DOCTORING THE BIBLE

CLED E. WALLACE

There is no short cut to a knowledge of the Bible. Publishers of and agents for specially edited Bibles with fancy trimmings and helps of various kinds have reaped a considerable profit for themselves by raising false hopes in the minds of the gullible, who would like to have, and imagine they can get, a knowledge of the Book without much hard work. The price tags attached to such wares are far from modest and in some instances so ridiculous they reflect on the intelligence of the customer. When the Bible with "helps" costs considerably more than twice as much as the same Bible without the "helps," it ought to occur to somebody that too high a value has been placed on human help. Some books of the sort are helpful after a fashion but they contain no magic that will cause one to absorb knowledge from sleeping with one of them under his pillow. This is true even of the best ones.

A lot of sectarian and speculative propaganda is spread about with the help of these doctored, high-priced Bibles. Sales-resistance is entirely too low among the brethren, and especially the sisters, when some of these talkative vendors ring the door-bell. When one is let in, he should be viewed with enough suspicion to give a healthy curiosity a chance to determine what he is and what he has. A very intelligent sister asked me to inspect a book she had bought from an agent for a financial consideration of several good American dollars. The agent got the money and she was laboring under the impression that she was getting just what the doctor ordered to help her and her household to grow in the grace and knowledge of the Lord Jesus Christ. What she got was "Bible Readings For the Home Circle." Sounds good, doesn't it? And it was mechanically very pleasing to the eye and had pictures in it. The agent of course did not tell the sister that he was a Seventh Day Adventist and the book was arranged for the spread of Adventist doctrine. When she found that out, she was mad!

There are a lot of people, too, who do not distinguish between the text of the Bible and the comments made upon it in some of these highly specialized editions. Some brethren proudly display their "Scofield" Bibles until somebody tells them that the Scofield part is the rottenest sort of premillennial propaganda, and then they nearly die from shock. Anybody who buys one of the things without knowing what he is getting, is being sadly imposed upon. A lot of men who write Bible "helps" are in need of a liberal amount of holly themselves, or past the point where any amount of it will do them any good. Brethren can at least take care not to pay out good money in exchange for such blindness on paper. "Our" own publishers are not too careful, conscientious or something, sometimes, when it comes to what is said about such works advertised in their catalogs. In one of them, I have seen the "Scofield Bible" praised as though it were almost inspired exegesis, instead of the pitiful, drivelling web of fancy which it really is.

Brother Larimore was wont to say that a fairly intelligent human being of either sex, was very well equipped to increase his knowledge of God, if he had a good text of the Bible, a good English dictionary and a good Bible dictionary. There is some wisdom here. This is no argument against the reading of good books, or the use of any "helps" that are helps. It does add up to this. There is no way to really learn what is in the Bible without reading and studying the Bible itself. Few students are capable of passing an examination on any subject, history for instance, after only one casual reading of a text and listening to a few lectures. The text must be read, re-read and studied. So it is with the books that make up the Bible. And dealing with the Bible after such a fashion yields tremendous and pleasing results. A student should read the gospels until he knows the life of Christ. He should read the book of Acts until he knows the history of the early church. He should read the epistles until he knows what the Lord expects of his church and his people. If he reads these things often enough, he will know them just like he knows other things he is interested in enough to read about. Some brethren can tell us where Joe Louis landed every punch on Lou Nova and which fist he used, who can't quote a memory verse at a prayer-meeting. There are two reasons for this. In the first place, they are not at prayer-meeting and in the second place they do not know the memory verse. It isn't lack of ability, it is lack of interest. This is really a serious matter. "Wherefore be ye not foolish, but understand what the will of the Lord is." (Eph. 5:17) "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly." (Col.3:16) The prevailing ignorance of the word of God on the part of large numbers in the church is both amazing and appalling. I still think we know more about the Bible than our religious neighbors do, but that just goes to show what I think about how little they know. It is my conviction that if an ignorant brother with a fairly good mind would pick out one book in the New Testament, start with a few interesting facts about it, and then read it over and over until he knew it, he would be so proud of himself and feel so good otherwise that he would keep up the good work and really find out what growth in grace and knowledge means. Reading the Bible should not be viewed as a task, or a drudgery. The pleasure it affords is commensurate with the profit it yields. There is no short cut to a knowledge of the Bible. The man who knows it was not born that way. He got that way by keeping company with the Book and behaving himself intelligently while he was at it.
THE LAMENTATIONS -OF C. B. F. YOUNG, PH. D.

The preachers of the brotherhood are again served to circular letters this time from "C. B. F. Young, Ph. D." of New York City. First of all, he wants everybody to know that he is "a Ph. D." so he puts its on his envelope, and prints it on his stationery. Perhaps, readers may want to know more about him than his own circulars tell.

Who is C. B. F. Young, Ph. D.? In addition to being "a far cry from a chemist" - an electrometallurgist -- he was "the president" of the New Christian Leader Corporation. He was, and apparently yet is, Clinton Davidson's right hand man. He helped with all his might and main to sponsor and promote the Davidson movement, the Davidson paper, and the Davidson cause. That just about nearly explains who he is.

What is ailing C. B. F. Young, Ph. D.? The same thing that is ailing all of them. He would have his circular list to think that it is the editor's "past actions" that have upset him so. Can you imagine why a man big (?) enough to be a Ph. D. away up in "Noo Yawk" should become so suddenly interested in the Banner editor's affairs? The fact that the source of his interest is "Clinton Davidson's files" answers that question.

What is C. B. F. Young, Ph. D. doing? He is using the same old Davidson scheme of trying to make a sucker list out of the preacher's list (and every other list he can get, I presume) to convey his mingled emotions, animi-ties, and lamentations to all the preachers and, incidentally, to tell them how hard he worked to earn his Ph. D. and what a good Christian he is.

Since the C. B. F. Y. Ph. D. circular's weeping and wailing is over what was said about him in the Bible Banner some months ago, perhaps it is well that the readers should see the articles. So here they are:

THE CHRISTIAN LEADER FOLDS UP

The Firm Foundation of December 10, carries an announcement, that Brother G. H. P. Showalter has acquired the Christian Leader and in his possession assumes responsibility for what it will be until it is merged with the Gospel Proclaimer, as contemplated, with the February issue of that paper. Brother Showalter says: "I crave the good-will, confidence of all who read and love the paper and love the whole truth of God." Brother Showalter has all of that from me. We who are of the Great, West have in G. H. P. Showalter during the past generation an almost unbounded and unlimited confidence, and the brethren all over this broad area accented his leadership almost unanimously, through the Firm Foundation, in the fight that he made in earlier days against all forms of error and digression. While some of us have thought that the Firm Foundation has not been as militant and outspoken against the menace of the Davidson movement, promoted by the Leader, as the importance of it demanded, yet the positions of the Firm Foundation and the integrity of its editor on any question never have been questioned. Whether the Christian Leader is merged with the Gospel Proclaimer or is issued as a separate periodical by the Firm Foundation under Brother Showalter's management, we wish for Brother Showalter the comfort and consolation of doing the Cause of Christ a service by taking over this added burden, for there will be no financial gain in it to him. We believe that Brother Showalter's loyalty to the truth will be the safeguard against the former false policies and promotions of the Leader.

It is not untimely to say here that "two years ago the Christian Leader passed into the hands of a new manager, the person of Clinton Davidson. He was the instrument, medium and tool to accomplish the invasion of the church with his schemes. He is said to have made the boast that he would have 50,000 subscribers, 30,000 in the South around Nashville, Tennessee. But after two years his dreams of conquest have come to an ignominious end.

But some phases of the Davidson campaign apparently have not yet. C. B. F. Young, of New York, sometime called Brother Showalter's "the president" (it is a chemist), appears to have succeeded him in the campaign of calumny, which Davidson waged against certain of us who opposed him in the Bible Banner sometime back I quoted John T. Lewis as saying that "Doctor" Young had made a statement over long distance telephone from New York to Birmingham that he had "enough information" on the editor of the Bible Banner in Nashville to ruin him if he "would tell it." The readers will remember to ask promptly to write Doctor Young to come right down to Nashville while I was there in a meeting and tell it. He did not do so. He would not. He could not. He had no intention of doing it. First he says that he did not make the statement over the telephone, but he did make it through another medium to the same party. He wants Bro. Lewis to correct the mistake. A slight mistake it is, involving only the medium of the statement. But that does not help C. B. F. Young any, for what did he do? Well, he goes to Birmingham and carries with him Clinton Davidson's "files" containing "information" on the editor of the Bible Banner and shows these "files" privately to certain parties whom he would love to turn against the Bible Banner and its editor! So the campaign of calumny continues. They would not fight in their paper, but they will fight behind it! The "Doctor" (?) would not come to Nashville upon my invitation and show me his files-but he will peddle Clinton Davidson's files around and show them to others. Of course, he does not have to show me the files, I know all that is in them. I and I know that it is not any old creditors from Nash-ville that they care about. They would never have taken the pains to get a report on me had it not been for the fact that I debated Premillennialism with Neal & Boll, Norris & Tinglo, and exposed the spirit of the Davidson movement. Nor do they care primarily any thing about the relations between me and the church in California (which have always been good and only good) -- it is my opposition to their diabolical schemes that has made them mad and brought down their vengeance upon my head.

