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

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

BAPTISM IN THE APOSTOLIC EPISTLES

FOY E. WALLACE JR.

Other texts on baptism—by that we mean the abundance of teaching in the New Testament besides Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38. If sectarian debaters were able to prove that Mark 16 is spurious (which they are not) and that Acts 2:38 means because of (which they cannot) they would yet be confronted with a formidable array of "other texts," which, indeed, are just as decisive as the two against which all denominational genius has for generations been concentrated. Having followed the subject through the Acts of Apostles in a previous article we now advance to other texts in the apostolic epistles.

The Roman Christians had "died to sin" and should "no longer live therein." To impress this lesson upon them Paul said: "know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death." Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.

For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin." (Rom. 6:11.)

The subject "we"—"we are buried with him by baptism"—includes Paul; hence, the baptism of this passage is linked with Saul's baptism of Acts 22:16. They are, in fact, twin passages. Whatever Saul was baptized for—the Romans were baptized for also. And the form of the Romans' baptism was the form of Saul's baptism.

Taking the two passages together, therefore, by Paul's own words, we have both the how and the what of baptism definitely settled. Ananias told Saul to "arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins"—that is the what of it as to design. "We are (R. V. were) buried with him by baptism"—that is the how of it as to its form.

Observe further that the text says very plainly what baptism does: "So many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death." Baptism puts one into Christ, and in so doing it puts one into his death. The word into is a preposition that denotes motion, out of one state into another from without to within. Baptized into Christ—previous to baptism one is out of Christ, after baptism he is in Christ, by baptism he is brought from without to within. And there are no degrees in a state; one is either in or out of Christ, just as he is either married or unmarried, or as he is either a citizen or an alien. Hence, to the Galatians (Chap. 3:26, 27), Paul again says: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Thus baptism preceded by faith is God's appointed way of bringing men into Christ.

Still not satisfied with the emphasis, the apostle further says that we are baptized "into his death." Baptism stands between the sinner and the death of Christ—it stands between the sinner and the blood of Christ, the merits and the benefits of his atoning death. Baptism is the recapitulation of the death of Christ; there the sinner being buried with Christ into death is made in the likeness of his death, his burial and his resurrection; there in death with Christ, and in Christ, he loses his sins, for "the old man is crucified with him" and "he that is dead is freed from sin." No stronger figure could be employed by which to set forth the design, form and benefits of baptism. It is the reenactment of Calvary. But the capstone of the argument is yet found in the clause, "like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Baptism stands between the sinner and newness of life.

This statement is embellished in the Colossian passage (Chap. 2:12), "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." In baptism there is a burial and a resurrection with Christ through faith in the operation (working) of God. In baptism God performs an operation. The comparison begins with verse 11. Circumcision was a physical operation, made with hands; the circumcision of Christ is a spiritual operation, without hands. One was the putting off of the flesh; the other is the putting off of sins. In baptism God performs an operation—the putting away of sin by the power of God. And the same power that God exerted in raising Christ from the dead is the power that is exerted when in baptism we are raised up with Christ—wherein ye also are raised up—and the one baptized! is baptized through faith in the operation of God. But if one believes he is saved before baptism, hence, has already had the operation—how could he be baptized through faith in the operation here required? It is mighty strong indication of the faith that qualifies for baptism. But having been buried and raised, concluding his effort to edify the Colossians on the subject of baptism, the apostle adds: "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek (Turn To Back Page)
THE NEED OF UNFEIGNED FAITH AND FELLOWSHIP

The end of Paul's charge to Timothy was "love out of a pure heart and a good conscience and faith unfeigned." From these things some who were desirous of being "teachers" had "swerved" and had "turned aside" and "understood neither what they said nor whereof they affirmed." These words of Paul set forth a rather accurate picture of the conduct of some men among us today. Some of them are young and are misguided by misplaced confidence in men who are plenty old enough to know better, and do know better, but have become Quislings in the church of Christ. Efforts are being made to lead the church into a pseudo unity and a false fellowship. Much is being made of "love" and "fellowship" but it is not love. love in knowledge and in all judgment nor is it fellowship "in the gospel," which Paul exhorted the Philippians to possess. One who does not know, and cannot discern, what to love is apt to love the wrong thing—w e need love, but love in knowledge and in judgment, or discernment. When a preacher is heard to remark that he believes this or does not believe that but—but, put it down that his faith is feigned! This lack of an unfeigned faith and love can be observed in the palpable inconsistencies in the attitudes of some leading preachers and brethren among. It is in order that some examples should be cited.

