A brother of ours in the flesh and in the Lord has written a personal letter to the man who helped personal abuse the follow is you wrote that letter to you just naturally in the bitterness that has come under which can't he just too much of him in the way of telling the unvarnished truth. He just like his Lord was. Now, as to the letter, I have some observations of my own to make about it, inasmuch as it has been published, even if it does involve a rebuke to a beloved brother. The letter was of that kind which we all feel like writing at times, but should never mail. He called the misguided and soured author of the article "a liar" and expressed an unmistakable and fervent desire to twist his nose and otherwise mess up his countenance. Now, I can't agree to that. The feeling, under the circumstances, is no doubt a natural one, especially in a giant who has had army training, but remember, son, that we are not in that sort of a fight. We have become partakers of the divine nature and fists and clubs and abusive language are definitely out. If any literal blood is shed in this conflict it will be ours; not theirs. A lot of our friends are likely to feel some applause rising within them for the personal sentiments expressed by this brother of ours and what I am saying is for their benefit as well as his.

Another thing, you are old enough to know, and have been around enough to know, that when a man gets as mad as he is in the letter, you just naturally can't expect too much of him in the way of telling the truth. He just couldn't if he wanted to, and he just naturally can't want to in that explosive frame of mind. So your first mistake was in calling him a liar. You are entitled to your personal opinion, but you should have kept it to yourself, or at least a little closer home.

In the next place you are clearly wrong in your expressed desire to twist or mash some blood from his proboscis. Remember what happened to Peter when he sliced that fellow's ear off. Peter possibly didn't aim to. There is a suspicion that he aimed to cut his head off and the fellow dodged. Anyhow the affair didn't tickle the Lord a little bit. He put that fellow's ear right back on. We don't want anybody, much less somebody in the family, going around knocking somebody's face out of plumb because of anything he says about us. If I could be there and had the power to straighten it back up, it might not be so bad, but then I can't do that you know.

Another thing, your judgment has not kept apace with your anger. Just think a little son. You've got sense. Diagnose his trouble, the man you wrote that letter to, and incidentally gave him a cue for a martyr act. The first thing that ought to occur to you, being a man of judgment when you are not writing a fool letter like that, is that around knocking somebody's face out of plumb because of anything he says about us. If I could be there and had the power to straighten it back up, it might not be so bad, but then I can't do that you know.

In the first place, you should not have raised a banner upon the high mountain, exalt the voice unto them. (Isa. 13:2.) Thy fist, brother. A brother of ours in the flesh and in the Lord has written a personal letter to the man who helped personal abuse the follow is you wrote that letter to you just naturally in the bitterness that has come under which can't he just too much of him in the way of telling the unvarnished truth. He just like his Lord was. Now, as to the letter, I have some observations of my own to make about it, inasmuch as it has been published, even if it does involve a rebuke to a beloved brother. The letter was of that kind which we all feel like writing at times, but should never mail. He called the misguided and soured author of the article "a liar" and expressed an unmistakable and fervent desire to twist his nose and otherwise mess up his countenance. Now, I can't agree to that. The feeling, under the circumstances, is no doubt a natural one, especially in a giant who has had army training, but remember, son, that we are not in that sort of a fight. We have become partakers of the divine nature and fists and clubs and abusive language are definitely out. If any literal blood is shed in this conflict it will be ours; not theirs. A lot of our friends are likely to feel some applause rising within them for the personal sentiments expressed by this brother of ours and what I am saying is for their benefit as well as his.

Another thing, you are old enough to know, and have been around enough to know, that when a man gets as mad as he is in the letter, you just naturally can't expect too much of him in the way of telling the truth. He just couldn't if he wanted to, and he just naturally can't want to in that explosive frame of mind. So your first mistake was in calling him a liar. You are entitled to your personal opinion, but you should have kept it to yourself, or at least a little closer home.
THE INFIDELITY OF GOD'S PEOPLE

Jeremiah's condemnation of the evils of God's people was the editorial caption in the former issue of the Bible Banner. His condemnation of their infidelity is the present subject.

The conduct of Israel toward God had become as a gadding bride. Jeremiah rebuked her fickleness. "Why gaddest thou about so much as to change thy ways?" (Jer. 2:36). One of the most forbidding things a woman can do is to gad about. It is the outward sign of an inward inconsistency, of changing desires, of a capricious attitude, in short a seeking of interest other than in the palace of her own home and in the contemplement of her husband's love.

THAT WAS Jeremiah's diagnosis of Israel's trouble. She was gadding about. She had gone after strange lovers. She said, "I have loved strangers and after them will I go." (Jer. 2:25) In Israel's folly God's people had "changed their glory for that which doth not profit" and in their unexampted backsliding the prophet's only hope for them in their extremes was that "thine own wickedness shall correct thee and thy backsliding shall reprove thee." (Jer. 2:19)

Has the church, like Israel, gone gadding about? Is it not possible that some of the trouble we are having with certain issues is due to a general attitude of softness toward all questions of doctrine? Any weakness in the attitude of the church toward sound doctrine, or a let-up in its defense of the truth, is but a repetition of Israel's folly. It is going after strange lovers. "Hath a nation changed its gods, which yet are no gods? But my people have changed their glory for that which doth not profit." (Jer. 2:11)

Israel's improbity was compared to the bride's infidelity. "Can the maid forget her ornaments or the bride her wedding attire? But in her conduct Israel had cast off and forgotten the righteous ways that adorned her as God's bride.

To the extent that the church forgets New Testament principles, the bride is forgetting her attire. Let us conduct an introspection-look into the things which the church of Christ should not forget.

I. AUTONOMY-THE CHURCH AS A DIVINE ORGANIZATION

The provisional organization of the New Testament church was the order of super-naturally endowed men, for the guidance and edification of the church while the will of God was in process of revelation and completion. This order of apostles, prophets, pastors, evangelists, teachers, was designed to safeguard the church against error in the absence of the revealed word, that the church be not "tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, in craftiness, after the wiles of error." These endowments were to continue only until the church should "attain unto the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God." (Eph. 4:1-16) The word of God was then in the man-the supernaturally endowed man-and not in the book; and being in the man was what Paul called "knowing in part," as no inspired teacher gave the which is perfect" (1 Cor. 13) was come, that is, when all the parts and fragments of God's revelation were put into the whole of God's word; it was fragmentary. But when "that which is perfect" (1 Cor. 13) was come, that is, when all the parts and fragments of God's Revelation were put into one perfect whole-the New Testament-then that which was "in part" ceased-the supernatural provisional order ended.

The permanent organization of the church is that of elders, deacons and members. Elders, with the qualifications set forth by Paul to Timothy and Titus, to rule by enforcing the teaching of the word of God; deacons, as assistants to the elders, to serve the church with compassion and sympathy; members, subservient to the divine arrangement to work out their salvation, God working in us "to will and to do" as we keep ourselves useful. As for preachers, their humble god-fearing task is to faithfully proclaim the gospel of Christ, leaving the executive administration of the affairs of the church with the elders where God put it. If this divine plan fails to function, the fault is not with the plan, but with our failure to respect it and work it. The plan is perfect because it is God's and any substitute will prove a failure because it is man's.

The organization argument has been concisely stated in a sentence, which is eminently true and is a safe rule of action, namely: Any organization larger than the local church or smaller than the local church is an unscriptural organization through which to do the work of the church. Indeed, there are methods of doing what is commanded, but they must be the church's methods and within the scope of the thing commanded. The church has no right to do anything, as a church, that God has not commanded the church to do. Nor does a Christian have the right to do through another organization that which God has commanded the church, as such, to do. Organizations are not methods. The missionary society is not a method: it is an institution. A Sunday School, a class or classes on Sunday, may be a very effective arrangement for teaching; but they often extend into organizations. It seems that nothing can be done these days without being organization. It is not frequent now that we find classes in the churches organized; children's classes, young people's classes, women's classes, men's classes, all with their presidents, secretaries, treasurers, operating as organized groups in performing the precise functions of the church. This perverts the very purpose of a class from that of teaching to a financial auxiliary: a miniature organization. It becomes an infringement upon the divine arrangement. As a matter of fact, if one group has a right to so function, every group has the same right, which if exercised would destroy the oneness of the church and its unified work. For the same reason that there can be no outside organizations to vie with the church, there should be no inside auxiliaries of like nature to function in the same way from within. The church, like the human body directed by its head, should function in unison.

The autonomy of the local church-its free, independent, self-government-is opposed to all forms of ecclesiastical control. Nor can congregations be scripturally tied together by inter-organization. If churches of Christ were so tied together, the mistakes and errors of one would affect the whole body. But in the autonomy of the local church, the mistakes and errors of one church affect only that church, and the others remain free. The wisdom of God so ordered it. The fallacy of man changes it.
II. TEACHING-THE CHURCH AS THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH

Being the pillar and support of the truth (2 Tim. 3:15) the church cannot be too careful to maintain soundness in doctrine. So important is sound doctrine that Paul told Timothy to preach it “in season; out of season.” That evidently means all of his time for it is either in season or it is out of season all of the time. There is doctrine, or teaching, that fits every occasion, and while its application should be made according to the fitness of things, the preacher who preaches on baptism at a funeral is to be preferred to the one who does not preach on it when he should.

