A TORNADO IN THE TEAPOT

CLED E. WALLACE

After the combined attack made upon us on the editorial page of the Firm Foundation, I suppose we are expected to fold our tents and quietly slip away somewhere to a remote retreat where we will henceforth neither be seen nor heard. But I think we won't, just yet anyway. I have a few more things to say before I relax into a posture of utter dejection, like the classical picture of the Indian on his horse in the midst of a storm, which I sometimes see hanging on the walls of homes I visit.

It seems that we have aroused a considerable-sized tornado in a teapot which I have an idea will blow out without even cracking the pot. I am a veteran and have seen it happen several times before, even a long time before our chief critic, Brother M. C. Franklin, decided to leave the digressives and return to the old paths. I once held a meeting in Greenville, Texas where Brother Franklin lives and I recall that he attended almost every service. I found him very companionable and helpful and therefore feel some surprise and regret over the fact that he is now loudly calling through the Firm Foundation for brethren everywhere to turn thumbs down on our "diabolical literature," referring to the Bible Banner, and to refuse us "all recognition" until we make our "acknowledgments to the entire brotherhood." On the whole the brother has laid out a good sizable task for himself in disposing of us and our "diabolical" ways and has started out by violating the law of love, he so sternly attempts to bind on us. I am also reasonably certain that he will not have the full support of the editor of the Firm Foundation in his ambitious efforts to rob us of "the munitions of war" and make it unprofitable. And I'm really not afraid that the little squib Brother Franklin set off in the Firm Foundation could not resist a mild wisecrack.

"And thus Brother Franklin concludes his 'soft answer' in an effort to turn away wrath." I'd have to try to be funny to get off one that good. When I finished Brother Franklin's stern arraignment of the Bible Banner and then read the editor's footnote, it hit me like the sun smiling at me through a rift in a cloud. During all the years I said things in the Firm Foundation at least as "diabolical" as anything Brother Franklin can now quote from me, I do not recall even a mild rebuke from the editor. Even worse things got in then and since that I did not write. I even now find myself in complete agreement with much that Brother Showalter says and think I know that he agrees with much that I say. I agree with some things Brother Franklin says but also think he has shown a sad lack of discrimination.

It is in order now to review the situation and see how the tornado got in the teapot. The Bible Banner, being more conservative than some of its critics give it credit for, was shocked at some of the excesses in manner and language employed by some. We expressed ourselves rather vigorously, maybe too much so, but not more so than Brother Franklin has expressed himself about us. He cannot qualify as an apostle of mild expression himself. He was one of trying to "enhance" our "private interests" and suggests that even these are "not entirely ethical in their nature." He classifies us as "competitively malicious editors" and says we are "vindictive" and have "a vast reservoir of hatred." He thinks we belong to "a crowd of self-seeking ecclesiastical gangsters" and "are in deliberate rebellion against God." He finally thinks we have opened the pits of hell from which "sulphurous fumes" are "pouring forth." He wants to know if we have never read "A soft answer turneth away wrath." Well, have you? This is what made the editor of the Firm Foundation get funny without even trying. I don't blame him for I don't think he could have helped it even if he had tried. Of course, we merely enter a blanket denial of the ridiculous and intemperate charges made against us. They are simply not true as most people know. I think Brother Franklin has made a serious mistake but at that, he is a good man, I love him and do not intend to refuse him recognition or ask "the entire brotherhood" or even a part of them to do so. I shall not even ask him to use a soft answer on me to turn away wrath for I'm not even angry.

In reply to our rebuke of certain men for their fanatical
THE CAMPAIGN OF CALUMNY

There is nothing new about it. It is the same old campaign of calumny. If it breaks out in a new place it comes from the same old source. It began with the discussions which were held with Boll, Neal, and Norris. Defeated on the issues, they swore vengeance in personal destruction. Even when Norris sought palliation for utter defeat in personal retaliation these false brethren fed him on slander and slime. There they met on common ground.

Then came the Clinton Davidson movement and anonymous letters. Because the Bible Banner stood squarely in the way of this sinister movement its promoters vowed to destroy its editor. His movement died but his bitter hatred lives and flows through other channels.

Next up was the Murch-Witty National Unity Meeting notion—a carefully devised scheme to take over the church. The Bible Banner opposed the schemes of Witty and Murch on the same principle precisely that it opposed the schemes of Clinton Davidson, Stung by defeat, Davidson was seeking revenge and saw an opportunity to enlist the assistance of Claude F. Witty. The following letter reveals the Davidson-Witty calumnious coalition. It was written by Brother F. L. Rowe as a “confidential” letter to the editors of the Christian Leader. But as it was sent as a form letter, it could hardly be maintained that it is confidential. Read it and see the spirit and the persons back of the campaign being waged.

CONFIDENTIAL LETTER TO LEADER EDITORS

January 8, 1941. Dear Brother: About three weeks ago, Brother Davidson called up from New Jersey about 8:30, but I let Sister Bauer answer the ‘phone as I have a little difficulty sometimes in hearing clearly. The substance of his conversation was that if I would go after Foy E. Wallace and expose him in every way that I could and in every way that would be proven to me that such a work on my part would be financed by a brother in Detroit. My answer to him was I would have no part in any such an affair and that so far as I am concerned I am out of all that. I had Sister Lena tell him that I was starting a new paper and wanted to keep it clean. So much for that.

Then this week, Monday, Claud F. Witty came to Cincinnati and called on me and talked to me privately about lending my name of influence to a paper for a few months at least whose purpose would be to expose Foy E. Wallace because of his bitter attacks up on Witty and others. I told Brother Witty I could not lend my name to any such a proposition and I suggested that he get some small town printer get the paper out for them and that they mail it themselves. I told him I was through with all that manner of contention among brethren. I asked him why he came to me. His answer was, he wanted my name and reputation. I told him he would have to find someone else that I would be no party to it.

Fraternally, F. L. Rowe.

No comment is necessary to point out the evident purpose of what is being done. Regardless of who is doing what or whether they have an understanding or not, they are one in aim, and intent. Here they meet on common ground “of one accord and of one mind”—to destroy whom they hate.

The amazing thing is that the men back of this thing are the promoters of “unity meetings” and appear as love embodied and piety personified.

Even G. C. Brewer descended to the level of contributing an article to the editor of the paper which is now their tool. He revealed his own mental level. He could not “sanction” what they did—but he “rejoiced in their iniquity.”

Brother Brewer admits that he distributed a bundle of papers containing what he said was indecent. He did it to get even with Foy Wallace because of his “unchristian” treatment of G. C. Brewer. In doing it he aided in smearing the church in Oklahoma City, and has lost the respect of some fine people whose favor he might have held.

As for M. C. Franklin’s article, it is a fine sample of a man doing what he condemns. He should read Rom. 2:1. Besides his inconsistency some things he said are wholly untrue.

As for John O’Dowd, his article can be viewed only as a smokescreen to cover up his own guilty connection with the valley paper and the valley affair. In the role of a dove of peace John O’Dowd is a misfit. He can roar but he cannot coo. As a peacemaker, he has “the voice of Jacob but the skin of Esau.”

The denominations will unite to oppose their common foe—the church. It is in the same spirit that these men, some of whom have little or no use for each other, have met on common ground to oppose the Bible Banner by any means or measures necessary, fair or foul—mostly foul.

That Brother Showalter has allowed these men to use the Firm Foundation to smear the Bible Banner contrary to his previously affirmed attitude, is, indeed, an enigma to me, but I shall not attribute to him any ulterior motives. It is my firm conviction that the public in general, and the readers of the Bible Banner in particular, can and will see the influences back of this campaign of calumny. It cannot be disguised.

Concerning the personal attacks that are being made, the Bible Banner has no reply to make. Our battle has been fought on issues and attitudes that affect those issues. We have not attacked the personal character of any man in all these controversies. We shall continue to leave that type of “journalism” to those who oppose us. It is significant that we have refused to even quote the bad language of articles that have been referred to, and attention has been called to the fact that the Franklin article in the Firm Foundation did quote the language it condemned and passed it on to thousands of others. The person of this editor is nothing, and his personal fortunes are nothing. Do unto him what they will; it does not matter. But as long as he lives he will continue the fight on error “while the heathen rage and the people imagine vain things.” We shall continue to stand by the issues involved in this controversy. And on these issues—they shall not pass!—Foy E. Wallace, Jr.
The above caption is taken from an editorial in the Firm Foundation by Brother G. H. P. Showalter in reference to the efforts of James D. Murch and other aggressive leaders, and by Claud F. Witty in the "beguiling churches of Christ" by their so-called, but mis-named, National Unity Meetings. Brother Showalter's editorial is a strong statement of the right attitude toward the unity question—the Bible attitude. It is characteristic of the writings of Brother Showalter covering more than a third of a century when he takes up his pen to deal decisively with a vital issue.

"THE UNITY MOVEMENT"

In another column (see page 2) the Firm Foundation is giving space to an article offered by Claud F. Witty and James DeF. Murch proposing a consideration of the question: Is This Unity Movement? Brother Witty sent to me the manuscript some weeks past and I am aware that it has not received the prompt attention that its authors might reasonably expect: Brother Witty in a personal letter accompanying the article says, "I know that you have not shown much interest in the movement, but I would like for you to let your readers know what the movement is."