1. A Feigned Love

Sometime ago a copy of the "Chicago Christian" was sent to me. It is published by the Cornell Avenue Church of Christ, Ralph Wilburn, Preacher. The sentiments in this particular issue of this church bulletin are not hard to trace. In an article entitled "The Choice Before Us" the preacher had much to say about the "self-appointed lords of orthodoxy," and "playing the game with the big, influential preachers in the brotherhood," and "the orthodox dogmas of the brotherhood," "dictators" "political rackets" and other expressions of like nature presumably to emphasize the love we should have for each other! These expressions all sound familiar to some of us. A few years ago R. H. Boll issued "A Doctrinal Manifesto" in which he branded the church and all of its loyal preachers and leaders with the same terms and many others like them. Such terms as "creed-bound sect," "orthodox dogmas," "popes," "dictators," "Pharisees," "Sanhedrin," have abounded in the writings of the Boll group and their sympathizers. Such terms always sound suspicious, but not knowing the preacher referred to above, who was author of the article, judgment might have been withheld if other expressions had not given him away completely. He criticises bitterly 'a certain preacher' in Chicago who "dogmatically refused to associate" with E. L. Jorgenson (R. H. Boll's chief aide) in a meeting there in the city. Next, he makes a critical reference to "such men as write for the B. B." Can anyone imagine what paper B. B. stands for? These fellows are, too sweet and ethical to mention the Bible Banner by name, so they just initial it in their articles. And, finally, he makes an assault to condemn all of the writers in all of the papers who have been condemning the Murch-Witty "Unity Meetings" which he refers to as "this noble Christian effort" the very knowingly and lovingly affirms that those who oppose it "have but the slightest notion of what these gatherings are" and says (in love) that their "gullibility is manifest" in what they write against these digressive promotions. All of this the brother was saying while exhorting to kindness and pretending to write in love—but it was not love unfeigned. He only located himself. His own article marked him. A further check-up revealed that he has been a student of R. H. Boll and writes for the Word & Work, Boll's paper.

And a recent issue of Word and Work copied the Wilburn article, "The Choice Before Us" in full. So the brother's "Choice" admittedly has been to cast his lot with Boll. It is generally known that Harding McCaleb, a rank premillennialist and Bollite, has been virtually in charge of the Cornell Avenue church. With that kind of a manager and this kind of a preacher, the chance for Cornell Avenue church to be a pure church of Christ is rather slim.

Incidentally, when a man loves the Word & Work and hates the Bible Banner he need not tell who and what he is—everybody knows. Their feigned love of the truth cannot be concealed—it will out.

2. A Feigned Faith

Before me is another example of one who is not a premillennialist—but a "world which cares to, may know" their "church to be a pure church of Christ is rather slim. And a recent issue of Word and Work copied the Boll group always make statements with plenty of loop holes, and wind up by trying to leave it so that their statement will be satisfactory to both sides. It can't be done. The check-up reveals that when the missionary, Lowell Davis, went to Louisville? Kentucky, he attended services and spoke at the Boll-Jorgenson churches! When asked why he did that, his reply was that the other churches (the loyal churches) did not invite him! And that is his "faith is this matter!" He does not believe premillennialism (try to find someone who admits it) but—but what? No one must disfellowship these dear dividers of the church—the premillennialists. And as long as these missionaries are under obligation to the missionary office of Don Carlos Janes and the Louisville party "all who care to may know" their faith in this matter!—it will be a feigned faith. Between the actual premillennialists and the "but" premillennialists, the but-premillennialists are far more dangerous to the church.

The Kansas church got its information, all right—the brother is a Bollite, pure and simple. His speech betrays him, that he has been with Boll.
3. A Feigned Spirit

There cannot be too much of the spirit of Christ exercised, but there can be far too much talk about the "spirit of Christ" by those who feign it. For instance, the personnel of Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas, have been loud and long in their constant and fervent protestations of the sweet spirit among the brethren. They have been chief advocates of what they term "the spirit of Christ." They have scorned and condemned bitter personalities among the brethren. But that was all varnish-religious veneer. For their real spirit read the official bulletin they issued against E. R. Harper. The writers dipped their pens deep in poison and from their quills flowed the venom of their sweet spirit of revenge. Instead of dealing with the issue of the school's doctrinal status—whether or not premillennialism is believed, taught, condoned, sympathized with, fraternized with, their purity and soundness pro and con, these professors of the sweet spirit descended to levels about as low as personalities can go. Not satisfied to appease their wrath by offering up on the altar of their vengeance the victim himself, they descended so low as to invade the family circles, so to speak, to do the loathsome work of casting aspersions upon a man's aged father. All the wicked things that have ever been put in print and circulated among the brethren, this caps the climax of iniquity. It not only indicates that they are guilty of the charges against them, and shows that they feel the effect of the exposure on the issues involved, but it reveals the depravity back of the spirit they sweetly but suavely feign. In this instance, their piety has not turned into putty, it has putrified into slime, seething in corruption. And they ask Christian parents to look to them for the spiritual development of sons and daughters. I will venture to say that there is not a worldly school or college in the land that would stoop to the thing they have done. I would rather send a son or a daughter of mine to a state school anywhere, than to send them to these men to imbibe their spirit and ideas of education, of ethics or of religion. They have themselves made the argument upon which the brotherhood should reject them—that argument is, the Harding Bulletin on E. R. Harper.

4. A Feigned Soundness

For an example of feigned soundness we need not leave the subject of the foregoing paragraphs. Harding College personnel has been persistent in their denials of charges that the school has harbored premillennialism in the form of some who believe and teach it and others who sympathize with it and privately promote it. To hear them talk one would think that they are the acme of soundness, and that opposition to premillennialism originated at Searcy! But what of their practice? Well, here it is: Clinton Davidson has recently been appointed to the board of trustees of Harding College, according to announcements in the state press. Of Course, everybody knows who Clinton Davidson is. He is the man of digressive fame, of the Copyrighted Christian Leader fame, of sue-the-socks-off-of-them fame—in short, the man whose whole campaign is to invade the family circles, so to speak, to do the loathsome work of casting aspersions upon a man's aged father. All the wicked things that have ever been put in print and circulated among the brethren, this caps the climax of iniquity. It not only indicates that they are guilty of the charges against them, and shows that they feel the effect of the exposure on the issues involved, but it reveals the depravity back of the spirit they sweetly but suavely feign. In this instance, their piety has not turned into putty, it has putrified into slime, seething in corruption. And they ask Christian parents to look to them for the spiritual development of sons and daughters. I will venture to say that there is not a worldly school or college in the land that would stoop to the thing they have done. I would rather send a son or a daughter of mine to a state school anywhere, than to send them to these men to imbibe their spirit and ideas of education, of ethics or of religion. They have themselves made the argument upon which the brotherhood should reject them—that argument is, the Harding Bulletin on E. R. Harper.

Doctor Benson aspired to become a great economist. So he began to tell government officials what to do and what not to do with their expenditures. Doctor Benson made some radio speeches over networks. It is generally rumored that his speeches were prepared for, him and that Clinton Davidson made the contacts as a publicity scheme for Harding College. Anyway, for awhile Doctor Benson was in national lime-light. It went to his head, and he began to meddle with the administration of the N. Y. A. He drew a withering rebuke from the head of that department and the result was exit, Doctor Benson, the great Economist!

The following clipping is from the Washington (D. C.) Daily News:

HARDING COLLEGE ECONOMY DRIVE RUNS AFOUL OF NYA

Those Harding College students who wanted to donate their NYA allotments to the Treasury during the war will not be permitted to do so, Director Aubrey Williams of the National Youth administration has made quite clear. While Treasury Secretary Morgenthau was drafting a letter of thanks to send the 20 students at Searcy, Ark., Mr. Williams was making critical comments on the conduct of Dr. George S. Benson, Harding College president.

Economy Campaign

For when Mr. Williams pointed out that the $210 monthly NYA allotments, which have been going to the Harding students, would be given to 20 other students selected from 179 in Arkansas who have dropped out of other schools, allegedly because of the lack of NYA funds, Dr. Benson said:

"The NYA action is an attempt to discredit my campaign for reduction of non-defense Federal expenditures. For weeks the NYA has been trying to line up colleges in the 11 southern states to put pressure on Congress for restoration of NYA funds. I refused to join the movement because I know that there is no need for NYA at this time."

In reply to this, Mr. Williams declared:

"We had been led to believe the Harding College students who gave up NYA jobs did so voluntarily because they didn't need them. I am surprised that Dr. Benson admits this action was part of a so-called economy drive of which he is the ringleader."

Endorsed By 1249

"The 1249 college officials who certified that NYA enrolling is essential if 14,616 college students are not to be forced out of school have 'done all that needs to be done in the way of discrediting Dr. Benson."

