The editor of the Baptist and Reflector works himself up to a state of more or less righteous indignation over the prevalent efforts of some religious leaders to conceal their identity and "slip up on the blind side" of people, so to speak. He takes a crack at Seventh Day Adventists, Jehovah's Witnesses and "others like them" who "seem to be unwilling to indicate their doctrinal complexion at the start in order that they may snare people into a situation where they can pump their doctrine into them." He thinks they ought to show more and earlier honesty in identifying themselves. I think that the editor is justified in a good deal that he says "along this line." Whatever a man is, he ought to be willing to admit it on the slightest provocation, unless he is ashamed of it, in which case he ought to quit it. The editor avers that

"When people are asked to attend a religious lecture or a series of religious services, they have the right to be informed as to the nature thereof and as to the auspices under which these things are had. Fairness to the public demands that in some way the denominational identity be made known."

The Catholics, Episcopalians, Christian Scientists, Campbellites, and certain others, are to be commended for their fairness along this line. So far as we have observed, they let the public know who they are when making announcements of their services.

We are glad "to be commended for fairness along this line" even if the editor does make the compliment a doubtful one by calling us "Campbellites." It is trick appeal to prejudice that Baptists generally feel compelled to make use of. We have learned from experience not to expect too much of them in the way of "fairness along this line." It is said that self preservation is the first law of life and when a Baptist editor calls me a Campbellite, I try to take a charitable view of his lack of courtesy. He is really not trying to offend me as much as he is trying to defend himself. Harnessed up as he is with party connections and unscriptural name, he senses the fact that it puts him at a disadvantage to recognize me for what I claim to be and he heaps upon the man whom he labels a 'sectarian!'

"Then there is the man who advertises himself as a 'Campbellite' or any other kind of an "ite" or a 'tite.' I just want to be a Christian and a member of the Body of Christ that includes all the true followers of Christ. Now, if I have made a mess of things by becoming a Campbellite when I didn't go to do it I believe that "fairness along this line" demands that the Baptist and Reflector point out my mistake and show me how to do what he and other partisans readily admit can be done. He has no right to try to compel me to be a partisan just because he is one. I don't want to be one especially since it is generally admitted that I can go to heaven without being one. I would like to do it like Paul and the early Christians did, before they were any "Catholics, Episcopalians, Christian Scientists, Campbellites, and certain others." I have read a good deal about Christians in the New Testament but do not now recall "that in some way the denominational identity" of them was "made known." A Roman orator called Paul a pestilent fellow ... and a ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes." I suppose he thought that "fairness to the public demanded" that Paul be denominationally identified. Unbelieving Jews in Rome said: "as concerning this sect, it is known to us that everywhere it is spoken against." We cannot commend "their fairness along this line." Of course Paul did not like to hear the body of Christ stigmatized as a sect, but he was rather polite about it. He replied: "But this I confess unto thee, that after the Way which they call a sect, so serve I the God of our fathers." This is about as good an answer as I can think of to point at the editor of the Baptist and Reflector when he calls us "Campbellites." If I were shut up to the choice of being either "a Campbellite" or a Baptist, I might be willing to leave the decision to the flip of a coin, but since I can be a Christian without being either, I believe I'll just take a sure thing.

The editor is rather caustic in speaking his mind about some of the nondescripts in religion.

"Then there is the man who advertises himself as a 'non-sectarian' or 'interdenominational.' What lofty scorn he heaps upon the man whom he labels a 'sectarian!' Doctrinally and eclesiastically speaking, he seems unwilling (Cont. On Back Page)"
THAT "NOBLE SYMBOL OF UNITY"

It will be remembered that not long ago the Bible Banner called attention to an editorial in the Christian Standard by Edwin Errett commending E. L. Jorgenson and his premillennial songbook. The Christian Standard announced editorially that it had adopted the Jorgenson songbook and urged all the Christian Churches to buy it and use it as "a noble symbol of unity." Between the "two groups" Christian Churches and Churches of Christ.

It will also be remembered that the Bible Banner called attention to the fact that in the Lexington Unity Meeting E. L. Jorgenson paid flattering tributes publicly to S. S. Lappin, one of the leading evangelists of the Christian Church, stating that he would like to go around with him and lead the singing in his meetings. In this same "National Unity Meeting" at Lexington, S. H. Hall, of Nashville, Tennessee, publicly pronounced, with his usual dramatics, that S. S. Lappin's address was the greatest speech he had ever heard in his life! And that sort of back-slapping and mutual admiration was the order of the great (?) unity meeting! Except that it was not altogether mutual-be cause as previously remarked the group of Digressive preachers there were said by eye-witnesses to actually turn and give each other the wink while S. H. Hall, Claud F. Witty, and others of our brethren were making their speeches. These Christian Church preachers knew that our preachers there were being taken in but they were so gullible as not to know it, or else knowing it were willing to be taken in.

It will not be forgotten that the Bible Banner also pointed out that the results of such meetings would be the abandonment of the issues entirely and that before long the Digressive preachers would be holding meetings in the churches where the brethren participating in these meetings live and preach.

It has come to pass. The following announcement was taken from the daily paper in Louisville, Kentucky:

S. S. Lappin, former editor of the "Christian Standard," will preside at a series of tent meetings beginning Sunday at Highland Church of Christ, Bardstown Road and Longest. Mr. Lappin was a professor at Bethany College and is author of several books. The meetings will be held at 7:45 p.m. daily except Saturday.

The following ad also appeared in the Louisville press:

Hear This Great Gospel Preacher!

S. S. LAPPIN
July 13 to 27
Highland Church of Christ
Bardstown Road near Longest Avenue

Three Sunday Mornings in the Church House
Every Evening (Omitting Saturdays)
in Tent on Lawn

The "Highland Church of Christ" mentioned in the above newspaper announcements is the church where E. L. Jorgenson preaches. It is the church in which Don Carlos Janes is a leader. Thus these two men, concerning whom the brotherhood has been repeatedly warned, have now come out into the open in their affiliations with the Christian Church. They believe in "fellowship" so strongly that they fellowship everybody-except loyal preachers and all Christians who oppose their millennial teaching. It was this same church, under the direction of E. L. Jorgenson and Don Carlos Janes, that "withdrew fellowship" from such men as C. A. Taylor and those who compose one of the best churches in the whole brotherhood today, (the Bardstown Road Church in Louisville) because they stood against the permillennial teaching of E. L. Jorgenson and Don Carlos Janes. But they extend full fellowship to S. S. Lappin, a Digressive evangelist, and have him to hold the meeting for the Highland Church of Christ.

The Gospel Advocate has recently made editorial comments on the report of this Jorgenson-Lappin meeting in the Christian Messenger. Brother Goodpasture did not tell who the Christian Messenger's editor is nor what it is. The most of his readers would never know who Brother Goodpasture was talking about. Why the timidity? Why let them down so lightly? The editor of the Gospel Advocate is so apparently afraid of engaging in some personalities that he will not even let people in on what and who he is talking about even when he (so seldom) undertakes to expose error.

But in the next issue of the Gospel Advocate Brother H. Leo Boles exposed the whole affair in a manner worthy of the old Gospel Advocate. He did not mince words. In the same article he exposed the modernism of Walter W. Sikes, and his Christian Church connections and sympathies. Walter W. Sikes is my brother-in-law, married a sweet sister of mine and led her astray. Walter Sikes received his start toward modernism and digression in Abilene Christian College under the influence of such men as G. A. Klingman, David L. Cooper, and others who Jesse P. Sewell retained on his faculty over the warnings and protests of some of the strongest men in the church who knew where these men stood. And it was Jesse P. Sewell who so recently did everything in his power to fasten Clinton Davidson on the colleges and churches of the West. It was also Brother Sewell who held a similar meeting with a Digressive preacher, with a digressive church cooperating, at Waxahachie, Texas, a meeting similar to the Jorgenson-Lappin meeting in Louisville. Yet Brother Sewell recently demanded that anybody name anything in which he has been "unsound." Well, he is the one who started such young men as Walter Sikes on the road to digression and modernism through Abilene Christian College. So Walter Sikes now writes an article for a magazine published by a Christian Church College, in which he avers that the "Church of Christ" and the "Christian Church" are two denominations that have grown out of the same movement! In other words, because those who first formed the Christian church departed from the New Testament order of things and went away, the church itself thereby became a denomination. If the...
church was not a denomination before 'the Christian Church came into being, why should the fact that some who were not loyal to the New Testament went out from us make it a denomination now? According to that idea of it, when John the apostle said some in his day "went out from us," that made the church that John belonged to a denomination! The "church of Christ" is just what it was before some went out for one thing or another—whether digressive or premillennialists. I am glad Brother Boles exposed the fallacies of Walter Sikes in his article. More is needed and the editor of the Bible Banner will join Brother Boles in doing it.

Surely honest brethren, even those who have been misguided, can now see that E. L. Jorgenson's songbook actually has a digressive and sectarian affiliation, being held as "a noble symbol of unity" between his group and the digressives. The Christian Church is now his medium of promoting his book. It should certainly be abandoned by all loyal churches. The reasons are obvious.

With digressive preachers holding meetings for Jorgenson's church in Louisville, and Jorgenson holding a meeting in return for a digressive church in Indiana, the purpose of the Unity Meetings is now revealed. No further argument should be necessary. The course of the premillennialists is also manifest. It is the common ground of these men. They are all unsound on every vital issue before the church, both in doctrine and worship.

The next Bible Banner will review more fully the report of the Jorgenson-Lappin meeting in the Christian Standard by S. S. Lappin and in the Christian Messenger by Don Carlos Janes. But knowing these things now—will the churches of Christ continue to aid E. L. Jorgenson in the promotion of his errors by the purchase and use of his hymn books? And will they continue to send missionary money to Don Carlos Janes who has proved so unfaithful in teaching and practice? I cannot believe loyal churches will do it; but if in certain instances they do, loyal members should protest and continue to protest until their protests become effective. Truly, "by their fruits ye shall know them."

—F. E. W.

THE LAMENTATIONS OF F. L. ROWE

In recent issues of the Bible Banner there appeared the reproductions of a letter written by Brother F. L. Rowe to the editors of the paper which is now called the "Christian Ledger." It was the old Christian Leader until Brother Rowe sold out to Clinton Davidson and Company and was "tricked" (he called it so) by old Leader, being tricked by Davidson once should have cured him, but instead he listened to another Davidson "trick" in which he was aided by Claud F. Witty, the Unity Meeting promoter, and so Brother Rowe is in trouble again.