So Doctor C. B. F. Young takes up where Clinton David-son left off, with the campaign of calumny.

The obligations that they so unfortunately made through several exceedingly hazardous and trying years between 1929 and 1934 in Nashville, Tennessee, were paid several years ago. My creditors never did cut up half as much as some who were never my creditors. They, my former creditors, were satisfied--but Clinton Davidson and Doctor Clarence are not satisfied.

All financial affairs between me and the elders of the Central Church of Christ, in Los Angeles, were understood and agreed upon when I went there in 1930 to become editor of the Gospel Advocate, and the details were worked out accordingly, during the strenuous task of building up the church and erecting a $75,000 edifice in Los Angeles after I left. They were satisfied. But Doctor Clarence and Clinton Copyright are not satisfied.

(Even in the matter of getting a disagreement adjust-
ed between the Gospel Guardian and the firm that printed it, these meddlers have shown their hand. Property rights were involved in this settlement. An adjustment was due.

One of the elders of the church in Oklahoma City, a business man who was not interested in the details, assisted me. The matter was settled out of court and amicably, and the adjusted account was paid in full, exactly as I had agreed to do in the beginning. But the attorney assisting us said that an outside party was interested in the concern to net a judgment against me and that awareness of this party had offered to buy the judgment in order to induce this concern to file the suit. Can anybody imagine what it was that was involved in my case? But this matter was honorably adjusted, and this concern gave me a written statement that the matter was settled just as I had agreed. They are satisfied. But Clarence and Clinton are not satisfied! So it is with everything they think they have against me. While all parties concerned are satisfied and have been for several years, Davidson, Young et al., who are not concerned, are not satisfied. Like "Brother Crawford's wife," they are very unhappy!

If the New York chemist, who appears to be so pious, insists on peddling the Clinton Davidson "files" around among the brethren, I propose to have a whostatic copy made of the documents in my possession, bearing on these matters and wrint them in the Bible Banner, showing the original statements and signatures, to put these scandal-mongers where they belong in the corner. I could put them there. I have not the slightest question of their possession, and have had for ten years, the wositive evidence to refute their charges, every one, in detail. Some of my friends have urged me to print them all—but I have not yet made up my mind to do it. They are satisfied. Like "Brother Crawford's wife," they are very unhappy! If the New York chemist, who appears to be so pious, insists on peddling the Clinton Davidson "files" around among the brethren, I propose to have a whostatic copy made of the documents in my possession, bearing on these matters and wrint them in the Bible Banner, showing the original statements and signatures, to put these scandal-mongers where they belong in the corner. I could put them there. I have not the slightest question of their possession, and have had for ten years, the wositive evidence to refute their charges, every one, in detail. Some of my friends have urged me to print them all—but I have not yet made up my mind to do it. They are satisfied. Like "Brother Crawford's wife," they are very unhappy!

If the New York chemist, who appears to be so pious, insists on peddling the Clinton Davidson "files" around among the brethren, I propose to have a whostatic copy made of the documents in my possession, bearing on these matters and wrint them in the Bible Banner, showing the original statements and signatures, to put these scandal-mongers where they belong in the corner. I could put them there. I have not the slightest question of their possession, and have had for ten years, the wositive evidence to refute their charges, every one, in detail. Some of my friends have urged me to print them all—but I have not yet made up my mind to do it. They are satisfied. Like "Brother Crawford's wife," they are very unhappy!

C. B. F. Young says that Clinton Davidson denies threatening to sue us. Is that so? Well, ask J. W. Akin if he understood the letter he received as a threat. Ask J. E. Williams if he understands the letter he received as a threat. Ask George W. Birchfield if he took the letter he received as a threat. Ask Austin Taylor if he interpreted the letter he received as a threat. Ask Leon B. McQuiddy why he would not meet me in Memphis to discuss his letter to me. That Davidson had said that he would sue me, and to talk the Bible Banner situation over. Brother McQuiddy thought he meant to do it, and withdrew from the prosed organization of the Bible Banner Company, leaving it up to me. The difference between him and me was that he was scared and I was not. Davidson ought to rewent and apologze for his conduct instead of denying it, thus adding another sin to what he has already done.

This has the same spirit of these men who were so much in favor of promoting a sweet-spirited journal—the New Christian Leader. We hope that Brother Showalter, now that he has acquired the Leader, will not give them the medium through which to feed us sugar in his paper and throw acid in our eyes out of it.

In "taking over this increased labor and responsibility with a determination to make the Christian Leader of just, as much help to each individual Christian as possible" we wish Brother Showalter the highest success, in such a cause, and proffer our assistance and encouragement as it serves as much help to each individual Christian as possible.
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is—but he has not circulated what Jno. T. Lewis told him. I happen to know that he told him plenty.

Again, the usual exception is taken on premillennialism. He insists that he is no premillennialist. Well, just who is these days? The ones that are won't admit it. We have heard that before. To hear them talk there is not a premillennialist among them—yet they are helping the premillennialists with all their influence and money. Davidson is not a premillennialist, he says, but he always goes to the R. H. Boll-E. L. Jorgenson church in Louisville, Kentucky. Thinking that he had better make an argument against premillennialism, too, Ph. D. calls it “fantastic.” That's quite a nice name for it—doubtless rather pleasing to those who teach it—but I have a better name for it. It is an out-and-out false doctrine, destructive of the gospel of Christ and the church of Christ. As well call Mormonism, Adventism, Russellism, or Spiritualism, “fantastic.”

Another exception taken by our high degree complainant is that my reference to those who “appear so pious” impugns his righteousness, and violates the Sermon On The Mount—but in the next breath he says that this is “not the first time that Brother Wallace has wilfully misrepresented” things. Note that he says “willfully,” and yet he objects to language that impugns his own pious motives! The same chapter that mentions the “the mote and the beam,” to which the brother of high degree refers, has something in pretty close connection to say about judging not that you be not judged. Was he trying to be a Christian when he let that one slip, or was he “throwing acid”?

It has been noteworthy and notorious that these superpious brethren can be as ugly as anybody. They would not publish what Ph. D. Young has circulated in their once glorious but now defunct Christian Leader, but they demand that we publish it. The foreground of their premises is alluring but when one looks at their background it spoils the scenery. Yes, “sugar in one hand and acid in the other”—is exactly what they carry regardless of the pious pretext. Nobody expects them to admit it. But people who think will always look with doubt on the man who talks about how much he prays and how hard he is trying to be a Christian. Watch him and see.

Among the other greater or lesser sins of the editor is that of referring to the brother’s letter as “long” and “rambling.” Since he has mailed it out to everybody, I am willing to let them be the judge. Does it read like the composition of a Ph. D? Someone said in a jocular vein that Ph. D. means Phenomenally Dumb, but the present character is a volume of personal correspondence went out from Clinton Davidson to preachers, enough of which fell into my own hands to give me an accurate picture of what was going on. Why all of this? There is but one answer: The cause they promoted required it. That is how they fight. Their paper was too ethical to print it—but they were not too conscientious to circulate it through underground channels.

Even the “National Unity Meetings” took on the same character, and the promoters of it were caught red-handed in an organized scheme, with malice aforethought, to destroy the reputation of the Banner’s editor. Here is where Witty, promoter of the magic movement for union with the Christian Church, showed his hand. He joined hands with Davidson in a base confidential scheme to expose the editor. Why? “Because,” he said, of the fight we have made against the Davidson-Witty-Murch movements. Now, that is the truth—they let it out themselves. There-in is the motive for it all. They care nothing about the “past actions” nor the present actions of the editor of the Bible Banner as such—they are after him because the Bible Banner has smashed every advance they have made on the church. By the Grace of Almighty God, we shall continue to do so.

The New Christian Leader folded up and Clinton Davidson went into retreat, or recluse, but he is still operating and will continue to operate. His methods and money are easily identified, and his agents cannot cover up their tracks, in their guerilla warfare.

There has been plenty of money and influence back of the fight that has been made to destroy the Bible Banner. Though Clinton Davidson is now out of the public picture, he is still in the fight. He is waging it through others and he will do that on and on. Preacher lists, and leader lists, and paper lists, will continue to be worked, and the preachers and the brethren may continue to expect such things through the mails, some signed, some unsigned, but all of one intent—the total destruction of the opposition to their diabolical plans and schemes by any means fair or foul.