Indifferentism is the order of the day. People are unconcerned about doctrine. They think that gospel preaching is only “questions about words and names” (Acts 18:14, 17) and like Gallio who “cares for none of these things” they are indifferent. This sentiment not only prevails in the world, it gains currency in the church. When Paul said “the time will come when they will not endure sound doctrine” he did not refer to the world; but to those who “having itching ears, will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts.” Who heaps the teachers? That is evidently the church. Then Paul forecast conditions in the church, when the ears of the members would itch for something other than sound doctrine, who would seek teachers whose teaching would have the same soothing effect on their desires that scratching has on the spot that itches.

The strength of the churches of Christ has been in the fact that all error to us has looked alike, from infidelity to every false way. Owen, the infidel; Purcell, the Catholic; Rice, the Denominationalist, all looked alike to Alexander Campbell. And he took them all in their turn. Do we unchristianize people? We cannot if they be Christians nor can we make Christians of those who are not by mere-ly recognizing them. To recognize as Christians those who have not obeyed the gospel is but to break down the very barrier that exists between the church and the world. The church what it is? It would not help that problem any if we call it “Christian Church.” Besides, the term Christian Jesus Christ ever had a church or not. While making and to call it “church of Christ”—but can it be sectarian to call denominations are not the church what it is? It would not help that problem any denomina- tion into the church, the fatal question is why the one hun-dred and forty-eight translators, the world’s ripest schol-ars, did not know that the word had any such meaning.

Who wants the instruments—and why? Those who have gone gadding about so much as to “change their glory for that which doth not profit.”

Instrumental music in the worship in the relic of an abrogated age. The Catholics borrowed it from the Jews; the Protestants borrowed it from the Catholics; the Christian church borrowed it from the Protestants—but the New Testament church did not use it.

IV. NAMES-DESIGNATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH

In the religious nomenclature of the day one hears a volume of terms and titles which are wholly foreign to Bible parlance. There is every sort of a church-Catholic, Episco-pal, Methodist, Presbyterian, Baptist, Evangelical, Reform-ed, Ad Infinitum—the world most surely wonder whether Jesus Christ ever had a church or not. While making and taking names for the church—why not call it after the Head of it? Some will say that it sectarianizes the church to call it “church of Christ”—but can it be sectarian to call the church what it is? It would not help that problem any to call it “Christian Church.” Besides, the term Christian is used only as a noun in the New Testament, applied to the individual—and never as an adjective, applied to the church. That fact alone should restrain its use as a proper name for the church. If it be asserted that the expression “church of Christ” is not in the New Testament try Rom. 16:16 on any other name. For instance, the “Baptist churches salute you.” Or, “The Christian Churches salutes you.” Would that constitute a designation? It is a weak at-titude that assumes it to be sectarian to designate the church as the church of Christ, and it indicates a fear of unchristianizing somebody who is not a Christian.

If Christ is jealous of the church’s purity (2 Cor. 11:2, 3) and if he is solicitous of her unblemished glory (Eph. 5:25, 28), the unspotted life must be worth attaining. If, then, the church has been gadding about, seeking strange lovers, “Go and proclaim these words to the north, and say, Re-turn, thou backsliding Israel, saith Jehovah; I will not look in anger upon you; for I am merciful, saith Jehovah.”
BROTHER ROBERSON'S
“A-MILLENNIUM”

In a recent issue of the Firm Foundation, under the caption of “The Millennium Controversy,” Brother C. H. Roberson, Head of Bible in Abilene Christian College, makes another labored attempt to set forth his views on Premillennialism. He states that he is not a post-millennialist, nor a pre-millennialist, but an “a-millennialist.”

It will be remembered by the readers that Brother Roberson’s book, “What Jesus Taught,” has been shown very definitely to teach Premillennialism. Brother Roberson’s friends have admitted that the statements in his book are premillennialism-no more, no less. Brother Don Morris, the president, admits this. But their attitude is that the statements should be classed as “unfortunate” and that Brother Roberson should be allowed to withdraw them, and to restate his views more clearly. When a man of education and scholarship has so much difficulty in making clear his views it is the proof that his views are not clear. Most people, whether educated or not, can understand plain language. When a man who puts himself up as a teacher cannot use plain language to set forth his views there is something wrong with what he is trying to set forth.

Lawyers sometimes use language to keep from saying a thing directly and to keep certain parties from seeing what is actually said. I do not at all make such a charge against Brother Roberson, for I regard him as a man of fine character, but this is nevertheless the effect of his several efforts to clear himself when, as a matter of fact, a simple repudiation of the teaching in his book, and a forthright declaration on the issues involved would have settled the “controversy” so far as he is concerned. As it stands, he has withdrawn the remaining copies of his book from the market in order to delete the Premillennial teaching that it contains. But while doing so he yet attempts to justify the objectionable teaching by affirming in each “explanation” what he has “always” believed and taught “throughout his entire religious life.” Then, he simply failed to write what he believed in his book, but wrote what he does not believe and is still failing in each and every attempt to explain what he believes, as both the statements of his book and of his explanations express exactly the opposite of what he avows pro and con.

In his book entitled “What Jesus Taught,” Brother Roberson says:

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

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

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

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

That the above statements are premillennialism, everybody who knows premillennialism will admit. The president of Abilene Christian College has admitted that it is: other teachers in the school have admitted as much. But they tell us that Brother Roberson stoutly disavows believing the doctrine and has withdrawn his statements. This would be fine, indeed, and we should all rejoice. But Brother Roberson continues to make and repeat the same things in all of his explanations, and he has withdrawn his statements only to repeat them again, and then again.

His first published explanation reads as follows:

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

2. “That the Jews will be delivered from all their enemies, recover Palestine, and reign literally there with their Messiah in equaled splendor.”

3. “That the Jewish conception stated above is correct with the exception that Jesus is the Messiah;”

4. “That there will be two resurrections, the first separated from the second by a period of a thousand years;”

5. “That Jesus Christ will reign literally on earth for a period of a thousand years;”

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

According to the above statement, Brother Roberson does not believe in a literal millennium of a one thousand years reign of Christ on earth. But he does say, and evidently believes, that the thing which cannot be accomplished by the preaching of the gospel in this dispensation, must be accomplished after the return of Christ that something is, as expressed by himself, “the universal knowledge of the Lord.” Brother Roberson says plainly that this time of universal knowledge and blessedness is future, and furthermore that it is “impossible” in this age and “must be after Jesus returns to this earth.” In his book and in his subsequent statements Brother Roberson declares that there is no time for this era of “the universal knowledge of God” until after Jesus returns to the earth. Herein is his holdover from the premillennial essay in his book.

Now comes his latest explanation in the Firm Foundation. In reiterating much that he said in his book, and in his former explanations, he tells us now that he is not a “pre” nor a “post” millennialist but that he is an “a-millennialist.” Notice some of these latest statements.

First: “The coming of the Lord and the judgment are contemporaneous.” That means that the second coming of Christ and the judgment will occur at the same time.

Second:: “The harvest is the end of the world; of the good and the bad. Jesus said: ‘Let both grow together until the harvest’; under such conditions, a millennium of universal righteousness and knowledge of the Lord is impossible until the separation takes place at the harvest.”

Can you not see the conclusion? Here it is: In Brother Roberson’s own explanations: He says there is an “a-millennium;” he says that this “a-millennium” is impossible until the separation takes place at the judgment; he says that the judgment and the second coming of Christ are contemporaneous; it follows therefore that this “a-millennium” cannot take place until the second coming of Christ. Then the second coming of Christ will take place before Brother Roberson’s “A-Millennium,” therefore the second coming of Christ is “pre-millennial” in Brother Roberson’s theory, or pre-a-millennial. Since Brother Roberson insists that the second coming of Christ and the judgment will occur before this “a-millennium” of his explanation begins, what keeps him from being a premillennialist of the “a-millennium” variety? There is an “a-millennium,” he says; but this “a-millennium” is impossible until the second coming of Christ and the judgment, which are contemporaneous: so Christ must come before his “a-millennium”—but he is not a premillennialist! If
R. H. Boll should write the same thing, we would all understand that he would be teaching premillennialism.

But again Brother Roberson says that "is not that space-time continuum which some men have espoused." In other words he has a theory of an "a-millennium" without "space" or "time" for it to fill, still it is an "era" of "universal knowledge of the Lord" which is "impossible" before he comes, and must occur after he "returns to the earth." yet there is no "space-time continuum" for it to occur! And this is the language of scholarship, friends! **Brother Roberson** is not a premillennialist, and he is not a postmillennialist—he only believes in an "a-millennium-continuum," without space or time for it to occur or continue.

It is now in order for Brother Roberson to give the scripture passages that teach his "a-millennium" theory. *He cannot* go to Rev. 20 because he has already said "the high symbolism in Revelation, and the uniform absence of the idea of the millennium from the teaching on last things elsewhere in the new covenant should make one extremely cautious before asserting its presence in Rev. 20:1-6." Not only is "the millennium" not taught in Revelation, but the idea of "the millennium" is absent from "the teaching on last things" everywhere else in the New Testament, according to **Brother Roberson**. But while the idea of the "the millennium" is absent, the teaching of the New Testament "on last things" includes the idea of an "a-millennium" because Brother Hoberson says there will be an "a-millennium," but without that "space-time continuum that some men have espoused." What we want now, and have the right to demand, is the scripture either "in Revelation" or elsewhere "in the new covenant" that teaches this "a-millennium" after the second coming of Christ. *Rev. 20* is the only passage that mentions the thousand years, and from this passage they get their word "millennium," a word nowhere used in the New Testament. *Since* Brother Roberson admits that Rev. 20 does not teach it, we should like very much to see the passage that does teach it. **And while he is furnishing** the passage that does teach his "a-millennium" we should like to have his explanation as to how an "a-millennium" could take place even after the coming of Christ and the judgment without "space" or "time" or "continuum" for it.