The story goes as follows: Clinton Davidson called Brother Rowe on long distance telephone from New Jersey or Cincinnati and proposed to finance his vaper if he would use it to "expose Foy E. Wallace, Jr." Brother Rowe did not accept the offer. Shortly afterward Claud F. Witty boarded the train and went from Detroit, Michigan, to Cincinnati, Ohio, to carry the proposal in person. The reason he gave for wanting me exposed, as stated by Brother Rowe, was because I have opposed their Unity Meetings and other Davidson-Witty activities. Now there is their reason—their very reason—for attempting in every underhanded way to cut the throat of the editor of the Bible Banner.

Brother Rowe states that he refused but because he wanted to run a clean paper. That was well and good. But he did not stop there. Brother Rowe aided and abetted in the thing these men were proposing to attempt to do by actually giving them advice on how to do it—told them to get a small town printer and a small town paper to do the job. So he evidently thought it should be done or he would not have advised them how to do it. Like Balaam of old he said to a modern Balak: "I cannot do it, but I will tell you how to get it done."

After this Brother Rowe addressed a form letter to the four editors of the "Christian Leader," which he entitled "Confidential Letter To The Editors Of The Christian Leader," in which he related these schemes. It so happens that one of the editors is a faithful friend of mine, and a friend of the Cause of God. Brother Ben F. Taylor, of Bowling Green, Kentucky, known by thousands of people as a godly man and loved by all who know him, is that man. When Brother Taylor received the letter revealing the cut-throat scheme of Davidson and Witty he wrote Brother Rowe that he (Brother Rowe himself) should send that information to me, the victim of their schemes. When Brother Rowe did not do so, Brother Taylor was Christian enough and man enough to send it to me himself because he thought that friendship, Christianity and common honor among men required it of him.

It was published—a photographic copy of it in the Bible Banner, without asking Brother Taylor's permission. This was done not so much as a matter of personal defense, though I was the personal victim marked for their wicked destruction. The letter was published because brethren everywhere should know the character of the men who are menacing the church and threatening those who are fighting to uphold it. It was published without Brother Taylor's permission because I wanted him to be able to say, as he has said, that he did not have it published and did not know that it was going to be published.

Now Brother Rowe puts out a special edition of the "Christian Ledger" which could very properly be called the "Lamentations of F. L. Rowe." He brands Ben F. Taylor, of Kentucky, as a traitor, and wishes that he could have died before this happened to him. Why? What he did was done by himself, and therefore what he wants to die for must be because it has been made known. He should want to live to make amends for selling out to Clinton Davidson in the first place, and for being a party to their dark schemes in the second place.

We simply contend that a scheme to destroy a man, stab him in the back, cut his throat in the dark, is not a proper subject for a "confidential letter," and I do not hesitate to say that I feel absolutely under no sort of obligation, christian or ethical, to keep such diabolical designs a secret. It is indeed a strange complex when men think that they may enter a secret pact to assassinate a man's character, but when the man they propose to assassinate discovers it and exposes them, he has committed a great sin and is a traitor and a betrayer! The fact is, they started out to do some "exposing" and they have got "exposed." It all depends on whose ox is gored!

There are a great many faithful brethren who will resent Brother Rowe's calling Kentucky's Ben F. Taylor a traitor and otherwise vilifying him. It is not true. As for the publication of the letter, the full responsibility is my own, and I gladly accept it. I have no compunction of conscience in having done so. I do regret that it has become the occasion of reproach and suffering on the part of my loyal friend. I would like to hear the reproach that is being heaped upon him. But while Brother Rowe and some of his other editors are tirading against Brother Taylor, there are other thoughtful brethren who are sending him words of praise and commendation. Among these is the letter from Brother R. L. Dunagan, an elder in the church where Brother Taylor preaches, than whom there is none better in God's service.

(Cont. on page 15)
In the Christian Leader October 15, 1940, Brother Armstrong had what I considered a very fine article under the heading “Free Speech and Fearless Teachers.” I published his article, with comments, in the January issue of the Bible Banner. I received a paper—Bulletin Harding College, on Premillennialism,” mailed to Searcy, Ark., Jan. 31, 5:30 p.m. I took it for granted that the Bible Banner had been received at Harding College. I thought that the “Bulletin” was the College’s reply to some of the questions I asked Armstrong. However, it seems now, that it was nearly two months before the Bible Banner, in a some what circuitous route, fell into Brother Armstrong’s hands. I published Brother Armstrong’s article verbatim; but with no thought or intention of mistreating Brother Armstrong, or misusing his article, I cut his article into paragraphs, and replied to each paragraph separately. Since Brother Armstrong thinks that I was unfair in my treatment of his article, I apologize to him, and will publish the following letter just as he wrote it.

Dear Brother Lewis:

I do not read the Bible Banner. I am forced to class it as bad literature because there is so much in it that is unfair, untrue, and divisive. A friend of mine in another state who never subscribed for the paper, yet receives it regularly, I understand, sometimes sends me a copy.

Brother Lewis, I think you have not forgotten a little piece of history that took place years ago, in which Daniel Sommer and David Lipscomb were central figures. They had engaged to discuss the College question or some other living issue, in their papers. When Brother Lipscomb sent his first article, Brother Sommer chopped it up into paragraphs, replying to each as you have done to mine. When Brother Lipscomb saw it in print, he withdrew from the debate, and said that he was willing for Brother Sommer to do all the good he could, but that his name would henceforth never appear again in the Gospel Advocate, and it did not while Brother Lipscomb lived. You give to my article the same fair (?) treatment that Brother Sommer gave to Brother Lipscomb’s, for I suppose, chopped up in paragraphs, you have included in your open letter my entire article, “Free Speech and Fearless Teachers.”

Since Harding College is a private institution, neither under government or Church control, the Board of Regents and the faculty are the only agencies that could “oust” me from the College. Of course our critics and enemies can fight the College, create embarrassment, destroy brotherly love, and cause to grow up in some congregations two parties—all this we deeply regret—but they can “oust” nobody.

No other member of the faculty, I think, has enjoyed or does now enjoy stronger support by the Board and Faculty than I. Your mention of this effort to “oust” me suggests to me, however, that you are suffering from some kind of illusion that there is a lack of harmony at Harding College. While we have our problems, Brother Lewis, our difficulties, and our burdens at Harding College, there has never been the slightest jar here in our faculty over our different “ideas on the millennium” to this minute. Oh yes, there have been efforts on the outside to put discord into our organization and to cause disruption. In fact, one man has admitted that his effort to reach an agreement with us was to get on the inside that he might have an advantage and be able to fight more effectively. But only one member of the Board has ever been disturbed and his case is rather pitiful when all facts are known. Inside we have had no lack of harmony over our different ideas on the millennium or any other subject. We, for instance, have different ideas on the Christian’s relation to war and other subjects and questions, as well, but we know how to get along in harmony in such matters. So there is nobody resigning at Harding College, getting out, and starting another school. I am confident that if I please God, as long as I am useful to Harding College and the work of the Lord, I shall have a place to work. You may rest easy regarding the movement to “oust” me. I am not worrying; I am letting these busy-bodies do that.

Your suggestion also indicates that you think that my “ideas on the millennium” are vitiating, destructive; so much so that they make me unworthy of the fellowship and association of those who differ from my “ideas on the millennium.” Brother Lewis, this sounds divisive. Is this an invitation to others in Harding College who may hold different ideas on the millennium from mine, to leave me, reproach me, and start up at another place? And for what? For differing in ideas on the millennium—shades of the Campbells, Stones and Scotts, who fought an unparalleled battle for the unity of God’s people!

Such veteran heroes of the cross as T. W. Brents and J. A. Harding preached their sermons on the millennium before David Lipscomb, E. G. Sewell, J. C. McQuiddy, F. D. Shrigley, etc. There was never a jar among them over different ideas on the millennium, and never was there a suggestion of anybody’s leaving anybody else and starting another work. The idea of making alienation, strife, disfellowship, and division over their differences on this question would have been spurned by these great leaders of God’s people.

I have held the same position on the millennium for well-nigh forty years, or else I am incapable of judging my own position. Either this, or I am a plain liar. My position is easy to understand, unless one prefers to take what my enemies say my position is rather than to let me state my position for myself. I think you could not claim that you do not know the positions of Brents and Harding on the millennium. That, “I hold and have held for thirty years about the same position on the millennium that was held by Dr. T. W. Brents and James A. Harding,” was published in the Firm Foundation, Gospel Advocate, and Christian Leader in 1935. To a man that knew J. A. Harding as you did, therefore, I ought to be pretty well in the clear.

In your open letter you say that if you understand the difference between my position and R. H. Boll’s on the millennium, it is the difference between “tweedledum and tweedledee.” Then, since I cannot see how you could misunderstand my position; namely, that “I hold and have held for thirty years about the same position on the millennium that was held by Dr. T. W. Brents and James A. Harding,” I conclude that you judge the difference between J. A. Harding’s position and R. H. Boll’s position on the millennium is the difference between “tweedledum and tweedledee.” So, this brings us face to face with this reality: If James A. Harding were living and were to preach on the millennium and T. W. Brents were living and were to preach on the millennium—as they freely did in their day—you brethren would be in a determined fight to exclude them from the fellowship of the faithful. You would be encouraging others in their school out of harmony with their ideas on the millennium not to “oust” them, but to get
I have said for years, Brother Lewis, that neither James A. Harding nor T. W. Brents could, if living and preaching as they did while living, escape the markings, the besmirchings, the vile misrepresentations, that are determinedly being made on faithful men in this age. You know, and I know, that these two men preached their sermons on the millennium when they got ready, and they got ready when they pleased, and nobody said the “nay.” But it now turns out that the difference between their position on the Millennium and R. H. Boll’s is the difference between “tweedledum and tweedledee.” Really, Brother Lewis, if these men were living now, would you invite them to preach in your congregation, and would you make them free to preach on the Millennium? Brother Brents, you know, thought enough of his sermon to leave it to us in his book of sermons. Must have valued it!

While I have believed about the same as Brents and Harding on the Millennium, there is, Brother Lewis, quite a difference, however, between me on the Millennium and Brents and Harding on the same subject. They thought the truth they held on this subject so important that it should be taught and accordingly they taught it in pulpits, in class and in print, whereas I have never thought it so very important and hence, in my forty-five years of active preaching life, have never spoken on the subject.