"The allegation that this agency has been lining up college students to request restoration of NYA funds is nonsense unbecoming to a college president."

The Treasury reported that while Secretary Morgenthau would write and thank the students, there is nothing that can be done about NYA funds except what is done by NYA officials.

Thus the N. Y. A. officials who certified that NYA enrollment is essential if 14,616 college students are not to be forced out of school have 'done all that needs to be done in the way of discrediting Dr. Benson."

"The allegation that this agency has been lining up college students to request restoration of NYA funds is nonsense unbecoming to a college president."

The Treasury reported that while Secretary Morgenthau would write and thank the students, there is nothing that can be done about NYA funds except what is done by NYA officials.

Thus the N. Y. A.; officials saw through the Davidson-Benson government meddling economy drive and branded it as a publicity stunt for Harding College. That is the real caliber of Davidson and Benson. Let the brethren take note of Benson's words quoted in the newspaper article. He says: "The N. Y. A. action is an attempt to discredit my campaign for the reduction of non-defense Federal expenditures." Brethren, we have an authority on government expenditures among us, a great economist—Doctor George Benson, President of Harding College, Searcy, Arkansas!

The inconsistency of this has not occurred to Harding College professors even yet. The college has always maintained that civil governments are evil, according to J. N. Armstrong, for wicked men to run, and not for Christians—and non-participation in war in any way has been an outstanding tenet of the college. Yet their president presumed to dictate the economic policies of the government! 0, Consistency and Soundness, where art thou, Brother Armstrong calleth for thee!
5. A Feigned Contending For The Faith

We were told in a recent article by another prominent Doctor among us, Doctor Brewer, that Contending For The Faith is not the mere title of a book, but that it is a very important book. This pronouncement was made at the end of his article in the Gospel Advocate relating the persecutions that he is enduring at the hands of the Catholics in Lubbock, Texas. But the denominational preachers stood by him nobly, as well as some of the brethren, and has escaped martyrdom, at least, temporarily!

Such a feigned contending for the faith! Everybody in Texas knows that the Catholics are very much in the minority at Lubbock. When Doctor Brewer espoused the cause of Protestantism there, he was on the popular side. And he has had much to say about Protestants this and that. Is that contending for the faith? Is Protestantism any more the faith than Catholicism? But that is Doctor Brewer all over—he can make a great splash over an issue like Commissinonism, Catholicism, Companionship Marriage, where he can arouse ‘the popular sentiment of the religious public, and rally the denominational preachers to stand behind him but when it comes to defending the church against isms and errors within our own borders that have a far greater immediate effect on the church than Catholicism, Doctor Brewer sits in the seat of the scornful.

The editor of the Gospel Advocate, recently presented me with a copy of the Brewer book, “Contending For The Faith.” I am expected to say something about it. My first observation is that Harding College has been snubbed. The author holds an “honorary” degree from Harding College, yet it is not listed among his “attainments” on the author’s page. We naturally wonder why. He seemed quite proud of being a Harding College LL. D. doctor, ordained by Benson, at first, but now it appears that his pride has waned. Is it because several others among us have become that kind of a doctor, too, and the distinction is minimized?

My next observation is that his book begins with a big peeve, right in the preface. The author is gruffy. Before his book was published he sent out letters to a select number of preachers stating that he would probably print photo-offset endorses by Foy E. Wallace, Jr. And N. B. Hardeman of certain articles that he wrote several years ago which would appear in the book. The Bible Banner commented on it to the effect that he had just called me a megalomaniac twice in two articles, and had been actually heard more than once to say some of the most uncompromising things at all about N. B. Hardeman, and everybody would wonder why he wanted to print endorsements from men whom he held in such an attitude. That seemed to sour on the author’s literary stomach, so he sent forth his book, to be read by whoever may ever read it, with a peeve, taking digs in the preface of it, without calling any names. He says “the editor” at that time was not in “agreement” with him on certain issues but wanted him to be his first convert. That is my fine for an editor to be willing for someone to convert him on a controverted point, even if it is Doctor Brewer. I have never heard of him being that humble. Then he explains that “not wishing to take advantage of any one” he did not publish the endorsements and added: “if any brother wishes to talk two ways he will have enough to answer for without any accusations from this book.” How charitable the brother was not to make any accusations in his book! Read the above again and see how many accusations you can pick out. Thus is recorded the author’s petty peeve in the preface of his book. It follows him everywhere he goes, in his writing and in his preaching, in his book, and I doubt not-in his dreams!