The theory that Brother Roberson so blundering seeks to set forth sounds very much like the school of Scofield Premillennialists who hold that the Judgment is a Dispensation, that is, the "day of judgment" is a dispensational day. We are made to wonder if Brother Roberson uses the Scofield Reference Bible. It contains these very doctrines.

Brother J. N. Armstrong says that he does not believe "Bollism"—but he does believe and teach premillennialism. He has his own brand of premillennialism—but it is premillennialism just the same. Brother Roberson likewise disavows the premillennialism "which some men have espoused" but his "a-millennium" is, as we have shown, premillennialism—his own brand of it, if not the Scofield brand. These are not misrepresentations, but the actual teaching of these brethren in the record of their own words. It is evident that the battle to make the church safe for sound doctrine must continue.

**WOMEN ELDERS WHEN?**

Brother C. C. Morgan sends us the Committee announcement of the Broadway Church of Christ, Lubbock, Texas. It is quite a multiple committee set-up. The women are given the lead over the men on these committees. It begins by stating that "The elders and G. C. Brewer, the minister, are members of all committees."

But it leaves the other minister, E. Gaston Collins, out. On the letterhead it lists "G. C. Brewer and E. Gaston Collins, ministers." But on this announcement it states that G. C. Brewer, the minister, is on "all committees."

On the finance committee there are thirty-six women and twenty-one men. It is stated that the deacons are "members" of the finance committee. That is remarkable, and deserves special mention, that *deacons* of the church should be "members" of the church's finance committee.

But that thirty-six women and twenty-one men of the finance committee—what Brother Morgan wants to know is "When will they start having women elders?" Ask "G. C. Brewer, the minister" Brother Morgan. He can answer it in the Gospel Advocate in a series of articles, if they will give him two or three pages to each article. It takes that much time and space for him to answer questions that us plain gospel preachers can answer on a post card.

**IN THE EVANGELISTIC FIELD**

A staff writer for the Gospel Advocate in a recent issue of that paper relates some incidents that occurred last year during "the seven months" that he spent "in the evangelistic field." Wonder what "field" this writer and preacher was in the other five months? Some more loose talk. If a preacher is doing the work of a preacher he is "in the evangelistic field" all of the time. Is not the "local" preacher an evangelist? Does he cease to be an evangelist when he accepts "local work?" Paul said to Timothy: "Do the work of a nevangelist; fulfill thy ministry." Was Paul telling Timothy to leave "local work" for awhile and spend a few months "in the evangelistic field?" Or rather was not Paul telling Timothy what to do locally—where he was—that is, do the work of an evangelist where you are. All of the evangelistic work that I have ever done has been local— in some local place. At least, I was local, and tried to make the preaching local in some effective spot on the hearer.

The distinction that is being made between "local work" and "evangelistic work" is a false distinction if the preacher who lives and labors with 'a congregation does what does the New Testament teaches: "Do the work of an evangelist." If he is not doing the work of an evangelist, then he is not doing the work of a preacher.

Travelling on the highways we frequently enter the corporate limits of a town where there is a highway sign that reads: "State Maintenance Ends." Then on other side of the town, leaving the corporate limits, another sign is seen, which reads: "State Maintenance Begins."

Since the brethren are putting up signs for the churches at the approach to the towns, suppose we add: "Evangelistic Field Ends-Local Work Begins!" The same apostle who told the preacher Timothy to "Do the work of an evangelist" also said to the same preacher: "Speak thou the things that befit sound doctrine" and "sound speech that cannot be condemned."
SHALL HISTORY REPEAT ITSELF?

HOMER HAILEY

History is replete with accounts of valourous and heroic deeds; with stories of mighty wars waged and battles fought; of victories glorious and wonderful. But these same histories also tell of periods of relapse and weakness, stagnation and decay, which so often followed.

This is not simply the history of civil and secular affairs, but of religious as well. Under the leadership of Joshua, Israel possessed the land of Canaan by a succession of brilliant and heated campaigns. In these God was with them, because they were trusting in Him; they were fighting as He directed. But tragedy followed success. “And the people served Jehovah all the days of Joshua, and all the days of the elders that outlived Joshua, who had seen all the great work of Jehovah that he had wrought for Israel. And also all that generation were gathered unto their fathers: and there arose another generation after them, that knew not Jehovah, nor yet the work which he had wrought for Israel.” ( Judges 2:7, 10)

Here was the tragedy, “there arose another generation after them, that knew not Jehovah.” Then began the decline, the worship of the Baalim, which ended in degeneration and apostasy.

This has been the history of religious movements from that time onward. The apostles waged mighty battles against heathenism and Judaism in their day, planting the church in all sections of the known world; only to be followed by a generation, or generations, who forgot or knew not God and His truth. This ignorance opened the way for innovations and errors which culminated in the Roman Catholic apostasy.

Then came Savanarola, Martin Luther, Zwingli, John Knox, and others, who dared lift their voice against the corruptions of Catholicism and its papal hierarchy. We cannot but admire the valor of these men, although we agree not with their doctrinal positions. They, too, were followed by a generation who knew not the fight they had made, and the object they had in view, only to end in new sects closely akin to that which they had fought, and from which they had sprung.

These men were followed by Joshuas and Jeremiahs of a new reformatory movement, who sought restoration, not mere reformation. Wonderful and mighty battles were waged by Campbell, Stone, the Sewells, Lipscombs, and hundreds of others. Sectarianism and denominationalism bowed beneath the mighty onsluggings of truth. That generation, converted under such preaching and debating served Jehovah faithfully. But now “another generation” is arising, unfamiliar with heated debates, brush-arbor preaching, and stirring discussions of Bible themes. Shall history repeat itself? Or are we sufficiently acquainted with the cause of Christ Jesus and the fundamentals of Christianity to stem a tide of digression and apostasy in this day?

Standing beside a tree, one can easily determine the way the wind is blowing by the direction the leaves are falling. We are rather anxiously watching a few leaves here and there today, seeking an answer to our question.

A rather thorough discussion is at present being conducted among us regarding the so-called “pastor system.” I shall leave that for others to discuss; but I frankly admit I would find it hard to defend the present set-up with a New Testament before me. And if it can’t be defended from it, it can’t be defended. Is our present system an indication of the direction of the spiritual breeze?

Recently an article appeared in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, with the following announcement: “Grapevine, Feb. 27. Grapevine churches will unite in a day of prayer for the world at 10 a.m. Friday at the Methodist Church, with Rev. A. W. Franklin as host pastor.

“The sermon, ‘The Kingdom Is Coming,’ will be given by Rev. E. A. Zund, Baptist minister, and Rev. Willard Morrow of the Church of Christ and Rev. J. Eldridge of the Pentecostal Church also will take part in the program.

“The Church of Christ will furnish a program consisting of a solo by Mrs. John Hemley and a poem read by Mrs. Loyd Fuller...”

A latter issue of the paper stated that Brother Morrow did not participate in the affair. In this I rejoice. We all had more confidence in brother Morrow than to imagine him in such a meeting. But some of us wondered if the sisters participated in it? If these two did not “render a solo” and “read a poem,” we can take courage. Yet, we cannot but wonder how their names appeared on the program in the first place. Was it without their knowledge? against their will? Let us trust that it was. Still, where a truly militant and aggressive church exists such reports seldom if ever get circulated concerning the church.

The complete apostasy of the digressive church in such a short time cannot but warn of the rapidity with which “another generation” that “knows not Jehovah” can arise, and be led into idolatry. I say “idolatry,” for that is about where the digression has led the Christian Church. The March 2nd issue of the Star-Telegram carried an entire colored page of scenes from the “Varsity Show” being put on by the T. C. U., featuring next to nude costumes, and vaudeville dances of various kinds. What a disgrace to the name “Christian”!

The present day pre-millennial departure from the truth, and the general aversion to strong uncompromising preaching as a fruit of the movement, along with the appearance of women of the church on sectarian programs, and the tendency of preachers to join about everything in a community, rather suggests the direction of the present day breeze.
STUPIDITY AND NEUTRALITY CRUCIFIED CHRIST—
THEY CAN DO IT AGAIN

One man could have saved him. As the fierce rays of the noon-day heat beat down mercilessly on the bowed head of that writhing figure on the cross, as the indifferent soldiers were throwing dice to while the time away until the end should come, as the awful tragedy of the ages slowly dragged its way on to the denouement, what must have been the feelings of that man? Did he wish he had been firmer? Did he revile himself for his weakness that had caused him to wash his hands of the entire affair, and so side-step his responsibility? Or was he somewhere in a drunken orgy trying to drown his memory of the humiliation that had been forced upon him by the bigotry of these fanatical Jews?

No one knows where Pilate was, or what he was doing. And no one particularly cares. His part had been played; as far as he was concerned the script called for no further appearance. But how terrible had been his role when he was the center of the stage! And how true to character he had acted! For Pilate's character called for exactly the sort of thing he did—the side-stepping of responsibility. He had noble impulses at first; he desired to release Christ; he even went out of his way to do so. But when the real pressure was put on him he called for water and washed his hands. This row wasn't of his making, and he would get out of it the easiest way he could!