Your letter also brings into clear light another thing; namely, either that host of faithful disciples in the brotherhood today who held that R. H. Boll’s position on the Millennium is not vitiating, not harmful enough to make a ground for division and strife and disfellowship, must be correct (since the difference between the position held and preached by J. A. Harding and T. W. Brents and the position held and preached by R. H. Boll is the difference between “tweedledum and tweedledee” or David Lipscomb, E. G. Sewell, F. D. Srygley, J. C. McQuiddy, and many others, with their far-seeing minds and their clear understandings of God’s Word, failed to discern the vitiating doctrines of Harding and Brents, a doctrine that has been declared by some in recent years to be “more unscriptural and God-dishonoring” than any “doctrine of men that has arisen.” Surely you and some others were born too late.

Very sincerely,

J. N. Armstrong.

I am glad to give the readers of the Bible Banner your letter, Brother Armstrong, just as you wrote it, and I hope it will please you. The profitable hour that I spent in your classes, back in the halcyon days of youth, are still ossaes in the halls of memory. In those days you gave your students permission to ask you about anything you were trying to teach them that they did not understand. I am asking that same privilege today, and I do not think you should class my writings, or questions as “unfair” and “bad literature.” Of course I have had no honorary degrees conferred upon me, and if you want to say that my writings are not rhetorical, that might be the truth; but I do not think that you should use such terms as “bad literature.” I have just read the following card from Huntsville, Ala. “Dr. J. N. Armstrong, President Emeritus and Dean of Bible Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas, supplying during summer for Mr. Pullias at Central Church of Christ on East Clinton Street.” Is it because I call you “Bro.” instead of “Dr.” that makes my writings “bad literature”?

Now to your letters. I suppose what you mean in the first paragraph is that you and your friend “in another state” do not subscribe for the Bible Banner, but read the free copies that fall into your hands. The subscription price is only $1.00 a year, I believe if you would subscribe for it, and read it regularly, you would feel differently toward its writers. You insist on people visiting Harding College, if they want to know its position on certain subjects, and I am insisting on your reading the Bible Banner, that you may know what it teaches on all subjects. Since you seldom read the Bible Banner, it must be what your friends have said about it that has forced you to class it as bad unfair, untrue, and divisive literature. It would really take a “Dr.” to prescribe such a classification, and his would have to have a lot of false ingredients from his friends to do it. I had a spell of sickness, when I was down, and the family “Dr.” came and prescribed some very bitter medicine. One day when I was alone in the room, I got up, poured the medicine into the fire, put some water in the bottle crawled back in the bed and I took the prescription (?) with no ill effects. So I am going to dilute your prescription a little, take it and go right on with the rest of your letter.

As to the “little piece of history” you refer to in the second paragraph of your letter, I am not sure that I remember that particular “piece of history,” but in 1904 Daniel Sommer wrote an article under the heading “Horrible Revelations.” I was in Medford, Ontario that summer, and a friend there was taking Brother Sommer’s paper. When I read some things he had asked about the Nashville Bible school, I wrote and asked him some questions. He wrote me that David Lipscomb did not know as much about the Bible as some people thought he knew, and if I had read his article—“Horrible Revelations”—he was talking about David Lipscomb. The “Horrible Revelation” was, David Lipscomb had said the commission given by Jesus Christ gave men the right to teach the Bible in schools. So I suspect, Brother Armstrong, if you will brush up a little on your history, you will find it was the “horrible” things Brother Sommer said about Brother Lipscomb, rather than “chopping up his article into paragraphs” that caused Brother Lipscomb to wash his hands of the discussion. To speak of Brother Lipscomb’s article as a “horrible revelation” was about as Christian (?) as if he had called the Gospel Advocate “bad unfair, untrue, and divisive literature.” A number of years ago I wrote an article to the Gospel Advocate, Brother M. C. Kurfees “chopped it up into paragraphs” and replied to each paragraph as I did yours. I am not saying that this made the “chopping” right; but it does show that Daniel Sommer and I are not the only recreants, if “chopping up articles into paragraphs” be recreancy.

Your third and fourth paragraphs confirm my long standing fears, that if “our” Bible Colleges should go pre-millennial, digressive, modernistic, what not, there is nothing the churches could do about it. But the chances are the churches under their influence would go with them. That is the history of Bethany College, and history usually repeats itself. This danger grows as the endowments of “our” colleges grow. Where the carcass is, there the buzzards will gather. Doubtless you have heard David Lipscomb and J. A. Harding express these ideas many times, in more vigorous language. I have, but I never did think they were trying to sow “discord in our organizations.” It was from them that I received the ideas that produce my fears along that lines, fears that have been substantiated by the antics of some of “our colleges in recent years. You also say in your fourth paragraph: “Your mention of this effort to ‘oust’ me suggests to me, however that
you are suffering from some kind of illusion that there is a lack of harmony at Harding College." No, Brother Armstrong, I am not "suffering from some kind of illusion," neither am I laboring under mental delusions about the matter. I have been told that both the president, and dean of Harding College, say, or admit that your attitude toward the premillennialists among "us" today.

I were talking about the digressives, and he said: "Brother Larimore, in your hobnobbing with, and defending Harding's campus. I am sorry therefore that what I intended as a compliment and defense of you and your life's work is "so divisive" to you.

In your letter you take me for a little excursion in history. I was very fond of history when I was in school, and have not completely lost my love for it. So let us get back to our study in history, I had rather have you for a teacher than any man I know. Why do you suppose that "such veteran heroes of the cross as T. W. Brents and J. A. Harding could preach their sermons on the millennium before David Lipscomb, E. G. Sewell, J. C. McQuiddy, F. D. Srygley, etc." without "a jar among them over different ideas on the millennium," and later, when R. H. Boll began to "preach his sermons on the millennium," these same men, excepting F. D. Srygley who had gone to his reward, cut Boll off the front page of the Gospel Advocate? And when Boll was in a meeting at the Nashville Bible school, and announced that he would preach on "the millennium," David Lipscomb stopped him? Do you suppose it was because those men were getting old and childish? Will you give me a frank answer to these questions? Another "little piece of history that took place years ago." On January 1, 1900, that saintly man, T. B. Larimore, came to Nashville and held a three month's meeting for South College St. Church. At that time Brother Larimore did not think opinions (?) over missionary societies and instrumental music in the work and worship of the church, should cause him to "mark faithful men," so he had the digressive preachers to lead prayers, and take part in his meeting. Some one suggested that Brother Larimore come over and lecture to the boys; but that "veteran hero of the cross," J. A. Harding, said, no, "T. B. Larimore will never come here to lecture to the boys, as long as I am superintendent of the school, till he takes a stand against digression. He has been calling on those digressive preachers to lead his prayers and I had just as soon call on the devil himself." Brother Larimore never came to the school as long as J. A. Harding was superintendent of it. I was in Brother Harding's class when he made these statements. Now, Brother Armstrong, do you believe Brother Harding was "marking and besmirching" Brother Larimore "with vile misrepresentations"? ([Italics mine J. T. L.]) I am anxious to know what you think of this "little piece of history." If you had followed the example of your illustrious father-in-law, instead of following the example of Brother Larimore, in your hobnobbing with, and defending the disturbers of the peace of the churches today, there would be no criticism of the college that bears the name of that "veteran hero of the cross."

In later years when Brother Larimore was in a meeting with the West End Church here in Birmingham, he and I were talking about the digressives, and he said: "Brother Lewis, some of my brethren have gone farther from the truth than I ever thought they could go." It seems to me, Brother Armstrong, with the examples of David Cooper, and Charles Neal, dangling before your eyes, it is about time for you to come to the same conclusion about the Advocates of the Premillennial theories among "us" today. If you ever do, and will follow the example of your venerable father-in-law, in dealing with the sympathizers of those who persist in teaching their theories to the description of the church, you will find yourself in company with the editor and co-editors of the Bible Banner. This statement may make you a little sick, so we will recess till our next issue.

* * * * * ANOTHER LESSON IN HISTORY

Here I am, Brother Armstrong, for another "little" excursion in history. We will begin where we left off at recess. It is but natural that a man would defend his associates. Therefore knowing Cled and Foy Wallace as I do I do not believe they are quite as bad as you, Brother Clinton Davidson, and Brother R. H. Boll think they are, even if Foy has been declared, by a Harding College "Dr." to be a "megalomaniac." When I found that they were fighting for the same principles that were indelibly stamped upon my mind more than forty years ago, by J. A. Harding, who was in his prime when I sat at his feet, naturally I fell in with them, and I do not believe I "fell among thieves."

Back to your letter. I do not believe you are "incapable of judging your own position" on the millennium, or else I believe you are a "plain liar" when you state it. Those statements are your own, not mine. However, it is your "position on the millennium for well-nigh forty years," that I want to ask you about, and not T. W. Brents' and J. A. Harding's. When you, by any method of reasoning try to make me say that "The difference between J. A. Harding's position and R. H. Boll's position on the millennium is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee," you are putting words in my mouth that I never uttered, and words that no ink from my pen ever spelled. I said the difference between your position and R. H. Boll's on the millennium was about the difference between "tweedledum and tweedledee." I said that, Brother Armstrong, because you are so vehement in defending Boll's right to teach his theories, and so bitter in the philosophies you hurl against those who challenge his right, I thought logic would "force you" to avow his theories, and suffer the consequences. I got my logic under J. Paul Slayden, he may not have been right always in his deductions; but he was hot in defending them.

In speaking of your position on the millennium, you say: "I have never thought it so very important and hence, in my forty-five years of active preaching life, have never spoken on the subject." It makes no difference what your position on "the millennium" may be, if you have not spoken on the subject in forty-five years, nobody has a right to criticize you. So don't you know, Brother Armstrong, that it is your defense of those who teach, preach, edit papers, and publish books to promulgate their theories to the disruption of the peace and harmony of the churches, that has brought the criticisms upon you and upon Harding College? If you had been as silent, "in your forty-five years of active preaching life," in your defense of those who teach their theories on the "millennium," as you have been on the subject itself, there would be no criticism of Harding College on that score today. Therefore, out of the love and respect that I have long cherished for you, is it asking too much of you to state that even though you have defended those who persist in teaching their vagaries on the millennium henceforth you defend no man for thus teaching, and neither will you criticize those who challenge his right to teach his theories. I would consider statements like these from you, Brother Armstrong, a bit of good "literature" for the Bible Banner, and I feel sure that the clouds gathering over the Ozarks would disappear, and there would be a brighter day for Harding College, an institution that I think you should love more than you do your premillennial
friends. Many of your premillennial friends were once my best friends, as you know, but I love the peace and harmony of the church more than I valued their friendship, so I have lost their friendship.