To the contrary I am interested. I am, at all times, deeply concerned in any discussion of the Scriptures. The thought of unity extended toward the unity of God's people. "Movements" are sometimes dangerous. If one is, religiously, in the right place the less "movement" the better. If he wiggles about he is an enthusiastic seeker of righteousness and desires and requires, and which alone is acceptable to him.

It is, of course, accepted without argument that God's people should be united. No one will deny that. But it is quite a different thing to say that anything unscriptural should be accepted or rejected on the ground of "unity. Any unity consummated at the expense of a recognition of and acceptance of either the teaching or practice of things not authorized in the New Testament is clearly a unity not of the kind for which Paul cleared the road. To say that the "movement" to unity desires and requires, and which alone is acceptable to him.

The Pauline teaching on unity was addressed to the local congregation. He nowhere talks of a unity that would bring about an ecclesiasticism. He does not call for that type of consolidation that would merge the different local churches into some sort of an organized brotherhood. The rebukes of Paul in chapter one of the First Corinthian letter had to do with individual and personal opinions and opinions with not with the sound doctrine of Christ. He might list Paul, Apollos and Cephas and Christ was one and the same thing. A polis and Cephas and Christ was one and the same thing. Also, "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ" (Phil. 2:5). This shows that when Paul says, "Be of the same mind one and another. It can be effectually brought about to eradicate from the church and from the practice of professed Christians all of those things that are-without divine authority and that are hence sinful in the sight of God."

The Pauline teaching on unity was addressed to the local congregation. He nowhere talks of a unity that would bring about an ecclesiasticism. He does not call for that type of consolidation that would merge the different local churches into some sort of an organized brotherhood. The rebukes of Paul in chapter one of the First Corinthian letter had to do with individual and personal opinions and opinions with not with the sound doctrine of Christ. He might list Paul, Apollos and Cephas and Christ was one and the same thing. And the church of Christ at Corinth was not divided on matters of doctrine. It was a matter of choice of preachers who were sent to the church. But Christ had already foretold what would have been different entirely had it been a dispute arising from following after false teachers who are introducing here-sies. Paul would never have advised the brethren at Corinth to be "businesslike" or "practical". He did not approach problems of this order and to declare himself in no uncertain terms. "False teachers" have always been the bane of the church. They have always—from the earliest days of the church—brought about an ecclesiasticism. He does not call for that type of consolidation that would merge the different local churches into some sort of an organized brotherhood. The rebukes of Paul in chapter one of the First Corinthian letter had to do with individual and personal opinions and opinions with not with the sound doctrine of Christ. He might list Paul, Apollos and Cephas and Christ was one and the same thing. Also, "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ" (Phil. 2:5). This shows that when Paul says, "Be of the same mind one and another. It can be effectually brought about to eradicate from the church and from the practice of professed Christians all of those things that are-without divine authority and that are hence sinful in the sight of God."

The above words of Brother Showalter will carry weight. We recommend that Brother Witty read them to his next Unity Meeting. For instance this passage: "There are times when God wants war, not peace-opposition, not submission-separation-not unity." Then another passage: "Brother Witty is certainly tying himself up with a most shameful corruption of the sound doctrine of Christ. And yet another passage: "There will be no such secession among the loyal churches of Christ—of that I am certain—and all the unity meetings and love feasts of misguided brethren will fail."

That editorial will do great good and we put in our bid for more of the same order. F. E. W.
DOCTOR BREWER PRESCRIBES A REMEDY

A voice is heard in Ramah—but it is not Rachel weeping for her children. It is Doctor Brewer mourning for his premillennial friends. And he would not be comforted. In the Gospel Advocate of recent date, he prescribes the remedy for the “sick preacher” who makes all of the members sick by making a hobby of preaching against certain things. He does not say so, but his descriptions clearly show that he means some of us who have exposed the teachers of premillennialism and other isms. Having already called this editor names that sound like serious diseases, it is not hard to discern by reading between the lines who he thinks the sick preacher is.

In a letter which was recently published, by his permission in a paper which he admitted was indecent, Doctor Brewer diagnosed the diseases of the editor of the Bible Banner by calling him a “Megalomaniac.” We all know now who the “sick preacher” is and what he has! He is some kind of a maniac, according to Doctor Brewer.

Then what is the remedy? Doctor Brewer says it is isolation. Avoid him, isolate him, he says. That means that somebody must be headed for the penthouse. But is this advice consistent on the part of the Doctor? Not so long ago he carried on a discussion with Hugo McCord, and in other articles, in the Gospel Advocate, in which he argued Paul’s admonition to “mark them that are causing the divisions ... contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned” does not apply to Boll and Jorgenson and others of the premillennial party. So when he says avoid him, isolate him, he does not mean R. H. Boll nor E. L. Jorgenson. It is an outstanding fact that not once in the Doctor’s writings has he prescribed a course of action against the men of that movement. In his Abilene address, he was reported by those who were present to have advised the churches to use both Boll and Jorgenson in meetings as a remedy for the division, and voiced confidence that they would not teach their theories! So he cannot mean them when he prescribes isolation.

Doctor Brewer disclaims being a premillennialist. He even preaches, at times and in places, against premillennialism and proves to the brethren that he is not one. Yet nobody has accused him of being a premillennialist. He is charged with the attitude toward the promoters of premillennialism that he cannot deny—and this is the point he invariably evades. He is an appeaser of premillennialists. He will neither avoid nor isolate them. But he would do both to us. But is it not strange that he would propose to print a letter of indorsement in his proposed book from an editor who is “such a Megalomaniac” and that ought to be avoided and isolated. Those “some fifty preachers” who received his letters asking them to help him sell his proposed book wrote down what he said and what they write to either of us the other reads. We are somewhat twinnish in our own way. Evidently the Christian Standard has not seen what they have written to us and innocently let the cat out of the baa. In fact it looks like two or three of them got out. The Christian Standard has this to say about “The Unity Conference.”

AN INTERESTING LETTER

A late issue of a certain periodical publishes a letter from “Frank L. Cox, Firm Foundation Publishing House, Austin, Texas under date April 21.” It reads:

Dear Junior: How is the editor? Have read the April 15 number of the Soldier. A brother requests 100 copies of this number-April 15th. So, if you have them send them to us, also the bill for them. Are you getting other orders for the number? Brotherly,

(Signed) Frank L. Cox.

Now, this April 15th issue happens to be the one that features the abusive attack on the character of the editor of the Bible Banner, and on the oldest church in Oklahoma City. It is vile and libelous. The Firm Foundation is “Brotherly” aiding in the circulation of it. The Firm Foundation, you know, is at present putting on some rather lofty airs as the exponent of a purer type of journalism. No wdont misunderstand us. We do not object to any improvement along that line in the Firm Foundation, or any lectures its editor feels duty-bound to point at us, even if he puts on a few airs about it. We can take a lecture with as good grace as anybody. We do object to being classified as “gangsters” and “factionists” and a recommendation that the brethren withdraw all recognition from us. We also protest against the Firm Foundation allowing John O’Dowd to call us “nasty” on its pages. With all our faults, we have never asked for the bill to be sent to us for a hundred copies of “the April 15th number of the Soldier.” There are a few mean things left we just won’t do. A nold negro mammy, busy with the dishes, grabbed one of her numerous offspring and wiped his dripping nose with the dishrag. “Law-sakes, chile,” she grumbled, “I jes can’t stan nas’ness.” The Firm Foundation just can’t stand “nas’ness.”—C. E. W.

CUTTING DOWN THE ATTENDANCE

We have been receiving some more or less catty letters from Brother Murch and Brother Witty barbed with assurances that our opposition to their phoney unity conferences has disgusted sensible brethren and helped more than it has hurt their efforts. If that is true they ought to be more pleased than sore at us. It really makes little difference whether the name signed to these letters is Witty or Murch because they are “Siamese twins” in all these matters. They think in the same groove and when one of them talks the other echoes. They do like to write to us and what they write to either of us the other reads. We are somewhat twinnish in our own way. Evidently the Christian Standard has not seen what they have written to us and innocently let the cat out of the baa. In fact it looks like two or three of them got out. The Christian Standard has this to say about “The Unity Conference.”

Space does not permit of extended treatment here of the Unity Conference of brethren at Columbus, O., last week; but we can not forbear stating that it registered a definite advance in the development of fellowship between brethren of two groups.

While certain brethren among the “conservative” element have conducted a campaign that seems to us to be motivated by factious spirit, not to say jealousy, and thus manifestly cut down attendance somewhat, the net result was a meeting in which brethren proved that they could speak frankly of their differences and do it in good spirit. That is an accomplishment.

It does not require a spirit of divination to see that the Christian Standard is disappointed and somewhat peeved. We already knew that Witty and Murch were by the sort of letters they have been writing us. The charge that we were “motivated by a factious spirit, not to say jealousy” is just the bitterness of disappointment working out. We do not mind taking a little of the credit for the “manifestly cut down attendance” but we do not deserve all of it. B. C. Goodpasture, H. Leo Boles and others in the Gospel Advocate have administered some stiff punches. The Firm Foundation has made a few mild, disapproving grimaces, but it is not displaying its former vigor. It seems to be tired and minded to serve as a “haven of refuge for the weak and faint-hearted.” We are not running a hospital, we are
PERIODIC NAUSEA

A brother who is reported to suffer from attacks of periodic nausea about as often as the Bible Banner appears relates a very pathetic case wherein “a splendid Christian woman” fell very suddenly and figuratively sick at her figurative stomach. The sad situation is presented in these words:

A splendid Christian woman who had been reading what purported to be a religious journal threw it down and exclaimed; “That makes me sick!” Her action was suited to her words. Even her expression of face indicated her indignation and feeling of nausea.