Thus it all links up, and as the President of the United States said in Collier’s, “the fight goes on—if they must have it so, very well, that is our dish, except we cannot and will not descend to their levels to serve it. Our fight has been on issues; for issues, and therefore for the church. Let them fight as they will—they have not passed, and they shall not pass!” F. E. W.
LEADERSHIP--HUMAN AND DIVINE

HOMER HAILEY

A casual study of the history of Christianity after the days of the apostles reveals that the two things from which the Lord's religion has suffered more than any other, are human philosophies and human leadership. Human leadership inevitably leads men into human errors. The prophet Jeremiah had no doubt seen enough of human leadership to have said what he did, even if he hadn't been inspired, when he said, "O Jehovah, I know that the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." (Jer. 10:23)

Sometimes we begin to reason: "What the church needs today is a great leader, one raised up to lead us out of the present confusion, and direct us in an aggressive campaign against our external foes." But on second thought this is the very last thing we need, for no religious movement built around human leadership has been successful in accomplishing the divine purpose. History is replete with illustrations. The great movements of the reformation, the Mormon church built around the leadership of Smith and Young, and even some modern movements within our own brotherhood.

It isn't 'leadership' so much as "follow-ship" that the church needs. Jesus claimed to be the leader, when He declared Himself "the good shepherd," "the way," "the light of the world" to be followed; and announced to His disciples, "if any man would come after me, let him deny himself. ..and follow me." It is not a 'leader,' therefore that we need, for we have one, a divine one; but the need is for the disposition to follow where He leads.

A tendency is sometimes found today to glorify "boy preachers." Having just recently graduated from the class of "boy preachers" myself, it would be most unbecoming on my part to say anything disparagingly of them. The attitude of most of them is better than that of many of the older preachers. But when one of them is over-exalted he looks upon himself as "the leader," a modern Moses to lead the church out of Egypt and through the wilderness. In this he loses sight of his real mission, which is to point people to the Christ, the real leader. Trouble inevitably follows.

Other young preachers, and some older ones, feel that the first thing to be done when they go into a place is to "appoint elders" over the congregation. The argument is, "the church needs leaders." No, the need is not for leaders, it is for "elders." If a man is not qualified for the work of an elder, he is not what God wants in an elder, regardless of how good a "leader" he may be. In fact, his ability to lead without the qualifications of an elder is the very point of danger. One function of an elder is to be an "ensample to the flock." He is an ensample worthy of being followed only as he follows Christ, and in his following leads others to follow Him. One who allows himself to be "appointed" without the necessary qualifications further disqualifies himself by that very thing. For in failing to respect the New Testament in the point of elder qualifications, he shows himself a poor ensample to be followed at all. It is "followers" not "leaders" that are most needed today.

Suppose we consider the challenge of sectarianism. Some of us think it would be fine if we had a good leader to guide us in the fight against these foes of truth. The fact is, we have such a leader. Jesus met the devil in debate soon after his baptism, which was not a spectacular affair before a large audience of people, but except for the possibility of heavenly on-lookers it was strictly private. Immediately afterward He began meeting the devil's children, the Pharisees, who were the sectaries of that day. He has opened the way and is leading. Christians need, simply to follow the leader in carrying the attack to all sectarianism, in private discussions or with them in groups as opportunity affords. He is all the leader needed, we need to follow the example. God never left the work of "defending the faith once for all delivered unto the saints" solely for preachers and "leaders," but for all of His children.

'Then there is the challenge of work, the work left to be done by the church. The cry made so often is, "We have no leaders to direct us, to tell us what to do." Why yes we have, there is the example of Christ, of whom Peter said, "Because Christ suffered for you, leaving you an example that ye should follow in his steps"; "who went about doing good." Every needy person whom He met, either in need of physical help or of spiritual help, was an opportunity. Every opportunity to serve was an opportunity in which to glorify His father by that service. What great leader could one ask for than the Saviour?

It is not even a "leader" that we need to lead the church out of any difficulties and differences that arise within its own ranks, but rather the need is for a disposition on the part of all to follow the Christ, whose way is bound to lead all aright. Difficulties and differences are bound to eventually iron themselves out when the right disposition is manifested by all. Often Jesus looked upon lost humanity as "sheep having no shepherd," a world suffering from human leadership. But this need not be true of us, for Christ is the Shepherd, and for one today to be the victim of human leadership is inexcusable.

Instead of talking "leadership" and "leaders" so much, as is being done in preacher's meetings and other similar places, let's put the emphasis on "following" for a while. No truly godly man wants to be "the leader of the church," nor does he want to "rule" it; he realizes that true greatness according to Christ's standard is to be realized in being a "servant of all." The truly great and godly is content to follow Christ, and simply insist on others following Him. It seems to me that the work of elders and preachers is not so much that of being "leaders," but it is that of instructing and guiding others to be followers of the Lord, as they themselves follow Him.

Just as surely as men learn that the need is for followers and not leaders, just that surely will the church be led in triumph from victory unto victory. Not only the church, but humanity will be led out of any chaos into which human leadership has brought it; either political, doctrinal, or moral.
HINTS ON GOOD BEHAVIOR

CLED E. WALLACE

Journalistic Rules And Ethics

At times some good men are inclined to be rather arbitrary in developing and binding rules on disputants in a controversy. Even some of the generally accepted rules are not inspired and occasions may arise when they need not be slavishly followed. Some efforts are being made in these latter days to bind on writers some rules that are not generally accepted, ought not to be, and will not be. I refuse to be bound by them and will ignore them. They are too suffocating to be fair and do not give me room enough to swing and deliver the punch that I think is sometimes needed. They afford too many hiding places for the advocates of error. The copyrighted Christian Leader, now, deceased, was a case in point. A wall of defense was erected against critics. It was unlawful to single out a paragraph in any article and make an attack upon it. The whole article must be published and that only by the permission of the editor. As far as I know such a rule was hitherto unheard of in all our journalistic history. Our editors and writers have been too bold and sure of themselves to feel the need of such protection in the past. We certainly do not need any such shelter as that. If anybody wants to take a crack at anything we write, in whole or in part, he is welcome to have at it. Brother Armstrong complains at Brother Lewis because an article of his was chopped up in paragraphs and replied to piecemeal. He thinks it was very unfair. In fact he does "not read the Bible Banner" because he is "forced to class it as bad literature because there is so much in it that is unfair, untrue, and divisive." That is one man's opinion. Others no doubt feel the same way. Many refused to read the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation in the days of Lipscomb, Harding and McGary for the same "because." They had some pitched battles, in those days and they did not always take time to read the rules. Some today are so rule-conscious that they spend more time shouting "foul" than they do in fighting.

Now, writers and speakers can be, and often are, unfair in dealing with those they criticize. Unfairness cannot be defended. Even the most unworthy opponents should not be misrepresented. Fairness does not always require that a man's position be stated in his own words. Any statement of his position that is true to facts is fair. A man is under no obligation to reprint a whole book, a tract or an article to review it. He can make use of a paragraph, a sentence or a phrase and offer any criticisms he may deem just. He is unfair only when his use of them may deem just. He is unfair only when his use of them misrepresents the position the author actually advocated. This is almost too obvious to be discussed. An unfair critic can take a sentence here and there and juggle them in a way that makes the author say the very opposite of what he intended. This is sheer dishonesty and criticism ceases to exist, for cheap chicanery has taken its place. Sectarian preachers and teachers often abuse the scriptures in this way. A quotation can be taken out of its context in the Bible and construed in, a way to pervert the meaning of the author. Calvinists have greatly erred here, as have others. That does not mean that a teacher cannot quote and use texts without reproducing the whole book from which they are taken. We recognize this principle in teaching the Bible. Why cannot it be recognized in dealing with the writings of men we feel duty-bound to criticize? John W. McGarvey and F. D. Srygley were two of the fairest and sharpest critics I have ever followed. One wrote for the Christian Standard, the other for the Gospel Advocate. They quoted freely from written sources without reproducing all that the authors had to say and made devastating remarks about these quotations, but I was never under the impression that they misrepresented anybody. Much of their work along this line has been preserved in book form. I have one such volume from each in my library and value them highly. I was brought up on the idea that sort of thing and do not at this late date propose to be enclosed in a strait-jacket of new and senseless rules made by men who seem to be afraid of the consequences of what they say and write. I am still somewhat inclined, or more so, to quote what I please and say what I please about it. This is still a fairly free country.