There are some other things in your letter that I cannot understand. You say: “I hold and have held for thirty years about the same position on the millennium that was held by Dr. T. W. Brents and James A. Harding.” Then after declaring that “R. H. Boll’s position on the millennium is the same” as that held by Brents and Harding, (or did you declare this?) You say: “These two men preached their sermons on the millennium when they got ready, and they got ready when they pleased, and nobody said then nay.” Of course you mean to say by this that nobody has a right to say “nay” to R. H. Boll when “he gets ready to preach on the millennium and he gets ready when he pleases.” Again, in speaking of Harding and Brents, you say, “They thought the truth they held on this subject so important that it should be taught and accordingly they taught it in pulpit in class and in print whereas I have never thought it so very important and hence in my forty-five years of active preaching life, have never spoken on the subject.” If you have never preached on the millennium during your “forty-five years of active preaching,” evidently you have never given the subject “an hour’s study,” and certainly could not qualify for Brents’, Harding’s, and Boll’s class. Therefore, I will confine this discussion to their positions, not yours.

In speaking of me, you say: “I think you could not claim that you do not know the positions of Brents and Harding on the millennium.” I have read Dr. Brents’ sermon on the millennium.” I have reviewed R. H. Boll’s book “The Kingdom of God” in the Bible Banner. I was in J. A. Harding’s Bible classes three years, and listened to his chapel talks during those three years. If I ever heard J. A. Harding mention the word “millennium,” like Nebuchadnezzor’s dream, it has “gone from me.” Many mornings I came out of the old chapel, after listening to Brother Harding’s inspiring “chapel talks,” feeling like I could turn the old chapel over. But I never did come away feeling or believing that Jesus Christ would return, convert the Jews nationally, gather them back to Palestine, re-establish the throne in Jerusalem, and rule the nations for a thousand years. R. H. Boll was there too. I do not think he got his ideas from J. A. Harding. After reading your letter, I wrote to Brother T. Q. Martin and asked him what he knew about Brother Harding’s teaching on the “millennium.” I quote from his reply. “I believe I may say, modestly, that I knew J. A. Harding as well as any other man ever knew him. He was older than I, yet we were very congenial in the later years of his life. We were reared in the same county, he baptized me in November 1879. I have heard him through many series of sermons, and I do not remember ever to have heard him utter the word millennium. If he believed the theory advanced by the Premillennialists now among us today, I never caught it either from his sermons or from private conversations with him.

I have heard Brother Harding on at least two occasions, preach on the new heaven and the new earth (2 Peter 3:13) in which he stated his belief in the fulfillment of this prophecy, in the last three chapters of Revelation. Quoting the first paragraph in Rev. 21st Chapter, he held the belief that after the general resurrection, the destruction by fire of the present earth, when it was purified from all sin, that God’s dwelling place would be on the new earth with the redeemed and glorified saints. This position he expressed at different times. But I repeat, that if he had any idea of a personal reign of Christ on earth, for a thousand and years, before the general resurrection, I never heard him mention it publicly or privately. He is not here to represent himself, and God forbid that I should misrepresent the dead. Nothing that he ever wrote, indicating that he believed the premillennial theory, ever came to my notice, and I have read much from his powerful pen. May God help us in this age of turmoil and strife to stay on safe and solid ground, and in all our contentions, be able to say: ‘It is written.’

I want to say amen to this last statement from Brother Martin’s letter. When I read Brother Martin’s letter, I did not censure my memory, on what I had heard Brother Harding teach. After writing me Br. Martin met Bro. B. C. Goodpasture in Glasgow, Ky. and spoke to him about the matter. Bro. Goodpasture remembered an article Bro. J. A. Harding had in the Christian Leader June 6, 1905, under the heading “Man Was Created to Reign For Ever and Ever.” When Br. Goodpasture got back to his office he was kind enough to have the article copied and sent to me. I spent the summer of 1905 on the Manitoulin Islands and evidently did not read Bro. Harding’s article when it was published. If you will turn to the Christian Leader and read Bro. Harding’s article and still insist on putting my “tweedledum and tweedledee” between Bro. Harding’s position on the millennium and R. H. Boll’s position I will publish Brother Harding’s article and some extracts from Boll’s book “The Kingdom of God” in the Bible Banner. I feel sure when you read their positions together you will let my tweedles stay where I put them. As the facts now stand, Bro. Armstrong, we have one sermon from Dr. T. W. Brents on “The millennium” one article from J. A. Harding “Man was Created to Reign Forever and Ever” One book of 84 pages from R. H. Boll and his paper Word and Work, financed by a rich Brother, in which he has, for a quarter of a century, advocated, and still advocates his vagaries on the millennium, when he “gets ready and he gets ready when he pleases.” And you say, no man should say him “nay.” I suppose you would not deny that Boll’s teaching on a future “earthly kingdom, with Christ on David’s literal earthly throne in Jerusalem,” has made shipwreck of David Cooper’s, and Charles Neal’s faith, and others. I do not believe that a man’s right to teach a doctrine that would send only two souls to hell, should be defended even by neutrals. Do you believe David Cooper and Charles Neal can go to heaven by believing their present course? They got their teaching and still advocates the premillennialism from R. H. Boll. What you say in the last paragraph of your letter about “that host of faithful disciples in the brotherhood today who hold that R. H. Boll’s position on the millennium is not vitiating, not harmful enough to be made a ground for division and strife and disfellowship,” etc., reminds me that “that host of faithful disciples in the brotherhood,” move in mysterious ways, their works to perform. Brother E. H. Ijams, President of David Lipscomb College, has said that no one believing and advocating Boll’s theories on the millennium could teach in David Lipscomb College. The first two weeks in June, Brother A. C. Pullias, Vice President of David Lipscomb College, held a good meeting for the Central Church, our new congregation here in Birmingham. On Sunday afternoon, June 15, he preached to about a thousand people on the subject “The right use and misuse of unfulfilled prophecy.” During his discourse, Brother Pullias declared that those who advocated Boll’s theories on the millennium should be “marked,” and “turned away from,” as taught in Romans -16: 17. At the time Brother Pullias was in Birmingham, you were at David Lipscomb College, and made a speech declaring against the “marking.” I asked Brother (Cont. on page 15)
THE CHRISTIAN STANDARD AND BROTHER McGARVEY

CLED E. WALLACE

The Christian Standard seems to be having some trouble in agreeing with Brother J. W. McGarvey on some important points. On the face of it, that isn’t so bad. Nobody is under any obligation to agree with Brother McGarvey any further than he agrees with the New Testament. It is of course an unpleasant duty to have to disagree with anybody to stick to the New Testament, especially if he happens to be a man of Brother McGarvey’s knowledge of the scriptures. In this particular case, Evangelist Charles H. Richards has written a sermon for the Christian Standard on “The Conversion of Lydia.” He raises a point in regard to the statement that the Lord opened Lydia’s heart. Brother McGarvey says: “The Lord opened Lydia’s heart, as He did that of the eunuch, by bringing from afar, at the proper juncture, the living preacher through whose word the end was accomplished.” Brother Richards takes issue with Brother McGarvey at some length. He concludes that

“Her heart was not opened by the presence of the apostle or by the preaching of the word. The apostle was present before her heart was opened. Her heart was opened ‘that she attended unto’ the words of Paul; or ‘to give heed unto’ the words of Paul; or so that she gave attention to the words of Paul. It seems clear to me that, in addition to the presence and preaching of the apostle, the Lord did something to her heart which made her receptive to the gospel message. To me, this is very important point.”

The Christian Standard editorially comments as follows. We quote in part.

“Our own feeling is that Brother Richards is right, much as we are always bound to respect the ability of Brother McGarvey in such matters.

Let it be quite clear, however, that Brother Richards is not teaching and that no teacher should leave the impression that any-sinner, who knows what God had commanded him to do, is warranted in waiting for some special act of divine intervention.

As to what God, and especially the Holy Spirit, will do to support the preaching of His Word, none of us has the power to say. Who are we thus to limit God?”

Who is trying to limit God? Brother McGarvey certainly was not when he agreed with Paul that the gospel is God’s power to save. The Christian Standard and Brother Richards seem to agree with the Baptists that God either could not or did not make the gospel powerful enough to open a sinner’s heart without “some special act of divine intervention.” Paul and Brother McGarvey are right, and the Christian Standard and Brother Richards are wrong. If it took “some special act of divine intervention” to open Lydia’s heart “in addition to the presence and preaching of the apostle” such “intervention” should be required today in the opening of any sinner’s heart. If not, why not? Speculations about “some special act of divine intervention” in conversion have already contributed too much toward mystifying conversion and confusing sinners, for the Christian Standard to join the Baptists in that unholy pastime. We have just about cured the Baptists of any desire to debate this “very important point” by agreeing with Paul and Brother McGarvey. If the Christian Standard and Brother Richards think they can improve on Baptist technique, we are willing to take them on, and allow the Baptists to root for them. Personally, we do not believe they can even do as good a job at defending “some special act of divine intervention” in conversion as the Baptists did in the midst of their debating career.

Certainly, the Lord opened Lydia’s heart, for the Book says so. It is also clear that the operation was not performed until Paul arrived and until he spoke. The gospel of Christ was especially and divinely designed for that very work. A study of the heart, its functions and nature, and the changes required to purify it, should remove any need for speculation about “some special act of divine intervention.” The Christian Standard and Brother Richards might also give closer attention to “give heed to.” She was giving heed to what she heard when she was baptized. We are not at all pleased with the Christian Standard’s collaboration with the sectarian position on the direct operation of the Holy Spirit and conversion. How long will it be before the Christian Standard cautiously advocates the return of the mourner’s bench? It would fit in quite well with the organ and the sentiment that “As to what God, and especially the Holy Spirit, will do to support the preaching of His Word none of us has the power to say.” We agree that the Christian Standard has wandered a good long way from Paul and Brother McGarvey.

Brother McGarvey went on record as saying that the organ could not be introduced into the worship without surrendering the principles upon which a restoration of the New Testament order is possible. The Christian Standard accepted the organ and a lot of other things and now seems ready to accept the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion. It is about time for it to approach the Baptists for some unity conferences. Brother Witty might be prevailed on to help the matter along in his new “brotherhood paper.” Brother Murch is in close collaboration with the Christian Standard and Brother Witty is in close collaboration with Brother Murch. “Things do move.”