The brother chivalrously shared the indignation of the sick sister and suffered such a violent sympathetic attack that soon his “action was suited to her words.” A whole article on sick women and sick preachers is calculated to precipitate a widespread epidemic of upset weak stomachs, so I think it expedient to pass around a little soda and paregoric as a sort of first aid treatment until the doctor arrives.
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A HAVEN OF REFUGE
CLEDE, WALLACE

Brother Jess Hall of Itasca, Texas sends his thanks to Brother Showalter of the Firm Foundation, who was pleased enough with it to put it in the paper. Here are his words:

I want to thank you for your splendid editorial in the June 3rd issue of the Firm Foundation on “Religious Journalism.” The letter by Brother M. C. Franklin was timely and along with your editorial and by way of encouragement, I hope will serve as a haven of refuge wherein the weak and faint-hearted may seek safety from the destructive deluge of hatred and intense aversion, coming from the muddy fountains of supposed to be strong brethren.

Under ordinary circumstances, it would please me for Brother Hall to compliment Brother Showalter. I have done the same thing myself and have defended him against charges that I thought were unjust. The circumstances in this case are somewhat unusual. Brother Showalter seems to be playing second fiddle to us in that some of the brethren are sending him daggers intended for us wrapped in compliments for himself. We can take it all right as best we can. Brother Hall is welcome to the compliments and we assure him that we feel capable of taking care of the daggers.

It seems very “timely” for Brother Franklin to classify us as “factionists” and “ecclesiastical gangsters” and call on brethren everywhere to refuse us all recognition and for Brother Showalter to publish it and write an editorial “by way of encouragement.” It is generally known that we have carried on a persistent campaign and an effective one against subversive movements in the church. At times the fight has been pretty bitter. We have been on the receiving end of a great deal of abuse, some of which has been recently published in the Firm Foundation. At the best, or the worst, as the case may be, Brother Showalter is not entitled to stand up in the temple and thank the Lord that he is not like other editors are, especially after publishing the Franklin “deluge of ... intense aversion.” We seem to be in the first act of a comedy of errors which threatens to become hilarious. Some “weak and faint-hearted” brethren need “a haven of refuge wherein” they “may seek safety from the destructive deluge” that flows “from the muddy fountains of” the Bible Banner. They are invited to take shelter under the benevolent wings of the Firm Foundation. Some of them will thrive and feel strong again when they get there and hear Brother Franklin call us names and John O’Dowd calls us nasty. We have a host of good brethren supporting us, some of them in high places, who are neither “weak” nor “faint-hearted.” If any feel the need of the “haven of refuge” offered them in the Firm Foundation, they have our permission to take advantage of it, and we advise them to get going, for this “deluge” we do not preach and we do not write like the irresponsibles some are trying to yoke us up with for universal rejection by the brethren. Nobody has a greater aversion to their imperceptive rantings than we have. We build up churches and they tear them down. The truth of this is best known where both of us are known. The charge made against us in the Firm Foundation that we are waging a fight against young preachers inspired by jealousy is too incredible and absurd to even be denied. We are not asking for any sympathy and have no martyr acts to put on. We are proud of the fight we have made because we believe we are right and we propose to continue that fight along the same line. I am thinking that some of the casualties of this war would not be too welcome under the wings of the Firm Foundation. Whenever the editor of the Firm Foundation thinks it “timely” to inaugurate a movement to refuse us “all recognition” for anything we advocate or practise, we will be glad to have him frankly and clearly formulate the charges and we promise to consider them fully and fairly. We will not accept M. C. Franklin and John O’Dowd as prosecutors, judges and jury in the case. Brother Showalter has the right, of course, to his opinion about our type of journalism, and to express it if he wants to. For one, I do not mind saying that I have a high regard for his opinions. I do not think he can blame me much for saying that I do not think he is contributing anything to the cause of the higher type of journalism he craves by allowing men, who are no better than we are, and who are emotionally upset besides, to say the things about us that have appeared on the pages of the Firm Foundation. We take no pleasure in joining issue with the Firm Foundation on anything. Like many others we are still somewhat under the spell of that name. There are some personal ties that bind us to its editor. We would much prefer to join him in abhorring that which is evil and cleaving to that which is good. We would not think we were very good neighbors if we set our dogs on him every time he passed our front gate. If he can’t make his behave he ought to put an editorial chain on them when we are around. No offense is intended and will not be taken unless somebody presses the figure farther than we intend him to.

Ending The Third Year

With the July issue, the Bible Banner ends its third year. All subscriptions dating from the first issue of each year are due. There are others that are over due. The address label on your paper shows the expiration date. Save the Bible Banner the expense of mailing notices by sending your renewal now.
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DEALING IN PERSONALITIES

CLED E. WALLACE

Some people think it is a mistake, even wicked, to ever deal in personalities, but there are some things of a personal nature I want to talk about and I'm going to call names. So gird yourself for the worst and get that thrill that comes occasionally through utter disappointment. I hope that the shock of a let-down will not be too much for you. If after reading this, you still insist on having the worst, you may write my friend Brother Frank L. Cox of the Firm Foundation and he will offer you a hundred copies of "the April 15th number" of a certain paper from "Dear Junior." If that number is exhausted any other date will serve as well, if not better. If the demand for it has exceeded the supply ahead of you, you can get the lowdown on us by reading what M. Č. Franklin and John O'Dowd says about us in the Firm Foundation. But I recommend that you stick to the Banner and get a higher type of journalism than that.

I am at this writing in a meeting in Mission, Texas in the Rio Grande Valley. Whoever named it "The Magic Valley" had something real to justify his enthusiasm. It is a garden of delight with its widespread citrus fruit orchards and fertile fields that produce corn, cotton and vegetables of many varieties. It really defies description. Its magic is not spontaneous. It is the result of intelligent planning, hard labor and thrifty attention to details. Nature is generous in rewarding the diligent but grudging in what she hands out to the slothful.

There are a number of faithful churches and preachers carrying on the work of the Lord throughout this section. The Bible Banner enjoys a wide circulation down here and the assurances of support and endorsement we are receiving is highly encouraging and greatly appreciated.

The church at Mission has a neat meeting house in the heart of the city near the business district. Brother W. R. (Billy) Wolfrum lives here and preaches and teaches the Bible. He may not be "My Most Unforgettable Character" but he comes in the unforgettable class. I met him a good many years ago and have not forgotten him yet. I did the preaching in some meetings at Wellington, Texas a long time ago when he lived there and preached for the church. He has a record everywhere for honesty, upright living and constructive work in the church. He is now in the middle age bracket and has a spot on the top of his head that reminds me of a drowned out place in a hay field. At that he is not hard to look at when you get used to him. He and his faithful wife came down here not very many years ago. It is my impression that he came down for much more than that. I have a lot of confidence in him for if a compound dose of premillennialism and digression under one skull does not add up to an incurable case, I am, although I'm not trying to start an argument. He is a distant relative as there are two girls between us. A lot of people think Fox is older than I am. Well, he's not; or at least, not as old as I am. However, I do not argue that point but hold it as a private opinion. Sometime ago a dear old soul argued with me that Fox was the oldest child. She used to live next door to the family and knew. I never did convince her and finally gave it up.

Brother Baxter, Batsell to me, and I have been friends since we were in the 'teen age. He is a little older than I am, although I'm not trying to start an argument. He is a teacher of Bible in Harding College and is somewhat of a specialist on premillennialism. He knows the theory and the answer to it. He is proud of the fact that he has only one preterist in his Bible classes at Harding and he is a digressive. That one exception should not be held against him for if a compound dose of premillennialism and digression under one skull does not add up to an incurable case, I can't think of anything just now that would. Anyhow, I have a lot of confidence in Batsell Baxter. He is saddened and somewhat lonely. Sister Faye, his wife and a marvelous woman, went where Christ is a few months ago. I knew them both before they were married and have since often enjoyed the hospitality of their home. Such memories draw people close together. Brother Baxter assured me that we had his hearty support in the work we are doing in the Bible Banner and would sign his name to it if we ever needed it. And he would do just that. If the proposition to "deny us all recognition" ever comes to a vote, somebody is going to get the surprise of their lives.
CONTRIBUTOKIAL

FACTS ABOUT THE FACTIONS

E. C. KOLTENBAH

When the Horse Cave, Ky., tragedy reared its ugly head in our midst a notion about factions was circulated in that community. The faithful few who set about courageously to re-establish apostolic worship and practice were stigmatized by the digressive element as a "faction." This attitude is not peculiar to that community, but sectarian and subversive elements everywhere so condemn the worshippers of the apostolic order. This being true it is deemed expedient to review some facts about factions in the hope of lending encouragement to the faithful in those fields where the unadulterated gospel is least popular. In one sense it should be encouraging to all loyal brethren to realize that the truth is generally unpopular.

A faction is a party in opposition to another group; a party unscrupulously promoting its private ends at the expense of the public good; discord; dissension. Factiousness is a disposition to clamor and raise opposition. We may sum up the matter thus: a faction is a party split off from the main group in order to promote its own interests in opposition to the main group. The size of the faction is irrelevant. Question: In the Horse Cave affair; what constituted the main group, upon what was it founded, and who has departed from it? This question is just as pertinent to the so called unity conferences. This is a live issue and not even the smothering effect of the unity conferences can stifle it.

There are no less than nine occurrences of the word, "faction," or "heresy" (Hairesis), in the New Testament. There are other words used synonymously, but this one furnishes enough facts for this brief dissertation. 1. Acts 5:17. Luke applies the term to the Sadducees. There can be no misunderstanding as to the factious nature of this group of Jews. 2. Acts 15:5. Here the term is applied to the Christian Jews who were of the Pharisees. The baneful effect of the factious spirit manifested in this party is evident even after conversion to Christ. It took the combined efforts of the apostles and the elders in Jerusalem to hold them in check. They caused Paul a world of trouble. 3. Acts 26:5. Here Paul admits his former affiliation with the Pharisees, showing his intense party zeal in persecuting the church. 4. Acts 24:5. In this instance the term was applied to the Christians by their persecuting enemies who sought to destroy the cause of Christ. There can be no doubt as to their use of the term. 5. Acts 24:14. This text occurs in the same context with Acts 24:5. Paul here admits that he is among the accused, but without admitting that the Christians were a sect. He refused that name. 6. Acts 28:22. In this case the Jews of Rome applied the name to the Christians, but in ignorance. 7. 1 Cor. 11:19. Paul names the parties of opposition in Corinth, "heresies," and that in condemnation. 8. Gal. 5:20. This text alone ought to settle the matter for in it Paul lists factions as a work of the flesh. The very fact that heresies fall in this list of sins presupposes the exclusion of the faithful in Christ from the designation of a faction. The application of this term to loyal believers, in view of its use by the Holy Spirit (Gal. 5:20), and the curse resting upon those so designated by the Spirit (2 Pet. 2:1), is closely akin to blasphemy. 9. 2 Pet. 2:1. Who needs explanation here is without understanding.

In these occurrences the word is translated, "sect," six times; "factions," one time; "parties," one time; and "heresies," one time (American Standard Version). The King James translation renders it, "sect," five times, and "heresies" (singular and plural), four times. Now it is evident that in every occurrence the word has an odious meaning. It goes without says, then, that when one stigmatizes others with this term one ought to be prepared to prove his right to do so and have the courage to put his proof forward in challenge to any objection. We might add another text carrying a different form of the word under consideration. "A factious man (a heretic) after a first and second admonition refuse: knowing that such a one is perverted, and sinneth, being self-condemned." Ti. 3:10-11. This statement contains a well-defined injunction, its reason, and the ground of that reason. Our care is not in understanding it, but in applying and obeying it, for it is plain.

In 1 Cor. 11:18-19 the word, "factions" or "heresies," is used synonymously with the word, "divisions." In 1 Cor. 3:3 Paul stamps the motives and open rifts of this condition as carnality-worldliness. Without being further tedious we briefly note several self-evident facts which show conclusively that the church of the Lord is not a faction.

1. The apostle Paul refused to admit that the church was a faction (Acts 24:14.)
2. Paul and Peter both condemned factions (1 Cor. 11:19, Gal. 5:20, 2 Pet. 2:11)
3. Paul commanded to turn away from factionists or opinionative persons who refuse admonition (Ti. 3:10-11)
4. A faction is a split off of the main body; but the church began as a new body. Modernists call it a development of Judaism; but believers know that the law of Moses; the authority of what is called Judaism, was nailed to the cross, and that the church was purchased with Christ’s blood (Acts 20:28), Judaism now has as much authority for existing as any other 'ism-none.
5. Factions are begun and maintained by men (2 Pet. 2:1; the church by Jesus Christ (Matt. 16:18, Eph. 4:16).
6. Factions rest upon the authority of men (Col. 2:18); the church upon Christ's authority (Col. 1:18).
7. Factions boast of certain distinguishing marks and doctrines which brand them as such. For instance, the group which digressed in Horse Cave boasted of their brotherly love and loudly gave as proof their fellowship with sectarians, Boll, and Christian Church preachers and members. There are a good many implications involved in such a position. It is not as simple as it looks, nor is it as innocent as it seems. We hereby challenge, as we did challenge before, that any man prove that such a position as that taken by the digressive and Boll element in Horse Cave (or any cave) is scriptural. Well, in opposition to the boast of factions, the church of God is "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. 3:15), So it has the Bible only as its rule. 
of faith and practice and can not and does not boast of any other distinguishing marks and characteristics than those set forth in the Word of God.

8. Factions, in the very nature of the case, are the exact antithesis of unity; the church of Christ exemplifies unity.

9. Factions cause evil (Jas. 3: 16); the church does good since it is the one support of the truth.

10. Factions are damnable (2 Pet. 2:1); the church is glorious (Eph. 5:27).

11. Factions destroy men (2 Pet. 2:1, Gal. 5:20,21); the church leads men to salvation (cf. Phil. 2:15-16).

12. Factions will be destroyed (Matt. 15: 13); the church saved (Eph. 5: 25-27).

Now it is pertinent to ask, are faithful churches of Christ factions? In answer we list these facts:

1. The church of the first century which was directly under the supervision of the apostles carried divine names only; present day churches of Christ do the same.

2. The first century churches of Christ recognized but one Founder (Matt. 16:18); present day churches of Christ recognize no other.

3. The first century church rested upon but one foundation (1 Cor. 3:11); the present day church of the Lord so rests.

4. The first century church had but one law of pardon for alien sinners (Mk. 16:16, Acts 2:38); the present day church of Christ has the same law and no other.

5. The first century church followed one practice, the apostolic (Acts 2:42, Phil 4:9); churches of Christ now so practice.

6. The first century church had but one organization to do the work and for the worship of the church, namely, local congregations with their elders and deacons; present day churches of Christ so teach and practice.

7. The first century church had but one form of government, the Headship of Christ; the true church today is identical.

8. The first century church had but one means of supporting the work of the church (1 Cor. 16:1-2, Gal. 6:6); the church of Christ today has no other means.

9. The first century church had but one rule of faith and practice (1 Tim. 3:16-17); churches of Christ now have the same rule.

10. The first century church worshipped in public assembly in praying, preaching and teaching, communing at the Lord’s Supper, fellowshipping together, reading the scriptures, and singing psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs; churches of Christ do the same things now.

11. The first century church opposed false doctrines and practices under the tutelage of the apostles; the present day church of Christ does exactly the same thing.

12. The first century church had a great purpose, viz.: save the lost, edify the saved, glorify God, and earnestly look for the return of the Lord; churches of Christ now have that purpose.

So, 1. The churches of Christ in the first century were not factions.

2. Present day churches of Christ are identical in doctrine, worship and practice to churches of Christ in the first century.

3. Therefore, churches of Christ are not factions today.

With these facts before us we are ready to consider certain deductions based up on them.

1. That any group (of Christians) that withdraws from any sort of willful disorderliness or perversion of the truth and takes its stand upon the pure Word of God cannot right-ly be considered a faction. The loyal brethren in Horse Cave had to do that.

2. That any Christian who withdraws from sectarian practice and from the perversion of the truth and takes his stand upon God’s word cannot be considered a factionist.

3. That any withdrawal from error in affirmation of the truth stamps the group from which withdrawal is necessarily made a faction.

4. That any group which draws away from the truth in order to fellowship with error makes itself a faction. This is precisely what the digressive element in Horse Cave did. So they are a faction even if in the majority. What is true there is true elsewhere; the locality is incidental.

5. That he who supports a faction is a factionist. (If chips fly in anyone’s direction, he is to remember that a hot blade is not far away).

6. That no faction can rightly lay claim to the true church.

7. That the very presence of loyal churches of Christ condemns factions as such.

8. That churches of Christ have no other choice than to obey the scriptures relative to factions when occasion demands. Cf. Rom. 16:17, Ti. 3:10-11, 2 Jn. 9-11, etc.

9. That churches of Christ are scripturally bound to stand in opposition to every kind of faction.

10. That efforts of churches to fellowship with and con-done sectarianism render such churches factional in spirit, and such practices, if not stopped, result inevitably in schism.

11. That any doctrine, practice, or act of worship, introduced into the worship and life of the church as such for which there is no scriptural authority is factional by nature and is to be avoided.

12. That the fearful curse divinely invoked upon factionalism in its manifold manifestations should drive every man to his knees in abject humility and complete self surrender to the Lord of Glory who is blessed forever! Such humility will eliminate from the heart those desires and lusts which, when gratified, introduce the elements or factionalism into the church.

Divisions are effects. Effects cannot be removed except by complete eradication of the causes. Unity conferences are thus powerless to cope with schism for those conferences who practice the elements of faction have openly declared their determination to continue in these divisive practices. If, with the open Bible before them, men persist in multiplying schism in multiplied concrete cases, what abstract panacea can be fondly looked for in conferences which avowedly spurn both scriptural diagnosis and treatment of the very causes of the division over which the conferences are called? In division, God accuses, man excuses; God calls to repentance, man calls a conference; God demands obedience, man says, “Prophesy unto us good!” When men see heresy as a heinous sin and do what God says to do to escape it, division will vanish as the shades of night before the glory of the rising sun. Since the whole-hearted acceptance of the Word of God and a faith-ful practice of its teaching inevitably and invariably results in the unity of those who so believe and practice, we are compelled to conclude that a conference to discuss’ ways and means to unite religious bodies is an imposition upon the credulity of man and a travesty upon the Word of God!
The words "mission" and "missionary" do not occur in the Bible, at least they are not listed in Young's Analytical Concordance, but I use them in the common and accepted usage today.

There is very little controversy over the fact that more mission work needs to be done, than is being done. The duty of making known to the world the "manifold wisdom of God" is resting upon the church (Eph. 3:9-11), and every member of the church is responsible for the work to the extent of his ability. That there is not enough of the work done is admitted by all; and in this article I want to point out some of the reasons why there is no more interest shown in this work. I think the brotherhood is interested in the salvation of the souls of men, but that many times the way mission work is carried on and supported, discourages brethren from wanting to have anything to do with it. I will show some things that hinder mission work; I think the greatest hindrances are from the very ones connected with the work.

Gospel work must be scriptural. In sending preachers to a field to work and supporting the work, the Bible plan must be followed. To use unscriptural means and methods of scriptural work is inconsistent and absurd. When a work has to be supported by means equally as unscriptural as the "ladies aid society," I think we had better wait to do that work until it can be done and supported on a scriptural basis. I think we lose our claim to the scriptural-ness of the work, when we use unscriptural and denominational methods to raise money for it.

Something more is needed in mission work than zeal, zeal is all right if directed in scriptural channels; but misdirected zeal is a detriment to the church and the spread of New Testament Christianity. The very first thing to be considered, concerning an endeavor, is the question of whether it is according to the Lord's plan or not. In mission work two things should be considered (1) character and qualifications of the one doing the work, (2) whether the financing is scriptural. Unsound missionaries and unscriptural financing have combined to kill many people's interest in the work.

The first thing I will consider here is, What about the man to do the work? A man that is unsound on many principles at home will not become sound just because he is sent out to some other field to plant the church. The men sent to do mission work must be loyal to Christ in every detail. They must be men that will not compromise with sin and denominationalism.

I knew of one case out here in the northwest of a man leaving a new congregation and another man coming to take the work and carry on. The preacher who was leaving began giving lessons on compromise to his successor. He explained, "Now you have just got to go easy on the divorce question, dancing, card playing etc. until you get the work established in these new places." That kind of preaching and mission work may get numbers, and give the preacher something to report as visible results to the folks back home who are supporting him, but that sort of thing will never build a loyal New Testament church.

Again one mission worker explained to another, "I call on a certain denominational preacher to lead prayer when he is here, I want to be nice to him, I think I am about to get one family of his members." One thing sure, after calling on a denominational preacher to lead the prayer of the congregation, he will never be able to prove to the congregation that the denominational preacher is in error and that his denomination will lead to hell. Calling on sectarian leaders to lead our prayers is to recognize them as children of God and surrender our plea of distinction.

Sometimes premillennialists are sent as missionaries to new territories. I know of one in a foreign field today being supported by a somewhat loyal congregation. Personally I had as soon see a Methodist who believed in infant baptism sent. Suppose this missionary establishes something which in my opinion is not very likely, the thing he establishes will be a Judaistic society, with doctrines as foreign to the Bible as they can be. Yes, I think I know how this condition arises, here is how it is.

First a man decides he wants to be a missionary, sometimes his decision is brought about by the fact that he can't find work in this country. The next step is to get in with some agent or society, and that agent or society begins to build him up, and write letters over the country looking for a church to sponsor his work. The millions dying without the gospel are pictured, and churches sometimes yield to this call because of the need, without investigating the man very much. I recognize that many are dying without the gospel, but I think we should be sure that what we are sending them is the pure gospel. Just because many are lost without the gospel is no reason for sending and supporting someone appointed and self-recommended missionary to any section of the world. The presence of the missionary will not help the condition one bit unless he reaches the people with the pure gospel. So the thing to be considered in sending out missionaries is the question, What will they do when they get there? Will they preach the gospel, or will they promote some "ism" and compromise with denominations. If we can be sure that they will preach the gospel, then let us send them; but if uncertain let us pause and learn about the missionary's before we hasten to the field.

Another thing to be considered in mission work is the ability of the man sent to do the work. Churches sometimes send men on the hard jobs that they would not have for their home work. It takes more ability to go into a new place and establish a church than it does to preach to a congregation already established. We don't need men in "mission" work, that are failures in "local" work, (some make this distinction however I can see no difference, but my point is, if a man is a failure in one field that is comparatively easy, don't send him to a harder field.) I am sure that if a man can't do satisfactory work in a local congregation, that he will not be much good in a new field. Better consider the ability of the man along with other things.

I don't mean to indicate that a preacher to do mission work in a new field must be a fire-eater, or that "he must skin them just like I think they ought to be skinned" but I mean that it takes a faithful, courageous, sacrificing man with some ability to accomplish good in a new territory.

I consider the greatest menace to the work and interesting Christians in it, is the "racket" that many have made of mission work. There are some who have never done any of the work, but have for many years been promoting and begging finances to be sent through them for
the work. The promoter agents and agencies are like many of the missionaries, self-appointed and accountable only to themselves. I have a letter that I want to use as an example to show how these one-man mission societies work.

The church here sponsored some work in Cheyenne, Wyo.; and except for one or two instances that work was kept free from all "our" (?) missionary agencies. Here is how one of the agencies worked in connection with that work. The agent wrote one of the elders of the congregation here and sent a "second-hand" donation, (One that had been sent to him to be used as he saw fit), to be applied on the Cheyenne work. He wrote a letter with the donation and began crying, "I thought I had a number of friends there," "I know you have a friend in me," and ended by asking "please send me some subscriptions to my paper." With this sugar ($1.50 second-hand donation) he wanted to further his personal interest here.

This shows the devices of the agents, just how they work. The agent gets himself up as a missionary expert, and professes to know the fields that are needy, and then asks people to send their contributions to him and he will distribute them as he sees fit. A beautiful set-up from the outside, looks like a strategy of a denominational bishop; but it has no resemblance to the New Testament order of things.

Notice that when the agent passes the donation on he has a string tied to the contribution saying, "Please send me some subscriptions." In other words these "second-hand" donations are used to place churches under obligation to the missionary agent, who then tries to dictate the policy of the church. Such activity is an insult to the brotherhood, it needs to be exposed; and brethren should quit sending money to these missionary agents. This is a representative story of every dollar that goes to the "one man mission societies," it shows that every dollar is used by the agent to glorify the agency, and further the selfish designs of the operator.

Brethren the Bible just does not authorize the "middleman" or the society through which to do the work. We need a restoration of the Bible plan of financing gospel work.

In the October issue of the Bible Banner I pointed out the fact that the Pepperdine Foundation in Los Angeles, Calif., had every essential characteristic of a mission society. It does mission work, supports or contributes to the support of the work of preaching the gospel; not only that but has published a little booklet in which others are asked to contribute to the Foundation, and states that your dollar will go farther in the Foundation than elsewhere. No one denies the Foundation the right to operate a school or a hospital, but does it have a right to 'invade the realm that God ordained for the church? My arguments made then have not been answered, they have not been explained away, and they still stand as the unvarnished truth, whether admitted or not.

We preach that there is one God, and that he is a jealous God; this forbids us having more than one God. We also preach that there is one body, which cost the blood of Christ; I think this forbids forming another body to do the work that the Lord ordained the church to do. Any other body robs God of the glory he should receive through the church.

The Bible recognizes only two units to do gospel work, the church Phil. 4:15-15, and the individual 2 Tim. 1:16-18. If we hold to the New Testament pattern we can have no other method or means of supporting gospel work, I contend we don't need any other. Individuals or organizations that propose to do what missionary societies do constitute de facto mission societies, whether they admit it or not. Toleration of de facto mission societies among us will pave the way for a wholesale digression, the spirit that tolerates one departure will tolerate a dozen if allowed to grow.

The building or forming of a mission society (whether it is a one-man type or one with a number of officers) defeats the very purpose for which it is allegedly formed gospel preaching. The forming of the society to send the gospel, perverts the gospel plan of work; so at the very best they just send a perverted gospel. Generally in most places they have enough perverted religions without adding another to increase the confusion. By tying a society or unscriptural activity on the work, it ceases to be pure gospel by the time it reaches the lost.

Some want to make excuses for unscripturalness in financing the work upon the grounds that the work must be done, and that it doesn't make so much difference how it is supported, just so it is done. In other words "do evil that good may come," a thing which does not happen. If you cut a hole in Bible truth to bring in the society (the one-man type or the Pepperdine Foundation type), through the same hole will come the other rats that are in the Christian church; "instrumental music," "open membership" and "worldliness" until you have nothing but a denominational rat trap, with every sort of rat (sin) in it that can be imagined. The same arguments to justify the societies among us could be used to justify instrumental music or any other innovation.

Let me make the plea that loyal brethren quit supporting unscriptural missionary agents-societies, and that loyal preachers do like James E. White, the Indian Evangelist, did, refuse to be taken over by the "one-man societies" and keep separate from such activities. It might mean that some preachers would lose a little support for a time, but what is that compared to the great service of checking a departure-if money is all you want, get with the Christian church and the U. C. M. S. Let us return to the Bible plan, and through the church make known to the world the manifold wisdom of God, as it is revealed in the gospel.

WALLACE-TAYLOR CAMP MEETING
FOY E. WALLACE, JR., Evangelist AUSTIN TAYLOR, Song Director
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO July 20-31
TWO SERVICES DAILY
Help Firmly Establish the Cause of Christ and Sound Doctrine in Colorado. Take your vacation in the Rockies and enjoy a Spiritual Feast with your physical relaxation.

Further information about the meeting or the scenic country around Colorado Springs will be furnished by Tew W. McElroy, minister, Pikes Peak Avenue church of Christ, 1402 W. Pikes Peak Avenue, Colorado Springs, Colorado.
The first of the “Unity Meetings W. C.” (Note: “W. C.” means “without Christ”) was held in the plains of Shinar about the year 2247 B.C. “And the whole earth was of one language, and of one speech. And it came to pass, as they journeyed from the east, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar; and they dwelt there. And they said one to another, Go to, let us make brick, and burn them thoroughly. And they had brick for stone, and slime had they for mortar. And they said, Go to, let us build us a city and a tower, whose top may reach unto heaven; and let us make a name, lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth. And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men builded. And the Lord said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have Imagined to do. Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech. So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city. Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the Lord confound the language of all the earth: and they left off to build the tower. So the Lord scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and from thence did the Lord scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth.” (Gen. 11:1-9).

There was unity among those who sought to build the tower of Babel. But God had not wanted them to build the tower. It is true that we do not read where He had told them not to build a tower whose top might reach unto heaven, but He did not want it done or He would have told them to build it. That He opposed it is shown in that He scattered the people who were “one.” The “Christian Church” has been one in its purpose to build a tower of additions to God’s word. It is our purpose to scatter every attempt to add to or take from the word of God. We are opposed to any unity that leaves God out. But we want the unity which He has commanded.

When we try to show our religious neighbors the difference between the doctrines of men and the doctrine of Christ, they often say, “Well, we are all going to the same place. If we do not meet again in this world, we will see you in the next world.” They are accustomed to talking with others who are engaged in the same kind of religious-denominational religions—all of whom go beyond the doctrine of Christ. It really does not make any difference whether you are building a tower of Babel or drilling a well that God has not commanded, you are going to the same place. You can build a tower to hell or drill a well to hell! God commanded that we “keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” It is our prayer and purpose to accomplish that unity and to keep it. The church of Christ wanted the unity of the Spirit back there when the “Christian Church” wanted division and brought it about by their “towers of Babel.” God wanted that unity of the Spirit. But those who wanted the musical instruments and other additions to God’s word “scattered” instead of gathering. Jesus said, “He that is not with me is against me, and he that gathereth not with me scattereth.” (Matt. 12:30). As long as they make additions to the word of God, or retain the ones that they have made, they are engaged in scattering, not in gathering with Christ. The unity of the Spirit will scatter the scatterers. A unity with the “Christian Church” which is not brought about by their renouncing their additions to the New Testament, would be to scatter what Christ has gathered.

We want unity but not at just any price. We want no unity that will sacrifice the truth. Some read where we are justified by faith and then say justification is by “faith only.” Others read that we are saved by grace and then preach that “salvation is wholly of grace.” Still others read of the admonitions to “be at peace” and then advocate peace at any price. But the Bible says, “The wisdom from above is first pure then peaceable.” Purity first then peace. Peace and unity go together. “Keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.” The peace of God rests on those who keep the unity of the Spirit—that unity taught by the Spirit. God scattered those who would build the tower of Babel. He is against that unity which adulterates His word. “The wisdom from above is first pure then united.” Unless the purity of the word teaches a “Christian Church” there should be none. Unless the New Testament, the purity, teaches that instruments of music should be used in the worship, then no unity of the Spirit is ever possible with those who use them until they are abandoned. If the “Christian Church” will let Jesus give them a “cleansing of the temple” and “take all their additions to God’s word “scattered” then no unity of the Spirit is ever possible with those who use them until they are abandoned. If the “Christian Church” will let Jesus give them a “cleansing of the temple” and “take all their additions to God’s word “scattered” then no unity of the Spirit is ever possible with those who use them until they are abandoned.

Unity alone would be as unwelcome as sacrifice alone. Is sacrifice a good thing? It all depends. Is unity a good thing? It all depends. What is its purpose? Who commanded it? Is it in obedience to God? If not “to obey is better than sacrifice” or unity. (1 Samuel 15:22). King Saul would have been glad to have had a unity meeting with Samuel that morning after he had disobeyed God. He claimed to have “performed the commandment” of the Lord, but the cattle and sheep told on him. Now, there could have been two kinds of unity between Saul and Samuel. If Samuel had disobeyed God and united with Saul in a forbidden sacrifice that would have been unity without God. It would have been the kind of unity now being advocated by the “Christian Church” and smiled upon by brother Witty and some others. But if Saul had obeyed God in all things he would have been united with Samuel in the kind of unity that is approved of God. Sacrifice is all right if it is in obedience to God, but if not, “though I give my body to be burned and have not love (do not keep God’s commandments) it profits me nothing.” You could give
your body to be burned for unity that is not of the Spirit—that is not in obedience to God—and it would profit you nothing.

From all reports, those who attend the "unity meetings" do not discuss the differences that exist between the church of Christ and the "Christian Church." Maybe you wonder what goes on. I have never been to one of them, but I imagine they engage mostly in "Babel exercises."

Murch says, "Brother (winks at his brethren) Witty, spell unity." Now brother Witty has been keeping company with them a good deal lately and is just a little bit confused in his spelling—he is spell-bound maybe. But he does not remember whether unity begins with a "t" or not. And, if it does, he does not remember whether it be "be-nity" or "fun-ity." But the interrogative "progressive" offers a suggestion. He spells the word for brother Witty but puts the accent on the last syllable, so that it would be "un-ity"—pronounced "you-nitty." But that is the way they have always pronounced the church of Christ. But the Babel exercise continues. This time brother Witty asks Murch how to spell the word "fidelity." Now the "pro-gressives" (I just cannot see how they are progressive, unless it is like that of the crab—backward) have always maintained that it does not make any difference what follows just so you start right—just so you believe, repent and are baptized, never mind how you worship. So, Mr. Murch spells "fidelity" in their usual way. "fidel-ity." They will do it every time! But now, brother Witty, what are you going to do with such ideas? What grade will you give them on such "Babel lessons?" You know the difference between "fiddle" and "fidelity," don't you? Now the church of Christ would have to give up fidelity to God to be united with Murch and his fiddle. Is that the Unity for which you are working? As I see it, Witty's pretty ditty is too much Murch!

I heard a story that pretty well illustrates what goes on at the "unity meetings." A boy had been playing on a gully bank. He came in with holes in the knees of his pants. "What have you been doing" he was asked. "I have been, a-h praying," he said. But when he turned to walk away, it was evident that he had been back-sliding too. They may boast of praying a lot and talking much of unity at the "unity meetings," but it will take obedience to God to bring about the "unity of the Spirit." Wearing the knees of their pants out in prayer will never mend the backslidings of the "Christian Church."

THE WITTY-MURCH COALITION

For a long time there has lingered in the back of my mind that so-called, premillennialism and Witty-Murchism had many things in common. Birds of a feather still flock together. When I knew of our apologetic brethren attending the love feasts, designed to open the flood-gates of digression into the last fortress of loyalty to the word of God, I thought I could detect the odor of the Bollistic skunk. A few days ago I discovered the animal. It has its den right in the headquarters of the movement. I have known for a long time that the Christian Church was stricken from the center to circumference with every variety of premillennialism from the common boll-weevil type to the Rutherford-Russell-Zionist variety. But what I did not know was where Witty came in.

There fell into my hands a few days ago a little hook written by Claude F. Witty. It bears the title: "Babylon Is Falling." On pages 53 and 54 of this book are some things that if not premillennial would take but very little effort to render them such. Here is a sample: After quoting Daniel 7: 26-27, Bro. Witty observes: "Thus we see that, while the little horn became a mighty power, God and Christ brought him to judgment. They destroyed all of the four beasts, all of the horns, and then they completely destroyed the eleventh, or the little horn.

"Nor did the world end at this time as many might suppose; far from it. All of the territory under the whole heaven shall at this time pass into the possession of the people of the Most High, and all the dominion of the earth shall serve and obey him.

"What a picture! The little horn gone forever, God and Christ supreme, and all mankind united in one great Christian family." I think Witty and Bro. Armstrong can fully and freely strike hands over these outpourines of this apostle of union at any price. True unity can be had only upon the truth of God's word.

But back to Witty-Murch debacle. I have thought with others that I could foresee the emergence of a Premillennial sect garnered from all the future-kingdom advocates in all sections. I am predicting when, and if, this ever occurs, that Witty and his kind will, to use a schoolboy expression, be right in the big middle of it. For awhile I was somewhat apprehensive of the results of this affair and of its effect upon the church. I feel inclined now to observe that every lover of truth has written this movement down as a farce, and has it properly classified. Its appeal, is, and has been all along, to those among us who are as soft as mush (with apologies to the mush) anyway. Probably a few withdrawals of this brand would be a healthy thing for the church. A backslapping, Christian-Church-petting preacher is a poor asset to the body of the Lord. My experience with Christian Church preachers has been that they are the most tricky of all the sectarianists that we contact, and this experience has been a fairly wise one. The earnest honest souls among the Christian Church are coming are out of it. One of their finest young ministers whose announcement occurs in this issue of the Bible Banner has been led to see the light of their digression, has denounced them, and has taken his stand for truth in all things. May God hasten the day when others shall follow. God commands: "Come out of her, my people."

Geo. B. Curtis, Henryetta, Okla.

A COMMENDATION

To Whom It May Concern: I have known Bro. Ralph E. Bivins of Afton, Okla., for the last five years. I know him as a young man of splendid ability and the courage of his convictions. It was Ralph as a Christian Church minister in 1935 that was in a laree measure responsible for the two debates at Bentonville, Ark., with the Christian Church, with the editor of the Banner championing the cause of truth. Since that time Bro. Bivins has studied closely the question of instrumental music in Christian worship and the other innovations peculiar to the Christian Church. He has now renounced the use of mechanical instruments in the worship of God, severed all connections with the Christian Church and is standing with the church of Christ in all things. It gives me pleasure to commend him to the brotherhood of Christ and give my personal recommendation and hearty welcome to the rank of the preachers of the one body. May God's blessings rest upon him, and much good be done by him in the Lord's vineyard.

Geo. B. Curtis.
I have a letter from Searcy this morning stating that Harding is planning:

1. To dig me up by the roots. 2. Answer my allegations. 3. Wait for my counter attack. 4. Smother me under a barrage of affidavits.

In this you get the method of attack used in modern war fare in religion, as well as in Germany. To dig me up by the roots will be a delight to them, I am sure, for as long as there is a "root of the truth" left in me and Harding College, is defending Premillennialism, I shall be a "thorn in their flesh."

But let me ask Harding College and Brother Benson if it would not be better. 1. To get rid of premillennialism at Harding. 2. To stop defending the premillennialists over the country. 3. Stop having them hang around Harding as they have been for the past years. 4. Come out in the open and meet me before the brotherhood and prove that what I have is not the truth as I have asked and settle this affair once and for all. If I am lying about it: if Brother Armstrong has not written these letters; if he has not published the articles I say he has, then a public discussion on the issue will show me up and forever ruin me with an honest brotherhood. I will then have "rooted myself up by the roots" and would have saved Harding all that trouble. They know I have what I say I have and they had rather "root some body up" than meet the issue and correct their errors.

But this is no new threat to me. I have had to meet all the time such charges here as the following:

1. That I want to be president of Harding and that I have threatened to so be.

2. That I want to be Dean of Bible, and have threatened to so be.

3. That I want to be president of the Board and have threatened to so be.

4. That I threatened to get them out so that I could place Brother L. R. Wilson in as president of the school, and I would then become Dean of Harding College • and we would run it. (It is a fact that about seven years ago one of the board members who was a special frierd of Brother Wilson's told me that Brother Armstrong was looking for some one to become president of the school, and this board member asked me what I thought about Brother Wilson's becoming that president. I asked him if Brother Armstrong would allow Brother Wilson to be the president and he said that he was sure he would. I was asked by this man to find out what could be done about it. As I now remember I never mentioned it to Brother Wilson in my life and this same board member spoke to others about him and one or two asked me about it and I remember telling one or two men that it would not work, that Wilson was not the man to work with Brother Armstrong.)

5. That I am the Pope of Arkansas.

6. It has even been told that I admitted that not one of these things I am publishing is true and that I am just doing it to try to hurt the school because I am jealous of them.

I am willing to meet the issue before the public but they take cover in tracts that mislead and whispering campaigns that are false. The reason for my tracts on this is that I can't get them to come out in the open before the brotherhood and it is my only means of defense. I will only be too glad to meet them face to face and discuss it. Then if I am wrong you will know, and if they are wrong you will know.

Brother Benson admitted to me in private conversation that these letters and articles were premillennial and that Brother Armstrong should be retired but he did not know how to get it done, but that he would retire him if he taught it in the schools if "he found it out." He was confronted with this material, most of it at Ft. Smith, and he together with Bro. Sears, gave as their reason for not retiring Brother Armstrong, that Brother Armstrong was so old and his health so bad that it would kill him to have to stop. Brethren Benson and Sears admitted to Brother Pool that Brother Armstrong is premillennial but that they could do nothing about it, and Brother Sears said they just could not keep him from writing these things.

I have a letter from Brother Mc-Nutt in Memphis Tennessee saying that Brother Clark said in the presence of others besides Bro. Mc-Nutt that he, Clark, had advised Benson that he should get rid of Brother Armstrong and Brother Benson told him that "he did not seem to know how to go about obtaining his resignation, in view of his age and long connection with the college." In this same conversation Brother Clark said that Brother Benson had admitted to him that Brother Armstrong was not right on this issue, and admitted his position on 1 Cor. 15:23-28, and Brother Clark told him that he should get rid of Brother Armstrong.

I have a letter from Brother Lyles, of Muskogee, Oklahoma, saying: "There are many things of which I have wondered since the Ft. Smith meeting a few years ago. When we were in-recently I heard some things that caused me to remember the Ft. Smith meeting. If you remember correctly Brethren Benson, Sears, and Sherrill all admitted in that meeting that Brother Armstrong is premillennial, but that it would kill him to retire him from the work. Later it was learned that he knew of the meeting (Brother Armstrong) all the time. During the meeting Brother Sherrill denied nothing but rather tried to prove that the stand they were taking was right. He even stated John T. Hinds and David Lipscomb taught the theory which proof he never submitted." This letter goes on to say that while on this same trip "one preacher stated he (a certain teacher in Harding now.) knew Brother Armstrong taught premillennialism but not the same as Boll. He stated nature would soon take care of the matter. If I remember correctly this same thought was advanced in Ft. Smith. It seems to me that it would be far better for the soul of a man to try to teach him his error than wish he would die. It seems to me that Brother Armstrong's supposed friends would rather see him pass on than try to convince him of his error. I love Brother Armstrong and hope he lives long on the earth but pray he may become convinced of the danger of his position before it is too late."

Now brethren just remember this: If I had wanted to be teaching in the school or had I wanted to be on the board of Harding College I could have gotten in by just doing what they wanted me to do. I was asked by them to come to their meetings: to appear at different times on their programs. Brother Benson has asked me several times to appear on their lecture courses. He even tried to get me to teach Bible this year, that is the past term, at Harding and it has even been discussed at times of my being a member of the board.

I have spoken once or twice at Harding in years past and appeared
on one of their Thanksgiving programs upon the promise that Harding was going to clean up. I even told Brother Benson that I would teach two days a week at Harding this past school term provided that Brother West will make Dean of Bible but that term only. For I would under no circumstance tie myself down to a school. My work with the church is too inviting and pleasant to give it up for school life.

Now as to waiting for my counter attack, I am able to send that counter attack on in advance due to the kindness of some friend I have there at Searcy, unknown to me thus far and I am sure unsuspected by them. They may be assured of the fact that I shall defend myself and if needs be I shall tour the brotherhood with these facts and challenge them on every hand to meet me in public. I am sure I have a number of places that I can appear and present the actual proof. So if they wish to try to ruin my influence in the above threats then may the Lord have mercy on them for I shall appear in person to see that truth is defended.

The threat to smother me with affidavits from people with whom I have talked is their privilege, but just remember I will meet Harding College in public debate on this issue. If they have the "goods on me" and I do not have "the goods" on them then why not meet me before the public and "root me up." That is what they want to do rather than settle this affair and have the truth to come to the front.

I remember that at the crucifixion of our Lord those in error were able to get the mob to swear falsely against the Christ. Naboth was put to death by the affidavits of false witnesses. Anything I have said I shall admit and keep fighting. One thing, be sure to remember. If Brother Armstrong is a premillennialist and I meet them and prove it, the "Battle of the Atlantic" will have been won and the "Axis Collaboration" with her threat of a blitz on Harper's honesty, will meet the same fate as did the "Bismarck" that now sleeps in "Davy Jones' Locker," and Harding will have to repudiate her present allies, the premillennialists, and come into the old Jerusalem order of the church, or "desert entirely" the church of our Lord and take his word with B. F. Davidson, Rutherford, Norris, Bogard, whom Brother Armstrong and Harding so gladly defended during our debate here at Little Rock, and all other Future kingdom advocates.

**IN APPRECIATION**

The Bible Banner is doing a work that no one has equaled in fifty years. The treatment you are called on to suffer from those who are obviously in the wrong is one of your very best recommendations. The noise they are raising shows that the Bible Banner is having a telling effect. I have followed you pretty closely and I cannot recall anything that you have exposed in the churches that every Christian is not solemnly obligated to expose.

Kindly accept my best wishes for success and happiness to you in your work.

James A. Allen, Publisher. Apostolic Times, Nashville, Tenn.

Your fight against denominationalism, sectarianism, false doctrine, worldliness and compromise continues to be appreciated by all who believe and know the truth. Let the battle continue unabated. I marvel at the accuracy of your predictions — for example, the prediction that Charles M. Neal could not be depended on to defend the truth and was headed toward denominationalism. That the Christian Leader would die when brethren knew the truth. I marvel, too, at your ability to "look unto Jesus the author and finisher of your faith" and therefore expose with equal fervor the error of your bitterest enemy or closest friend. It is this, Brother Wallace, which makes even your bitterest critics admit, "Wallace plays no favorites." My appreciation for the great service you have rendered the brotherhood in the past and for the good you are doing today continues to grow. Perhaps you do not need encouragement from such as I, yet even a farm horse nulls better if he receives a word of encouragement occasionally, so here it is and please keep uninfected! We seldom pray at our house but that we ask the Great Heavenly Father to keep His everlasting arms underneath you and give you strength to press the battle. The persecution, sorrow, tears, heartaches and long hours of labor here are not to be compared to the joys which you shall certainly know when the day dawns and the shadows flee away.

Yours in the kingdom,

George W. DeHoff, Portsmouth, Ohio.

---

**Premillennialism**

DO YOU KNOW WHAT THIS THEORY TEACHES? ARE YOU ABLE TO COMBAT ITS ERRORS?

ORDER THE Neal—Wallace

**Discussion**

Held At

Winchester, Ky., and Chattanooga, Tenn.

Proposition: The Bible clearly teaches that after the Second Coming of Christ and before the Final Resurrection and judgment there will be an Age or Dispensation of One Thousand Years during which Christ will reign on the Earth. A full Discussion of Modern Premillennialism Embracing the Following Live Questions:

1. Will Christ reign on the Earth a thousand years after his Second Coming?
2. Is there a future "millennium"?
3. Does Christ occupy David's Throne now?
4. Will national Israel be restored to Palestine?
5. Will Jerusalem become the capital of a World Kingdom?
6. Are the Old Testament Prophesies concerning fleshly Israel, "unfulfilled prophecy"?
7. Was the Kingdom of Dan. 2: 44 set up on Pentecost or was it postponed?
8. Is the Second Coming of Christ imminent-impending?
9. Are the theories of Premillennialism vital to Christianity?
10. Are the consequences of these theories destructive of the Gospel Plan of Salvation?
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Brother Showalter says he heard some nice things about Brother John and some that will judge us in the end. We were not so nice. Take him up one side and down the other, as Foy and I both were weaned on it. The Bible Banner would not even quote them. You will never see some of those expressions in our paper. We did not use them in the first place and do not propose to be guilty of "second-hand cussing" by passing them on even in quotation marks. We think we are cleaner in this respect than either Brother Franklin or the Firm Foundation. Brother Showalter says: "The vocabulary, about which Brother Franklin complains, justifies his vigorously expressed abhorrence. It is seriously vulnerable." I should say as much! You should not therefore have offended the sensibilities of your readers with them. We have publicly declined to "match adjectives" with the most intemperate villifier I have ever known to break forth in print. Regarding what he said and what we said, Brother Franklin remarks: "There is no choice. The one is as vindictive as the other." Very well, my brother, I have a proposition to make to you. You pick out the worst things you can find in my articles and I will pick out a few from your one article and you can put them in the Firm Foundation with due credit given and without comment let the readers judge how much "choice" there is. You have "vigorously expressed" yourself too, as Brother Showalter put it. The Firm Foundation is "going out by thousands to every part of the land." In it you call some prominent and widely-beloved-brethren "infamal," "malicious editors," "vindictive," "self-seeking ecclesiastical gangsters," deliberate rebels against God and other nice things like that. "What havoc will this matter not work, when it falls into the hands of a babe in Christ, or one who has recently been snatched from the toils of sectarianism? And when we tell folk that we take 'the Scriptures as our only rule of faith and action,' we will only be met by the contemptuous sneers of a to arrange some way to get a portable one and take it into all of us "indiscriminately." We do not claim that he is as bad as the crowd we jumped on, but the way he is using his teeth and nails, we do think he needs a little elementary instruction on the rules of a fair fight. As for the other crowd, they do not know there are any rules.

Really, we believe and try to practice all those Scriptures both Brother Franklin and Brother Showalter have quoted to us. Sometimes, though, I think we do not make a much better out at it, than they do sometimes. Believe me, though, Brother Franklin when I tell you that I do not hate anybody. I'm no plaster saint. It wouldn't do any good for me to tell you how good I am, for most of it just wouldn't be so. I do get aggravated at the brethren sometimes, some of them, for the way they carry on and can't even blame you for being "horrified." But let's you and me "learn to endure with much longsuffering vessels of wrath," and not too hard on each other. The Bible Banner has done some good, now hasn't it?, fighting isms of various kinds and standing up for the faith. The editor of the Firm Foundation says it has' and I believe he is right. Some of the ablest men in the church agree with us. You are the first one I have observed who called us "ecclesiastical gangsters" in print and that in the Firm Foundation. Why, Foy and I both were weaned on it. It may be partly responsible for some of our meanness, as well as some of the few virtues some people think we have. But I really do not believe you meant that and some other things you said. You were just aggravated like the little boy was who was trying to say his prayers one night before going to bed. "Now I lay me down to sleep, ..." and his little brother tickled his feet and he had to begin over again. The third time, he was interrupted, he said: "'Scuse me, Lord, till I slap the devil out of Tommy." I don't know just how long it will last, but I think Brother Franklin can now return to his devotions.

Brother John O'Dowd comes out in the Firm Foundation with a call for a peace conference. He hopes "that the parties involved in this controversy can get together and formulate some Christian peace terms." Well, now, I have heard some nice things about Brother John and some that were not so nice. Take him up one side and down the other. I do not believe that he is the sort of flower which would bloom brightly in the button-hole of a peace conference. If my information is correct, he is pretty much of a stormy petrel himself and has enough tempests of his own making to keep him pretty busy. As for us, we believe all we said about the activities of the wild boys, and up to date have nothing to take back or even discuss around a peace table. If we had to attend a peace conference everytime we attacked some abuse in or out of the church, we would have to arrange some way to get a portable one and take it along with us. Brother John doesn't express a very high opinion of us anyway and as long as he thinks of us as he says he does, we wouldn't take him along if he were portable. We think we are reasonable and we think we are right. We shall continue to say what we think ought to be said and of course everybody who reads it is at liberty to think or say what he pleases about it. Public opinion, enlightened or otherwise, will judge us here, and the Lord will judge us in the end. We face both judgments with calm confidence.

he voluntarily without any request from me, copied it on the editorial page of his paper. He did not even suggest that the language was "seriously vulnerable."

There is one little twist in this little tornado I can't figure out. Brother Franklin is, I think, properly "horrified" over the methods and the language of some who called that "horrified" us. We sailed into them with "vigorously expressed abhorrence" as Brother Showalter would say. Instead of helping us, Brother Franklin takes off his coat and sails into all of us "indiscriminately." We do not claim that he is as bad as the crowd we jumped on, but the way he is using his teeth and nails, we do think he needs a little elementary instruction on the rules of a fair fight. As for the other crowd, they do not know there are any rules.

Really, we believe and try to practice all those Scriptures both Brother Franklin and Brother Showalter have quoted to us. Sometimes, though, I think we do not make a much better out at it, than they do sometimes. Believe me, though, Brother Franklin when I tell you that I do not hate anybody. I'm no plaster saint. It wouldn't do any good for me to tell you how good I am, for most of it just wouldn't be so. I do get aggravated at the brethren sometimes, some of them, for the way they carry on and can't even blame you for being "horrified." But let's you and me "learn to endure with much longsuffering vessels of wrath," and not too hard on each other. The Bible Banner has done some good, now hasn't it?, fighting isms of various kinds and standing up for the faith. The editor of the Firm Foundation says it has' and I believe he is right. Some of the ablest men in the church agree with us. You are the first one I have observed who called us "ecclesiastical gangsters" in print and that in the Firm Foundation. Why, Foy and I both were weaned on it. It may be partly responsible for some of our meanness, as well as some of the few virtues some people think we have. But I really do not believe you meant that and some other things you said. You were just aggravated like the little boy was who was trying to say his prayers one night before going to bed. "Now I lay me down to sleep, ..." and his little brother tickled his feet and he had to begin over again. The third time, he was interrupted, he said: "'Scuse me, Lord, till I slap the devil out of Tommy." I don't know just how long it will last, but I think Brother Franklin can now return to his devotions.

Brother John O'Dowd comes out in the Firm Foundation with a call for a peace conference. He hopes "that the parties involved in this controversy can get together and formulate some Christian peace terms." Well, now, I have heard some nice things about Brother John and some that were not so nice. Take him up one side and down the other. I do not believe that he is the sort of flower which would bloom brightly in the button-hole of a peace conference. If my information is correct, he is pretty much of a stormy petrel himself and has enough tempests of his own making to keep him pretty busy. As for us, we believed all we said about the activities of the wild boys, and up to date have nothing to take back or even discuss around a peace table. If we had to attend a peace conference everytime we attacked some abuse in or out of the church, we would have to arrange some way to get a portable one and take it along with us. Brother John doesn't express a very high opinion of us anyway and as long as he thinks of us as he says he does, we wouldn't take him along if he were portable. We think we are reasonable and we think we are right. We shall continue to say what we think ought to be said and of course everybody who reads it is at liberty to think or say what he pleases about it. Public opinion, enlightened or otherwise, will judge us here, and the Lord will judge us in the end. We face both judgments with calm confidence.