There is bitter irony in the fact that Christ was done to death by the very sin which he had so often and so forcefully warned against. It was the sin of side-stepping responsibility. In the story of the good Samaritan (Luke 10) Christ had no words of condemnation for the thieves and robbers who beat the traveler. Anybody would condemn them; Christ saved his censure for the priest and the Levite-men who side-stepped their responsibility. In the parable of the talents (Matthew 25) Christ made no charge of embezzlement or dishonest use of money. Anybody would recognize those things as wrong; Christ saved his censure for the money changers. And in that enigmatic miracle of the cursing of the fig tree (Matthew 21) there is no charge that the tree brought forth rotten or poisonous fruit. The trouble was simply that there was no fruit at all, the tree had "side-stepped" its moral obligation.

And Christ was crucified by a man who committed the identical sin.

But that isn't all. There was another evil working side by side with Pilate's failure. And that was the ignorance and stupidity of the people. They were wicked and sinful, to be sure. But they were also fools. They were enacting the most horrible chapter in human history, and weren't even aware of what was happening. Christ prayed, 'Father forgive them; for they know not what they do.' (Luke 23:34).

A close study of the words of Christ will reveal how often he was forced to speak out, not against open rebellion and deliberate transgression, but against folly, stupidity, ignorance. The man who heard his sayings and did them not was likened, not to a sinful or wicked man, but to a fool. (Matt. 7:26). The people who make no preparation for the coming of Christ are likened unto foolish virgins. (Matt. 25:2). The rich man (Luke 12) who sought to lay up treasures for himself, but was not rich tward God is typical of a large class of humanity; and the word used to describe that class is "fool." Christ preached against sin, but how much of his teaching was directed against folly and stupidity—against blind, blundering ignorance!

And that brings us down to date. For just as surely as Christ was crucified physically by stupidity and irresponsibility working together two thousand years ago, just that surely can he be crucified spiritually by the same forces today.

Consider, for example, the working of the first of these twin evils, stupidity, in a certain case in point—the question of premillennialism. If the published and spoken statements of gospel preachers are to be believed, at least 95 per cent of them (to use the percentage figure made familiar by the famous 'questionnaires') are opposed to premillennialism in any form. They do not believe it; they do not preach it; they believe it is injurious to the cause of Christ; and they are categorically opposed to every phase and form of the whole doctrine. They agree absolutely and in toto, so far as the doctrine is concerned, with the position of the Bible Banner and that group of faithful gospel preachers who have taken the lead in exposing the errors of this heresy.

Then enters stupidity.

And a goodly number of this 95 per cent, because they disagree with the method used in the fight against premillennialism will oppose the men who teach what they believe, and defend the men who teach what they deny—thus giving their influence to tearing down what they say is true and building up what they say is false. Can there be any doubt that somewhere there is some muddled thinking?—or maybe it's just a muddle without any thinking.

If the body of Christ is not to be crucified again, there must, somehow, be developed that sort of Christian charity which is tolerant enough to permit a wide divergence in the methods of work—an allowance for the individual differences which are not only inevitable but desirable.

Surely the church of our Lord is great enough to find a use and a place for every conceivable type of personal- ity—so long as there is no compromise of the truth. Some men are temperamentally unfitted for the militant and aggressive fight which comes natural to others. Will they seek, therefore, to curtail all controversy with error, and try to conform all Christians to their own particular type of non-aggressive, non-militant, but mild and gentle preaching of the truth? To do so would be an act of stupidity on the part with that which once crucified God's son. They must recognize that while God can use their sympathetic and genial personalities for certain kinds of work, he has other and sterner tasks which call for more aggressive and less yielding types of men.

And the militant, hard-hitting gospel preacher must realize that God has a place and a work for his milder brother. It is neither possible nor desirable that all come from the same mould. As long as there is no compromise of truth the differences in temperament must be subordinated to the need for unity. The folly of any other course should be apparent.

The Bible Banner stands, as all realize, in the forefront among those who are militant and aggressive in the propagation of the gospel and in its defense against error. Most of the men who write for it are men who are vigorous and unrelenting in their efforts to defeat false teaching either in the church or in the world. But so far as this writer knows there has never been the least hint of sugges-
tion on the part of any of these men that every gospel preacher should copy all their methods. Let the mild-mannered individual oppose error and advance truth in his own way—as long as he really opposes error and advances truth. For such a one the writers of the Bible Banner have nothing but the deepest respect. He is a faithful brother in Christ and is honored and loved as such.

The strictures in the Bible Banner against “soft” preaching and compromising are aimed more often than not against the man who side-steps his responsibility—the man who is guilty of the sin of Pilate. The stupidity of the people and the irresolution of Pilate brought tragedy on that far-off day; the stupidity and irresolution of gospel preachers can achieve the same result today. Stupidity in attacking those who teach the truth and defending those who teach error, and in opposing their brothers in Christ because they disapprove of their methods of work cannot but bring disaster.

But, perhaps, an even greater danger than stupidity lies in irresolution-neutrality. How easily can Christ be crucified by his servants merely doing nothing! When responsibility comes knocking at the door, demanding action, instant, decisive, and uncompromising action, how tragic for one to stand irresolute and do nothing-like Pilate. Can there any longer be any doubt (if there ever was any) that thousands of churches throughout the northern part or our nation were swept into digression merely because some of the preachers in those sections stood halting and irresolute-holding their peace when they should have been firm and unyielding in their opposition to error? Is not the great cleavage between the church and the Disciples today traceable in large part to the fact that these brethren of a past generation side-stepped their responsibility? The situation wasn’t of their making, they declared, and they would take neither side. And the result was sheer tragedy.

There are serious problems before the church today. They cannot be solved by being “let alone.” That was the way Pilate tried to solve his problem. The result of such an attitude today will be the same as the result then—crucifixion of the Savior. The questions facing us today call for tolerance, wisdom, and resolution on the part of every Christian. Petty likes and dislikes for style or method must be forgotten in the overwhelming need for unanimity of action. Those who believe the truth must stand together; there must be no compromise with error. To oppose a faithful and godly preacher of the gospel just because his style or method may be “distasteful” to one is folly of the rankest sort. This sort of attitude, coupled with a disposition to side-step responsibility and leave the settling of these questions to others can have one, and only one, result—a spiritual re-enactment of Cavalry.

KING IN FACT AND ACT
C. B. DOUTHITT

Jesus has all authority and is exercising it now. “All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth” said he to the apostles in Galilee. He is King in both “fact and act.”

The teachers of premillennialism agree that Jesus is King in fact, but deny that he is King in act; they agree he has all authority, but deny that he is exercising it now; they claim he will not exercise it until he returns to Jerusalem to rule for a thousand years on David’s throne.

There are three departments of authority (and only three) in every government-legislative, judicial and executive. Is Jesus exercising legislative, judicial and executive authority now?

Is Jesus exercising legislative authority now? He is the author of every legislative enactment in the New Testament, and his law—the New Testament—is in force now (Heb. 9:16, 17). If Jesus is not exercising legislative authority now, one of two things is true: either he is not the author of the New Testament, or the New Testament is not in force now, and will not be in force till Jesus returns to Jerusalem. To contend that the New Testament is not in force now, or to contend that Jesus is not the author of the statutes in it is to vitiate every legislative enactment in it. And yet some claim that the theories of premillennialism do not vitiate the gospel of Christ!

Is Jesus exercising judicial authority in his kingdom now? The Father “hath given all judgment unto the Son” (Jno. 5:22). Jesus is the author of the New Testament. The New Testament contains many decisions and judicial decrees for the kingdom of God now. Are these judicial decrees and decisions in force now? If so, Jesus is exercising judicial authority in his kingdom now. If not, then every decree of the divine court contained in the New Testament is null and void, and will be until Jesus returns to Jerusalem. And yet some claim that the theories of premillennialism do not vitiate the gospel of Christ!

Is Jesus exercising executive authority now? It is the power of the executive authority to enforce the law-to inflict punishment on the violator. Somebody executed Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1-11) and old King Herod (Acts 12:23). Who did it? Pardoning power belongs to the executive branch of government. Any one who is exercising pardoning power now is exercising executive authority now. Is Jesus exercising the authority to pardon now? If so, he is exercising executive authority now. If not, then we will be compelled to wait until he returns to Jerusalem before we can receive pardon from our sins. The theory that Jesus is not King in ACT—that he is not exercising authority now—strikes at the pardoning power of the Christ. And yet some claim that premillennialism does not vitiate the gospel of Christ!!
DOCTRINAL PREACHING;
FRANK VAN DYKE

The author of a recognized textbook on speech-making tenders some advice on pulpit speaking, pointing out that "purely doctrinal sermons are not much desired in this age, for most people are impatient with quibblings of creed." This advice comes with poor grace from a person whose interest in religion, I venture, is only nominal, if not nil. It is doubtful that he would know a gospel sermon if he heard one; yet he feels that his position as an authority on secular speaking qualifies him to tell preachers not only how the sermon should be delivered, but also what the content of the sermon should be. Preachers should not speak on doctrine, because people in this advanced (?) age do not desire that type of sermon, is his advice.

The eminent authority makes two blunders. First, he ventures into a field where he is not qualified, and second, he makes the mistake of telling preachers that the content of their sermons should be what the people desire instead of what the Lord commands. This is not so astonishing, coming, as it does, from a modernistic college professor who is also a denominationalist. Of course, he would hardly be expected to know-and probably would not care if he did know-that Paul said that the preacher who tried to please men (that is, preach the type of sermon which are desired in this age) could not be the servant of Christ. Perhaps, his admonition was intended primarily for denominational preachers who are in the business as men-pleasers, and think that much of the advice in the New Testament is not modernistic enough for a streamlined, twentieth century sermon. To them the doctor's advice may be a pearl of great price, but to a gospel preacher it is abominable.

It would be difficult to think of a thing any more ridiculous than the doctor's suggestion. Nothing can hardly equal his stupidity, unless it is an insurance salesman who know nothing about religious journalism, yet thinks that his financial success and prestige will qualify him to tell our religious editors how to run their papers. Even the youngest of us feel that we know a little more than the professor of speech when it comes to what a gospel sermon should contain. He can tell people how to make the halls of Congress reverberate with gems of political oratory, but we think he needs a few lessons on the fundamentals of the gospel before he starts telling us what to include and what to exclude in our sermons. In the same vein, it seems that the competent religious editor would feel that a cracker jack insurance salesman ought to take a course in the A B C's of religious journalism before he begins an effort to revolutionize our papers. People are not led to live lives of faith and obedience in the same way that they are led to invest their money in bonds and insurance policies. A man may be without an equal in telling us how to compose and deliver a political speech or a speech given purely for entertainment, and yet be a dismal failure when it comes to telling us how to preach the gospel. Even so, a man may make a million dollars selling insurance, and then make a complete failure in religious journalism. Indeed, it seems that we have living examples to prove both of these statements.

The cases of the speech instructor and the insurance salesman are parallel. Both have just about the same conception of the gospel: one says that we should preach what is desired in this age, while the other makes a brotherhood survey to determine what type of religious journalism is desired today. However, it does seem that the speech teacher has one advantage: he knew what people desired without sending out a questionnaire. If the insurance salesman had been a close observer of human nature, and could have sensed the trend of modern thought as well as the speech instructor did, he might have been spared the trouble (and shall we now say the humiliation?) of the survey.

What about doctrinal preaching? Every gospel preacher must choose between what is desired in this age and the kind of preaching that the Bible says we should do. The early Christians continued in the apostles' doctrine. Acts 2:42. It is obvious that the apostles must have preached doctrine. People obey a form of doctrine in becoming children of righteousness. Rom. 6:17. How can preaching save people, unless it presents the doctrine, and shows people how to obey "that form of doctrine?" Paul warned against preaching any other doctrine. I Tim. 1:3. This implies that there is a doctrine to be preached. Timothy was told to give attendance to doctrine. I Tim. 4:13, 16. Maybe, Paul and others knew that in this age people would not desire doctrine, and hence gospel preachers would have to give it a little emphasis. Paul must have had something like that in mind when he told Timothy to preach with doctrine, for the time would come when people would not endure-would not desire-sound doctrine. (2 Tim. 4:2, 3) Those who have so much free information on how to preach ought to get together with Paul, or show us what Paul was wrong. Paul said for us to preach doctrine, because people would not desire it; man tells us to omit doctrine when it is not desired. One of the two has given the wrong advice, and personally I think that Paul is not the one.

What about doctrinal preaching? The afore mentioned speech teacher makes a distinction between a doctrinal sermon and a gospel sermon. After discrediting doctrinal sermons, he speaks with approval of "the gospel sermon—or sermons intended to draw inspiration and encouragement from the great religious truths of the gospel, and through this inspiration to lead audiences to apply these truths to their own lives." How ridiculous is such a distinction! Doctrine is nothing but "the great religious truths of the gospel." Imagine a man drawing inspiration from "great religious truths" without preaching those truths. How can a preacher lead people "to apply these truths to their own lives" without preaching the truths-the doctrine --so people can know what the truths are?

What about doctrinal preaching? It is a common thing to hear someone say, "We ought not to preach doctrine so much; we should exhort people more." Not so long ago a denominational preacher visited one of our services, and at the close he favored us with this comment: "That is just the trouble; we have too much doctrinal preaching and not enough convincing preaching." This reminds one of the little boy who went out to shoot the birds, but didn't take his shooter along. Nobody denies that we should exhort and convince people. Too many preachers, however, go out to exhort without the exhorter. They go out to convince without the convencer. Paul said that elders should exhort and convince the gainsayers, but that they should be able to do it with sound doctrine. Titus 1:8. It takes doctrine to exhort and convince people in the right way.
IN CULLING%COMMENTS
AND CORRESPONDENCE

THE SUBVERSIVE CHARACTER OF THE MURCH-WITTY MEETINGS

( Editorial)

There has never been a movement in the history of the church on this continent with more sinister designs than the much publicised Witty-Murch Unity Meetings. The Bible Banner made this charge at the beginning, when these so-called “national unity meetings” were announced. We have been told that the motive was not imperialistic, nor imperialistic purposes, because the Lord only knows whether men are sincere or hypocritical. But Jesus said “by their fruits ye shall know them” and by their fruits we do know them. With the history of digressive designs back of us, in the virtual theft of meetinghouses all over the land, divided churches and misplaced confidences, brethren who have seen or read the past to any profit will reprove no confidence in Witty and Murch.

The letter which appears below in the article by Brother B. C. Goodpasture, which is copied from the Gospel Advocate, furnishes a clear case of the designing character of these meetings. Brother Goodpasture makes some excellent remarks, containing timely truths. One point, however, is being overlooked. The proponents and opponents of these Unity Meetings are all speaking of the desire for Christian Unity. The Lord’s prayer for unity is repeatedly referred to as not having been answered. We hear prayers for God to answer the prayer of his Son. That sounds like these “unity meeting” preachers have a better standing with God now than his own Son had then, for they are praying for God to answer the prayer of his Son! For their information, the prayer of Jesus has long been answered. He prayed that the apostles should be one. They were one. He prayed that all who believed on Him “through their word” might also be one. All that believed on Him “through their word” were one. If there are any Christians wherever Christians are, whether few or many, who believe on Him through the word of the apostles, we simply mean to say that Christian Unity does not depend on what the digressive Christian Churches have done for any thing. Does Christian Unity depend on what the Methodists are going to do about sprinkling for baptism? Neither does it depend on what the digressives are going to do about instrumental music, missionary societies, delegate conventions, lay membership, women preachers, women pastors, women elders, vested choirs, union meetings, Thursday observance of the Lord’s Supper. Junior churches, consecration of infants, modernism, and a thousand things that would separate them from simple New Testament churches if instrumental music in the worship had never been heard of. If they, like Ephraim, are joined to their idols-still Christ exists in the church large or small, where Christians follow Christ and His apostles, “through their word.” The Lord’s prayer for unity was answered before the Witty-Murch meetings were born, and the best that can be said for the digressive Christian Churches is that it is a digression from that unity an apostasy from the New Testament order of things.

In this department also appears an article from Brother John Allen Hudson, of Los Angeles, California, under the title “Unity Meeting Decline.” Brother Hudson says some good things. I have personally seen him in action with a few digressive preachers when he made “the fur fly” and I know he can do it. But it occurs to me that in that letter sent to these digressive leaders over his signature there is a super-abundance of love making. The gobs of love with which these digressive “brethren” are being anointed everywhere seems to me to be rather superfluous and gratuitous. It is fine to love when it is the time to love. But a dose of love is not the medicine these Witty-Murch Meetings need now. Jesus loved the Pharisees but there were occasions upon which he did not take any time out to tell them so—the occasion required something else.

Brother Hudson states that we regard the Christian Churches as our brethren in Christ. I will venture the assertion here that three-fourths of the members of the Wilshire Boulevard Christian Church in Los Angeles have never obeyed the gospel. Large numbers of them came one day and departed from the denominations without obedience to the gospel; many of them went into the Christian Church on marriage compromises. In my home city, Oklahoma City, the pastor of the First Christian Church stood in the baptistry and apologized for immersing a man by saying that there were members of that church who had never been immersed, and some who had not received baptism in any form, and they were all welcome, but that he immersed those who wanted to be! That is the situation in all of the large Christian Churches and most of the small ones. On what basis then can the blanket statement be made that we regard them as our brethren in Christ?

Suppose the organs in the worship should be removed. What of the other innovations? And what of that majority in the Christian Churches who have never been converted to the gospel and have never obeyed it? Suppose the “two groups” united—there would be an incompatibility as great as if a union should be formed with any other protestant denomination. Union is not unity, and Christ did not ask the Father for union. He asked for the unity of all who believed on Him through the word of the apostles and obeys it. Whatever any church does is its own business. Unity is immediate. Why Unity Meetings? The idea is itself unscriptural.

Back to the designs of the digressives, including Claud F. Witty, in these mush meetings. Read the letter from the brother C. R. Elerich of Columbus, Ohio. Brother Witty did not even consult any loyal church in Columbus. Brother Witty claims to represent churches of Christ. These meetings are widely publicised as getting the two groups—Christian Churches and Churches of Christ—together. Yet Brother Witty did not even consult any loyal church in Columbus. “The Church Of Christ” mentioned in the announcement is a digressive church wearing that name! Brother Witty went to Columbus and consulted with the digressives about this “Unity Meeting” but did not go around the loyal brethren at all to even find out whether they wanted such a meeting or not. It is in this high-handed arbitrary manner that the Witty-Murch Meetings are being forced upon brethren in various sections by Claud F. Witty. He is the one that is responsible, led around by the nose by James DeForest Murch and W. R. Walker of the Christian Standard.

