him in over the protest of older, more experienced members. It created a combustible situation. About that time Brother Austin Taylor and I were called for a meeting at that place. Neither of us knew the condition things were in when we left home. We found ourselves in the midst of brethren tense with feelings of strife-all over a young preacher. Some were determined that he should not preach again. Others were as much determined that he should stay and he agreed with them and did stay. Brother Taylor and I tried to show by our conduct and our gospel work what Christianity is and how it helps peoples behave themselves in the church. Crowds were good despite bad weather and we felt that we did some good. We assumed no dictatorial powers but tried to give some good advice that might helw the cause. The young preacher resisted all our efforts to persuade him to go to another field. He and most of his supporters seemed determined that he stay at all costs. Just before the last service was dismissed, an old brother about three times as old as the young preacher announced that another preacher would preach the following Sunday and the meeting was dismissed. The storm broke. Some excited, hysterical women pave some older men who had been with the church from the beginning, a tongue-lashing and denounced them as popes etc., etc., and demanded that they "resign" and get out of the way. Most of this happened after we left for the train and it is reported that the clamor and confusion continued for nearly an hour. The fight continued the following Wednesday evening with the young preacher, in his very early twenties, in charge reading and making accusations and demanding resignations and all that sort of thing. Some left in disgust and it is reported that the preacher is in full charge. It seems that many who have been there for many years have left the congregation and are worshipping elsewhere.

I am reciting this sordid story for one purpose. It can serve as a warning to other churches to be on the alert against insidious influences which can wreck them and leave them in an unholy mess. Those of us who place a high value on soul-saving shudder at the number of people who will fail to reach heaven because of such upheavals with the hatreds they arouse. I feel sorry for them, all of them, and sorriest of all for the worst of them, I wonder in view of their silly conduct if it may be said of them, "They know not what they do" in rending the body of Christ." I pity the young preacher, foolish and vain, who thinking he has won a victory, will probably find that he has badly damaged his influence for years to come, if not for all time to come. He will possibly soon be sending in glowing reports of the unity and progress of that church. In a church fuss all are to be pitied, whether right or wrong, if any can stay right in the middle of one. A church fuss is stark tragedy, especially when the issue is a silly, baby preacher, spoiled by foolish women and shallow men. It is so useless, since it is so easy and expedient for a preacher to move out. They reap the whirlwind who sow the wind. "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity."