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

"Lift ye up a banner upon the high mountain, exalt the voice unto them."—(Isa.13:2.)
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JOHN Q. PUBLIC

Some of the counts in the alleged “findings” of “Judge John Q. Public,” as recently interpreted, or maybe more accurately interpolated, by Judge R. O. Kenley, need some touching up. My high personal regard for Brother Kenley is a sufficient guarantee that any criticisms I direct at him will be free from any bitterness. In fact I’m not after him. It is very charitable and very true to merely remark that he knows little about the mind of “John Q. Public” in this case. These “findings” may be found in a late issue of the paper devoted to smearing the character of the editor of the Bible Banner. If you like that sort of thing and would like to get hold of a copy of the paper on the sly, so to speak, I understand that they are being delivered in “bundles” at the Broadway church in Lubbock, Texas in care of Brother G. C. Brewer. Brother Brewer might slip you one as he seems to be quite interested in its circulation, in fact he is a contributor of some of the hottest stuff in it. Here is one “finding.”

“We suggest, in the future when a preacher determines to invade the territory of some other preacher for the purpose of destroying him, that he first sit down and read an account of Napoleon’s invasion of Russia in 1812.”

It is assumed that we “invaded the territory of some other preacher for the purpose of destroying him” in the Rio Grande Valley, got a thorough threshing and staged a Napoleonic retreat. The truth is that the editor of the Bible Banner toured the Valley and gathered in a long list of subscribers for the paper. I did the preaching in two meetings down there and took in a few more which a few people were anxious to hand me. Since when did “some other preacher” become the Czar of a “territory” that we must stay out of when we have proper invitations to go there? We did not retreat from a fight. We left after we finished the work we went there to do. We suggest to our friend Judge Kenley, since he is taking a lively interest in the case, that he go down and interview “John Q. Public” in the Valley. He should not fail to see such preachers as Brethren Davis, Adams, Leamons, Wolfrum, Fikes, Williams, Jeffcoat, Casada and others. They preach for churches in Harlingen, San Benito, Mission, McAllen, Raymondville, Edcouch, Brownsville, Weslaco and some other points. He might compare our standing down that-away with that of “some other preacher” and the “Irish” from Houston who went down to help him conduct his defense against a threatened annihilation. He might find some “Irish” on our side of his so-called invasion. Should Brother Brewer decide to go down and scout around a little, he might find things as one-sided as he did in Oklahoma City. He would at least get the inspiration to write a sequel to “That Makes Me Sick.”

OTHER “FINDINGS” IN “THE RECORD”

Here is another count in the “findings.”

“From the record before us we find Eugene S. Smith not guilty of wrong, the only complaint against him being that he preaches the ‘true gospel’ over the radio, and asks his listeners to contribute to the expense thereof. This party has shown the true Christian spirit ‘when smitten on one cheek, he has turned the other.”

There is nothing in “the record before us” upon which to base a charge that we have ever complained against anybody, anywhere, anytime, preaching the gospel over the radio, or anywhere else. We think it ought to be preached there and everywhere else. We have complained, and shall continue to complain, when anybody, regardless of his name, assumes to speak for “the churches of Christ” and carries on a begging campaign that can be, and probably will be, interpreted widely as “a church of Christ” racket. Where does a man get his authority to speak for “the churches of Christ”? Who invited Brother Smith to do so? We still believe that Brother Smith was guilty of what we complained about, nor do we believe that “John Q. Public” has rendered the verdict that Brother Kenley says he has. We have nothing personal against Brother Smith, nor have we attacked his personal character. If we smote him on the cheek, it was a mistake on our part, for that was not the place we were aiming at. We give him all due credit for the true Christian spirit to the extent that he has not retaliated with a vicious personal attack on us after the manner of G. C. Brewer, L. C. Utley and the unmentionable Oklahoma City mouthpiece of the Rio Grande slander sheet. He probably has his faults along with the rest of us, but we are confident that he is not capable of that.

Here is another “finding” that deserves a remark or so.

“We commend the ‘Irish’ for going to the defense of ‘little’ Ira, and find John O’Dowd ‘not guilty,’ whether his action was prompted by love for ‘little’ Ira or just his love to be in a fight.”

Now we do not believe that anybody, whether “Irish” or Russian should be prompted to go “to the defense of” anybody when he has shown himself undeserving of such defense, regardless of how much the “Irish love to be in a (Continued On Back Page)
ANOTHER BROTHERHOOD MOVEMENT

We are about to be treated to another “brotherhood” something. Not long ago one Clinton Davidson, an ex-digressive, claimed that he had made a “brotherhood survey” and announced “a brotherhood paper” based on that supposed survey. He tried to take over the Gospel Advocate and threatened to put it out of business; he even tried to get the Firm Foundation and extend the influence of his movement into the schools and all the high places of “the brotherhood.” He did get the old Christian Leader, had it copyrighted so that nobody could quote it or reply to anything in it, and started his “brotherhood” blitz. But his invasion of the “brotherhood” bogged down; his machine stalled; his paper died; his movement failed.

Now, comes Claude F. Witty with another brotherhood paper provision. In case there are some who do not know it, Brother Witty is the left member, or as Murch would say, the “conservative” member, of the Witty-Murch Unity Meeting combination. Can anybody imagine what Witty wants with a brotherhood paper? He says that the paper (Christian Tribune) which he is taking over is now only “a state paper,” but when he takes it over and becomes its editor it will be a “brotherhood paper.” Now, just what is “a state paper”? Some of us will naturally wonder if it is something like “a state evangelist.” Then what will his brotherhood paper be?

Brother Witty has been running with Murch and the digressives so much that he talks like them.

On page 11 will be seen the cut of a “confidential” letter which Brother F. L. Rowe wrote to the editors of his Christian Leader, known now as the Christian Ledger. This letter which Brother F. L. Rowe wrote to the editors of his Christian Leader (Christian Tribune) which he is taking over is now only “a state paper,” but when he takes it over and becomes its editor it will be a “brotherhood paper.” Now, just what is “a state paper”? Some of us will naturally wonder if it is something like “a state evangelist.” Then what will his brotherhood paper be?

Brother Witty has been running with Murch and the digressives so much that he talks like them.

The question is now in order: Will Brother Witty use this “brotherhood” in an attempt to do what he wanted Brother Rowe to do? If not, why did he try to get Brother Rowe to use his paper to do something that he will not use his own paper to do?

Or did they find that small town printer and a small town paper to do their work? This is quite an interesting question. According to the testimony of their own words, on record, they will furnish the finance for others to do an underworld job, while they assume an air of pious innocence and run nice papers.

A brotherhood paper indeed! The evidence is conclusive that Brother, Witty is the middle member of a set of unhappy triplets. He has Davidson on one side of him and Murch on the other side. What an “Axis!” And Claude F. Witty has the temerity to propose a brotherhood paper! The brethren will turn thumbs down on it.-F. E. W.

ON THE HONOR ROLL

The slander-slingers of the Rio Grande are making up quite a long honor roll of preachers throughout the nation, who for one reason or another are out of humor with us. Many of them write personal letters and get them published with or without permission. Brother Brewer was anxious to have his published. Brother Collins wrote one, Brother Brewer says, and requested that it not be published. They ought to publish it, since it is known that he sent one. We would like to know what he had to say about us.

Dear Brother Paisley got on the honor roll and is so embarrassed over it that he wants off. It develops that he did not intend for his letter to be published. In it he added his support to all the ugly charges made against us, including the one that the editor of the Bible Banner was “crooked in business.” I have sensed all along that the brother was going to sooner or later be embarrassed by writing letters and talking too much. He has written me several that he should not have written that I did not publish. When he had his latest brain-storm in print, he hastened to write a long “Criticism, Correction and Apology,” a copy of which I have. He explains that “I am making this correction before I see any reaction to my criticism.” Well, my “reaction” to his “criticism” was in the editor’s hands before I received the “correction and apology.” After reading it, I see no reason why I should change or recall my “reaction.”

I have no desire to unjustly add to or prolong the brother’s embarrassment. We shall give him full credit for the apology he has made. He now refuses to believe that we, or either of us, “was” or is “crooked in business.” He apologizes for everything he has said which lent support to that ugly charge. He goes to great length in still insisting that we are guilty of “unprincipled misrepresentations” and still affirms “any day or night” that the editor exhibits “outstanding unfairness toward all men who dare to cross his path.” He repeats most of the charges that put him on the honor roll. The apology adds up to this. The editor is not “crooked in business” but otherwise both he and I are monumental fibbers! Now, that is very nice of you, Brother Paisley, to make such an all-out apology as that. Your generosity and manumagnanimity will ‘possibly win widespread applause. It should insure “peace in our generation” and be a guarantee that henceforth no cross-word shall pass between us. It is wonderful to enjoy such a full measure of your confidence after all these years, and we shall strive to be worthy of it. There is one little thing, though, that bothers me mildly. I just wonder if our brother would ever have made such a noble correction and such a humble apology, if he had not appeared on the honor roll.-C. E. W.
THE AKIN FUND

I. L. BRIGANCE

This is a large sum of money provided annually by Brother and Sister J. W. Akin for the education of young preachers. It is administered by Freed-Hardeman College to young men who desire to preach the Word but are unable to pay their way through school. It takes care of a large part of their expenses. Although this fund has only been available for the past three years more than 200 young men who couldn’t otherwise have done so, have attended Freed-Hardeman College, received its teachings and are out in the world now preaching the gospel.

Not this side the Judgment can any of us know the good this fund has already accomplished. At the last “chapel exercises” of 1940-41 the students were making their little farewell speeches. They were speaking of the great benefits received from the school and many of them referred to the “Akin Fund.” Right in the midst of it Brethren Akin and Foy E. Wallace, Jr., unannounced stepped quietly into the farewell speeches. They were speaking of the great benefits upon all who could not have attended school but for the help received from this fund to stand. More than fifty-five young men arose. He then introduced Brother Akin and asked him to say a few words. He couldn’t say much but among other things was this significant statement: “I have already seen and heard enough this morning to more than repay me for every dollar I have put into this fund.”

From fifty to seventy-five young men can be assisted each year by this fund. Any one desiring such assistance should write Brother N. B. Hardeman, Henderson, Tennes-
see, for full particulars.

All young preachers will be taught the pure word of God undiluted with human opinions, speculations or interpretations. They will be shown the errors of Denomination-alism, and how to meet them. They will be taught and trained in the preparation and delivery of sermons. Other subjects, such as Biblical Geography, Church History, etc. will be offered to everyone. Special course is offered in the history of the Restoration Movement.

Freed-Hardeman College in its Bible teaching is safe and sound. It believes in the divine inspiration and all-sufficiency of the Bible. It rides no hobbies, accepts no human opinions or “inventions of men,” but accepts all -the Bible teaches and rejects everything it does not. There is no question mark concerning its soundness in the faith.

KIPLING'S MAN

If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs and blaming it on you;
If you can trust yourself when all men doubt you,
But make allowance for their doubting too:
If you can wait and not be tired by waiting,
Or, being lied about, don’t deal in lies,
Or being hated don’t give way to hating,
And yet don’t look too good, nor talk too wise;

If you can dream—and not make dreams your master;
If you can think—and not make thoughts your aim,
If you can make one heap of all your winnings
Twisted by knaves to make a trap for fools,
Or watch the things you gave your life to, broken,
And stoop and build 'em up with worn-out tools;

If you can make one heap of all your winnings
And risk it on one turn of pitch-and-toss,
And lose, and start again at your beginnings,
And never breathe a word about your loss;
If you can force your heart and nerve and sinew
To serve your turn long after they are gone,
And so hold on when there is nothing in you
Except the Will which says to them: "Hold on!"

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with Kings-nor lose the common touch,
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you,
If all men count with you, but none too much:
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty second's worth of distance run,
Yours is the Earth and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a Man, my son!
-Rudyard Kipling.
A REVIEW OF THE SITUATION

CLED E. WALLACE

It is generally conceded, I think, that we have done a pretty fair job in our fight against the future kingdom foolishness and certain compromises which we feared might become widespread enough to bring tragedy to the churches. In it all we have kept in mind the warning of that apostle of Christ who said: “But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve in his craftiness, your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity and the purity that is toward Christ.” (2 Cor. 11:3) Corrupting influences both within and without have been, and are still, at work. We have fought them and shall continue to fight them where and when we recognize them. We are not fighting them with powder puffs and bouquets. This is not a battle or roses. We are using the sword on them. We are not claiming any undue credit, in fact we are not seeking glory from men at all. There are many others like-minded who are fighting for the same things we are. We have been actively supported and commended by some of the strongest and best men in the church for which we are profoundly grateful. Brother H. Leo Boles is reported to have paid us the highest sort of a compliment before a large and representative audience at Freed-Hardeman college. In fact we have had enough of such praise from men in responsible places to make us “cooky” if we had any inclinations in that direction. We have been accused of just that and if it is true we deserve rebuke. Christians should not be “cooky,” they should be humble. However, the source from which such charges come reassures us. Men who know us, love us and endorse the truths for which we stand, do not so accuse us. We have the right to be bold for the cause we are pleading for deserves boldness.

It is tragic but inevitable that this fight should be the occasion of so much bitterness. The crescendo of the opposition is “Down with the Wallaces.” Should that consummation so devoutly wished by some be reached, it would not settle these issues. Others, probably better qualified, would take our places. Personalities are merely incidental in this war. There are issues at stake and men will be found to fight for them whoever goes down or up. “For all flesh is as grass, And all the glory thereof as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower falleth; But the word of the Lord abideth for ever.” (Isa. 40:6) We are not primarily concerned over what our enemies do to us.

Withal, it is well enough to review the situation betimes and take note of who’s who and why. There are some criticisms we will not condescend to answer for they carry their own condemnation. There are others we shall continue to pay our respects to. We will not be taunted into descending the depths into which some have gone, by charges of cowardice. We shall continue to choose our own battle lines and stick to our own methods. If any wish to think that we fight and run away, we shall waste little time arguing the point with them. They are possibly guilty of some wishful thinking and had better keep a weather eye open.

The latest sensation seems to be the “Battle of the Rio Grande.” Our part in that battle was not the major engagement at all. The aspiring young editor who started it outraged all sense and reason in the harmful method he was employing. The rebuke we administered was merely an expression of a verdict already rendered by the preachers and churches throughout that section. If you have any doubt about it, go down and take a look. We have never yet opposed a good work anybody was doing. If Timothy had rated the same grade in deportment from the brethren “at Lystra and Iconium” that the “adolescent” editor does from the brethren in the Valley of the Rio Grande, Paul would have left him at home for he could not have used him without performing a major operation on him, “through the Holy Spirit which was given unto us.” “John Q. Public” as interpreted by my friend Judge R. O. Kenley, recommends that this seething young editor “go and sit at the feet of J. D. Tant and W. M. Davis and he will thereby find his wisdom greatly increased.” I was present when Brother Tant tried to reason with him without success and I know what Brother Davis thinks about the whole situation because he told me and he did not tell me to keep it a secret either. “John Q. Public” has rendered a severe verdict in the Rio Grande Valley. Compared with it, what we have said is not a “battle” but a mere skirmish.

The doughty young editor went fishing for help in his fight to down us. He baited his hooks with personal abuse a Christian should never direct at anybody and what do you suppose he caught! Well, of all things, G. C. Brewer, F. L. Paisley and L. C. Utley. Now, if I were not a charitable sort, after reading what they say about us, I’d be tempted to say that Ira pulled up a string of mud-cats that time. But I’m charitable and in a good humor to boot. When men of their reputation, not to say self-esteem, make such a paper a walling wall for their bitter resentment toward us, we think the matter deserves some attention, unpleasant as it is. We, of course, deeply regret that these brethren think of us as they do and would be willing to remove the cause, if we could righteously do so. In looking over their complaints, I shall begin with the greatest and move on down to the least.

Brother Utley swallowed the bait away up on the shore of Lake Michigan and here is what Ira pulled in:

Dear Brother ******* (the blank stands for the unmentionable in Oklahoma City)

"I read your article on Foy E. Wallace, Jr. I have had no faith in him for several years. I know that many good brethren value him as little as I do. The dose you gave his should settle him, but it won’t. I am fully impressed that he would boss the church if we would take it. If he or his paper have the cause of Christ at heart, I am crazy."

Now, Brother Utley must be a pretty good sort of fellow. I do not know him very well, but my friend the editor of the Firm Foundation recently spoke of him editorially in the very highest terms and lauded him as both a good and a brilliant man. I also “read your article on Foy E. Wallace, Jr.,” and it was the most abusive thing I ever laid eyes on. The maggots of malice wriggled in every line. I can’t understand how Brother Utley can be so pleased with it and be all that the editor of the Firm Foundation says he is. If he really likes that sort of thing, we take it as a compliment that he has no faith in us. We are not crawling on our knees imploring the support of men who write such letters to the unmentionable from Oklahoma City who is starring for Ira’s paper. We are not offended because Brother Utley dispensed with “Brother” in referring to the editor of the Bible Banner, and even express the hope that our many friends who know that we “have the cause of Christ at heart” will not start a movement to confine him in an institution. Maybe he is what Brother Brewer calls a “megalomaniac,” sane except when he thinks about us, then he goes crazy, He ought to do his
thinking about something else. If thinking about Brother Utley affected me that way, I wouldn't ever let him enter my mind, much less write letters about him. I wouldn't even smell of a "dose" somebody "gave him" to "settle him." No, beloved, we would not "boss" the church even if it should ask us to, but we do not mind saying that we would hate to see it turned over to the men who are using the valley sheet as a wailing wall.

Now, Brother Paisley, bless his little broken heart, stomped his toe in Temple, Texas several years ago and has been crying about it "in season, and out of season" ever since. He blames us with it when we were not even there and had nothing to do with it. We had something to say about preachers dividing churches, and although we did not call his name, he insisted on applying it all to himself. We really didn't mean it all for him. He should not have gorged himself on it and got a bad case of permanent indigestion. He swallowed the bait up in Dallas and Ira pulled in another helper via the unmentionable in Oklahoma City. He came in crying about Temple as usual. Between sobs he avers that

"The Wallaces have without fail been on the side of error, sin and division, defending the most glaring, outstanding principles of error found in the churches."

We do not need to pluck the petals of a flower to see whether he loves the editor or not. Every plucked petal says he loves him not.

"But I am not qualified to question the truth of one single statement you or others have made of the crookedness of the editor."

He rambles on hysterically for a whole page accusing us of cowardice, lying and the like and finally gets to this gem. "But I have written too much for your time." 0, I don't think so. The editor of the "Soldier" must have really been enjoying it. After reading it, he broke into copious tears "the sober convictions of a square shooter and straight thinker." Seriously, gentlemen, if your aim is to injure us, take a pointer from me. You are overdoing the thing. It is going to be rather difficult to make people believe that we are as mean as you say we are. And it just wouldn't do for anybody to get the notion that you are stretching things a little. You know some things are hard to believe, for instance that little yarn Brother Paisley tells everybody who will listen to him about being "forced" out of the Temple church for righteousness' sake. Now, it so happens that I lived in Temple about a dozen years, held membership in that church and preached for it for months at a time and nobody ever tried to run me off "by force." It seems that they tied a tin can to Brother Paisley after I left. There seems to be a little misunderstanding about the matter. I was told later when I happened to be visiting up that-away, by men whom I had known for years and who never lied to me about anything else, that Brother Paisley got mad and ran off and took part of the church with him, the godly minority of course, and another church was split. It follows him around like Banquo's ghost. He talks about it by day and dreams about it by night. He is nearly as pitiful as Lady MacBeth trying to wash the blood off her hands. I can't be mad at him for feeling sorry for him. Maybe he is one of Brother Brewer's "megalomaniacs." Honest, we may not be as good as some people, but I have my doubts about us being as bad as they are proving we are. If they can find that anonymous crowd and get them to take off their masks and testify, but maybe they are already doing it. The size of the ears and the sound of the voice reminds me of something I've seen and heard before. They have accused us of everything but companionate marriage and I am looking for that next. Our only salvation is that the people Brother Brewer is handing the "Soldier" out to may take time out to decide that the witnesses against us are all the way from slightly biased to being overwhelmed with an all-out desire for revenge. When they prove everything else on us, we shall endeavor to maintain a comparative calm, unless they accuse us of appealing to a congregation over the heads of its elders to hold a job. That is one piece of chicanery we cannot tolerate. The invariable charge in such a case that "the so-called elders" are not qualified is a smoke-screen to cover up an illegal operation. If we had a "desire to murder" as Brother Paisley charges, the professional church-buster is the first "megalomaniac" we would point toward the graveyard. All the victims of our murderous intentions are not dead yet, judging from the shrieks of agony that are rending the air. The charge of murder is a little premature. Besides, when dividing a church kills a preacher, it is a clear case of suicide.

When editor Ira went fishing, he showed some skill in the sort of places he dropped his hooks. He tells us that "a bundle was sent to the Broadway church of Christ in Lubbock in care of Brother G. C. Brewer." This "bundle" contained that now celebrated vitriolic attack on the personal character of the editor of the Bible Banner. Brother Brewer turned out to be a hungry fish. He announced "that the papers were here" and told the congregation they had an "opportunity" to "see the Wallace method applied to Wallace." "The papers were all taken and we had calls for more." How did I learn all this? Why, Brother Brewer wrote editor Ira a letter and expressly gave him permission to publish it. We can only imagine the glee with which Brother Brewer took advantage of this "opportunity" to partially satiate his consuming desire for revenge. He carefully refrains from referring to us as "Brother." It is Brother Rice, Brother O'Dowd, Brother Tant, Brother Srygley, but when he gets to us it is Foy Wallace, Wallace, He and Cled etc. Of course that is all right with us, since he feels that way about it, but I do not envy some of our critics the malicious bitterness of soul that burns inside them. I would not feel toward them as they do toward us for anything in the world.

Brother Brewer writes Brother Rice that "whether you are justified or not I can excuse you." Why, bless your heart, Brother Brewer would not have missed it for the world. He got more kick out of it than he did when he slew the four horsemen of Communism. He talks as though he were on the sidelines watching the young Samson of the Rio Grande Valley slay a thousand Philistines "with the jawbone of an ass" and intent on seeing that he did not run out of ammunition. If melodrama ever reached the ludicrous we have it here. He excurses Brother Rice, but here is a little bit of the lot he says about us.

"Wallace will not answer your charges nor will he meet you for any fair settlement of your differences or in any other way treat you with respect or decency. I speak from experience. I have tried him thoroughly. He is such a megalomaniac that he will probably assume that you are beneath his notice! He and Cled will also probably run for cover and claim that you boys are too rough to play with! Don't forget, though that they have written and preached for the last eight years about the 'method of approach' and have done all they could to justify 'abuse,' 'personalities, harsh,' 'crude,' and 'coarse' language in opposing error. They have cited Matt. 21:35 and Acts 13:10 to justify their methods. They have inveighed against every man who will not kneel at Foy's feet and call him Lord. They have filled their paper with invective, vituperation and falsehood. . . ."
And on and on he goes in true Brewer style and finally gets to this point. “Well, I’ve written too much.” Why, no, no, go on. Nobody ever wrote too much of that sort of thing for the “Christian Soldier” and according to Brother Brewer, the members of the Broadway church in Lubbock like to read it. One reason we touched the match to this inflammable situation to begin with was to give the wild boys an occasion to reveal themselves and Brother Brewer is even wilder than I thought he was. The brethren are learning things fast and it is not all on us. I take it that we will not be widely blamed for not meeting these soft-speaking gentlemen “for any fair settlement.” It would not be a major fault if we should conclude that they “are too rough to play with.” Everybody who does not think they are “rough” stand on your head! It is not even necessary for us to deny these grievous charges. Our friends and supporters and fairminded neutrals do not believe them and our enemies would sneer at our denials. It is entirely possible that some of Brother Brewer’s friends will lift their eye-brows at his latest display of “respect or decency.” His imagination is running a high fever inflamed by pent-up feeling he has had no former opportunity to fully express in print. We do not feel any worse and I hope he feels better since he has vomited that gob of poison out of his system. After admitting that he had “written too much” he shows that getting rid of the poison did relieve him at least temporarily and added “but I do not hate him, and I would not harm him.” Thanks, that is very nice of you indeed! We were beginning to think that maybe you did and would.

Something has made some strange bed-fellows in this fantastic situation. It tickles my risibles a little to see men like G. C. Brewer, L. C. Utley and F. L. Paisley crawling into the same bed with Ira Rice, John O’Dowd, and the Oklahoma City unmentionable. It is a short bed with a narrow blanket to hold all of them. They may lie together but we’ll see to it that they do not do much sleeping. We can see that they stay warm without any cover.

There is something ghastly about being hated as some hate us. We do not reciprocate it. We are more interested in issues than men. We have definite objectives which we shall continue to incessantly fire at. Whoever recklessly or carelessly projects himself into the line of fire will find that we will not elevate our guns to keep from hitting him even if “the Gentiles rage and the people imagine vain things.” We do not believe that hate and injustice ever won any spiritual victories and we do not believe that they can triumph over us. If we go down, we shall go down fighting with our guns blazing. We shall not surrender. These men are wrong while we are right. We propose to outfight them, outmaneuver them and rate a much higher grade in decent conduct than any of them have or can, judging from their past performances.

---

**Complete Christian Hymnal**

**COMPILED BY MARION DAVIS**

**SECOND EDITION GOING FAST**

- Heavy cloth binding-unbreakable backs-325 songs. It is SPIRITUAL and SCRIPTURAL. Considerable expense was incurred in changing plates to correct erroneous teaching. The compiler was assisted in this work by Foy E. Wallace, Jr., and we believe all vital errors have been eliminated from these songs.

**THE MOST POPULAR OLD SONGS AND THE MOST POPULAR NEW SONGS**

**TWO BINDINGS: LIMP COVERS AND HEAVY CLOTH-BOARD. RED EDGES**
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<table>
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**The Marion Davis Co.**

Fayette, Ala.
They want us to unite. That sounds good, provided it is a unity that pleases God. Harmony is God’s order and one has said that order is heaven’s first law. Order first, unity follows. But as long as there is disorder, there is no unity, nor divine sanction for it—not among the people of God. Paul was in favor of unity, but he wanted to walk orderly. Of himself and his companions he said, “We behaved not ourselves disorderly among you.” He and all those who walked not disorderly were a unity, but the disorderly were not united with them, neither did God want them to be. They must first quit their disorderly ways. Of these the apostle wrote plainly: “For we hear of some that walk among you disorderly.” Well, what of these? We are now urged to unity, regardless.

But what says Paul? He spoke with the Spirit of inspiration and here is what he says: “Now we command you brethren in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which they received of us.” (Read the entire third chapter of 2 Thessalonians.) The things that brought on division among a once happy, influential, and united people—influential and happy because united—are things that confessedly are “not after the tradition which they received of us” (Paul). Now these same things stand today as they did when the division took place. They divided then, and they divide today. They are barriers that stand like a mighty stone wall to prevent unity. If and when they are removed we will again be united. Now Brother Witty thinks that the five points of “Prayer,” “Survey,” “Friendliness,” “Co-operation,” “Study and Discussion” will iron it all out, though some have walked, are walking and propose to continue to walk not according to the traditions received from the inspired and holy apostles of our Lord.

But Paul said from these “withdraw yourselves,” and he said, “We command you” to do this, and added that the command was “in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.” Somehow Paul and Claude do not write just alike. Paul’s plan was to withdraw from those who did not follow after Christ, Brother Witty’s plan is to survey and be friendly and co-operate and study and discuss. All this is trying to be like each other in order to unite, while God’s order is to try to be like Christ and get rid of everything that is unlike Christ, in order to unity. And that will bring unity as sure as the Bible is from God and completely furnishes the man of God unto every good work. It seems that brethren could see that God’s unity means that we be of “one mind,” and “one heart” and that this “one mind” must be “the mind of Christ.” Why not read what Paul says to the Corinthians along this line? There are just plenty of brethren united in loyal congregations, in this way, and others may be so united, without compromise of the truth or sacrifice of scruples.

There are three to be pleased in order to the proper sort of unity—each of the two human parties that desire unity, and then a third party, the God of heaven. Two robbers might be a unity in a plan to rob a bank but they would certainly have to leave God out of it. It would be a bad piece of business, and a unity abhorred of heaven. Ananias and Sapphira were a unity when they conspired together to lie to the Holy Spirit and keep back part of the price. They left God out of it and God was not well pleased. Not all unities please God—not by any means. I am opposed to the entry into any united religious people that leaves God out.

He is left out of any arrangement that disregards his law and leaves out of consideration any of his commands or prohibitions.

The Lord abhors incongruities and things in inharmonious. The law of Moses in material things laid down many great principles that find an application in spiritual things under the law of Christ. And Moses says, “Thou shalt sow thy vineyard with two kinds of seed, lest the whole fruit be forfeited.” “A woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman’s garment.” “Thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together.” “Thou shalt not plow with an ox and an ass together.” Well, what is that to us? someone says. For “our admonition” they were written, declares Paul. “Is it for the oxen that God careth, or saith he it assuredly for our sakes? Yea, for our sake it was written.” And I am not yet persuaded that God wants Witty and Murch hitched up together to plow the spiritual fields in the vineyard of the Lord. Not unless they are more nearly of the same spiritual species than I had supposed.

It is good and acceptable to God to be united in the Lord’s work and way. If we all go to Christ and stand there we will be united. For my part, if my brethren and I are doing anything not according to the tradition delivered us—not according to the sound doctrine of Christ—I want to know it and to turn from it. I am perfectly willing to test it by the word of God. But is it not our practice that is under challenge. It is the religious service that is being rendered by those who have brought in certain innovations among the Lord’s people without one particle of authority from the writings of inspired men. The removal of these things from the churches will bring concord, peace, harmony and happiness, and not only promote, but secure, establish, and perpetuate among a great people with a great ideal, a great purpose, and a great plea, that unity for which our Master prayed which the apostles labored, and which God desires and God requires. It is the only unity among his people that is well pleasing in his sight.

(P. S. Brother Witty, you are kindly requested to Put this in the next issue of your Quarterly Journal to be published from Detroit. If you have room, include also my article in Firm Foundation of June 24.—G.H.P.S.)

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.

THE BIBLE BANNER
Box 1884—Oklahoma City, Okla.
It is doubtful whether many are taking very seriously the "Witty-Murch" Unity movement, at least among the thinking members of the church. It is true, all who love the Lord want unity, but there can be no unity at the price of compromise. It is difficult to understand why members of the church cannot realize that there is only one of two alternatives to be taken in the present movement: either compromise on the part of the church, or complete rejection of all innovations by the "digressives."

Another difficult thing to see is that our brethren do not realize the "conversion," "unity," and such things are not mass accomplishments. These are individual problems, which must be brought about by the convincing and turning or individuals. Unity in the church is me result or each individual respecting me wishes of the Lord, and as an individual, submitting himself to his wishes. To accomplish the end of our desire for unity, each member of the Christian church must be brought to see the error and sin of innovations, and as an individual moved by conviction, persuaded to give them up and take his stand for truth. Most of us see this, all should.

The magnitude of such a task can clearly be seen by a brief study of the present condition and practice of the Christian Church. Although it is possible that most preachers have in their files many such clippings as the following, yet I venture to offer these as evidence of what the Christian Church is doing today in its practice. Instrumental music is by no means the real issue, it is simply a phase of the issue. The issue is the authority of Jesus Christ in matters religious. This, as is readily seen from the following clippings and practices, is practically rejected "en teto" by the Christian church.

Dance Interpretation of Hymns Pleases Congregation at Columbia

Columbia, Mo., March 11 (A-P). The interpretation of hymns through the dancing of 15 pretty girls drew praise today from church-goers who witnessed the "experiment" at the First Christian Church here last night.

The girls were from Christian College, alma mater of Sally Rand.

Before 300 persons, including most of the elders and deacons of the church, the dancers from Christian College swayed and glided to piano and vocal accompaniment, their movements and ensemble formations symbolizing supplication, humility and prayer.

"Any unfavorable reaction would come only from those who didn't witness tonight's presentation," said Lieut. Gov. Frank G. Harris, President of the board of trustees of Christian College and a member of the church's board of elders. "I'm sure none in the audience was unfavorably impressed."

No. I suspect that none of those present were unfavorably impressed, for a Christian who has any respect for God and for spiritual worship, would not have been there.

The following is taken from the "Topeka Daily Capital." May 11, 1941:

Mothers Will Conduct Service At West Side Christian Today

"Mother's Day will be observed at the West Side Christian this morning. Mrs. C. A. Hale, Mrs. Maxine Bair, Mrs. Hazel Shanton, Mrs. Thelma Talbot and Miss Lorraine McCormick are arranging the song service. Mrs. N. P. McComas, Miss Audry Hick and Miss Mary Jane Frederick will have charge of the Communion Service. They will be assisted by a group of young ladies of the congregation. The Rev. G. D. Noland will speak on the subject, "To Every Mother's Son."

"The baptismal service which was to have been held tonight has been postponed one week in order that the congregation may join others of the city in hearing Dr. E. Stanley Jones at the high school auditorium. The young people will attend the service at the First Presbyterian Church at 5:30."

Now what do we have? That which no true Christian mother would desire, a day in which Christ should be worshiped dedicated to her. Mothers conducting the communion service. The baptizing of individuals postponed in order to hear a sectarian preacher lecture. The "youth people" as visitors and guests of the First Presbyterian Church. Suppose the instrument should be removed, how much nearer would such a group be to real respect for the authority of Christ and the Bible?

Memorial Day Service At West Side Christian Church

"A special memorial Sunday service for all patriotic organizations of Topeka will be held at the West Side Christian Church, Sixth and Lindenwood, Sunday, May 25th, at 10:30 a.m."

The Rev. G. D. Noland, pastor of the church, will have charge of the services, which will especially honor (10 names follow).

Special music will be featured by the church choir and Mrs. Thelma Talbot, musical director. Taps and echo taps will be by the Veterans of Foreign Wars buglers. Memorial sermon will be by the Rev. G. D. Noland."

West Side Christian Will Observe Children's Day

"Children's Day will be observed at the West Side Christian Church this morning. A program under the direction of Mrs. O. W. Blair and Mrs. Clyde Longbottom will be presented. A playlet, "God's Flower Garden," will be featured."

"Now, just where is the Lord to come in? "Mother's Day" with mothers "officiating." "Memorial Day," honoring war heroes, and their many organizations, with "taps and echo taps" by buglers of a secular society; and "Children's Day," featuring "playlets." The "Inn" had nothing on the Christian church, there is no more room for him in one of its services than there was for Him in the Inn."

These last three are the programs of one congregation in Topeka, Kansas, and that the "conservative" congregation of the Christian church of that city. The next two will present a couple of interesting things of the First Christian Church of that same city. Someone might ask brother.
Witty where he expects to squeeze the Lord into their program, even if he should get the instrument out.

having considered the “Worship program” of dancing and special events, have a look now at their method of supporting their work, and of entertaining a “Bible Class.” The following is taken from the Topeka State Journal, June 17, 1941:

**Topeka Church Has 125 Dinner Reservations**

“Members of the First Christian church, 622 Topeka, met one week ago, almost baffled by the problem of meeting church obligations with a dwindling church treasury. (It probably never occurred to them to try the Lord’s plan.)

Today a new idea is paying dividends—the money will come rolling in, committee workers can guarantee.

For the church, next October, will serve the first $5-a-plate dinner in the history of *topeka churches*, according to Mrs. J. II. Casson, 1267 Tyler, chairman of the reservations committee. It will be a fine turkey dinner, better than ever before; the date probably, will be October 17.

“It’s a scheme of the church finance committee, and the women’s board will be in charge of the dinner,” Mrs. Casson said. ‘The plan was approved by the church board and the pastor, the Rev. C. O. Stuckenbruck, just one week ago—and we already have 125 reservations.

“We usually do have a turkey dinner, each fall, but we’ve never charged over 50 cents before. We hope to make this a very good menu. We ought to, for $5.”

Now, if you can beat that one, just write and tell these folks about it, and I am sure they will use your idea. Members of a wealthy church, in a capital city, who cannot give a measly $5 bill for the support of the church work without a turkey dinner! Mrs. Casson certainly spoke one truth, when she said “It’s a scheme of the church finance committee,” for it was certainly no part of the Lord’s program.

And did you notice the prominence of women in all of these “programs” and “schemes”? All of them run by women. Brother Witty is working with the wrong group in dealing with the men. Women run the Christian church, not men.

And now, one more, this also from the Topeka State Journal, taken within the past six weeks. It shows the type of recreation sponsored by one of the former elders, if not still an elder, and a teacher of the young people’s Bible class.

**Hoe-Downs, Square Dances At Party**

“Dr. Smith’s Bible class sponsored a rural barn party Friday night at the Zinn Brother’s farm on the old *Bur-lingame* road. Old-fashioned hoe-downs and square dances were in order. Caller for the square dances was M. T. Brook. Rural rhythm was furnished by a 3-piece orchestra...About 75 people attended.”

Now when one adds to these departures from worship, practice, and recreation, the Christian church’s attitude toward sectarian fellowship, infant church membership, missionary organizations, bazaars, Modernism, and their general attitude toward the Bible, what is there left to appeal to? The Christian naturally asks, “What fellowship have righteousness and iniquity? or what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial?”. Where can unity exist between the church and such practices?

Someone might casually suggest to brother Witty that instrumental music is only a small “pebble” in their love feasts now; the real boulder is “infidelity,” rejection of the authority of Christ and the Bible in their faith and practice. Truly, the Christian church has sent “an ambassage after him, saying, We will not that this man reign over us.”

**Acceptable Giving**

Hugo McCord

Oftentimes money is contributed to the Lord that He does not accept. The local church treasurer puts the money in the bank but the *Almighty* does not mark it down as acceptable worship. When Ananias and his wife went to church (Acts 5) they gave liberally-nearly everything they had. Actually they had sold all they owned, kept something for themselves, and gave all the rest to the Lord. But it was not acceptable worship, for they told a falsehood about it. They told they did not keep back anything for themselves. Today a man can keep his mouth shut and commit the *sin* of Acts 5: if he does not give as he is prospered, yet allows men to think he is, there is no difference between him and Ananias.

Giving as worship is a serious thing. We can give to our friends, give to kinfolks, freely and loosely. But when we bring the Lord into the matter, and count the giving as worship, then we must go to the Book to find His will. One of His first requirements is that there shall be No Display.

“Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men, to be seen of them: else ye have no reward with your Father who is in heaven. When therefore thou doest alms, sound not a trumpet before thee, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and in the streets, that they may have glory of men. Verily I say unto you, They have received their reward. But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth; that thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father who seeth in secret shall recompense thee.” (Matt. 6:1-4).

No Merchandising

When a man has to be baited with pie and coffee to give two prices to “the Lord’s cause,” that man loves his pie more than the Lord, and that kind of giving is not worship. Free-will offerings have always been the Lord’s plan. Moses was commanded to take an offering “of every man whose heart maketh him willing.” (Ex. 25:2) And He has told us to give “not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver.” (II Cor. 9:7)

No Gambling

When a man agrees to give to the Lord by way of bingo parties and other “religious gambling,” nobody could say such is worship. It is just an excuse to gamble. And the church that advocates such is just after money, anyway it can get it.

Worshipful Giving

1. Purposing. If a brother only thinks of his offering when the basket starts around, and then gives whatever change happens to be in his pocket, it is vain worship. Paul commanded (II Cor. 9:7) that a brother plan ahead, purpose, pledge what he is going to give. Little or great, he must purpose it ahead of time. The Lord has not set any assessment percentage; He has not done the purposing for us; but every man, according as he purposes in his heart, to let him give. “But this I say, He that soweth sparingly shall reap also sparingly; and he that soweth bountifully shall reap also bountifully.”

2. Quietly. Worshipful giving is not ostentatious. A devout man does not make a big-to-do about his giving; he is giving to his Lord; he does not advertise his righteousness.

3. Cheerfully. To give with a frown, or to give as if it is an unpleasant duty, of necessity, is not worship. No matter if I give a thousand dollars, unless *cheerfully* offered, it is empty worship.

God is a spirit: and they that worship him must worship in spirit and truth.
WITTY-MURCH-DAVISON ‘BROTHERHOOD PAPER’?

The following letters reveal another “brotherhood” scheme. After Clinton Davidson’s counterfeit “brotherhood” survey and fake questionnaire and the New Christian Leader’s fiasco, Claude F. Witty has the audacity to propose another assault on the church in the form of a “brotherhood paper.” On the opposite page will be seen a photographic reproduction of a “confidential” letter from Brother F. L. Rowe to the editors of his Christian Leader. Will Brother Witty use this “brotherhood paper” in an effort to do what he tried to persuade Brother Rowe to attempt to do? If not, why should he try to get another man to use a paper to do a thing that he will not use his own paper to do?

The “brotherhood” is not quite so gullible as to be deceived by the same scheme twice. Anybody can see that the source of the Witty “brotherhood paper” is no higher nor better than the Davidson movement, if not the same. But everybody knows that Claude F. Witty could not operate such a paper on his own power. In view of Clinton Davidson’s long distance telephone proposition to F. L. Rowe and Claude Witty’s trip from Detroit to Cincinnati to persuade Brother Rowe, as revealed in the letter on the opposite page, it is not difficult to discern the Clinton-Claude tie-up. They are not even smart. They cannot cover up their own tracks. Their purposes are apparent and their schemes transparent. Discerning brethren see through them.

Dear Bro. Wallace:
Enclosed is letter from Bro. Witty, and carbon copy of my reply.

I’m sure I have not been writing enough lately, else Bro. Witty would never have written me. Enclosed is also a short article, “Meeting With The Christian Church.” I’d like it if you could find space to publish both it and also my reply to Bro. Witty.

Faithfully, Hugo McCord.

Dear Brother McCord:
As you may or may not know Bro. C. B. Clifton has been publishing a monthly paper here in Detroit called The Christian Tribune, and now on account of his age and failing health he has asked me to take over the paper. That is, the editorial part of it.

I intend to make it a brotherhood paper instead of a state paper. I want some of the best articles I can get for the next few issues. Will you be good enough to go through your files and select something you may have written in the past and send it to me as soon as possible?

Of course, you can write an article expressly for this paper, but I want to save you all the time I can. I will greatly appreciate your cooperation.

The work in Detroit is making the greatest progress in its history.

As every, Claud F. Witty

Dear Bro. Witty:
I should be glad to have my articles appear in the Christian Tribune, but I am afraid you would not want to publish them. Following are two articles that appeared in the Gospel Advocate and an excerpt from one published in the Bible Banner.

ARE WE ON THE SAME BOARD?

“The installation of Raphael Harwood Miller as permanent pastor” of the “National City Christian Church, Washington, D. C.,” was a matter approved by the Disciples of Christ brotherhood. Said the Christian-Evangelist: Raphael H. Miller is there doing the work not for himself or just because it is a prominent place, but he is working to extend the influence of every one of us, and direct in a great kingdom enterprise.”

Dr. Miller, in the services of installation by which he was formally inducted to the ministry of the National City Christian Church, asserted: “Denominations and sects are not wholly or even largely the product of human pride and prejudice and unbrotherliness. ... A thing entirely wrong could not long endure by the devotion of men. (Emphasis mine. H. Mc.). It is unthinking to condemn all sectarianism as sinful. So long as we know in part we shall be in parties.”

Brother Witty pictures churches of Christ on one end of a board and the Disciples of Christ on the other end. If we are on a board with such preaching as the above, we had better move off the board entirely, not move toward the middle. It would not be going the second mile to move toward the middle; it is a betrayal of Christ even to stay on the same board.-Gospel Advocate.

CONCERNING UNITY CONFERENCES

Detroit brethren are mistaken to say we are not doing all we can for unity because we do not join the Murch-Witty movement. We just do not mean to compromise, for that is the only direction we can go if we have the truth now. Any movement from truth is bound to be either compromise or treason; truth does not vibrate or see-saw on a board.

If a conference with the Christian Church would do any good, of course every peace lover would participate. But the Christian Church does not intend to change its practices. Do I hear someone say, “You are judging them without a trial?” No, brethren, they have judged themselves. They do not consider us their equal; they consider us non-progressive, non-missionary, old-fashioned; unless we are willing to become as progressive (?) and modern as they, they are not interested in a unity movement! A harsh statement? Ask those staunch men who have come out from the Christian Church. Ask them if the Christian Church is turning back to the Testament or more to modern Christianity. We are no closer to the Christian Church today than we are the Baptist Church-Bible Banner.

WHAT DO WE HAVE IN COMMON?

I know it is nicer to talk about things on which we agree than on differences; but that never gets any further than talk. A Catholic and a Protestant may talk forever on the fact that they both believe in Christ; they may praise each other, sing and quote poetry; but they will never be united till the differences are discussed.

I do not want to be unkind or radical. I do not want to discourage sincere efforts to promote unity between Christians and the Disciples of Christ, ... What is the common ground between them? I know there used to be much in common. But in 1938 can it
be said that plain New Testament Christians are any closer to Methodists than to Disciples? or vice versa?

1. **Inspiration of the Scriptures.**
   A Butler University professor (Disciple) in October, 1936, said to a class of young preachers: "You may read McGarvey as a good sermonizer, but you know we are a long way from his ideas of inspiration of the Scriptures." A young man, still believing the Bible hurt, objected with real seriousness. With a cynical laugh, the professor replied: "You have dyspepsia."

   Modernists among the Methodists have much in common with the Disciples on inspiration. Do Christians? (John 16:13.)

2. **Church Government.**
   Methodists have the pastor system. Disciples acknowledge on their bulletin boards the pastor system. Christians reject the pastor system. Which groups have more in common?

3. **Church Work.**
   Baptists have missionary boards. Disciples have missionary boards. Christians contend the church is the only scriptural missionary society. Who has common ground?

4. **Plan of Salvation.**
   Presbyterians deny immersion is essential. Peter Ainslie, Baltimore Disciple giant, said that to insist on immersion is to be without the love of Christ. Christians affirm we "are buried with him in baptism."

   Which groups have more in common?

5. **Music.**

   Catholics have mechanical music and robed choirs. Disciples have mechanical music and robed choirs. Christians make melody in their hearts.

   Which two groups are closer together?

6. **Lord's Supper.**
   Lutherans observe the Lord's Supper on Thursday. Disciples observe the Lord's Supper on Thursday. Christians break bread on the first day of the week.

7. **Special Days.**
   Catholics observe Lent, Easter, etc. Disciples observe Lent, Easter, etc. Christians do not observe days, months, seasons.-Gospel Advocate.

---

**THE NEW CHRISTIAN LEADER**

F. L. ROWE, Publisher
434 ELM ST., CINCINNATI, OHIO

**January 8, 1941**

CONFIDENTIAL LETTER TO LEADER EDITORS.

Dear Brother:

About three weeks ago, Brother Davidson called up from New Jersey about 9:30, 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 Roy 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 influence to a paper for a few months at least whose purpose would be to expose Roy E. Wallace because of his bitter attacks upon 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, "I wanted my name and reputation. I told him he would have to find some one else that I would be no party to it."

Fraternally, [Signature]
In this age of machinery and specialization we need to define the word "hospitality." With many it is a lost virtue. With others hospitality knows no restrictions. Since Christians are to be "given to hospitality" we ought to know to what extent and of that which is forbidden. The word is defined as the love of strangers, but we apply it to those whom we know, who are our guests. "Forget not to show love unto strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." (Heb. 13:2). This verse reminds us of Abraham and Lot, both of whom "were given to hospitality." Once Elisha the prophet "passed to Shunem, where was a great woman; and she constrained him to eat bread. And so it was, that as oft as he passed by, he turned in thither to eat bread. And she said unto her husband, Behold now, I perceive that this is a holy man of God, that passeth by us continually. Let us make, I pray thee, three, a little chamber on the wall; and let us set for him there a bed, and a table, and a seat, and a candlestick: and it shall be, when he cometh to us, that he shall turn in thither." (2 Kings 4) They were given to hospitality, but they were not blind as to the man for they perceived that he was a holy man of God. They were not harboring a criminal.

The servants of God have often far exceeded more sumptuously than the Son of God. Jesus gave up his home in heaven, where welcome was celestial, and came to this land of sin and sorrow to find that he was unwanted. There was no room for him to be born in the inn. He was the love of strangers, in Nazareth they cast him out of the city. The Gaderenes asked Him to leave their country. He had no place to lay his head. "He came unto His own and they that were His own received Him not." They rejected Him and crucified Him. Today He stands at the door of men's hearts and knocks. He would be in our thoughts, conversations and life. This is the hospitality to which we all are to be given. But the world seems to think that it can get along without Jesus. There is no room for Him in the home. His word must not be discussed in the home. We may talk about politics, athletics and business but we must not talk about religion for fear that someone will get angry. If the homes of our country would welcome Christ, divorces would be unwelcome. But there are many Christless churches in the world today. In them He is unwelcome. Men join churches of their choice rather than choosing to be members of His church. His name is unwelcome, so they choose others. They cannot endure His doctrine so they heap to themselves no restrictions of doctrines after their own lusts. The Jews would not have Him to rule over them. They said, "We have no king but Caesar." Men are making the mistake today of having no one to teach them but a "pleaser." But there is objection to my saying that the denominational churches are Christless churches. Then I will speak in the language of the Bible. Hear these words: "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." (2 John 9). Christ is not welcome unless His doctrine is welcome. You cannot endure Christ unless you can endure His doctrine. You are not given to hospitality toward Christ unless you abide in the doctrine of Christ. If you are ashamed of the word of Christ you are ashamed of Christ. Of you He will be ashamed when he comes to judge the world. You will be unwelcome before Him.

Now, before your zeal gets ahead of your knowledge, we want to advise you to be careful not to violate some restrictions on hospitality. There are some limitations on both giving and receiving hospitality. It is against the laws of our country to harbor a criminal. It is against the law of God to fellowship an evil-doer. God says, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: for he that biddeth him God speed is a partaker of his evil deeds." (2 John 10, 11). It is a fearful thing to teach any doctrine other than the New Testament. It is an evil deed. Those who do it are evil-doers. Those who encourage it partake of the evil.

On the other hand, hospitality to the servants of Christ is hospitality to Christ. He said, "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth Him that sent me. He that receiveth a prophet in the name of a prophet shall receive a prophet's reward: and he that receiveth a righteous man in the name of a righteous man shall receive a righteous man's reward. And whosoever shall give to drink unto one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, verily I say unto you he shall in no wise lose his reward." (Matt. 10:40-42)

Now you ask, "What are we to do? We must not bid the false teacher God speed and we must encourage the righteous man. How are we to know the one from the other?" You have asked for an answer which is as strong an argument that every one must study the Bible for himself, as can be made. Your neglect of studying the New Testament invites your participation in an evil by bidding a false teacher God speed. We are not building up a case to favor ourselves. We do not ask for the support of what we preach until the hearers are convinced that it is the word of God-as it is written. Only the false teacher has any fears of your study of the truth. You had better beware of the hospitality which bids God speed to a false doctrine.

The lethargy of this age has left the word of God standing outside, a stranger and unwanted. "Receive with meekness the implanted word which is able to save your soul." That is being given to hospitality to the word. When the word comes in the light comes in. "The entrance of thy word giveth light." When the light shines in you will be able to see the sheep's clothing of false prophets. You will remember that "the ministers of Satan transform themselves into ministers of righteousness." You will prove all things and hold fast only "to that which is good." You will try the spirits to see if they are of God. As Jesus cleansed the temple and cried, "Take these things hence; hence is no place for thee," so will you have a house cleansing when you "let the words of Christ dwell in you richly." This will apply to persons, homes, colleges and congregations.

Do not ask that we dull the edges of the sword of the Spirit. It is high time that the hearts of men were prickled. Their indifference has made them partakers of the evil deeds of false teachers. They have been harboring criminal doctrines. They have been utilized to sleep by the fumes of fair speech from the peace pipes of seducing spirits "set on fire by hell." Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee." Like the conquered and demobilized nations by Hitler, you are helpless to resist the onrushes of false doctrines when disarmed of the sword of the Spirit. We want that weapon in your hands. Do not ask the preachers of the gospel to pull their punches that the strongholds of Satan may fall of themselves. There must be some pulling down of those strong-
holds before there can be the proper rebuilding. There is a negative work to do as well as the constructive. Do not stay the hand that would direct the hammer of God which breaks the rocks of Satan to pieces. Do not try to soothe the burning spot on error that was put there by men of God focusing the rays from the book of the Sun of Righteousness. Do not ask us to tiptoe where we should put our foot down. We are building the temple of God, so do not ask us to come down into the plains of Ono for any compromise. That is forbidden hospitality. How could the unity which might come out of the "unity meetings" of Witty and Murch be acceptable to God when in them the discussion of the word of God is unwelcome? If discussion of the issues is forbidden the unity would be forbidden. The hospitality of such meetings is forbidden. As we would be careful not to accept the hospitality of a family with smallpox, without carrying to them the remedy, so should we beware of the hospitality of that church which has "caught" every sin from the "earitch to the blind staggers."—unless we can carry the remedy for their maladies.

It is better to be impolite than to accept an invitation to a place of revelings or a house of ill fame. "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor standeth in the way of sinners, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful." "Evil companionships corrupt good morals." Do not heed the call of the red lights or the bright lights. They welcome you as a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. Let us be given to hospitality to that which is good, but let us snatch those in sin from the fire of Satan's hospitality.

But we close with a word about a neglected hospitality. "When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends, nor thy brethren, nor thy kinsmen, nor rich neighbors; lest haply they also bid thee again, and a recompense be made thee. But when thou makest a feast, bid the poor, the maimed, the lame, the blind: and thou shalt be blessed; because they have not wherewith to recompense thee: for thou shalt be recompensed in the resurrection of the just." (Luke 14: 12-14).

**MEETING WITH THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH**

HUGO MCCORD

Brethren in many states from on the Murch-Witty arrangements, not because they love division, but because the reconciliation is hopeless. Those who know the Christian Church know that it does not aim to change at all. Hence, wise brethren are not wasting time giving the beautiful unity plea where it is in no wise appreciated. But certainly there is not a man among us who would reject an invitation to speak that story of one- ness to anyone or to any audience that is really interested.

The Fourteenth Street Church, Washington, D. C., recently had an opportunity for a meeting with a Christian Church. At Riverdale, Maryland, a Christian Church had become so rundown that its pastor deserted, and most of its members quit. A few women and one man allowed speakers from Fourteenth Street to go there Sunday after Sunday. Then a series of meetings was held, resulting in the entire church (ten people) taking public stand for what is right, and against all digression. One organ and two pianos were disposed of and steps taken to put the restrictive clause in the deed. They worship regularly now after the New Testament pattern.

A lady (member of National City Christian Church) told a loyal preacher, "I don't think there is much be-
GLIMPSES INTO THE BAPTISMAL CONTROVERSY

WARREN E. STARNES

When did the baptismal controversy begin? It did not have its beginning in the primitive, or apostolic period of the church. The controversy on infant baptism began, in the early part of the ancient period, in the time of the “church fathers.” In that same period clinic baptism had its origin, which led to skirmishes related to debate. The question was: Whether copious affusions upon sick, bedridden persons should be accepted as baptism, as in the case of Novatian. Can the reader not see that, if during the apostolic period of the church, the primitive period, if during that period there had been any use for copious affusions upon sick, bedridden persons, the world would have known it? Did they not have sick folks in those days? Did they not have infants in those early, first days of the church? If humanity had lost its fecundity and they had no infants, two generations would have exhausted the human race. Besides, sickness, disease, illness were still invading the bodies of men. If not, Novatian would not and could not have been a subject for the (mode) of baptism which led to the debate. Cannot any one see that the occasion of the first skirmish that even resembled a controversy, that near to the apostolic period, was a departure?

Who, then, is responsible for the origin of the controversy? and, who is responsible for its sinful propagation? The debate is going to continue. It cannot cease. Notwithstanding its sinfulness, despite the fact that it is a reproach to Christ and to his church, the debate cannot be avoided; for the ever-living Christ is the Author of the ordinance, and it will continue to be an ever-living controversy, or, it will bring an abiding peace.

Let the reader now try to imagine on what ground a controversy could arise, either about infant baptism, or clinic baptism, that near to the primitive period of the church. What would the reader think of a man today, who would affirm that there is no such thing as infant sprinkling, affusion, and pouring for baptism, with that thing going on all around us, with Methodist and Presbyterian church records as cautiously guarded in setting down their additions to their respective churches, as they do in marking the birthdays of new-born infants in their homes. Why argue or debate, in the early days of the second period of the church about whether a weeping infant should be sprinkled, or whether adult manhood should receive an affusion, if that thing had been going on at any time during the apostolic period of the church? The reader should remember, that in years the apostolic period of the church is the shortest of all the periods, howsoever divided, as we have the divisions to-day. There were people living at the time the controversy began, who had the most reliable traditions of the church from Pentecost, up until the day Novatian took his illness. Add those traditions to the fact, that they still had the New Testament, and it will be easy to see how the controversy got started. It was a departure, that is all; and no thinking man can justly criticize the repetition here: That the sin of this thing shall lie at the door of those who started it, and remain in the polluted sanctuary where it is being foisted.

Baptism was preached and administered to all the Jewish sectaries, throughout all the provinces the assembled multitudes represented on the day of Pentecost. Besides, during the life time of the apostles, the gospel invaded all the cities and provinces of the Gentile world. The facts seem to show that a directive providence took a precaution, for which all the denominational preachers of the world cannot account, from the premises they occupy; and which, all the wisdom of this world cannot set aside.

Glance at it for a moment. Baptism, as we have it in the commission was a new word to both Jews and Gentiles. It was not such a new word, as far as the four letters in it are concerned; but as it appears in the commission it was a new word to both Jew and Gentile. Faith was an old word to the Jews; yet, as Jesus used that old word to the Jews in the fourteenth chapter of John, it had a freshness and newness of meaning, which the five letters in that word never had before. Look at it: “Ye believe in God, believe also in me.” (John 14:1).

Those seven letters making up that word always meant “faith” to a Jew; but those letters had something projected into them in John 14:1, which never resided there before in that sense. The same thing is true of the untranslated word “Baptize,” as Jesus gave it in the commission. The seven letters of baptism, making up the “baptism of John,” are in appearance and formality the same as that word anywhere else, except in the commission of our Lord. In that commission, there is latent and inherent an element of animating, life-giving power, not found in that word anywhere else. “New” therefore does not mean that they had not seen that word before; but it means “new” in another sense.

This “new” word to both Jew and Gentile required definiteness in statement. If that definiteness in statement did not reside in that word as every man heard it in his own tongue wherein he was born, on the day of Pentecost, then the Holy Spirit, not the apostles, sowed the seeds which had inherently in them, all the elements of dissension and dissolution. Notwithstanding the formalities of John’s Baptism; notwithstanding the act performed by the twelve and the seventy, this baptism of the great commission has something all the others did not have.

Let us now consider the premeditated caution of a directive providence. That there should be words expressive of different uses of water, as well as different applications of water, is a necessity of language. This is simply self evident. To choose therefore, the word expressive of a specific mode, or action in the use of water is the consideration now before us; and this choice will take care of the necessity of language to accommodate itself to whatever Jehovah wants done in any or all of His uses of water, especially, regarding baptism.

The Holy Spirit made choice, and gave utterance on the day of Pentecost, a word which wrought unity and unanimity out of all kinds of confusion; and the continuation of the “apostles’ doctrine” etc., of that occasion, kept uniformity and peace through the apostolic period of the church on baptism; for there was not a jar on that subject until the ancient period had begun which was after the apostles and their contemporaries were dead. There is one side to the baptismal controversy which can account for this; there is one side which cannot do so from its premises. Which one is the truth side?

Every reader knows that the Holy Spirit did the speaking on Pentecost, through the apostles. Those apostles were not merely “moved to speak,” beyond that, they were used for speech. “The prophecy came not in old time by the Will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved.
ed by the Holy Spirit." (2nd Pet. 1:21)
There is a graduated, higher difference between being simply "moved to speak" and being "used for speech." "And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit it gave them utterance." (Acts 2:4)
What does "utterance" mean? "Utterance, the act of uttering words." The Holy Spirit not only moved them, to speak; He used them for speech: He used their vocal organs, selected the words Himself, their verbal utterance; so the apostles neither selected the thoughts nor the words of the occasion for what they said. The Holy Spirit Himself selected the word, from all the languages understood and spoken by the various representatives from all the provinces, and that word meant the same thing to each individual present, whether a Mede or an Elamite. When the Holy Spirit did that, He struck off an imprinted sheet of inspiration from which no one present ever departed, even if there were diversities of tongues, notions, etc; together with all their traditions of parent and infant relations in the same covenant, under their former religion.

Ah! Indeed the apostles spoke as "they were moved by the Holy Spirit;" but they were also used for speech in striking off this stereotyped copy of inspiration which was kept inviolate during the apostolic period of the church. "There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit." "There are diversities of administrations, but the same Lord." (1st Cor. 12:4-5).

In the reports from Pentecost, to the close of the first period of the church, all classes, ages, and sexes were commanded to be baptized, and were baptized, except one class only, Jews, Samaritans, Gentiles; those who worshipped idols and those who worshipped God under the influences of an old religion; treasurers, centurions, jailers, sorcerers, and murderers; but no mention or hint of the most innocent helpless and beloved of all classes: no infants.

Let the Paedo Baptist side to this controversy extricate itself from all this, or else permit the sin of the departure from the word of God, lie at the door where it originated, and remain behind the threshold of the polluted sanctuary where it is harbored.

Recently, where I attended church, a young man got up at the close of the service and made an announcement and pep talk about the United Service Organization. He stated that this organization was for the purpose of raising money to aid in keeping the morale and standards of army and civilian life at high pitch, and to build recreation halls where the boys in training would have a nice place to spend their spare time. He also stated that the other "churches" of the city were going to cooperate in this movement and left the impression that the church of Christ was being expected to contribute to this fund.

Of course, this money will be used to promote dancing, card playing, picture shows and just what it takes to entertain the boys, but will any of it be used in preaching the gospel to these boys? I believe I am safe in saying that not one dime of it will be used for that purpose. How can a Christian contribute to anything that is connected with war? There is a line of separation between the church and the world; which side is war on? If it is all right to contribute to the USO, why not contribute to the Salvation Army and other such organizations? I believe it wrong to even make an announcement (such as this young man made) in the house of the Lord.

This young man is a fine fellow, has many friends, is a publisher, teaches in the High School, teaches a Bible class on Sunday morning (when there) and could be a wonderful leader in God's work; if he would take as much interest in it as he does the U. S. O., Lion's Club and such. I am told that he helps promote dances and such in the high school where he teaches, and then on Sunday comes to church and teaches a Bible class. I have nothing personal against this young man, but I am afraid he has the wrong idea about the church and what it stands for.

One should not be surprised at what the young do when they grow up under a leadership that donates money to denominational preachers and churches, announce their programs from the pulpit, go and indorse their services, brag on the sect preachers, buy their ice cream and pies when they know that these sects are false denominational friends and they might lose a dollar in the business world. I am glad to say that about three fourths of this congregation stood pat behind brother Wallace and we had a good meeting. The next year there were 23 baptized during the meeting at this place and many have said that it was due to the meeting brother Wallace held the year before.

Brother, better stop playing around with the Lord's work, getting into every little old organization, indorsing the sects and taking part in their doings. Just a few years on this old earth and then we go to face the great Judge. Would you want to take all these organizations with you? You better shake them while you can, it might be too late when you walk up to the bar. If you are a Christian, it is the church or it is nothing.

WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THAT?
MARION DAVIS

A Songbook Hint
Do not purchase new songbooks until you have sent for a copy of Complete Christian Hymnal for examination. The second edition now off the press. Three hundred eighty two songs — old and new. Two bindings: Limp, 35c; heavy cloth, unbreakable backs, red edges, 50c write for price per hundred.

Marion Davis Co.
Box 162 Fayette, Ala.
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fight." This is not the "true Christian spirit" Brother Smith is commended for having "shown." We believe that the Bible Banner is prompted by higher motives than the "love to be in a fight." If you doubt it, let one or more of our best friends begin doing some of the things we are fighting, and see whether or not we run to his defense. That is not our idea of fighting.

There is one more "finding" which must have been found with the record book closed and both eyes shut.

"We acquit W. Wallace Layton and .........", of all guilt in connection with this matter, as the evidence conclusively shows they acted in self-defense. against what appeared to them real or apparent danger.

The blank stands for the unmentionable in Oklahoma City, and as far as he is concerned "the evidence conclusively shows" nothing of the kind. That is one time the Judge's finger slipped clear off the pulse of "John Q. Public." The idea of acquitting that chief of sinners in vile utterance "of all guilt!" If he is to be thus acquitted, it should be ruled a mortal sin for anybody to ever again put a bridle on his tongue. I suggest that Judge Kenley go to Oklahoma City, as G. C. Brewer did recently, and put his finger on the pulse of "John Q. Public" up there where the character assassin has his lair.

CONSIDERING THE SOURCE

Brother Brewer might be real good at invective if he would climb down off that high-horse vocabulary of his. His temperament and present state of mind are ideal for that sort of thing. Since he professes to think I am an expert in that line, I am passing him a bit of advice even at the risk of later being the victim of it. When you want to get under a man's skin, don't call him a "megalomaniac" or anything else that is hard to spell or pronounce. It might be all right if you only wanted to crack his jaw. Call him something he can understand without thumbing a dictionary. Now, take the editor of the Bible Banner for instance. When you called him a "megalomaniac," if it had been anybody else in the world besides you talking, he might have thought you were bragging on him. When Brother Brewer gets mad he sounds like a racing automobile engine with the clutch out and the wheels standing still. He ought to streamline his vocabulary and let the clutch in.

We are not wanting to fight with anybody who naturally just does not like us much, and winces a bit at the directness with which we go at things, if he will be about half-way decent about it. But I have been doing some figuring on this mad crowd which has risen up "in self-defense" to smite him a "megalomaniac." If you only wanted to crack his jaw. Call him something he can understand without thumbing a dictionary. Now, take the editor of the Bible Banner for instance. When you called him a "megalomaniac," if it had been anybody else in the world besides you talking, he might have thought you were bragging on him. When Brother Brewer gets mad he sounds like a racing automobile engine with the clutch out and the wheels standing still. He ought to streamline his vocabulary and let the clutch in.

We are not wanting to fight with anybody who naturally just does not like us much, and winces a bit at the directness with which we go at things, if he will be about half-way decent about it. But I have been doing some figuring on this mad crowd which has risen up "in self-defense" to smite him a "megalomaniac." If you only wanted to crack his jaw. Call him something he can understand without thumbing a dictionary. Now, take the editor of the Bible Banner for instance. When you called him a "megalomaniac," if it had been anybody else in the world besides you talking, he might have thought you were bragging on him. When Brother Brewer gets mad he sounds like a racing automobile engine with the clutch out and the wheels standing still. He ought to streamline his vocabulary and let the clutch in.

LOCAL CHURCH DISTURBANCES

The surest way for some elders to bring their qualifications under fire from some preachers is for them to decide that a change of preachers is desirable. Even majority rule preachers are willing to be subject to "qualified" elders, meaning of course that the elders think they are the right men for the places they are in. A change of mind on the part of the elders disqualifies them and then the congregation develops a "qualification" that had hitherto blushed unseen, if a majority happen to be in favor of keeping the preacher. Sometimes, or oftener, the preacher is able to contribute his mite to the development of this congregational qualification by judicious "personal work." The members sometimes need some clerical help to find out that their elders are "unqualified." It is possibly just a coincidence that the preacher discovers that elders are not "qualified" about the same time they discover that he would be better qualified for another field. Preachers might be better able to pass on the qualifications of elders, if they had less of a personal interest in the matter. The qualifications and duties of elders should, of course, be studied and preached on, but there ought to be some sort of a law against a preacher taking it for a subject at a place he is trying to stay when the elders have decided he ought to leave. It is not adding anything to the qualifications of either preachers or elders. It more often creates discord in the church.

There are several angles, all serious, to the problem of a divided church when a church-busting preacher is mixed up in it. One of them is the woman-question. Bless 'em, we can't get along without them, but they are sometimes hard to handle in a church fuss, especially if we are trying to save a church and the preacher ought to move as a part of the process. He is sometimes "a devil" with the women. No, this is no reflection on his faithfulness to his wife, if he has one, or his personal purity if he hasn't. The woman involved may be as old as Sarah, if not as docile, and have a fair record as "a mother in Israel." She has a big sympathetic heart always yearning to mother some unfortunate victim of injustice-and the preacher knocks at the door. When he "confidentially" and sorrowfully relates his "problem," his hungry heart gets the sympathy it craves. She may let him sample something she has in the ice-box to refresh his wounded spirit and her attitude is as easily translated as one of AESop's fables. "Why, you poor darling, these old popes can't do that to you?" From here out he has some help with the visiting "problem" and the elders begin to hear that they are "so-called" and "unqualified." And sometimes the charge is not entirely without foundation. What have the elders been doing? It may be that they have been too busy attending to their own problems. "Tend the flock of God" and the preacher tends to the flock instead of doing the work of an evangelist as he is supposed to do. It is not unusual in a local church disturbance to hear a chorus of feminine voices running up and down the whole diatonic scale to the tune of how some dazzling preacher has been abused by some "so-called" elders. "The forgotten man" is often some devout soul who suffers in silence, and anxiously wonders what is going to become of the church which the Lord purchased with his own blood.