The Columbus case is an example of the sinister designs of this group of men upon the churches of Christ. Brother Witty has proved himself a traitor to the church. He is not going to the digressives, he is already with them. His prediction that he will not long be identified with the Witty-Murch Meetings is being forced upon brethren in churches of Christ at all, unless someone can show him his sin, or something happens to check his course.

It is more and more evident that churches of Christ have nothing to gain by these love-making meetings, and Christian Churches have nothing to lose. Loyal brethren everywhere are being more and more convinced of this.
The Bible Banner

The digestives went out-let them repent and return. “They went out from us because they were not of us; if they had been of us they would not have gone out from us; but they went out from us that they might be manifest that ye be not consumed of another.” (Gal. 5:15.) Even brethren in Christ, by bitter strife and contention, can destroy each other. The forbidding spectacle of a divided church, the bitter strife of the world, nullifies our Lord's claims to the divinity of his mission. In the night before Calvary, Jesus prayed fervently "that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us, that the world may believe that thou didst send me..." (John 17:21-23.)

James DeForest Murch and W. R. Walker will not succeed in their designs on churches of Christ. Claud F. Witty will not succeed in victimizing the loyal churches and selling them down the river. The author's review of the “Bible Banner” has been too long and hard to surrender it to Witty, Walker and Murch. The atonal Unity Meetings will not succeed. They Shall Not Pass! F. E. W.

THE COLUMBUS (OHIO) UNITY MEETING

Another “unity meeting” has been announced. One to be held on May 13 and 14 at Indianapolis Church of Christ, Norwich and Indianaola Avenue, Columbus, Ohio. This “Indianola Church of Christ” is the “Christian Church” where W. R. Walker serves as “pastor.”

The following letter from Brother Elerich will throw some light on Columbus conditions as related to the “unity meeting”:

1373 East Hudson Street, Columbus, Ohio,
April 30, 1941.

In view of the publicity which has been given by the Witty-Murch forces to the “unity meeting” to be held on Columbus on May 13 and 14, to make the following statement in behalf of the congregations of the church of Christ in this city, located at 28 East Seventh Avenue, 1290 West Broad Street, and Mount Vernon Avenue, near Taylor (colored):

Brother Witty's announcements through various papers that the sessions were to be held at the Christian Indianola Church may be misinterpreted by some brethren as meaning that this is a loyal congregation adhering to the New Testament doctrine, without additions, innovations, music societies, etc., which is not the case. The “pastor” of the Indianola Church is W. R. Walker, who is prominent in the columns of the Christian Standard, published at Cincinnati, Ohio. No loyal congregation of the church in Columbus was consulted relative to this “unity meeting,” and none of the local preachers of the gospel were invited to have part in the discussions.

C. R. Elerich.

Assuming the correctness of the foregoing statement, it seems that the loyal churches in Columbus have not been dealt with unfairly in the publicity given for the “unity meeting.” They have had a problem thrust upon them without their consultation or consent. If our memory is not at fault, the same thing was done to the loyal congregation in Lexington, Ky., last year. Evidently the Christian Church on Indianaola Avenue was consulted about the matter. Are the local churches of Christ to be dealt with as inferiors and consulted according to the good pleasure or dictates of these other bodies? Are they to have these meetings brought to their midst regardless of their local problems or wishes? We are not even suggesting that they had the remotest desire to cooperate in these meetings. You do not know. But the basis of common fairness it would have been just and proper to have consulted them. As it is, these loyal congregations in Columbus have been laid under the necessity of making an explanation to keep the record clear. If unity among the Christian Churches and the churches of Christ in Columbus is even a remote purpose of the proposed meeting, we utterly fail to see even these beside Dr. Cowden.

We have never been enthusiastic about these “unity meetings.” We have never expected much good to come from them. This does not mean that we are opposed to Christian unity. That unity among those who profess to be the followers of Christ is highly desirable, no one acquainted with the Scriptures will deny. “Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity! As the southwest is toward the sun, so let us also walk in the light.” But there are not pleasant, and some things are pleasant that are not good; but unity possesses the rare quality of being, at the same time, both good and pleasant. It is “like the dew of Hermon, that spreadeth itself on the grass.”

There is great power in unity. The early church was “of one heart and soul,” and it was able to meet all opposition; ancient Israel divided, and fell before her enemies. “Every house divide against itself will not stand.” (Matt. 12:15.) Rome divided, and fell. The Kingdom of Satan, if divided, would suffer the inevitable results of strife. The opposing parties, in any division, neutralize the power of each other and tend to be mutually destructive of each other. But “the two will take heed that ye be not consumed one of another.” (Gal. 5:15.)

No one should fail to encourage any scriptural effort toward unity among brethren, but it should be remembered that any unity attained on grounds other than those contained in the sacred oracles is not worth the time involved in its attainment. Any scheme of union which ignores the causes of division is foredoomed to failure. We cannot get rid of effects without removing causes. If the Christian Churches wish to be united with the churches of Christ, they will have to give up the innovations which have brought about the division. The churches of Christ occupy the ground upon which they stood and are determined that division is not desired to the extent that there is a willingness to give up instrumental music, the societies, open membership, and other suchlike Romish and denominational practices, all of which the worlds is in favor of. Let us do this, it will not take long to let it be known. If they are not willing, why the waste of time? Why not get down to business, or quit? Much as we desire unity, we cannot surrender our principles to have it. We cannot be found seeking peace at any price.

So far we have been unable to see any “visible results” of the “unity meetings” which would justify their existence. We believe that the same efforts, time and money spent in preaching the primitive gospel would be productive of a great deal more good. Besides, it seems likely that these meetings are producing more problems among us than they are solving. B. C. Goodpasture, in Gospel Advocate.

COMMON GROUND REJECTED

As we hear much these days about so-called “Unity Meetings,” I thought you might like to read an account of such a meeting attended by my brother, M. C. Kurfees, in Nashville, Tenn., February 18, 1909. I just happened to notice this in one of this memorandum books, in which he noted, among other things, the following is a copy of what he wrote concerning that conference:

“I received a call from Nashville, Tenn., to attend a conference with some brethren favoring societies and organs,” while they had requested of those opposed these things; and boarding the 8:24 A.M. train Wednesday, February 17, 1909, I arrived in Nashville at 3:15 P.M. the same day. The conference was held at Dr. Cowden's residence on West Broadway, beginning at 10 A.M. on February 18th, and continuing till 4 P.M. the same day.

Of those favoring the divisive things in question there were present Brethren R. Lin Cave, Pendleton, McKissick, R. J. B. Ross, R. B. Cowden of Minniville, Texas, and J. B. Cowden of McMinville, Tenn.—these beside Dr. Cowden himself.

Of those opposing these things there were present Brethren E. G. Secor, E. A. Sloan, J. C. McStevyn, V. T. Boaz and myself—these besides Miss Emma Page, the stenographer.

The purpose of the conference was to ‘do as we could find a common ground on all matters’ to work and worship. All present expressed themselves freely and the conference took on the form of an informal and at times debutiful discussion of our differences. It was not a question of right or wrong, but rather a question of how to stand on any matter, but whether there was a common ground accepted by all and on which all could work and worship in harmony.

After much discussion, Brother J. B. Briney made a speech suggesting a common ground and used Bro. Pendleton and myself to illustrate his point. He said in substance that Bro. Pendleton might be preaching with a church on one street using an organ, and I might be preaching with another on another street not using an organ but here in
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another part of the city a work is needed and it is proposed to start up the work at that new point. Bro. Pendleton goes to work and the leaders of the churches of Christ go there to work, both with the understanding that the organ and societies are not to be used in that work at that place. 'Now I maintain,' said he, 'that there is common ground and that both can work in harmony.'

No sooner did he take his seat than I was on the floor with a prompt acceptance of the common ground suggested. heartily endorsed the suggestion and agreed to co-operate and work in harmony. Several speeches followed and they claimed that they would still have the right to retain the organ and societies out of their own suggestion and that the meeting should not be a fellowship dinner or goodwill meeting for the purpose of promoting unity among the Churches, but the meeting should be a serious-minded affair for the purpose of trying to persuade each other to worship in harmony.

They gave evident signs of resistance and restlessness under their own suggestion of a common ground and their admission that all could stand in harmony on that ground, but we pressed the point with increasing emphasis and finally they gave in and they gave us a common ground where all can work and where both can work in harmony. The conference adjourned with their rejecting the compromise of it. Nothing was settled and the meeting remained in suspense and in confusion.

The following letter sneaks for itself.

Mr. Merle Applegate,-Figueroa Christian Church, Los Angeles, California. Dear Brother Applegate:

Pursuant to the meeting between certain preachers of the Christian Church in California and certain preachers of the churches of Christ of this area on Wednesday, January 27, 1941, it was at that time decided by the preachers of the churches of Christ that they would not consider entering a meeting in California with the Christian Church folk until they had first met among themselves and gone over the whole matter. This was done, as we clearly stated to you in the January meeting, that we might present a united front to your approach toward us. We did not want to do anything that would cause disagreement among our own group. In the January meeting we declined a unity meeting, but we did agree to a full and frank discussion of the cause of the issue.

In a meeting attended by several preachers and leaders of the churches of Christ of Los Angeles on March 14, 1941, the matter of the proposed unity meeting with the Christian Church was discussed and the consensus of opinion was as follows:

That we should show every kindness and consideration to these brethren and that we should welcome the opportunity to meet on common ground, but we should inform them with firmness that we could not enter into a meeting with a view to compromise of the issues that separate us.