Two Good Reasons

Paul gave Timothy some specific instructions about "how men ought to behave themselves in the house of God." There are at least two good reasons why we should learn and follow these instructions. In the first place, the church is "the pillar and ground of the truth." The truth is God's weapon against error. With it God proposes to free men from the bondage of sin and prepare them for heaven. "Jesus therefore said to those Jews that had believed "(3 John 4) The church upholds and supports the truth. Each member of the body has his own responsibility in this work. When one is guilty of misbehavior in the house of God, he is retarding the divine program and throwing his influence upon the wrong side of this fight the church is engaged in. That is the reason Paul charged the brethren to "walk worthily of the calling wherewith ye were called." (Eph. 4:4) "Only let your manner of life be worthy of the gospel of Christ: that, whether I come and see you or be absent, I may hear of your state, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving for the faith of the gospel." (Phil. 1:27) A member of the body is insulting Christ the head of the body, doing despite to the Spirit of grace, and becomes a stumbling-block and a nuisance when he acts up in a way that interferes with the progress of the church in the divine program which the Lord has assigned it. It is a serious business. The reason for the existence of the church is to "show forth the excellencies of him who called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." (I Pet. 2:9,10)

Another reason why members of the church should learn to behave themselves in a proper manner is that they are "a holy temple in the Lord" and "are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit." (Eph. 2:21, 22) The dwelling-place of God must be holy and free from corruption. When a church becomes a tabernacle of sin, then God withdraws from it. He will not live in such a place. "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the washing of water with the word, that he might present the church to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." (Eph. 5:25-27) The temple of God is being polluted by some who are "serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy, hateful, hating one another." (Titus 3:3) Such things ought not so to be. Then again, we have disturbers who "teach a different doctrine" and dote about hobbies and extreme views that create "envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings" and the like. In the name of loyalty, although they may be "puffed up, knowing nothing," they defile the temple and drive God
out of his own proper dwelling-place. The Lord is an avenger in such matters. Christians are house-keepers for the Lord and should do a good job of it. We also have with us the nasty little mess-makers who “learn also to be idle, going about from house to house; and not only idle, but tattlers also and busybodies, speaking things which they ought not.” (I Tim. 5:13) The temple of God should not be defaced by such vandalism.

All would do well to heed these divine hints on good behavior. “But the end of the charge is love out of a pure heart and a good conscience and faith unfeigned.” (I Tim. 1:5) “But we exhort you, brethren, that ye abound more and more; and that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your hands, even as we charged you; that ye may walk becomingly toward them that are without, and may have need of nothing.” (I Thess. 4:10-12) “Faithful is the saying, and concerning these things I desire that thou affirm confidently, to the end that they who have believed God may be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men: but shun foolish questionings and genealogies, and strifes, and fightings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain.” (Titus 3:8, 9) This sort of behavior promotes fellowship, keeps the fires of holy zeal ablaze, maintains the order of the Lord’s house, and gives great momentum to the entire program which the church was established to carry on.

* * * *

Our “Wrong Way Corrigan”

A, now famous Irishman nosed his antiquated crate toward the west coast, got turned around on purpose, crossed the Atlantic and wound up in London. Everybody knows about “Wrong Way Corrigan.” We have our Wrong Way Witty. The accepted and hitherto successful way of dealing with digression has been to fight it. Brother Witty is terribly, if not painfully, interested in unity and proposes to reverse the whole procedure. He is carrying an umbrella of appeasement instead of the sword of the Spirit. He is making buddies of the innovators and is blushing for shame at the rest of us who will not turn around and go along with them. According to me and the best light I have, he is a wrong way blusher. He actually published the fact that he is “ashamed” of all of us who will not throw in with his unity meetings with the digressives. A roll call of those of us who are not with him and those who are would reveal the fact that his feeling of shame for us is not a very huge exhibition of modesty. If he has expressed any shame for DeForest Murch’s digression and premillennialism, I have not seen it in print. Murch is his chief buddy in this business, and if Murch has any notion of soft-pedalling his premillennialism or giving up his instruments and other digressive ways, it has escaped my attention and don’t think I’m not looking to see what I can see. Brother Witty has not printed any blushes over Don Carlos Janes, R. H. Boll, E. L. Jorgenson or any of the extreme developments that have come out of their section of Louisville. I am under the impression that no extra blood will surge upward to redden his countenance over the fact that the Highland church Louisville called S. S. Lappin, a digressive preacher, to do the preaching in a meeting. Of course I’m in no position to speak for everybody Brother Witty is ashamed of, but personally, I’m not very deeply distressed over the fact that he is ashamed of me, when I survey the crowd whose fellowship he welcomes and whose waywardness he condones. I admit that I do not blush easily, and I am not ashamed to wonder out loud if Brother Witty would not exchange some meetings with Lappin, Murch or some other of his digressive “unity” buddies, if the time were a little riper and he were not afraid to. We dare him to do it and promise that when he does, we will give him something else to be ashamed of.

There is another angle to this business that should not be overlooked. According to the Christian Standard this fight with digression is about seventy-five years old and the Standard ought to know as it was there when it started. The digressives never did win anything by argument for their appeal was to sight and sense and not to faith. They were strong on strategy. “By their smooth and fair speech, they beguiled the hearts of the innocent.” The old heroes of faith who stemmed the tide of innovation that swept in on the churches did not do so with an appeasement policy such as Brother Witty advocates. Had they done so, there would have been unity all right, but what a unity! There were some fence-sitters back there pulling strings from both directions, like Brother Witty is doing now, but they all went digressive in time and some are now wondering where Brother Witty is going in time. Maybe I ought not to say so, since Brother Witty blushes so easily, but it’s the truth; he sounds like a blushing Charlie McCarthy to me. Digressive strategy is again at work.
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In Matthew 7: 15-20, Jesus Christ says: "Beware of false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves. By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so, every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but the corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. 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. Therefore by their fruits ye shall know them. Do men light candles in a basket under a lever? Yea, let them light them. But is it good to set a lamp under a bushel? Therefore let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven. The same is true of religious teachers. In fact Jesus Christ was only using the example of the corrupt tree and its fruit, as a warning against false teachers.

A few years ago James DeForest Murch and Claud F. Witty began to father what they called "unity meetings" between some of the Christian Churches and some of the churches of Christ. A few gospel preachers like S. H. Hall H. F. Adamson, and F. L. Rowe, who evidently thought good things could be gathered to the storehouse, entered into their acts of the individual, and not through synods, committees, nor unity in Christ would have to be based upon individual acts, or acts of the individual, and not through synods, conferences, fellowship in service. Foy E. Wallace, Jr., publisher and editor of the Bible Banner, the paper in which the fight was made against the Murch-Witty farcical unity (?) meetings, has been consigned to oblivion, by the well wishers of the Witty fiasco. However the delivery has not been accomplished yet, and the job now seems to hinge upon finding "some small town printer" who may be induced, by the "filthy lure" of some unnamed Quisling in Detroit, to take over the task. In the meantime we will examine some of the fruit produced by the Murch-Witty unity (?) meetings. Read the following illuminating report from the Christian Standard of August 16, 1941. It is both interesting and significant.

LOWLANDS AND HIGHLANDS

By S. S. Lappin

I could have chosen as a title, "Progressives and Anti-s." But I submit that "Lowlands and Highands" is better, though its significance is remote. Leatherwood Church, in Lawrence County, Ind., now 111 years old, was located in the lowlands on Leatherwood Creek. Highland Church, its significance is remote. Lawrence County, Ind., now 111 years old, was located in the lowlands on Leatherwood Creek. Highland Church, its significance is remote. Lawrence County, Ind., now 111 years old, was located in the lowlands on Leatherwood Creek. The paper in which the fight was made against the Murch-Witty farcical unity (?) meetings, has been consigned to oblivion, by the well wishers of the Witty fiasco. However the delivery has not been accomplished yet, and the job now seems to hinge upon finding "some small town printer" who may be induced, by the "filthy lure" of some unnamed Quisling in Detroit, to take over the task. In the meantime we will examine some of the fruit produced by the Murch-Witty unity (?) meetings. Read the following illuminating report from the Christian Standard of August 16, 1941. It is both interesting and significant.
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gospel I have always preached and praying that we may all be one.

Now a few observations that I have made during this very happy season of labor with my princely brother, E. L. Jorgensen, and his good church. In addition to what I have always preached and praying that we may all be one.

1. One good man, able to think with clearness, said to me, "I believe it is wrong to use musical instruments in worship, I will not disfellowship my brother or shut myself from God's house on this account, but I will not sing when the instrument is used."

2. Another said, "I am opposed to the use of instruments in worship on grounds of expediency alone; I believe voices can be better developed and a better service of praise enjoyed without it." Were I to judge wholly by Highland music, I shall agree with them. A layman said, "I love Highland Church; I am happy to worship and work there and to accept the policy in vogue; but I have had no quarrel with my brethren about instrumental music, or some such weal.

3. A layman said, "I have been somewhat given to worship for months or years where these are in use."

4. A discerning layman and a good giver said, "I believe in the co-operative principle in missionary work; I believe there shall be the same type of having a business oversight, and of integrating the work so it would not be shown wholly haphazard as it is with us of the conserva-tive way; but, when I consider the abuses that have risen when the church was forced to lead the way of innovations in this matter, I would shun that, too. I have won-dered whether there is not a way suited to churches of Christ that avoids the defects of both.

5. But there is need of charity more than of logic. When I say "music," I do not mean the jingling of the organ, or the soft sounds of the piano, but the sweet harmonies of the singing myrtle or ivy that gets started in graveyards; it-soon covers the whole surface and kills out the grass. I find here talk of two-cuppers and one-cuppers and individual cupping. I have been a two-cupper, and the exact formula said, as a fetish! "for the remission of sins." I find as great chasms in the fellowship of my conservative brethren, and often much more of antipathy than exists between them and the so-called "Christian Churches." God pity us, we are all poor creatures!

7. I would not have ventured the above paragraph had I not had this one in the back of my mind as I wrote. The article which states that it was not an instrument, too, I did not ask him; we were evangelizing, not arguing; High-land Church and her preacher have a right to attend to their own business without any meddling from without.