CONDUCTING BUSINESS FOR THE CHURCH

CLED E. WALLACE

The business of running the church is important and should be conducted in a serious and efficient manner. Those who have been entrusted with the oversight of a congregation should be aware of the need of qualifications and should diligently apply themselves in seeing that the congregation functions according to the will of God. The following is taken from the minutes of a certain church in a Texas city and frankly recognizes a condition which is too general.

“The elders and deacons met for their regular meeting April 5th in the office of the church. One deacon and the preacher were present. They waited. The telephone rang. It was Brother .......... He said he was about to leave for the church but decided to call and see if anybody was coming as the officers had just about quit meeting. Business is now transacted by running from one officer to another. According to reports Brother .......... had some business to attend to. Brother .......... had company to come in unexpected. Brother .......... forgot about Tuesday night being meeting night. The meeting adjourned to meet again when it would be convenient with everybody. Brother .......... was appointed as chairman of the research and investigating committee to find out when if ever that would be.”

I know these men and they are very good men and the church seems to be getting along surprisingly well. It seems that neither the gates of hades, nor the carelessness of its leaders can prevail against it. With a sloppy leadership a church is almost certain to run into trouble sooner or later and sometimes it is sooner. Sheep without a shepherd can do some foolish and harmful things. Shepherds everywhere should ponder the divine advice laid down in the New Testament. “Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops,
to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood.” (Acts 20:28) “Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight, not of constraint, but willingly, according to the will of God; nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock. And when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away.” (1 Peter 5:2-4) Surely, elders of the church need to meet occasionally or oftener to discuss affairs pertaining to the welfare of the congregation, make plans for the progress of the church, and make some investigations toward a better understanding of what the will of the Lord is. They should not forget that “they watch in behalf of the souls of the disciples and should remember that they “shall give account” either “with joy” or “with grief.” (Heb. 13:17) Their responsibility is too great to be discharged through slapped methods. “But let all things be done decently and in order.” (1 Cor. 14:40) Everything from apathy to division in the churches can often be charged up to inefficiency or carelessness on the part of the leaders. A family without discipline may muddle through with good luck and a tight squeeze, but most of the time it doesn’t.

DEALING IN PERSONALITIES

CLED E. WALLACE

I am running about a good deal these days holding meetings here and there, preaching the gospel, sometimes to large crowds, sometimes to small ones and meeting some delightful people. I meet some of course who are fussed up about this that and the other and sometimes they are right and sometimes they are wrong, according to my lights. Possibly they all think they are right. Some become visibly agitated over matters which appear to me to be of no importance, while others appear to be indifferent or hostile concerning matters that appear to me to be of vital importance. I suppose that is what makes the life of a preacher both interesting and important.

During the early part of July, I was in a meeting in Konawa, Oklahoma. Hubert Roach has been doing the work of an evangelist there and thereabouts for several years. He has a good education, an unusually good preacher’s library which he uses for something else besides an ornament as he is a hard student and is generally well-liked. He has been with that congregation for several years which seems to be a matter of choice with him and them as he has had ample opportunities to go elsewhere. He is a positive uncompromising preacher with plenty of good common sense. The meeting was in the open and drew large crowds. Several were baptized.

During that meeting I enjoyed some visits with my life-long friend Brother C. R. Nichol of Seminole Oklahoma. He has been with the Seminole church, one of the best in Oklahoma, for about eight years and it would be hard to find a preacher anywhere who enjoys and merits greater love and respect from both the church and the community than does Brother Nichol in Seminole. Should a very short list of the most useful men in the kingdom be drawn up, his name would have to be in that list, and if it were put at the top, it would draw no protest from me. His record of activities in behalf of the cause in preaching, writing and debating covers many years and is a phenomenal one. His books should enrich every preacher’s library, nor do I mean to suggest that they are adapted to preachers only. Some of us have been deeply concerned over the state of Brother Nichol’s health. I am glad to report that he has regained his lost weight much of his strength and is rapidly regaining his normal health. He should be with us for many more years of useful service. I happen to know that he is hard at work on some matters of current agitation, that I am impatient to see in print. • • • •

During the latter part of July I was in a meeting at Paragould, Ark. This is an old church, a large one and a good one. Many able men have held meetings there during the years. They have recently enlarged their building and it was well filled during the meeting. Brother B. G. Hope, who is reported to be one of Arkansas’ best, has been with the congregation for ten years. My impression was that he could stay that many more if he wanted to. I had never been associated with him before but found him to be all that I heard he was in the way of loyalty and strength and more. I have heard some things about him that I did not and do not believe, for he has been mixed up in some pretty hot fights in Arkansas and you know what that means. Some folks will tell things on you. I even got hit over there with the rumor that the editor of the Bible Banner “does not believe in hell.” I wonder what they think he has been giving some people. I have even heard lately that the editor is “slipping.” When I see some of the places he goes and the size of the crowds he preaches to, and the number of people he mails the Bible Banner out to, it looks to me like he is climbing. I never heard of a fellow slipping uphill. It is too much like water running uphill. Of course, I’m partial and an interested party to boot, but I’m inclined to believe that some of the editor’s critics are indulging in wishful thinking. When he learns to slip uphill, I’m going to either find out how he does it, or want the life out of him trying to. As it is I have to climb too hard to even stay where I am. The slander crowd has not visibly slowed his progress by telling things on him that are not true. They might change their tactics and tell the truth on him awhile and see how that works. I might even furnish them some information along that line, if they are minded to seek an interview. Back to Brother Hope, he thinks he has been in Paragould long enough and is moving to a new field. He will be connected with the church in Lawrenceburg, Tenn. There may be some people in Arkansas who are glad that he is leaving the state, but if so, it is a compliment to him, not to them. • • •

While at home in Austin, Texas recently, I heard Brother Horace Busby preach two sermons. He was in a meeting with the Southside church in Austin. Services were out on the lawn and crowds were large. Brother Busby has a way about him that people like and he preaches the gospel to them and baptizes them. If people will do what I have heard him tell them to, they won’t miss heaven. He had some mighty nice things to say publicly about me and even the editor. Now, being as I’m who I am, that is calculated to make any sort of preaching sound better. But the sermons I heard were good, even if he had left me and the editor out. We enjoyed a visit from Brother Busby in our home. He is a pleasant company. He has held a good many meetings in Austin and is still in demand there. Don’t get the idea that Brother Busby is a recent discovery of mine. He has been calling us Cled and Ola ever since “Miss Ola” first set eyes on me and made up her mind she was going to be a bride. • • •

Brother Price Billingsley, who preaches for the Highland Park church in Fort Worth, Texas has mailed me some “Mild Hints to C. E. W. and F. E. W.” It contains some very sensible suggestions that I’m glad for our readers to see. It so happens that the editor and I had already discussed some of the very points that Brother Billingsley “hints” at, and arrived at about the same conclusion he advances. You may be surprised to know that the compli-
A DECISION FOR AN IMPORTANT MATTER

CLED E. WALLACE

One of the decisive battles of the world was fought in the city of Jerusalem a number of years after the church was established, when the apostles and the elders met to consider an important matter of doctrine. The matter was considered, discussed and decided and the decision was final as far as the will of God is concerned. Simon Peter, a key-man in the divine setup, made a decisive speech, which I propose to make the basis for some extended remarks.

"And the apostles and elders were gathered together to consider of this matter. And when there had been much questioning, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Brethren, ye know that a good while ago God made choice among you, that by my mouth the Gentiles should hear the word of the gospel and believe. And God, who knoweth the heart, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit, even as he did unto us; and he made no distinction between us and them, cleansing their hearts by faith. Now therefore why make ye trial of God, that ye should put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as they." (Acts 15:6-11)

The occasion of this gathering of notables in the church was a disturbance that had arisen in the church in Antioch. That church had a large Gentile membership and was going along in a fine way after enjoying the ministry of such men as Paul and Barnabas. Then some men with no authority whatsoever came down from Jerusalem and sowed the seeds of discord by insisting that Gentiles who had obeyed the gospel could not be saved unless they also submitted to circumcision and observed the law of Moses. It precipitated a serious situation. Paul and Barnabas opposed these men and their subversive schemes with results that were short of final and satisfactory and it was decided that the matter should be taken to the apostles and the elders in Jerusalem. The guiding hand of God was in this decision as Paul in a later reference to the incident said he 'went up by revelation.' (Gal. 2:2) The crisis in Antioch involved questions of world-wide importance. In Jerusalem "certain of the sect of the Pharisees who believed" stated their views bluntly. "It is needful to circumcise them, and to charge them to keep the law of Moses." The battle was fought to a decision over this issue. The Judaizers were allowed to state their case fully and Simon Peter fired the opening gun that broke up their attack on the integrity and all-sufficiency of the gospel of Christ. Guerilla attacks were still carried on by schismatic outlaws who were too irrepressibly partisan to be held down by the revealed will of God. They were dubbed as "false brethren" and their activities were bitter and malicious.

It was Simon Peter who first preached to the Gentiles* and he did so by the choice of God. "God our Saviour. . . would have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth." (I Tim. 2:3, 4) This included Gentiles. There was no way for them to be saved except "to hear the word of the gospel and believe." The facts of the situation are crystal clear. They must believe in order to be saved. They could not believe unless they heard the gospel. They could not hear it unless somebody preached it to them. God chose Peter to preach it to them. Peter has reference to the time when he went from Joppa to Caesarea and preached to Cornelius, the centurion. This man Cornelius was a devout, God-fearing, praying, almsgiving man, but he was out of Christ and unsaved. An angel appeared to him and in-

* For footnote see pg. 14.
structured him to send for Simon Peter that he might hear words, whereby he and his house should be saved. (Acts 11:1) There can therefore be no doubt that this faith by which the heart of Cornelius was cleansed, came from hearing the gospel that Peter preached to him. The choice of Peter to do the preaching was sensational. It was considered unlawful for a Jew to enter a Gentile’s house. Peter had never preached to a Gentile under any such circumstances and did not intend to. The vision on the housetop in Joppa was a divine visitation to show him that he should not call any man “common or unclean” but that the gospel should be preached to all in defiance of the racial distinctions of Judaism.