As for talking two ways the author under review is the last man that ought to mention that. He takes both sides of every issue before the church, then flops his wings and lights on the fence, and crows! In this book he runs true to form. His chapter on Premillennialism, as expected, is the outstanding example of his inconsistencies. He avows that he does not believe premillennialism, of course, and he makes some arguments against it—but he criticises those who have opposed the doctrine far more severely than he does those who teach it! There it is, first on one side of the issue, then on the other, then on the fence, and cock-a-doodle-doo!

For an example of talking two ways, the chapter on “Premillennialism” is remarkable. The author says “This is a most excellent subject to let alone—but he does not, let alone. He says “my opponent can construe a criticism of it and ‘remain entirely balanced and serene and sane’—then he himself enters into the discussion of it! His criticism of those who teach the doctrine is draped in flowing, easy-to-listen-to offensiveness language, but when he refers to those who oppose the teaching he bluntly calls them hobbyists—that they have made a hobby of opposing the teaching. This can serve no other purpose than to break the influence of the opposition to these false teachers and their teaching—a thing that Brewer has persistently tried to do from the beginning of the controversy. He brands those who have debated against these heresies, as hobbyists. Is that talking two ways? Or talking just any way? Premillennialism on the same principle he has made a hobby out of criticizing them who have opposed it! Between the two, I would certainly rather make it my hobby to oppose a bad doctrine than to make a hobby of opposing the men who do oppose the bad doctrine, as G. C. Brewer has done and he rides that hobby in his book. When he renounces the teaching he also denounces those who have exposed it. That reveals where his real heart is on the question.

For the outstanding inconsistency in it all compare the following. On page 191, of chapter 9, he says that it is “a question that is entirely academic and touches no essential point of doctrine or item of practice in any Christian’s life.” Then on page 195, in the same chapter, he declares that the premillennial theory contradicts the Scriptures.” Is that talking two ways? Or talking just any way? Premillennialism contradicts the Scriptures—but it should not be an issue! Premillennialism contradicts the Scriptures—but it is a question that is entirely academic! (The word “academic” means that it is a debatable question. But if it contradicts the scriptures, how can it be classed “academic”?) Premillennialism contradicts the Scriptures—but it touches no essential point of doctrine! Premillennialism contradicts the scriptures-but it does not affect practice in any Christian life! How about the effect it has had upon the practice in the life of R. H. Boll, E. L. Jorgenson, and the entire group of men who have taught the doctrine, divided the church, and have no more fellowship today with true churches of Christ in Kentucky than a digressive Christian church has? Does preaching a false doctrine have any effect on the “practice in any Christian’s life”? Preaching a bad doctrine would seem to me to be a mighty bad practice in any Christian’s life.

An author so illogical ought not to try to make a syllogistic argument on anything much less on a subject on which he has so often contradicted himself. Thus the author of the book which bears the title “Contending For The Faith” proceeds, to minimize the issue and to weaken rather than strengthen a real contention for the faith. The truth is, he loves the teachers of premillennialism far better than he loves those who oppose it. There is nothing in the doctrine to him that would keep him from working wholeheartedly with the Boll group—and if their party was big enough, it is evident that he would be with them in person as he is in heart. His every utterance on the subject in
pulpit and press has been a feigned contending for the faith. On Catholicism, where Protestants are overwhelmingly in the majority, he is bold. On Communism, he declared that Russia is the place for it, to the American Legion, exclaimed, “give me a gun” to defend Americanism against Communism! (Wonder how he feels about that now in the light of the present war?) He is a martyr on Catholicism, wants a gun to use on Communists, but minimizes Premillennialism! By all means, he should keep the denominational preachers behind him. As much as he has called on them to lead the prayers in his meetings, he evidently thinks the Lord will hear them when the Catholics get after him. Contending for the faith!

6. A' Feigned Unity

The world today has witnessed a new method of warfare with new and scientific weapons. These weapons are not all mechanical, such as huge tanks, giant bombers, and late model guns. One of the most potent weapons of modern warfare has been psychological. The name of it is Propaganda. It was used as a means of softening and undermining certain nations preparatory to an invasion, and by this weapon Herr Hitler's succeeded in subduing some of them without firing a shot. But the world has become wise to his ways and Der Fuehrer is not faring so well.

Years ago the leaders of the Christian Church decided that they could not win the battle for digression in open warfare-they learned their lesson in the first debates that were held. Now, after so long a time, they launch a new offensive-they attempt to soften the church by propaganda.

The Minister of Propaganda in Germany is Dr. Josef Goebbels. In the Christian Church his name is James DeForest Murch. Through the fifth columnists in France, and a Quisling in Norway, Germany's office of Propaganda became effective. In the same way The Christian Church's Murch has attempted to make his pseudo-unity campaign propaganda effective in the churches of Christ. Our ranking fifth columnist was Clinton Davidson, and our chief Quisling is Claud F. Witty. There is, of course, a whole brood of them in various forms. But the brethren have become wise to their ways, and they are fast becoming impotent.

A few months ago Herr Hitler boasted that his latest invasion was a push-over, the opposing armies, in fact, had been “smashed” then “shattered,” afterward “crushed” and finally “annihilated”-but still he never reached Moscow! Since then has been with these invasions in the church. Propaganda was sown throughout the length and breadth of the brotherhood in the form of Clinton Davidson's surveys and questionnaires. Then came the shattering announcement that ninety-five per cent of all the preachers had surrendered to him-it was a push-over! He would then crush the press by buying up the papers and starting one great paper of his own, and finally he would annihilate the remnant of us by suing the socks off our feet! But where is Clinton Davidson now? Does anybody know? The only wee little word we have had lately is the notice in the Arkansas papers that Doctor Benson had put him on the Board of Harding College, at Searcy! His movement fizzled out. The men who tried to help him put it over began to fall off his hand-wagon like rats deserting a sinking ship. Since then they have been trying to explain why they ever had anything to do with it-they did not know this and that and so forth and so on! And they wouldn't let anybody tell them. Doctor Jesse P. Sewell (D. D.) stood in the pulpit at El Paso, Texas, and, referring to some of us by name, publicly declared that we had lied on Davidson. He proceeded to tell them what a great person this man Davidson was. But after Davidson's movement had collapsed, at the close of a lecture by E. R. Harper at San Antonio exposing the Davidson affair, Doctor Sewell hurried to the front, emphatically endorsed all that Harper had said and declared that Clinton Davidson had deceived him! Then with his usual dramatics he shouted for everybody that endorsed his statement to stand up!! But where was Doctor Sewell when the fight was going on? He was hiding out behind the lines, helping Clinton Davidson and all the other Quislings all he could.

The following recent report in the Firm Foundation is an example of the influence of Jesse P. Sewell, and other older brethren, on some of the younger men in the church, TO CORRECT A FALSE IMPRESSION By P. D. Wilmeth It has been called to my attention more than once that my connection with the New Christian Leader as a writer has and is still misunderstood by many brethren who do not know me personally. This connection has been construed by some as indicative of my belief in, or non-committal to or sympathetic attitude toward the doctrine of premillennialism and those who espouse the same. Such is definitely false. I neither believe-the doctrine nor do I wish to lend my influence favorably in that direction. Those who know me personally know that my convictions are definitely in onnosition to this as well as all other error. It is a happy-privilege of mine to express my conviction at this point and this is the only one who may have a question mark on my position. I never care to do anything in any way that might mitigate against my influence in the kingdom of God, and by this principle I am at all times guided.

The Minister of Propaganda in Germany is Dr. Josef Goebbels. Through the fifth columnists in France, and a Quisling in Norway, Germany's office of Propaganda became effective. In the same way The Christian Church's Murch has attempted to make his pseudo-unity campaign propaganda effective in the churches of Christ. Our ranking fifth columnist was Clinton Davidson, and our chief Quisling is Claud F. Witty. There is, of course, a whole brood of them in various forms. But the brethren have become wise to their ways, and they are fast becoming impotent.

A few months ago Herr Hitler boasted that his latest invasion was a push-over, the opposing armies, in fact, had been “smashed” then “shattered,” afterward “crushed” and finally “annihilated”-but still he never reached Moscow! Since then has been with these invasions in the church. Propaganda was sown throughout the length and breadth of the brotherhood in the form of Clinton Davidson's surveys and questionnaires. Then came the shattering announcement that ninety-five per cent of all the preachers had surrendered to him—it was a push-over! He would then crush the press by buying up the papers and starting one great paper of his own, and finally he would annihilate the remnant of us by suing the socks off our feet! But where is Clinton Davidson now? Does anybody know? The only wee little word we have had lately is the notice in the Arkansas papers that Doctor Benson had put him on the Board of Harding College, at Searcy! His movement fizzled out. The men who tried to help him put it over began to fall off his hand-wagon like rats deserting a sinking ship. Since then they have been trying to explain why they ever had anything to do with it—they did not know this and that and so forth and so on! And they wouldn't let anybody tell them. Doctor Jesse P. Sewell (D. D.) stood in the pulpit at El Paso, Texas, and, referring to some of us by name, publicly declared that we had lied on Davidson. He proceeded to tell them what a great person this man Davidson was. But after Davidson's movement had collapsed, at the close of a lecture by E. R. Harper at San Antonio exposing the Davidson affair, Doctor Sewell hurried to the front, emphatically endorsed all that Harper had said and declared that Clinton Davidson had deceived him! Then with his usual dramatics he shouted for everybody that endorsed his statement to stand up!! But where was Doctor Sewell when the fight was going on? He was hiding out behind the lines, helping Clinton Davidson and all the other Quislings all he could.

The following recent report in the Firm Foundation is an example of the influence of Jesse P. Sewell, and other older brethren, on some of the younger men in the church, TO CORRECT A FALSE IMPRESSION By P. D. Wilmeth It has been called to my attention more than once that my connection with the New Christian Leader as a writer has and is still misunderstood by many brethren who do not know me personally. This connection has been construed by some as indicative of my belief in, or non-committal to or sympathetic attitude toward the doctrine of premillennialism and those who espouse the same. Such is definitely false. I neither believe-the doctrine nor do I wish to lend my influence favorably in that direction. Those who know me personally know that my convictions are definitely in onnosition to this as well as all other error. It is a happy-privilege of mine to express my conviction at this point and this is the only one who may have a question mark on my position. I never care to do anything in any way that might mitigate against my influence in the kingdom of God, and by this principle I am at all times guided. I am grateful for the confidence of my brethren, for their help, and long ago dedicated my life to the full service of Christ and the church. I trust that all who read this will clarify this false impression should it arise in the future.

(Brother Wilmeth has reference to the Christian Leader under its former management-G. H. F. S.)

Thus it now is that every man who ever wrote for Davidson's Christian Leader wants the stigma removed! They were all deceived. Yet the Bible Banner was telling them the truth in every issue, They have now admitted that it was the truth—but they are still' mad at the editor of the Bible Banner for telling it, and have never apologized for the bad names they called us. Even the editor of the Firm Foundation puts a P. S. to the above piece to let everybody know that the reference is made to the former management Christian Leader.

The best evidence that the Murch-Witty pseudo-unity movement is on its way out is the recent article on 'Straws In The Wind' in the Christian Standard by James DeForest Murch. A casual reader can see the evident weakness of the Murch article. It bears the marks of a dwindling movement. It came in with a great gust of wind. There was a "rapprochement" at Detroit, a "fine fellowship" at Indianapolis, and a "veritable victory" at Lexington. They had enlisted all of the "intellectual" and "spiritual" brethren among us, such as S. H. Hall and T. C. Wilcox, as recruits to the Unity Movement. Only those on outer "lunatic fringe" were left among the objectors, and they heralded to the brotherhood that the opposition would be "annihilated" with the next spring offensive! But the Christian Standard admitted the failure of their very next report at Columbus, Ohio, conceding that the attendance was "cut down" due to the counter-attacks from certain sources among the "conservative brethren" whom Murch designated as "the lunatic fringe." The Murch-Witty movement began its retreat. According to the latest from General Murch and Lieutenant Witty, it has now dwindled down to a few "straws in the wind." The threatened storm has passed, the dust has cleared away. It was only a whirlwind. That accounts for the straws! Since Paul says only those without knowledge are tossed around by the wind and James reminds that only the doubters are...
driven by the wind," and judge pronounces a woe upon those who are "carried along by winds," we will let Murch and Witty have what they can get from the wind they blow.