2. Another said, "I am opposed to the use of instru-

ments or societies when it has been more convenient in our "brotherhood." whatever that is: another commit-

tee, originating in some other way, has set itself to pro-

duce at one of the unity confer-

ences" that Brethren Jorgensen and Lappin met, and Brother Lappin having already commended Brother Jor-
gensen's song book, they thought it "a good thing to criss-
cross a little in the very vital work of evangelism." That is how the Highlands' unity meeting came about. The churches of Christ in many places are using Brother Jor-
gensen's song books, and if the preachers for these Churches would commend, through "our" papers, Brother Jor-
gensen's books as the best since the "Hymn and Tune Book," their admirers would get an invitation "to criss-cross a little" with Brother Jorgensen and the Highlands' church. Brother Lappin says: "Mrs. Lappin was with me through the ser-
ies, not as soloist, but as my companion, and was used re-
peatedly, by Brother Jorgenson in special songs." It is cer-
tainly something "new under the sun," for the local preach-
ers in the churches of Christ to use the visiting preachers' wives "repeatedly in special songs" or otherwise in their meetings. Surely the "Murch-Witty" unity (?) meetings are producing some rare performers among "us!" To show what "royal and loyal co-operation and response" he and his wife received "at Highland," Brother Lappin says: "Not once in homes, in private or in public has any contro-
versial note been sounded." Shades of the Pioneers! In March 1864, Moses E. Lard wrote:

"As a people we have from the first and continually to the present proclaimed that the New Testament and that above is our full and perfect rule of faith and prac-
tice. We have declared a thousand times and more that whatever it does not teach we must not hold, and whatever it does not sanction we must not practice. He who ignores or repudiates these principles, whether he be of layman, has by the act- become an apostate from our ranks; and the sooner he lifts his hands high, avows the fact, and goes out from amongst us the better, yes, verily, the better for us.

Now in the light of the foregoing principles what de-
cense can be urged for the introduction into some of our congregations of instrumental music? The answer which they ask, "is it not an instrument, too." I did not ask him; we were evangelizing, not arguing; High-
land Church and her preacher have a right to attend to their own business without any meddling from without.

3. A layman said, "I love Highland Church; I am not once in homes, in private or in public has any contro-

versial note been sounded." Shades of the Pioneers! In March 1864, Moses E. Lard wrote:

"As a people we have from the first and continually to the present proclaimed that the New Testament and that above is our full and perfect rule of faith and prac-
tice. We have declared a thousand times and more that whatever it does not teach we must not hold, and whatever it does not sanction we must not practice. He who ignores or repudiates these principles, whether he be of layman, has by the act- become an apostate from our ranks; and the sooner he lifts his hands high, avows the fact, and goes out from amongst us the better, yes, verily, the better for us.
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cense can be urged for the introduction into some of our congregations of instrumental music? The answer which they ask, "is it not an instrument, too." I did not ask him; we were evangelizing, not arguing; High-
land Church and her preacher have a right to attend to their own business without any meddling from without.

3. A layman said, "I love Highland Church; I am
listed seven observations he made "during this very happy season of labor with my princely brother E. L. Jorgenson and his good church." If Brother Lappin had been writing about cattle we would say that Brother Jorgenson had quite a mixed breed in his herd. But Brother Lappin's efforts were to poke fun at the system of worship prescribed by "divine authority," which he terms "legalism." He writes: "When legalism gets a foothold, it is like the pestiferous green myrtle or ivy that gets started in graveyards; it soon covers the whole surface and kills out the grass." This is a very apt illustration of the truth where it has free course. A third of a century ago, the digressive-Brother Lappin's people-had five churches, and five preachers, in the Birmingham, Ala., district. There was a small bunch of "pestiferous green ivy," in the third loft of a grocery store, on the corner of 19th Street and Fourth Ave. The digressives, in those days, contemptuously referred to that bunch of "ivy" as being dead. Finally a "prickly porcupine of unfeeling legalism," came along and began to root around in that little bunch of "ivy." It took root and began to spread. It has since covered the Birmingham district with 14 white congregations, and two buttons-two congregations. in prospect, with several colored congregations. That bunch of "ivy" was never one time watered by a unity (?!) meeting of the "Murch-Witty" brand. Instead of just one "prickly porcupine of unfeeling legalism," in the Birmingham district today, there are about a dozen faithful gospel preachers scattering that "ivy"—the truth—that is so deadly to digression and denominationalism. On the other hand, the progressive brethren, who believe in doing things, with their fiddles, horns, vested choirs, and special music, have lost one congregation, so today, they have only four congregations, and four preachers, instead of the five congregations, and five preachers they had thirty years ago. If it was not odious to compare them with Brother Lappin's "grass in graveyards," I would say that that "pestiferous green myrtle or ivy" has about covered the whole surface and killed the grass"-digression, in the Birmingham district. And at present there is not a ghost of a chance for a Murch-Witty unity (?) meeting to remedy the matter-too much "ivy." The outstanding (?) work of the digressives during the last thirty-five years, aided and abetted by "that great host of faithful disciples among us who did not believe the introduction of missionary societies and instrumental music into the work and worship of the church was" divisive enough to cause disfellowship and alienation among brethren, "has been to take over or steal the property bought and paid for by loyal brethren, as they did in Nashville, Tennessee, when they drove E. G. Sewell and a few others out of the Woodland Street meeting house and took over the property, paid for by David Lipscomb and others. But that old "prickly porcupine of unfeeling legalism," David Lipscomb, was not willing to give up the ship, so he began to advise the brethren, through the Gospel Advocate, to write to their brethren in the South. The digressives knew that that was the beginning of the end of their taking over property bought and paid for by faithful brethren, so they began to howl, "creed in the deed," but their cry affected only a few spiritually (?) minded brethren and caused them to leave their church property open to seizure. However since it has become necessary for the Christian Standard brand of progressives to insert the "creed in the deed" to protect their church property from the Christian-Evangelist brand of progressives, whom the Christian Standard stigmatizes "radicals," the "creed in the deed," has just become "a contract." The Christian Evangelist ought to look up some of the back numbers of the Christian Standard and show their readers what Brother Errett and his brethren used to call "a contract," that would keep them from taking over other people's property. If the Christian Evangelist would do this, it might set some of the gas out of Brother Errett's balloon, and he might have Murch and Witty invite Burris Jenkins and his open membership brethren into their unity meetings. If not, why not? In the language of W. W. Sikes, they would be trying to unite (?) three denominations instead of just two, and all agree that both the Christian Standard might bag all three of them. S. S. Lappin would make a good follow up man in either camp.

In his "observations" of the Lappin-Jorgenson union meeting, Brother Lappin tries to leave the impression that there is no difference in singing with an instrument in the home, and singing with it in the worship. Of course, Brother Jorgenson would not argue this question with him because they were "criss-crossing" in evangelism. He tries to leave the same illogical conclusion about the "amplifier" they used "so that the preaching and singing were sustained until, they could be heard by those passing in cars and busses." He says: "A member of Highland church chuckled and wished me to ask Brother Jorgenson whether that was not an instrument, too. I did not ask him; we were evangelizing, not arguing; Highland Church and their preacher have a right to attend to their own business without any needling from without." That was magnanimous indeed upon Brother Lappin's part; but I do not think he should have allowed his magnanimity to thus stultify himself before the thinking element among the readers of The Christian Standard. Of course the "amplifier" was an instrument, and it was doing for the preaching precisely what it was doing for the singing, "sustaining both until they could be heard by those passing in cars and busses." But what would the people, "passing in cars and busses," have thought if a musical "instrument," an organ, or a piano, had been going while Brother Lappin was preaching? Doubtless they would have "chuckled" too; but it would not have been a chuckle of ignorance.

Judging from what Don Carlos Janes said, in the Firm Foundation, Lappin is not only, a spiritual minded man; but he is a man of intelligence, and therefore he should not have concluded that all his readers were idiots because he found "a member of Highland Church" that did not know the difference between an "amplifier" and a musical "instrument." Brother Lappin says: "I find here talk of "one-cuppers and two-cuppers," and individual communion cups. I hear of rebaptism with the exact formula said, as a fetish, for the remission of sins." I find as great chasms in the fellowship of my conservative brethren, and much more of antipathy, than exists between them and those of us known as Christian churches. I suppose Brother Lappin would offer the "Lowlands and Highlands" union meetings as evidence of his last statement in the above and I will concede his point. And if he contends that Witty, and his unity brethren, in the Murch-Witty union meetings, have about agreed that the "one-cuppers and two-cuppers" among the "conservative" brethren are about as bad as the missionary societies, and musical instrument, in the work and worship of the church, among the "Christian Churches," I will concede that too; because I think that is about what they have done.