“And God, who knoweth the heart, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Spirit, even as he did unto us.” This witness of God borne by a miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit, a precedent for which only Pentecost could offer, deserves our attention. A witness of what? It was not a witness that these Gentiles were saved, but a divine witness of their right to hear and accept the gospel on equal terms with the Jews. The evidence is so clear that a challenge to it is absurd. The “giving them the Holy Spirit, even as he did unto us” is not unrelated to the appearance of an angel to Cornelius, or the apostle’s trance and vision on the housetop in Joppa. Men of partisan minds and a tremendous prejudice against baptism as a condition of pardon, insist that since God “bare them witness” before they were baptized in water, that they were saved before and without baptism in water. Peter says that God cleansed “their hearts by faith.” By faith. But they had to hear the word of the gospel in order to believe. Later, Peter was called on by certain brethren in Jerusalem to give an account of his conduct in Caesarea when he preached to the Gentiles. Peter began and expounded the matter unto them in order.” (Acts 11:14) Here is the order as he explained it. “And as I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, even as on us at the beginning.” (Acts 11:15) It appears quite certain that God bore his witness to them before they heard the word of the gospel and believed. Can that be taken as evidence that men are saved before and without faith? Hardly. Peter took it as God’s witness to the fact that the Gentiles had the right to baptism. “Can any man forbid the water, that these should not be baptized, who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.” (Acts 10:47-48) It is passing strange that some today hold the view that their reception of the Holy Spirit argued that their baptism was unnecessary. Even as Paul made the basis of overriding all opposition to their baptism and commanding them to do it as a condition of their salvation.

“He made no distinction between us and them.” Jews and Gentiles are saved alike. The issue had to do with the basis of that salvation, and the conditions upon which it might be enjoyed. The Judaizing party subordinated Christ and the gospel to Moses and the law. Their contention was that neither Jew nor Gentile could be saved by the grace of God through faith in Christ without submitting to the ordinances of the law of Moses. The point of Peter’s speech is decisive. The hearts of the Gentiles are cleansed by faith, gospel faith, apart from the law of Moses or any of its peculiar requirements. The final shot that Peter took at the Judaizers must have been peculiarly humiliating. “But I believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, in like manner as they.” The Gentiles without the law were in sin and in need of the salvation that was offered through Christ. Likewise the Jews under the law were in sin and in need of the same salvation. Peter in this speech sounds like Paul in the Galatian letter. “Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the law; ye are fallen away from grace.” (Gal. 5:4) It is settled beyond doubt that Gentiles were saved in Christ without the law of Moses and that Jews had to be saved in the same manner even though they had the law. It firmly establishes the doctrine that all men of whatever race must be saved by the grace of God through faith in Christ Jesus, if saved at all. In Paul’s famous illustration of the olive tree with its branches in Romans eleven chapter, the natural branches, the Jews, were cut off only because of unbelief. The believing Jews were still in. The Gentiles were grafted in because of faith. The unbelieving Gentiles were still out.

There has been a modern effort with partisan motives to show that certain conditions of salvation were imposed on Jews that did not apply to Gentiles. This ruse has been employed to evade the force of Acts 2:38 where inquiring Jews under gospel conviction were told to “Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins.” We are sometimes gravely told that this applied to Jews and not to Gentiles. Even a few Baptist preachers, who make much over grace, have been guilty of this unworthy evasion. But whatever the Jew had to do as a condition of salvation in any case, the Gentiles had to do the same. “He made no distinction between us and them.” The Magna Charta of salvation covered all alike. It reads: “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned.” (Mark 16:15,16) “For I am not ashamed of the gospel: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.” (Romans 1:16) Some seem to be unable to understand how it can be “by faith” without excluding baptism. The answer is simple and obvious. Baptism belongs to the gospel of the grace of God, not to the law of Moses. It is obedience of faith and would be of no value whatever apart from faith. Such obedience is clearly required. “He became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation.” (Heb. 5:9) “He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.” (John 3:36) This is the reason that the witness of God at the house of Cornelius was followed by a command to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.” Such baptism is for the remission of sins both to Jews and Gentiles. (See Acts 2:38).

It is remarkable but not too surprising, in view of the natural tendencies of men to justify themselves, that this Jerusalem meeting has been used in an effort to justify everything from a delegate convention to settling issues by a majority vote of the congregation. Such efforts should not go unchallenged. To challenge them with the facts in the case is to defeat them. The congregation was not called upon to determine anything. The matter at issue was determined by a revelation of the Holy Spirit. In a recent issue of the Christian Standard, Brother Edwin R. Errett makes some pointed and potent remarks.

“It must be noted, first of all, that there is not the least indication of proportional or delegate representation. It was composed of the apostle Paul and Barnabas and the apostles and elders at Jerusalem, with some sessions attended by the brethren of the churches and the zealous. That is no council or convention in the modern sense.

In the second place, and, most important, it was a seeking for direction of the Holy Spirit, not for the wisdom of men. We need to read the first two chapters of Galatians to reinforce the point that Paul was not submitting to a convention, but determining that the Holy Spirit had given the same instruction to them all. They were putting it all up to the Holy Spirit and abode by His decision. We should do the same, on similar matters, for we have His word in the New Testament.” (Cont. on page 16)
THE EFFECTS OF PREMILLENNIALISM, “NATIONAL UNITY MEETINGS” AND DIGRESSION

THE FRUIT IS EVIL

C. W. Scott

The warning of Jesus the Christ has sounded! “Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them (the false prophets or teachers) by their fruits. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them.” Matt. 7:16-20.

The fruit or works of millennarians in Central Kentucky is evil. Compromise, digression and promiscuous fraternizing with the denominations in their services and the pastors in Alliance and Ministerial Associations is the blighted fruit falling here and there, a nauseating and weakening influence to the faithful lovers of truth and righteousness everywhere. The tree is premillennialism which has been planted chiefly among us by R. H. Boll and his students of prophetic discernment and watered by the foul stream of “harmless guessing and speculation” with the trunk of said tree being whitewashed by the much talked of “sweet spirit” and “pious goodness.”

The neutral fence-riders and liberalists who affirm they do not believe the theoretical speculation of a millennial reign after the second coming of Christ but still emphatically emphasize everywhere they go that the departures suggested as a result of the facts and over-stressed by some a visit to Kentucky among loyal investigation of matters.

received an appeal from Jimmie Lovel1 that he be not suspicious of the late Davidson-Leader movement. I

certainties of errors blight with gospel in several instances cut down and uprooted by the Sword of the Spirit.

To those who “by good words and fair speeches” have been misled and deceived I present the following which declare the fruit borne is evil.

REV. CHARLES M. NEAL RESIGNS PASTORATE AT MAIN STREET CHURCH.

“Rev. Charles M. Neal, pastor, of the Main Street Church of Christ, Sunday resigned his position at the local church, after serving in the pulpit there for 15 years.

“Rev. Neal announced that his resignation would become effective Dec. 31, 1940, and that he had not made any plans after that time. . .” (News item in Winchester Sun).

Then December 30, 1940 the same paper brings the announcement,

“Beginning the first of the New Year, the Rev. Neal will travel through Kentucky, Indiana and Ohio delivering services under the auspices of the Biblical Research Society, Los Angeles, Calif. . . The Rev. Neal’s tour begins Wednesday in Louisville.”

Several days later the Courier Journal in Louisville bears this announcement,

“Three Closing Services Church Of The Open Door.” Rev. Chas. M. Neal, Speaker, Saturday 7:45 P. M., Sunday 10:45 A. M. and 7:45 P. M.

After a tour among denominations and churches who would support his Premillennial vagaries and encourage his “shining of light in dark places” the resigned and openly digressed Chas. M. Neal returns to Winchester and his former residence where his “opinions” suffered severely to the triumph of truth through the efforts of Foy E. Wallace in debate a few years ago. Where will the “Man of Prophecy and Biblical Research” preach? Will he enter the pulpit of the Main Street Church where he preached his ideas for 15 years or will he seek a hearing upon the street corners? See the following announcement and circular.

Prophetic Evangelistic Bible Conference Seven Days—March 10-16. Under the Auspices of The Biblical Research Society At The Central Baptist Church.

Chas. M. Neal Will Give Illustrated Lectures 7:30 o’clock Each Night. Services at 2:30 P.M.-Tuesday Through Friday.

LECTURE TOPICS

The Perfect Life, The March of Time; The March of Empire; The Lion and the Lamb; The Man Who Double-crosses Satan; Sunset Limited; The Second Coming of Christ.

Able And Well Known Speaker

Dr. Neal as a preacher and Bible teacher is no stranger to this part of Kentucky. He is a real student of the Word and presents it in an interesting way. The present and future state of the world, according to prophecy, will be featured. Central Baptist Church heartily welcomes not only its members, but all who will attend.

“Everybody Welcome”

Now, he that “went out from us” is worshipping with the Baptists and other denominational constituencies with only a few months back one of his daughters baptized into the Baptist fold. What has happened to Brother Neal has
happened to numerous brethren: McHenry and Martin, Virgil and Earl Smith with their father, O. S. Boyer, and others. But here are some more departures to be viewed with genuine regret but true to history as in previous instances. Again, I remind you, “The Fruit Is Evil.”

New Pastor Here

The Rev. N. Wilson Burks, principal of the Oddville High School, located near Cynthia, has accepted the position as pastor of the Parksville Christian Church, it was announced Saturday.

A native of Hart County, the new pastor received his A. B. degree from the University of Louisville in 1930 and later attended the Portland Bible Seminary (R. H. Boll’s school of Premillennialism—CWS). In addition to serving as pastor of the Salem Church of Christ for ten years, Mr. Burks has much experience as a school teacher, having taught six years in various county high schools.

Up to the time Mr. Burks was named, various supply pastors had filled the pulpit (E. L. Jorgenson, J. Scott Greer, H. L. Olmstead and others—all Premillennialists, CWS) at the Parksville Christian Church. (News item in June Sunday Advocate.)

One will notice in the above mentioned items Neal preached for the Main Street Church of Christ for 15 years and departed to “Research Society” and the denominations while Wilson Burks boasts his having had ten years in the Salem Church of Christ to become identified with the Christian Church at Parksville which is definitely digressive from the spirit of its members in their concerted efforts against the loyal church in Danville and in their giving way to denominational ministers and their services in compromise, even though the congregation does not use the instruments of music. The latter they would have I was told were it not for a few of the old folks who object. And it is here that H. L. Olmstead is scheduled to preach again this fall. But the end of facts in evil fruit borne is not yet come.