That the contemplated meeting should not be called a "Unity Meeting" or conducted along the lines similar to meetings held in the East. A real unity meeting could not be held until the dividing elements have been removed so that the churches of Christ and Christian Churches could all become one group.

That in such a proposed meeting we take it for granted that brotherly love exists on both sides: that we all desire unity; that we all appreciate the value of the united front to the cause of Christ; therefore this occasion should not be a fellowship dinner or goodwill meeting for the purpose of promoting unity by overriding the differences, but the meeting should be a serious-minded affair for the purpose of trying to persuade people of the churches of Christ to worship in harmony, to be a fellowship dinner in spite of their differences on the subject of baptism.

That both sides should enter the meeting with the realization that the issues dividing us are either right or wrong. There can be no half-way position or compromise. If they are definitely proved to be right, they should be immediately adopted by both groups. If they are definitely proved to be wrong, they should be immediately dropped by those who tolerate them, then there would be immediate unity automatically.

The question of respect for the authority of the New Testament Scriptures in matters of worship, doctrine and practice must be decided. The issues of innovation that are now a curse to the Christian Churches are only symptoms or results of the disease that has existed for man years. Large portions of that body have been carried away into liberalism of theological infidelity. They have sowed to the wind and reaped the whirlwind. The uninformed masses of laymen and the remaining leaders who still have faith in the Word of God should return all the way to the New Testament and try to persuade people of the churches of Christ to be swept away by the current of modernism and disrespect for God's authority which breeds first innovations, then brings liberalism.

We are hopeful that continued prayerful study and discussion of the matters involved will be beneficial to all concerned.

Fraternally yours,

-John Allen Hudson.

"WHAT IS THE UNITY MOVEMENT?"

I received by mail a leaflet bearing the above caption, purporting to be by Brethren Claude Denny and James DeForrest Murch. I suppose the leaflet has been pretty well distributed throughout the country. Its avowed purpose is to explain what they mean by "The Unity Movement," its aims, its methods, its teachings, and its principal consequences. The purpose of The Unity Movement, but any one has a right to question its feasibility, its expediency, its consistency, its possible results: also, its scripturalness. They claim "friends" who approve the movement as "a good thing." They also admit "enemies" who regard it as "a dangerous experiment." An "experiment" is the proper name for it, for there is no...
scriptural precedent for such "conferences" to decide and determine what rules shall govern churches of Christ.

This was the answer to the question: "Then who is guilty of causing fights against what God teaches in his Word, he fights against God." That is fine. How is this? "When one fights against what God has not taught in his Word, he is fighting for and with a group convictions." Why do these two groups of worshippers together ask such questions? They both know very well why. They know, and we all know, that those two groups of people would be worshipping together in peace and unity if one of them did not insist on the use of unauthorized equipment in their worship which the other group is afraid to use without God's sanction.

The Great Teachers. "The things which ye have learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do: and the God of peace shall be with thee." (Phil. 4:19)

The leaflet suggests that the scriptures dealing with unity and peace are being ignored by them who are taking no stock in their Unity Movement: but are they not tacitly ignoring these other scriptures bearing upon "sound doctrine," abounding with "false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies and many shall follow their pernicious ways." (2 Tim. 2:1-2.) With these warnings, Paul prescribes the former and "examine" such scriptures as: 1 Cor. 15:34, "Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil." (Eph. 6:11)

The Campbellites were "men," and made errors as do all men. They were just emerging from the depths of denominational errors, and spoke and wrote many things in the early days of their study that they later reviled. No one knows how much more they would have rejected if they had continued to live and study. They were farther advanced in study than the reformers in Luther's time. But not so far from "being complete in knowledge, and every "brethren." The time is ripe for the appeal to "The Restoration Movement" for any sort of bolster for items of faith and practice. Christians should have enough sense to go over the heads of Campbell, Luther, Jerome, and all other great teachers, and be not stop short of the place Timothy was instructed to tie his faith: on the teachings of Paul and his associate apostles. Also, a great play is made upon "Our" Plea. That means no more than the "Plea" of the organism. The disciples of Christ have no "plea" except "That which is written." That is all that works such change in the individual.

"The Word of God has not taught in his Word," and are accused as trouble makers. when there would be no trouble at all if all were satisfied to "not think above that which is written." The group which "does not think above that which is written," and are accused as trouble makers. (Titus 1:9, 10.) Holding the faithful word, as he has been taught, and uncorrupted by false doctrine. (Titus 1:9.) The things which ye have learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me, do: and the God of peace shall be with thee." (Phil. 4:19)

They present a "five point approach" to unity for consideration. The first point is, "Prayer," which sectarian prescribe to the believer, such as an antidote for sins, diseases, and obedience. Second: "The Bible" to determine how much we have in common in faith and practice. That also is a sectarian tactic used in all their "union meetings." The third point is, "We will very nicely into this "Unity Movement." The sects will speak of this as being careful to not mention controverted doctrines, and then return to their several places of worship just as far apart as ever. That will very likely be the first result of this "Unity Movement." If they will both be with the innovators. If they expect to remove the difficulties, they will have to bring them out into the open, discuss them, measure them by the Word of God, agree to discard from both sides every thing unscriptural.

But will they do that? Have they been doing it? When certain brethren with good intentions, attempted to pull those skeletons from the closet and discuss, and prescribe the proper, they have met with stern rebuke, and were not invited again. If those two groups of worshippers, not only in Illinois, but in almost every hamlet, are ever to iron out their difficulties they will have to study the points wherein the trouble lies, and not continue to boast of the things wherein they agree. Christians can fraternize with Catholics, jews, Mohammedans. by such a policy. Friendliness is the third point, which needs no comment except that, "The friendship of the world is enmity with God." Fourth: "Co-operation: in enterprises which will not do violence to our personal or group convictions." Why, I do not know. They should ask the other group how they want to do the "mouth stoning," the cry is raised of persecution: right of conscience causing division;
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Our fourth point is "Pleasure" which means no more than the "Plea" of the organism. The disciples of Christ have no "plea" except "That which is written." That is all that works such change in the individual.
on undisputed points. Murch is afraid to discuss controverted points with one who will stand for Truth, and Witty is afraid to discuss anything with one who will stand for his views. The division came, and then the division existed. Who was to blame? Was it he who "fought against what God has not taught in his Word?" God will answer that question. If we are wrong, he will answer it. We will be there.

James T. Arnis, Springfield, Mo.

DEPARTING FROM UNITY

We hear much today about the subject of unity among the neeole of God. That God hates division among his people one-cannot deny, in view of his revealed will. Division is listed among the lusts of the flesh and, therefore, is carnal. Furthermore, in one passage, the Apostle Paul says, "while we walk after the flesh, then will the God of all peace comfort us and keep us ever in his peace."

In Jesus' prayer for unity, when he uttered these words, "That they all may be one as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they may be one in us," was a prayer offered in view of his death and the unity and one-ness that would come as a result of that death. Paul says, "To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."

We must sneek the same thing in teaching and doctrines, or never will, divide Christians. Division comes as a result of teaching and offenss contrary to the teaching of Christ, is guilty of the terrible sin of division. We are taught that we are to "all speak the same thing and "be one in the same mind and the same judgment." We are to "mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them." But there are certain things which are essential to maintaining peace. We must observe those principles that make for peace.

The birth of Christ heralded him as "The Prince of Peace." They said of him, "Peace on earth, good will toward men." Jesus is the author of peace, he purchased it and left it with his Church. Jesus said, "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; I must bring them in, and they will hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." In Jesus' prayer for unity, when he uttered these words, "That they all may be one as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they may be one in us," was a prayer offered in view of his death and the unity and one-ness that would come as a result of that death. Paul says, "To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."

We must maintain that one-ness and unity. The Apostle says, "Endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." This is a challenge to disciples of Christ to maintain that peace. We must sneek the same thing in teaching and doctrine, or never will, divide Christians. Division comes as a result of preaching things, apart from, in addition to, and contrary to, the doctrine of Christ. Unity is based upon the teaching and doctrine of Christ.

Follow after things that make for peace. By doing this, division cannot invade the Body of Christ. All too often, trouble comes to us because we do not "follow the things that make for peace." Many times, locally in congregations, where matters of judgment and policy are the only issues under discussion, many times we do not follow things that make for peace. We become stubborn and are determined to have our way in the matter. The result is division.

Brethren talk and write about the "Unity Movement" as though in this movement was the first and only attempt at unity. Jesus bought unity with his blood. It is in the very birth of Christ heralded him as "The Prince of Peace." In him thev would have neace and division and offenses contrary to the teaching of Christ, is guilty of the terrible sin of division. We are taught that we are to "all speak the same thing and "be one in the same mind and the same judgment." We are to "mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned and avoid them." But there are certain things which are essential to maintaining peace. We must observe those principles that make for peace.

This language is so plain, that one would need help to mis-understand it. There is but one place, where men may find the authoritative explanation of this language, and that is in Christ, the Church. This peace and unity was purchased with the blood of Christ in his death upon the Cross. Jesus said, "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." In Jesus' prayer for unity, when he uttered these words, "That they all may be one as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they may be one in us," was a prayer offered in view of his death and the unity and one-ness that would come as a result of that death. Paul says, "To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."

The "Unity Movement" was begun some 1900 years ago and has never stopped in its workings. I believe in it, and I am anxious to have all people come to that unity of the Spirit and to that bond of peace, which the apostle says, "which once were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ."