But let us look at the sophistry of this set-up. What would be wrong in using just one cup, or two cups, if only a few had come together to worship God? Would they be adding to or taking from the worship? Would they be offering to God something he had not commanded? What would be wrong in using several hundred "individual communion cups," where you had several hundred members? Would they be adding anything to the worship? So brethren, it makes no difference whether one cup or one hundred cups are used in the communion services you are not adding to, or taking from the worship. I know there are a few brethren who argue that you cannot use but one (Cont. On Page 16)
DEALING IN PERSONALITIES

CLED E. WALLACE

I am at this writing in the midst of a series of meetings in Barrackville, West Virginia where the Almighty Landscape Artist piled the hills about in breath-taking beauty. "The earth sheweth his handiwork" in patterns that are unmistakably divine. The language of Isaiah does justice to any atheists or skeptics who may be lurking in these hills. "for this people's heart is waxed gross. And their ears are dull of hearing. And their eyes they have closed." Open eyes are open windows to let in the light of the glory of God.

There has been a church here a long time, how long I do not know. The present meeting house, a very good one, was built in 1881, sixty years ago. A good many years ago the church divided and separate groups met at separate places as a constant advertisement of a deplorable situation. I do not even know what the division was about, but it was over some sort of foolishness no doubt. A year or so ago, sanity was restored and all the groups merged them all together again, and so it is now and so it should remain. They appear to me to be sober, sensible people and it seems strange that they should ever have been divided. Let us hope that they will forget the things that are behind and press forward to the things that are before.

My memories of Barrackville date back to my boyhood days and are associated with Ira C. Moore. The Christian Leader came to our home and Brother Moore was a regular writer for the paper. I followed his writings for Years while he lived at Barrackville. He later moved to Charleston W. Va. where he remained till the time of his death two or three years ago. He was a man of great faith and a vigorous and able advocate of New Testament Principles. For that reason he was both loved and feared. He is one of that honorable number who "being dead yet speaketh." He still lives here and at Charleston and countless Places where he has never been. The influences of many men, now dead, are living in me. Those influences will carry on after I am gone. If people would stop to consider the indestructible character of influence, some of them would surely revise their conduct. "The good man out of his good treasure bringeth forth good things: and the evil man out of his evil treasure bringeth forth evil things. And I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned." (Matt. 12:35-37)

During the early part of September, I spent ten days in Marietta, Oklahoma in a meeting. Russell Lewis of Austin, Texas, a well-prepared young man had charge of the song services. The meeting drew some large crowds. A man and a woman, both past middle age and with former sectarian connections, were baptized. Meetings were held under a large tabernacle located near the business section of the town. The church there has grown until it is a veteran in that line. I left the city with a feeling of gladness that I had come. Great wealth is concentrated in Pittsburgh and rich men have left monuments of various kinds including extravagant cathedrals of worship. It might have occurred to some of them that they were building fire-escapes for themselves, if you know what I mean. They probably affect God after the same fashion the idols did that stirred the heart of Paul in the city of Athens. It seems a pity that so little of this wealth is available to bring the gospel to the one thing that they need most, the gospel of Christ.

My oldest son, Dow, is in the U. S. Signal Corps at Fort Monmouth, New Jersey. He came over for a week-end visit with me. I was much pleased with his interest in plans to start a work at Red Bank, near where he is stationed. My last letter from him says in part: "We have our first service tomorrow at Red Bank and will have about fifteen out. I have been busy all afternoon getting things together. We have the Molly Pitcher Hotel Ball Room free for tomorrow and maybe free all the time. We are borrowing books from Trenton for the first service. I am to have charge of the services at least for a time."
in battle, hath all our foes o'ercome; and now by death we shall be saved from death and life eternal gain. ... Tremble not, soldier of the cross, at the trumpet blast of strife. It is the stern necessity of our fallen state. ... The healing virtue imparted to Siloam's waters must be diffused from the troubling angel's wing. Liberty blooms in the track of revolution. Religion is not the frail, sickly sentiment-alism that many paint it. Its baby clothes were sprinkled with the blood of Bethlehem's slaughtered innocents. The good fight of faith is a great fight of affliction. Christianity is a nurslng of the storg; was rocked into vigor upon the purple crest of opposition. The apostles, as they sped along the highways of earth with the message of salvation, were hailed as the troub-lers of cities, and upside-down turners of the world. Princes ... trembled in their presence; the faces of priests gathered blackness. Hated of all men was rocked into vigor; rested not, but resisted unto blood, striving again sin, and now await the victor's crown beneath the altar. Shall we be worthy the society of those who attained heav-en thru much tribulation? Of some it is said they shall walk in white, for they are worthy. What is it to be worthy of the world to come? The sol-dier who endures with his leader the toil of the weary march and the dan-gers of battle, is accounted worthy to share with him the wealth of victory and glory of the triumph. ...}

We may not die for Christ, but much weariness and painfulness attend upon the church heavenward. We war against spiritual wickedness in high places, and what is more difficult to subdue the promptings of our own sinful hearts. Luther was wont to say that he feared his own heart more than the pope and all his cardinals. The con-lict between the law in our members (Rom. 7) and the law of the spirit will end only with life. Let us put on the whole armour, and praying with all prayer, and watching thereunto, gird ourselves anew for the fight. ... Shall we in the "storms that sweep our win-try sky," hear "the sound of a going," and arouse us to smite the hosts of the enemy (II Sam. 5:24). The conflict of ages was never more sanguine than now. Never was sin more impu-dent in its mein, nor potent in its sway. Inadequate views of the malignant na-ture and tendency of sin, coupled with a chilling indifference, is the bane of the present generation. 0, that the "enemy" between us and the serpent were quickened anew. All intelli-gences, supernatural and infernal, are ac-tively engaged. Shall man, on account of whom this strife is waged, remain neutral? ...}

Above is timely article published in Bible Index, January, 1874, a monthly periodical of Tornoto, Canada, devoted to primitive Christianity. ...
JUSTIFYING COMBATANT
SERVICE
Hugo McCord

A chaplain in the United States Army presents reasons justifying, to his mind, active military service, even killing, by Christian men:

Cleansing the temple. (John 2: 13-22) Jesus used the scourge but that is far from killing men. Under no circumstances would he kill, nor allow others: “Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them.” (Luke 9: 55)

Centurion at Capernaum. (Matt. 8: 5-10) There is work that a Christian soldier can do, but he will not “destroy men’s lives.”

Not peace, but a sword. (Matt. 10: 34) To use this to justify bloodshed is to pervert the Word. See II Cof. 10: 5; Eph. 6: 17.

Wars and rumors of wars. (Matt. 24: 6) “It is argued that Jesus here intimates that wars are inevitable in the present state of the world.” True, and so are offenses inevitable (Matt. 18: 7), but war to the man who takes part in either one.

Sell his garment and buy a sword. (Luke 22: 36-38) Would two swords be enough for eleven men, twelve counting Jesus? Three would be enough for what? for Jesus’ purpose: to show by an obnoxious lesson that Jesus was not to be defended by carnal methods. “Put up thy sword.” If we are not to defend the kingdom of heaven by bloodshed, are we to shed blood for any cause?

Matt. 26: 52. “If the aggressor is to perish, how shall this be if not by the sword of the defender.” By another aggressor. Witness Babylon, which slew God’s people, and was slain by other heathen.

Luke 11: 21. “The teaching being that the guarding of God’s makes for further security and peace in the community.” Policemen are part of the powers that be. Christians will respect them, obey them, pay taxes, but a child of God shedding blood is another thing.

John 18: 16. “The deduction from this text is that when the issue is one of loyalty to a worldly kingdom, Jesus would have his servants fight.” Yes, but loyalty to Christ’s kingdom comes first. “We must obey God rather than men.”

Mark 12: 17. “The argument from this passage is that Jesus himself teaches what the Christian’s duty to his state is as well as his duty to God.” Hitler is the German state; should Christians in Germany do what he says— invade weak countries? We must obey the state so long as the state’s laws do not conflict with God’s.

Paul’s military metaphors. “Paul is continually using military metaphors without ever inferring that the soldier’s life is completely incompatible with Christianity.” Compare the unjust steward: the Savior used an unjust life “without ever inferring that” it “is completely incompatible with Christianity.”

John 15: 13. “Some of the noblest of men comforted themselves in the very act of going over the top by quoting these words of Jesus.” When there are Christians on both sides, Jesus in our Civil War, where is the comfort? Killing not heathen, but Christians. Christians will lay down their own lives; they will serve on minesweepers, but they will not mow down the lives of others, whether Christians or heathen.

No weakness in Jesus. “He was not the kind of pacifist that twaddled his fingers and did nothing.” Right. He fought hard: he smote the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips he slew the wicked.

Lincoln’s statement. “I have never yet been able to evolve any other way to settle the slave problem except by drawing the sword.” Two wrongs do not make a right. Moreover, slavery existed in Jesus’ day, but he did not meet it by a sword. His spiritual sword (Eph. 6: 17) is to cut into men’s hearts and changes them from the inside. Literal swords do not change hearts. We may not do evil that good may come (Rom. 3: 8).