The Hanover Cramer Church of Christ in Lexington, site of the last year so-called National Unity Meeting with Homer Rutherford, brother-in-law, to Clinton Davidson as its minister had a series of meetings. The church and its avowed premillennial preacher had Hall Calhoun Crowder, minister of the recently organized Christian Church in Lexington (Division in Broadway Christian Church) to lead the singing in the effort. But why not? If in the Unity Meetings they be fellowshipped in prayer and song, who have digressed, why not in regular services. Well, that is the evil fruit of Unity Meetings so-called among us, for their fruit is evil! We quote Jesus again, “By their fruit ye shall know them.”

TIIEIR DEVICES EXPOSED

Ted W. McElroy

I have considered certain movements among us as “fifth-column” activities which would, were they not restrained, destroy the church from the inside. The purpose of this article is to bring to light the devices used by this group to fasten themselves on the church. An old adage says, “to be forewarned, is to be forearmed,” so it is hoped that this article will be helpful, to those who want to be able to stand in the battle to save the church from digression. Paul said, “that no advantage be gained over us by Satan: for we are not ignorant of his devices,” 2 Cor. 2:11. The purpose of this little essay is to throw light on the devices to be used and now being used against us, so that no advantage will be gained over us.

I haven’t been in the west very long, less than a year; but I got some early experience combating the same kind of fifth-column activities in Arkansas, that we have here in the west. I was more or less involved in the fight to keep premillennialism from spreading in the state of Arkansas, and to keep Harding College from fastening its control on the church. It was not very hard to keep the church where I was preaching out of their control, because I was under the “rule” of some elders that knew the situation and had the backbone to say no, and mean it. Thus I was initiated in this fight back in Arkansas, and I learned much about their many devices before I came to Colorado. So when I contact the same kind of activities here in the west, I am not ignorant of their devices, nor deceived by their “little yarns.”

About the time I came to work with the church here, or soon thereafter, I began to receive bundles of papers at the study from Jimmie Lovell. I was not ignorant of his identity. I knew the movement with which he was connected; I remembered that his paper had merged with the Christian Leader to give the brotherhood a new type of journalism—a soft, copyrighted kind, that the brotherhood evidently didn’t care for. I also remembered seeing bro. Lovell, (The New Christian Leader for the New Christian Leader. Accidentally on purpose I contacted the same kind of activities here in the west, I am not ignorant of their devices before I came to Colorado. When I contact the same kind of activities here in the west, I am not ignorant of their devices, nor deceived by their “little yarns.”

And now comes the announcement over Louisville Radio Station that S. S. Lappin will preach in a series of services this week (July 13-27) at the Highland Church of Christ where E. L. Jorgenson is the minister. A large tent has been pitched on the front lawn with large sign inviting everyone to hear S. S. Lappin, Evangelist. On the regular bulletin board Brother Jorgenson reveals his intimate and chummy relation to the speaker by designating the man—Sam Lappin. To those who do not recognize this compromise and evil fruit-S. S. Lappin is an outstanding Christian Church evangelist, contributor to the Disciples of Christ paper Christian Standard, and one who has taken active part in the Witty-Murch union efforts. But why not have him? If Hanover and Cramer can have a Christian Church minister for its song leader, why not let one of their number do the preaching and praying in a meeting. Well, that they have done. Did I hear or read someone declare all that will result in the “Unity Meetings” will be the union of the Premillennialists and their sympathizers with the Christian Church Premillennialists? It has happened! The fruit has matured! The fruit is compromise, digression and general fraternizing of the sects and their preachers. The tree that has borne the evil fruit it premillennialism, a deceptive and faith destroying growth. The whitewash of “piety and sweet spirit” placed about its trunk by its caretakers and approving sympathizers will not cover up the fruit in the branches above.

Therefore, dear friends, and brethren, beware of the teachings of premillennialists among us, who have not completely gone out from us, for their fruit is evil! We quote Jesus again, “By their fruit ye shall know them.”

By merging his paper with and defending the New Christian Leader, bro. Lovell manifested that he was connected with the Clinton Davidson premillennial subversive movement. And it was not until the collapse of the Christian Leader was fore-seen, that bro. Lovell began his paper again, this was about the time of my coming to Colorado Springs to work with the church here. Bundles of Jimmie’s papers came to my study. I glanced through them and noticed a campaign of calumny being carried on against some un-named brother. When I saw the attack, I
immediately recognized their favorite and familiar device: they use this campaign of calumny against everybody they don’t like, and they don’t like anybody who stands in the way of their schemes. I noted down some of these harsh sayings, and wrote Jimmie and asked him who the villain of his story was. He did not answer my letter but wrote a short note on a card saying I should subscribe to the West Coast Christian, and I would come to some understanding of his language. As a result of my wanting the man and the name issued, I decided that he was not a fit victim for his dignified journalism, and I did not receive any more papers free gratis, and I did not subscribe. He began sending his bundles of papers to other brethren here and begging for subscriptions. I saw one of these bundles with the names to whom they were to be given, and there was a notice in the paper to the effect that those who received this issue free had been selected to receive the blessings of his journalistic efforts and that they should send subscriptions immediately.

The next device used was this. Brother Love11 wrote one of the elders sending a “second-hand” donation, to be applied on some mission work that this congregation was sponsoring at that time in Cheyenne, Wyo. The donation was made to the Love11 Mission Society. (Not yet inc.) In the letter he bragged about how much success he was having, and how much good his paper was doing. The money ($1.50), he said was donated by a woman and sent to him to be used “as and wherever I (Jimmie Lovell) saw fit.” He selected to use the donation as sugar, in an attempt to lure the Pikes Peak congregation into his fold. The elders accepted the money and sent it on to the mission work, over my protest however. (I contended that it should be sent back to Jimmie, with proper rebuke for his unscriptural activities.) In the letter in which he sent the money he began crying, “I thought I had a number of friends there.” “I know you have a friend in me,” now please send me some subscriptions. With this sugar ($1.50 second-hand donation) he hoped to catch the Pikes Peak church and put it in his fold, but we were not ignorant of his devices and were not caught. So far as I know his letter was not answered, and the last correspondence I heard of Jimmie having with brethren here in Colorado Springs he was still crying, “I haven’t any subscriptions from Colorado Springs yet. Please send some.”

This shows their devices, and just how they work. Bro. Lovell sets himself up as a missionary agent and professes to know just where the fields 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 donations are made to him that he passes them on but 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 action is an insult to the brotherhood—it needs to be exposed and I am happy to have the privilege of doing it, and am fearless of the campaign of calumny that will rage against me for so doing. This is a representative story of every dollar that goes to any of the “one-man mission societies.” It shows that every dollar is used by the one-man agency to glorify the agency, and to further the selfish designs of the operator.

The next I want to discuss is a man who is another vital link in this chain of soft, premillennial fifth-column activity. He is the first and last preacher I have heard of, who works on Jimmie Lovell’s time chart. He is working with the Park Hill congregation in Denver and seems to be accountable to Jimmie—at least from the best information I get he punches the time clock for Jimmie; I refer to Herman O. Wilson.

Bro. Wilson, on his day off, (his chart calls for so much time at this, that and the other thing, and I reckon he sets holidays off, and when he leaves town he must report it), came down to Colorado Springs New Year’s day. He did not know me, and probably never heard of me, so he did not bother to look me up during the day. It didn’t happen to be my day off, so I worked in the study putting out an article for a Colorado Springs paper, in which we have a lesson each week. New Year’s day was Wednesday. Wednesday night is our prayer meeting night; and the elders asked me to teach the lesson.

A large crowd was at prayer meeting on this occasion: and some were expecting Bro. Wilson to preach. (I don’t know where they got the idea; the elders had said nothing about it.) At any rate the class went off as usual. I did not call on bro. Wilson to speak during the class. because the elders had instructed me not to do so.

The reason that the elders did not ask him to preach and the reason they “ruled” (Heb. 13:17) that I not call on him in the class, was because he was under suspicion. The reason that he was under suspicion was because he had been a writer for the Christian Leader, and everyone knows that that paper harbored subversive activities in the church. It is an old saying, “Tell me thy company and I will tell thee what thou art.” Since bro. Wilson had been keeping journalistic company with the sponsors of oremillennialism, and its sympathizers; we naturally associated him with that group.

After the prayer meeting class was over. I was formally introduced to him, and I invited him back to the study to talk over some matter with myself and some other brethren. He agreed and we went back in the study and had a little talk. (I think I did scripturally, Mt. 18:15-19.) I went to him and gave him a chance to clear himself of the things I had connected him with in my mind; however he convinced me of only one thing: i. e. he is a link in the fifth-column subversive chain.

The first matter we talked about was, I asked bro. Wilson, “Why didn’t you announce our meeting when brother Wallace was here?” To this he replied that one of the cards, (I sent about 25) was placed on the bulletin board. A member of the Park Hill congregation had previously testified, that the only way he learned of the meeting was by finding the cards advertising the meeting in the wastebasket. No point was gained and we were not convinced.

Next I asked bro. Wilson, “Are you a premillennialist and do you have any connection with the group?” To this bro. Wilson made quite a lengthy answer, he told us how hard it was to preach on prophecy and said, “I don’t believe you can be dogmatic about prophecy.” To this I replied, “I am not dogmatic about what unfurled prophecy is or shall be, but I get pretty emphatic about what it is not going to be.” He did not make it clear whether he believed premillennialism or not: but he did manifest a lot of sympathy for those who do. I talked with one of the brethren who heard the conversation, and we asked each other, did he say yes, or no, to the question, and to the best of our memories, he skillfully evaded saying either.

Our next subject of conservation was about religious papers. Bro. Wilson seemed rather bitter toward some paper but he did not name the one (I reckon he meant the Bible Banner.) Brother Wilson said “We have good and bad papers and I think the church would be better off if they all would quit.” This statement was made after the fall of the Christian Leader, and it seemed that he was bitter over its defeat that he wanted all the others to fold up and quit. I just couldn’t withhold a big grin when I re-
marked, "The Bad Paper just failed and quit publication a short time ago." From the look that came over his face, I think he knew which one I meant.