The "Unity Movement" was begun some 1900 years ago and has never stopped in its workings. I believe in it, and I am anxious to have all people come to that unity of the Spirit and to that bond of peace, which the apostle says, "which once were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ."

The "Unity Movement" was begun some 1900 years ago and has never stopped in its workings. I believe in it, and I am anxious to have all people come to that unity of the Spirit and to that bond of peace, which the apostle says, "which once were afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ."}

FIFTH NATIONAL UNITY MEETING

Announcement of this meeting, the fourth of its kind in as many years, has come to me, and along with the announcement, a four page folder explaining the aims and purposes of the meeting, which is to be a two-day meeting in which "twelve men from the Christian Church and twelve from the Church of Christ will take part in these meetings." In this meeting "a panel discussion will be held on Monday in a quiet room alone-and freely discuss such questions as the use of instrumental music in the public worship of the church, and the selection and use of liturgical psalms." Then too, had brethren who comprise the "Disciples of Christ," the Christian Church, followed the things that make for peace, and endeavored to keep that unity of the Church in the bonds of peace, they would today be enjoying that peace and unity in Christ. To follow the things that make for peace would have ruled out the many innovations that have been made. For example, the Bible was never a "lost art," it is not something to be created. It is possible to all neace. Every man, who preaches the Gospel in its purity and entirety, pleads for people to be united. Jesus is the author of peace, he purchased it and left it with his Church. Jesus said, "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold, them also I must bring, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." In Jesus' prayer for unity, when he uttered these words, "That they all may be one as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they may be one in us," was a prayer offered in view of his death and the unity and one-ness that would come as a result of that death. Paul says, "To wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself."

The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, kindness, self-control, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance, gentleness, goodne...
lies 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 any discussion, if it was on some subject of importance. He would be like a great many others who want to hear the will of the Lord on the question discussed.

When quite a young preacher I was invited to appear on a platform at the International Convention at Indianapolis in 1926 and read from papers of various groups after I came from a discussion behind closed doors? My belief that instrumental music in the worship, and missionary organizations are unscriptural is not based on the wisdom of man, but upon the word of God. Am I now expected to surrender to the opinion of men? I fear that I will be found a dull student! Had the brethren now sponsoring this unity movement lived in Texas during the 1850's and 1860's, and heard of the fellowship the Digressive Disciples with Christians who have been walked over by the Christian Church as were those of the Cassells around Manila. I had no part in or sympathy for the errors with which they were charged by personal letters that I took no stock in his premillennialism.

They did not begin to fight 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 the statement that our approach to the problems of today is 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. Let us not have strings on me religiously. During my five years as Bible teacher and evangelist in the Philippines, I went out of my way to let Don Carlos Janes know by personal letters that I took no stock in his premillennial vagaries. From my childhood I have understood the Scriptures plainly to mean that Christ's coming will usher in the beginning of eternal joy with Him in glory—not any super-Hillerian world empire in the flesh.

My work in the southern Philippines was located about five hundred miles from Manila, and I had different language from that of the Casseals 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, California, and you are to your home congregation in Oklahoma City while preaching in various parts of the great outside field where we need more sinners without regard to race, color, or national residence.

Therefore, as one who wants to "hew to the line and not fooled around on foolishness" feeling around on feels for the sake of the very things now to be studied prayerfully. brethren, the road of broken fellowship was traveled and 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.

Union is sweet, far sweeter to those who have possessed it and lost it than 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 route. We cannot trade the peace of God for the peace of man. If we desire this long lost, I point to the still bleeding fragments. to the things which broke it, and exhort you to stay the blood and heal its hurts by removing the things which broke it. I still have confidence in the power of a faith that will work by love to accomplish this blessed desire if allowed to work. To you who admit that the instruments by which the fellowship was broken are instruments of preference, we say once and for all, we cannot exchange faith for preference.

M. 0. Daley, Rock Springs, Texas.

*A FACTION OF DIGRESSIVE DISCIPLES*

Just recently I read the February Bible Banner with your gracious invitation for any and all true Christians—not pussyfooters—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 digressed from God's Word. At first their volutary 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 apostles" of the Digressive Disciples would have been turned, rather than proclaiming God's perfect terms of unity—which is the only kind of religious unity that should interest us. It might have been different if our speakers had fallen silent to the fact that now 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 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 can only appear to "obey God fully and freely, 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 causes of division but to let them openly and objectively in the light of Scripture. What human innovation have the Digressives offered to give up for the sake of unity?

The history of the Christian Standard and Christian Restoration Association's phoney fight against the United Christian Missionary Society's modernistic dictatorship over the Disciples is revealing. I saw personally in 1926 and 1927 and read the history of the anti-U. C. M. S. North American Christian Convention at 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. wacawc a long time ago. They thought nothing of associating 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 the statement that our approach to the problems of today is 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. Let us not have strings on me religiously. During my five years as Bible teacher and evangelist in the Philippines, I went out of my way to let Don Carlos Janes know by personal letters that I took no stock in his premillennial vagaries. From my childhood I have understood the Scriptures plainly to mean that Christ's coming will usher in the beginning of eternal joy with Him in glory—not any super-Hillerian world empire in the flesh.

My work in the southern Philippines was located about five hundred miles from Manila, and I had 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, California, and you are to your home congregation in Oklahoma City while preaching in various parts of the great outside field where we need more sinners without regard to race, color, or national residence.

Therefore, as one who wants to "hew to the line and let the chips fall where they may," I wish to congratulate you and other standfast brethren who never let a 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 that we still have many brethren capable of wielding the Sword of the Spirit—"the only weapon of righteousness on the right hand to fulfill the mission of the body of Christ" to interpret the Word of God to them. We are to be trucked into our lives what is the good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God. There is a valuable lesson to be learned from this plea of the great Apostle.
First, demonstrations are much more effective than any other way we have of getting a thing forth. The familiar saying: "I'd rather see a sermon, than to hear one any day" is still true with practically all people. The influence of a man may be felt as a result of teaching by word of mouth alone, but it is always much more potent if he teaches both by word and deed. Neither of these, however, should be emphasized to the exclusion of the other. The apostles were men whose lives were characterized by holiness, but they also were men whose tongues were at one with the words of truth. Artificial piety will not replace the preaching of the Gospel of Christ. Nor will the preaching of the Gospel take the place of a clean and holy life. They are unalterably joined together.

Second, we are made to know the value in a thing by having the experience more than in any other way. I may believe that I know the value to be derived from the public services of the church, but unless I have experienced it I do not. Giving of our means to the support of the church helps us to more fully appreciate the work and to enter with greater zeal into it, but if we do not give, then the benefit is not ours. Advertising companies realize this. Hence, oftentimes they give away great quantities of goods. Why do they do this? That people may experience the benefit there is in the product. We can experience the benefits to be derived from Christianity only having a part in it.

Third, Preachers talk about being sound in the faith, colleges write and talk about being sound in teaching, and I am disposed to believe that in most cases they are telling the truth. I yet have a great deal of confidence in the truth and uprightness of my brethren in the Lord. But there are ways and means apparent to all that would put these things beyond all reasonable doubt, even to the most skeptical.

Here is the way it might be done in accordance with the thoughts already presented. If a preacher wants to be known among the brethren will soon find out about it without any statement as to his soundness. If he will reprove, rebuke, and exhort all who are in error, there will be a day of accountability.

If each college will employ a staff of teachers known among the brethren for their steadfastness, they will have the full endorsement of all faithful brethren everywhere. By previous conduct some already have records that may be questioned. If you would remove this arrange for the editor of the "Bible Banner" to come there and deliver a series of lectures on themes that have brought a doubt. Or better still, arrange a debate between Brother Wallace and Brother Boll, and have it in the college auditorium. You can remove the question mark. If you really want it removed. A restoration of confidence would be a step in the right direction.-Oscar Ellison, Norman, Okla.

SIGHTING-IN SHOTS

I drove by a place of business in the beautiful hills of West Virginia and noticed this in large letters over the door: “Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy.” Under it information appeared that “We close on Sunday.” My friend, you used the wrong text. You should have said: “We close on Saturday.” Or selected another text. It would have been as logical to have quoted the law pertaining to the Passover, feast days, or new moons and then said: “We close on Sunday.” The sabbath was a Jewish memorial day and has nothing whatever to do with the new covenant under Christ. Christians do not observe the sabbath. The first day of the week is the Lord’s day and was never called the sabbath by the authority of Christ. It is a new day with an entirely new meaning and does not suggest the sabbath. A new and an entirely different law governs its observance.

It is commendable to close a place of business on Sunday for good reasons that could be given but the fact that God commanded the Jews to “remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy” is not one of them. “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or of a new moon or a sabbath day: which are a shadow of the things to come: but the body is Christ’s.” (Col. 2:16,17) “Let no man therefore judge you.” Why the Therefore? Because he who circumcised us with a circumcision not made with hands “blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us: and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross.” (Verse 14) The sabbath belonged to this “bond written in ordinances” which has been blotted out. We have a better law than the law of Moses and a better day than the Jewish sabbath. We should possibly not expect an ordinary business man of devout character to be possessed of very much information along this line when even the preachers, who ought to know better, talk piously about “the Christian sabbath.” It is important to “hold the patter of sound words.” The popular use of the term sabbath to describe the first day of the week is out of harmony with “sound words.” No inspired writer ever called the first day of the week the sabbath.

-Cled E. Wallace.
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