Force to get justice. “No one who is a Christian can, support force that is backing up injustice. We must determine what the motivation of our force is. Is it to help maintain justice?” Germans are taught they are fighting for justice and liberation from English tyranny. We Americans know their leaders are deceitful, but those lads believe they are dying for as just a cause as ours. Anyway, it is wrong to kill whether one is backing up injustice or justice. “When he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not, but committed himself to him that judgeth righteously.” (I Pet. 2: 23).

Policeman’s club. A policeman clubbed people in making a path to go into a burning building to rescue a woman. Good, but he did not kill. Had he killed anybody, what gain to him the rescue of the woman?

Quoting Lyman Abbott. “You ask me what Jesus meant by ‘Resist not evil.’ He meant for you not to resist evil when it assails your personal interest, but that you may resist it to the death if need be, when it assails those whom it is your duty to protect.” Were Christ in person being assailed today, would not American soldiers protect him to the death? But Christ would not allow it.

In the garden. “At the close of his life when the temple police came to arrest him, he confronted them and they fell backward to the ground, and not until his disciples had escaped did he suffer himself to be led away by the police. Whatever power he used on this occasion, the effect was physical.” In none of the gospels is the idea given that he used power to knock them down— he could have called legions of angels had such been his motive. Nor is the idea presented that he refused to allow himself to be taken till his disciples ran off. But even if he had done those things, he did not kill, nor did he allow it.

All perish. When Peter came to the defense of his Master, he told him to put up the sword. or they would all perish.” I say respectfully such is a perversion of the Word. Put up thy sword, why? to save the eleven? Jesus said. “My kingdom is not of this world. If my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.” To save the eleven? No, why? “My kingdom is not from hence.”

The church’s function. “The Church’s function is to inspire men at every sacrifice to transform an anan world into a kingdom of righteousness and justice on earth.” Right, but how? RV bloodshed and carnal force? If so, it defeats its own purpose, for bloodshed and carnal force are nanan. The devil is not to be fought with the devil’s methods. Jesus could have called legions of angels and could have transformed a nanan world into a kingdom of righteousness and justice on the earth by physical force, but that is not his way. A kingdom built on blood will die by it.

The ancient heroes. “It is not to be forgotten that the writer of Hebrews counts among the glories of faith that it inspired the ancient heroes to fight successfully the forces that opposed what seemed to be the way of God for men.” Right, and so must we. We are to fight evil and all wickedness, but the weapons of our warfare are not carnal (II Cor. 10: 5).
ONE FOR THE ANTIS TO ANTI
TED W. McELROY

I am in possession of an official letter mailed out by the “anti” church of New Castle, Indiana. It seems to be a circular letter, and is being sent to “brethren” all over the U. S. A. and Canada, and its purpose is to “Advertise” something, that is called a Bible Reading. Since the letter or bulletin is a public statement from the church, it is altogether fitting and proper that I should write an article about it. If I want to. I am going to show the inconsistencies of the “anti-college” group. Brother Zerr, the Anti-preacher under consideration, I think is a representative man among them: he has worked some here in Colorado with this group, he figured in the Porter-Ketcherside Debate held at Ozark, Mo. in 1937, he is widely known among these “anti” folk, and the New Castle claims that it is his home congregation: With his long public record of working among them it will be hard for the antis to disown Bro. Zerr, and what he and the New Castle church are doing. I am going to review and analyze their letter to show you just what the “antis” have “gone and done.”

Beginning in the first Paragraph. we auote. “The Church of Christ, 304 North 14th. Street, New Castle, Indiana is sponsoring a Bible Reading of the entire Bible, on which a schedule is enclosed. The reading conducted by E. Zerr will start June 2. and close August 22, 1941.” Of course no Christian would oppose a Bible Reading, but would encourage it as much as possible; however “Bible Reading” is a misnomer in this connection, it expresses the truth, but as Daniel Sommer probably would have said, “it is the truth, but not the whole truth.” This thing called a Bible Reading is more than the name implies. Bible Reading limits the reading and study to one field, religion, and that as revealed in the Bible: but the Bible Reading under consideration is not so limited. I quote from the anti letter: “In addition to the regular reading at night, it is planned to have a Vacation Bible School for the children of this community during the day. Bro. Zerr states that he is willing to give instruction in Public Speaking or anything else provided we have interest shown.” No one would object to a “vacation Bible school” for the children, along with the one for grown-ups. But what else in addition, quote, “Bro. Zerr states that he is willing to give instruction in public speaking or anything else provided we have interest shown.” Now that includes a great deal besides “Bible Reading.” Note that he named “public speaking,” which is a secular subject, and “anything else provided we have interest shown,” now that “anything else” includes a lot that is secular-limited only by people’s interest. “Any” branch of secular study that the people are “interested” in will be taught, according to the letter; the letter mentioned “Bible Reading limits the reading and study” to “Brethren” all over the Church of Christ. We cry out against Bible Colleges, and contend to speak where the Bible speaks, and to be silent where it is silent, and teach and preach to give God the glory in the Church, Eph. 3:21.” They say they are against colleges, and they are-from what I hear, but I want to ask a question: What is taught in Abilene Christian College (maybe that is another misnomer too, I won’t argue with anyone on it) that is not offered in the New Castle Bible Reading? I contend that their words, “anything we have interest shown in,” includes everything that is taught in Abilene, and then some. What is the difference between the New Castle school, and the Abilene school? I grant that there are some differences, but most of them favor Abilene. First the New Castle school is sponsored and paid for by the church while Abilene school is privately owned and is supported by those who patronize the privately owned business. This difference is in favor of Abilene. Sure I grant that some brethren at Abilene got out of line, and beged the churches for money, but they had no right to; and faithful churches should have turned down their begging. Let Abilene make its own way in its business the best it can, it has no right to drain the church treasury. But it has as much right to ask the churches to sponsor and pay for the teaching of public speaking, as the New Castle church has to sponsor Bro. Zerr in the same work. I am going to state my position here. I am not necessarily referring to my position here, but am pointing out the difference between the institutions; the one at New Castle and the one at Abilene.

The next thing I want to call your attention to is the purpose of the New Castle school. It is stated in the letter, I quote, (Paragraph 2) “preschools, and drop in some time in this twelve weeks and receive help from Bro. Zerr.” Sounds like the “antis” are “Setting their preacher incubator” at New Castle, at least if they do their consent and endorsement.) Where is the scripture that authorizes a church to sponsor and pay for a school, misnomer it a “Bible Reading,” and teach secular subjects? I do not question their right to teach the Bible, that is granted; but where is the authority for these secular subjects? That will be “Addition” to the “Bible Reading”?

To further show that these anti-brethren are inconsistent with themselves, I quote them again, (Paragraph 4 of the letter), “Bible Reading limits the reading and study to “Brethren” all over the Church of Christ. We cry out against Bible Colleges, and contend to speak where the Bible speaks, and to be silent where it is silent, and teach and preach to give God the glory in the Church, Eph. 3:21.” They say they are against colleges, and they are-from what I hear, but I want to ask a question: What is taught in Abilene Christian College (maybe that is another misnomer too, I won’t argue with anyone on it) that is not offered in the New Castle Bible Reading? I contend that their words, “anything we have interest shown in,” includes everything that is taught in Abilene, and then some. What is the difference between the New Castle school, and the Abilene school? I grant that there are some differences, but most of them favor Abilene. First the New Castle school is sponsored and paid for by the church while Abilene school is privately owned and is supported by those who patronize the privately owned business. This difference is in favor of Abilene. Sure I grant that some brethren at Abilene got out of line, and begged the churches for money, but they had no right to; and faithful churches should have turned down their begging. Let Abilene make its own way in its business the best it can, it has no right to drain the church treasury. But it has as much right to ask the churches to sponsor and pay for the teaching of public speaking, as the New Castle church has to sponsor Bro. Zerr in the same work. I am going to state my position here. I am not necessarily referring to my position here, but am pointing out the difference between the institutions; the one at New Castle and the one at Abilene.

The next thing I want to call your attention to is the purpose of the New Castle school. It is stated in the letter, I quote, (Paragraph 2) “preschools, and drop in some time in this twelve weeks and receive help from Bro. Zerr.” Sounds like the “antis” are “Setting their preacher incubator” at New Castle, at least if they do...
not intend to “hatch” new preachers, they intend to “hover” and help the ones already “hatched.” To show farther that making preachers is at least one of their motives, I quote again (paragraph 4) “What are we doing to develop teachers and preachers of the true Gospel of Christ?” (next paragraph continues), “It is because this is a scriptural way to carry out this work that the church at New Castle is sponsoring this reading.” This is set forth as the “Lord’s plan,” it is the way to make preachers and teachers. What is it? I have already proved that it is a religio-secular school sponsored by the church, and they contend it is the Lord’s plan, I deny it. If it is the Lord’s plan it is set forth in the Bible. I recognize that the Lord intends for the church to teach the Bible, I know scriptures to prove that point; but the scriptures I want, are those to prove that the church can sponsor the teaching of “public speaking or anything else,” to develop preachers. When Bro. Zerr and the New Castle church produce the scripture that authorizes the religio-secular school “sponsored by the church” for “twelve weeks” in 1941: I will, by the same scripture, show that the church can sponsor the same kind of religio-secular school 52 weeks a year. I contend that there is not such scripture.