Brother Wilson spent considerable time trying to vindicate the Christian Leader, and said it stood for what he thought was best in religious journalism. That it was the only paper that could be laid on "doctors and dentists tables" to be read by the sufferers who had to wait-I knew it was soothing to some, but I had never heard it recommended for tooth-ache before. (Those to whom it was so soothing had no backbone, and were suffering from a weak heart; spiritually speaking of course). Maybe if they had advertised the Christian Leader as light reading for stomach sufferers, they might have gotten farther. Anyway there were not enough doctors and dentists in the U. S. A. interested in dignified religious journalism to keep the Christian Leader going, and it folded up. Judging from the outcome of the venture, brethren didn't care for soothing journalism; personally I felt nausea coming even time I read the thing, and I know a lot of brethren who felt the same way.

Our little talk rambled on, and bro. Wilson said, "I think a man can be doctrinally right and have the wrong spirit and be spiritually wrong." I agreed, then asked, "Do you think a man can be spiritually right with God, and doctrinally wrong at the same time?" In answer he repeated his first expression, and when I pressed the question, he said, "I don't know." My reply was, "I know, if any man abides not in the doctrine of Christ, he hath not God" 2 Jno. 9.

Finally our conversation drifted to the point where I asked "Will you endorse and cooperate with us here in Colorado Springs, if we have brother Wallace for a meeting next summer?" He hesitated so long, I had to smile, finally he spoke, "No, I won't cooperate in any way, I won't even come to the meeting." We tried to find out why, there were three of us, and we each tried to squeeze a reason from bro. Wilson, but none of us got an intelligent reason, so we don't know why; but we were sure of one thing, that is, he wouldn't cooperate in the meeting. Then I told him, "We plan to have bro. Wallace and bro. Taylor for a meeting next summer, and advertize it as a 'vacation Gospel Meeting,' and thus invite brethren from all over the nation (we had a good crowd of them too.) Since you don't endorse the meeting, I am inviting you to fight it just as hard as you can; do your best." And he did.

As our little visit came to a close, and he got ready to leave, he said, "I suppose that what I have said will be used against me," to which I replied, "I'll use it as I see fit."

The whole affair amounts to this in my mind. A block was formed in Colorado with Love11 and Wilson as their leaders to fight our meeting. But we had the meeting anyway; we put over one of the best meetings Colorado ever had; and Love11 and Wilson, and other premillennial stooges and sympathizers, cried they had the right idea, and they had not come out in the open with their campaign of calumny; but, we were not ignorant of their devices and we caught them at every turn. Their devices were the same as they have been since the beginning; we are called liars and legalists, and accused of dishonesty, all this and more, was carried in a whispering campaign against us; but "we shall not be moved."

BEGINNING THE FOURTH YEAR

With this issue the Bible Banner begins its fourth year. Have you sent your renewal? Look at your label. If your subscription is due, mail it today. The Bible Banner contains information no other paper publishes. Keep it coming. Address Box 1804, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Dear Brother Taylor: Christian Ledger of August 5, 1941 just received. Have read Brother F. L. Rowe's Notes, Pages 10 and 11, and the editor's letters. You have done exactly right in exposing the attempt to murder Brother Wallace. If Brother Rowe or any of the editors were in Brother Wallace's place they would view this entirely different and appreciate your stand for the truth, honor, justice and christian attitude. No man has any right to withhold the truth when a brother's character is at stake or the Master's cause is attacked. Your brother, R. L. Dunagan.

This letter is a copy of the original and was sent to me by Brother Dunagan. We deeply appreciate the attitude expressed and its depth of brotherly feeling.

If this affair, as Brother Dunagan suggested, were reversed; if Davidson and Witty had made such a proposition to me involving Brother Rowe as their proposition to him involved me; as little as Brother Rowe thinks of me, I would have sent him the information anyhow, by air mail. And, as for the special edition of the Christian Ledger which is being sent to all the preachers, I know of no better way that Brother Rowe could help Brother Taylor. He evidently secured the funds which he said he did not have to make a general distribution of this edition. Perhaps Davidson and Witty furnished the money as they suggested. People will wonder.

With Brother Taylor, we are really sorry for Brother Rowe, and devoutly wish that he could have saved himself the humiliation of the blunders he has made in connection with the Davidson-Witty schemes. It is not too late for him to make a clean breast of it all and square himself with the church. And he owes a straight-out apology to Brother Ben F. Taylor for the abuse he has heaped upon him.

-F. E. W.

Pullias why it was that he was advocating the "marking" in Birmingham, and you were preaching against it in David Lipscomb College. He said he was not there. I knew he was telling the truth, because I learned from Dr. J. S. Ward, when I was in his classes years ago, that no object could occupy two places at the same time. Therefore, it has never been any trouble for me to understand Dr. Ward's position on "Bollism." As to "that host of faithful disciples in the brotherhood today," who do not believe in the "marking," it was their tribe that neutralized, to some extent, the fight that David Lipscomb, J. A. Harding, E. G. Sewell, and F. D. Strygley made against digression in Tennessee nearly fifty years ago. It was only a short time before J. A. Harding hurled his famous philippic against fellowship- ing the digressive preachers in Nashville, that they had driven E. G. Sewell, and others, out of the Woodland Street meeting house, and had taken the property that David Lipscomb himself had put $1,100.00 in. The neutralizing influence of "that host of faithful disciples in the brotherhood" has always been, and ever will be, on the side, and for the "troublers in Israel." "For the violence done to thy brother Jacob shame shall cover thee, and thou shalt be cut off forever. In the day that thou stoodest on the other side, in the day that strangers carried away his substance, and foreigners entered into his gates, and cast lots upon Jerusalem, even thou was as one of them." (Obadiah 10, 11).
A DOUBTFUL COMPLIMENT—CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

to face the question, ‘What is thy name?’ It is strange for a man to lay claim to no name. It awakens suspicion for a man to be unwilling to acknowledge the name that he has. And, after all, the denominational man is more deeply enmeshed in sectarianism than the man whom he labels ‘sectarian.’ For which the latter line up with one sect, the former line up with all sects. Moreover, the one is definite enough to be classified denominationally; the other has neither conviction nor courage enough to be classified.”

I am inclined to agree with Editor Taylor that some of these fellows, whom he is making editorial faces at, are pretty much of a nuisance. Surely, they ought to be marked and named for what they are. If they are running around nameless, somebody ought to rope the mavericks and brand them. If they are operating under aliases, they ought to be told that the kingdom of God is not a masquerade party and be required to remove their masks. But there is one little point along here. I crave a little more information about the editor seems to think it is all right for a man to “line up with one sect” but that he ought to be castigated for trying to “line up with all sects.” How much difference does the editor think it makes which one he “lines up with”? If sectarianism is right, it should not make so much difference which one he “lines up with” and if sectarianism is wrong, he should not “line up with” any of them. If one is right and the others wrong, he should be given directions of a reliable character so that he will not “line up with” something he oughtn’t to. Does the editor of the Baptist and Reflector think it would be all right for instance for a man to “line up with” the Methodist sect? A man, of course, should never bite off more than he can chew, but if denominationalism is right, a man should have the liberty to “line up with” as many of them as he thinks he can masticate and digest.” It awakens suspicion” when a good man cannot “line up with” a couple, or a few, “sects” if they can be ‘doctrinally and ecclesiastically’ justified. If not, then he should be discouraged in any designs he may entertain to “line up with” either, any, or all of them.

Personally, from what little I know of the New Testament, it seems to me a tragedy that any man should be “enmeshed in sectarianism” by “lining up with” either “one sect” or “all sects.” The whole sectarian business is condemned in the New Testament. Paul taught Christians to ‘give diligence to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all.” (Eph. 4:3-6) “For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit.” (1 Cor. 12:1,12,13) This body is the church (Col. 1:18) and not the sort of a sect, “one” or “all” the editor of the Baptist and Reflector talks about men “lining up with.”

Another thing that is strange” to me. He seems to think that a man must “line up with one sect” to be “definite enough to be classified denominationally.” If he isn’t so “classified” he “has neither conviction nor courage enough to be classified.” Now, suppose that a man has a “conviction” that he just wants to be classified as a Christian and belong to nothing except the body of Christ, which in the New Testament included all Christians, and has the “courage” to resist all efforts to “classify” him “denominationally?” As I understand the matter, Paul had plenty of both “conviction” and “courage” and was “definite enough to be classified.” In his plea before Agrippa, he expressed the devout wish that “all that hear me this day, might become such as I am.” He defies denominational classification. If he was a Baptist, Methodist, Episcopalian, or was “lined up with” even “one sect” the New Testament says nothing about it. If he was “lined up with” all of them it was all of us ought to be. Otherwise, none of us ought to be. It is my “conviction” that he was a member of the body of Christ which cannot be classified denominationally.” The body of Christ was not, and is not, a denomination. This denominational business is too new to have the endorsement of the New Testament. If the editor of the Baptist and Reflector thinks he can classify Paul as a Baptist, let him try it, and it is likely that we will pay our respects to any efforts he makes along that line.

Of all the bad business connected with sectarian line-ups, we are told what “seems to be out of all” in these words.

“But for a man to allege himself to be a Baptist and then decline specific Baptist alignment and denominational cooperation with other Baptists is to hold the same general convictions that he professes to hold, seems to be worst of all. A man wearing the Baptist name disdaining Baptist work under a Baptist label is a sorry sight. When people say, ‘You cannot tell whether he is a Baptist or not,’ they intend it as a compliment on him, but it is far from being complimentary. One had as well say, ‘You cannot tell whether he is an American or not.’ You cannot tell whether he is married or not. A man need not, and should not, strut his Baptist affiliation or be offensive in it. But the public is entitled to know what a man is. And if he is nothing, he ought not to claim to be something.”

Now, I admit that it is a pretty “sorry sight.” The editor seems to have bored down to where the milk is in the coconut. If a man is going to be a Baptist, it is my opinion that he ought to be one and not the sort of a Baptist the editor of the Baptist and Reflector thinks he can classify Paul as a Baptist, let him try it, and it is likely that we will pay our respects to any efforts he makes along that line. If we are really looking for trouble, we can have enough to keep us busy without it.

(Cont. from page 11)

Brother Errett is eminently right. Our appeal is to the New Testament, not the church, “on similar matters.” And the effort of some of the brethren to use the proceedings of the Jerusalem meeting as authority for submitting matters that are not similar to a vote of a congregation is wholly beside the point. They are clearly going to the wrong place for their authority. Majority rule is out of step with the divine plan which places a congregation under the oversight of qualified bishops. An appeal to the majority opened the door for the organ and some other things which even Brother Errett feels constrained to protest against. Let the Baptists and digressives have the majority rule toy to play with. If we are really looking for trouble, we can have enough to keep us busy without it.