To farther show that the New Castle church is paying the bill, I quote (paragraph 5) “There is no tuition charged to any one. This is our part at the New Castle congregation.” The cost of the teacher in this religio-secular school is borne by the church, but it is explained in the letter, that each student must pay for his room and board. Where is the scripture that tells the church to support a teacher to teach public speaking etc.; even though he spends part of his time teaching the Bible. They contend that it is the Lord’s plan, I deny it until the scripture is produced.

Other congregations and individuals are asked to help this school along. I quote, (Paragraph 5) “Brothers and Sisters or congregation what are you going to do? Are you going to send or help send some worthy young man or woman to this reading,” (paragraph 6) “If any one reads this letter and wishes to help, we appeal to you to write us at once. We will put the two parties. (the helper and the helped) in touch with each other so you may work directly, or you may work through us.” (Who is the us? the Bible Reading or the Church.) Now if that isn’t an appeal to the church at large to support the New Castle school by sending (paying for their sent) some one to the school, I would not know how to make one. I agree that it is right for churches to support the teaching of the Bible anywhere they feel good will be accomplished, but I deny that a religio-secular school such as the one at New Castle or any where else has any claim on the church treasury. Book, chapter, and verse for your practice please.

Brother Zerr once made this statement of his position, and I agree with it entirely, “As long as the worship publicly is pure and the doctrine and practice of the church as a whole are scriptural and where the church as such does not support the college and other innovations, one should not refuse to worship with them on account of private opinions.” That is my position in the words of Brother Zerr. But that puts Bro. Zerr and the New Castle congregation in an awkward situation. Here it is. Bro. Zerr contends that the church should not support the religio-secular “college,” and that if it does one should refuse to worship with it. Now then I have proved by their own letter that the New Castle church is supporting a thing that is De-facto, though not in name, everything that the college is and more. It is a religio-secular school sponsored by the church and taught by Bro. Zerr. This puts Bro. Zerr in peculiar light with his sponsors. What do you reckon they will do? My guess is that they will close their eyes to their inconsistencies, and go right on with the school; they won’t even try to send me a scripture that authorizes a religio-secular school sponsored by the church-they won’t even need one to satisfy themselves in the matter: but others will see the inconsistencies pointed out in this article.

I said I would state my position on the college question, I am going to do that briefly; and set forth to you the three possible positions on the question, two that are wrong, and the one that is true.

First, some take the position that the church can erect and support religious schools and that the church should support the colleges where the Bible is being taught. This position is wrong and sinful, because it is an attempt to fasten the school as an institution upon the church. That is unscriputural Col. 2:10 Eph. 3:21 Rev. 22 :16-18.

Second, and this is my position. Christians have as much rieht to engage in the school business as they do the grocery business, and may teach the Bible in school sponsored if they have opportunity. Note the proof 1. School teaching is an honest occupation, and Christians may engage in it.

2. Christians are to teach the Bible as they have opportunity Gal. 6:10.

3. Therefore Christians have a right to engage in the school business and teach the Bible to their students.

To say that my position is wrong on the college question you must either affirm, (1) that it is wrong to follow the occupation of teaching school, or (2) that it is wrong for a Christian to teach the Bible along with his occupation; I doubt any one being willing to affirm either of the above statements, therefore must agree that my position is right.

Third, some take the position that Christians cannot engage in the business of school teaching, and teach the Bible to the students without sinning; and that Christian parents cannot send their children to these teachers, and be loyal. This attitude and position is sinful creed-making. It legislates, what occupations a Christian may engage in, and under what circumstances a Christian may teach the Bible; such human tradition is sinful (Mt. 15:9-13).

The Bible teaches that the home is responsible for the education and training of the children (Eph. 6:4; Prov. 22:6). Parents do not do all the work, but they send the children to the public schools and pay taxes for the support of these schools, none question but that this is right. When the children are ready for college, the parents should have the right to choose the school they think best suited to the needs of their children. They may send them to a state owned institution, or they may send them to a college owned and operated by a Christian, or to some other privately owned institution. The private institutions may be a little more expensive, or maybe it is a little les, the parents have a right to investigate about the relative costs and education offered, and choose the place they think best for their children. Schools whether public or private are adjuncts of the home in training the children. I maintain that every father has the right to choose the school for his children to attend, and that he can patronize a privately owned institution (Owned by a member of the church or some other private individual or concern), or he can patronize the state owned institutions. For any group to legislate and make a church law, about the matter of which school parents must send their children to, is contrary to the scriptures; in speaking where God has not spoken, and making a law where God has made none.
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A LOOK INTO THE MIRROR

CLED E. WALLACE

My friend, and admirer, Brother Grover Cleveland Brewer, who sits among the doctors and time and time again views the landscape o’er with somewhat of a lofty disdain, has held up before us a life-sized mirror in a recent issue of the gospel Advocate. He indulges in a lengthy analysis of the personal pronoun and its antecedents, with particular reference to its relation to personal egotism. I took a long look into the mirror and my efforts at deduction led me to the conclusion that the antecedent of “I” is “me.” Robert Louis Stevenson once wrote an essay on “An Apology for Idlers” which was pleasing reading to me as it seemed almost like a personal defense. I am almost tempted to make a hit with the preachers by writing “An Apology For Egotists.” According to Brother Brewer, and I guess he knows one when he sees him, there are so many of them, an apology for them ought to prove popular. He virtually asks the Lord to be merciful to us a bunch of sinners, and I’m not inclined to find fault with the prayer but suspect we should all say “Amen!”

Some home-made philosopher once appealed to the popular imagination by suggesting that “it takes a rogue to catch a rogue.” It is somewhat surprising, therefore, in view of Brother Brewer’s nation-wide reputation for humility, that he should be able to so accurately ferret out “the following characteristics” of an egotist. They shine like a mirror.

1. Sensitiveness.
2. A disposition to criticize or to find fault.
3. A disposition to domineer or dictate or boss.
4. A lack of forbearance and willingness to forgive.
5. A disposition to be conspicuous and to seek publicity.
6. The desire for personal attention, compliments, and special mention.

Now, that doesn’t leave much of a hole for even a “layman” to escape through much less a “doctor” or even a popular “minister.” This is no complaint against the accuracy of the diagnosis, but rather an examination of dis-may over the epidemic spread of the trouble. It reminds me of the despairing cry of the apostles: “Lord, who then can be saved?” Brother Brewer evidently suspects the setting of this mirror in front of us to be disarming, for he immediately adds: “Let those who are without sin cast the first stone.” Now, that may be just, but it seems a little severe under the circumstances. We might set too much “personal attention” from the disarmed multitude. I alone carried stones in our hands, and it might encourage even in me “a disposition to domineer or dictate or boss.” Then we would be no better than the rest of the brethren. I’m in favor of letting them keep their side-arms, just in case...egotism, or no egotism, it would be mighty hard on me and Brother Brewer, for instance, not to be able to stoop down and pick up a stone occasionally, when we see the other in print too often. I suggest that we might help the Lord a little in his efforts to keep us humble. There are brethren who believe that it we should have a nation-wide contest, I would be chosen as Public Egotist Number One, with Brother Brewer running a close second. He might even nose ahead of me due to the fact that he has a slight edge on me in the way of “sensitiveness.” Since looking into the mirror, however, I do not see how anybody could concede him any edge on me in the “disposition” business, criticizing, finding fault, domineering, dictating, bossing, being conspicuous and seeking publicity. As free as he is known to be of such “a disposition” I have actually heard him criticized here and there as he has doubtless heard me criticized. Now, when critical brethren, and sisters too, are with him, they do not criticize him, they criticize me; and when they are with me, they do not criticize me, they criticize him. To get the straight of all this, maybe we ought to get together, light up, and swap yarns. It might help the Lord to help us to be humble. I’m sure it would, if brethren have told as much of the despairing cry of the apostles: “Lord, who then can be saved?”

Again it might not, as we would probably wind up by accusing the brethren of eating sour grapes, and licking each other’s wounds with some compliments, even if we did retain some mental reservation’s to be expressed later in different company. Possibly we will just keep looking into the mirror and decided that what we see is somebody else.

BY THEIR FRUITS

(Cont. From Page 10)

“cup” in the worship, and where you find one like that in the lead, one cup is about all they will need. The cause of Christ cannot grow under the leadership of cranks. If I were arguing with a “one-cupper,” I would try to show him he was hindering the growth of the congregation: but I would not accuse him of adding to the worship. As to the exact formula said, as a fetish, “for the remission of sins,” used by some “preachers in baptizing, I would list that also with a lot of unnecessary statements made by song leaders when leading songs in meetings. I certainly would not class either with instrumental music, which is definitely an addition to the worship.

We need some “clear thinking” here. Brother Lappin, and more “logic” than your kind of “charity.” I will appreciate it, if you will pass this article, with any comments you may wish to make, on to the readers of the Christian Standard. It will do them good.
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