Periodically, General Murch and Lieutenant Witty write articles of a revealing nature-exposing the real spirit and inner purposes of these Unity Meetings, falsely so called. Quite inadvertently this time Murch has exposed that the purpose of the Unity Meetings is to bring about generally what happened at Horse Cave, Kentucky, locally-with a step beyond. Only the restrictive clause in the deed kept them from introducing the organ into that church. In all other particulars they have become an orthodox Christian Church. Murch now claims that this is an accomplishment of the Unity Meeting. He reveals that it proposes to do that to all of the churches. They are poor diplomats-not even good schemers. They cannot keep their secrets. They ought to stay out of print, or else establish a censorship, for every time they break into print they say a lot of things that vindicates all that has been said of their intents and purposes. They prove that we have told the truth on them. The unity (2) they have offered is not in part but in whole. Feigned unity! The New Testament is replete with warnings against such schemes and schemers. If the complicity of the American people constitutes a inner danger to our national liberty, it is less so spiritually. If the leaders of our nation must cry, Wake up, America! it is also imperative that the church awake. Awake to what? To the dangers yet within. The fifth columnist and the quislings are still at work. They do not sleep. They are known not by what they say so much as by what they do not say; not by what they openly teach, but by their attitude toward certain teaching and teachers. Their pulse on these questions can always be felt in an attitude which they hold. They do not believe this or that-but! They have no compliments for men who have fought the battles against error and never a criticism of those men who promote them. It is an attitude, brethren, an attitude that marks men among us today. It is not an actual preaching of error, but the works are capable to do the preaching of all of the truth. Some men preach truth, and do not preach error; but they do not preach all of the truth, and they do not condemn error. Withholding a truth is as evil in God's sight as teaching an error. It is the mark of a timeserver, who cannot be trusted with the spiritual interests of the church. The church is not now endangered so much by actual premillennialism as it is by an attitude toward error, a by-product of premillennialism-softness. It exists in many forms. We are told that the nation is soft, that society is soft, and the general effect of it all on the church is to make it soft. It is the back-wash of the general condition of the world.

Remember, the Ministry of Propaganda exists for the purpose of softening opposition before an invasion! But whenever and wherever, in whosoever or in whatsoever form anything contrary to sound doctrine and faith unfeigned may appear let us unite in the determination that they shall not pass! F. E. W.

---

**THE CHRISTIAN AND THE GOVERNMENT**

The Christian who does not know how to deport himself in time of war, does not know how to deport himself in time of peace-the instructions are the same. The attitude that causes a Christian in time of war to appear as a freak specimen of humanity, and to be placed in a concentration camp, or in a federal prison, or in the world is in distress, and there is so much work to do, no man practical in time of peace. A crisis merely brings it to light. The only problems raised by war are in the application of the rules of love and kindness, one of these grown-up undisciplined, children of somebody's inflictions upon you a bodily injury. It is reported by you, or by someone else. You are called to testify. You tell the truth without coloring it by personal feeling. The guilty party is punished according to the law. Have you recompensed evil for evil? Have you broken the command to "be at peace" in Rom. 12? Have you disobeyed what "is written" that "vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord"? Have you been overcome of evil? The answer to these questions is, No. No evil has been perpetrated in the enforcement of the law. The employment of physical force in its proper sphere, and in the manner prescribed by God's authority, is good and necessary. The methods employed in a material realm are not rendered null and void, because they are not to be used in a spiritual realm. Force has no place in Christ's kingdom, because citizenship there is spiritual and voluntary. It would vitiate every act of worship and service. There is no virtue in doing what we are compelled to do. But a Christian can and is even commanded to operate in other realms than the church.

A case in point: Despite all of your efforts under the rules of love and kindness, one of these grown-up undisciplined, children of somebody's inflictions upon you a bodily injury. It is reported by you, or by someone else. You are called to testify. You tell the truth without coloring it by personal feeling. The guilty party is punished according to the law. Have you recompensed evil for evil? Have you broken the command to "be at peace" in Rom. 12? Have you disobeyed what "is written" that "vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord"? Have you been overcome of evil? The answer to these questions is, No. No evil has been perpetrated in the enforcement of the law. The employment of physical force in its proper sphere, and in the manner prescribed by God's authority, is good and necessary. The methods employed in a material realm are not rendered null and void, because they are not to be used in a spiritual realm. Force has no place in Christ's kingdom, because citizenship there is spiritual and voluntary. It would vitiate every act of worship and service. There is no virtue in doing what we are compelled to do. But a Christian can and is even commanded to operate in other realms than the church.

Another case in point: The qualifications of elders in the church, Paul says, "one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?)." Now, a man cannot employ force as an elder in Christ's kingdom, but the only way he can prepare and qualify himself for the eldership, according to Paul, is by the experience gained in the wise use of force and discipline in the home!
Paul was born a Roman citizen. When he became a Christian, he did not repudiate his citizenship in a civil kingdom; he exercised it. If any Christian has repudiated his citizenship, he should in all honor and fairness register as an alien. The government is entitled to know the exact status of every one living within its borders during an emergency. Paul's conduct, when revealed with the implication of divine approval, constitutes a very good commentary upon his teaching. The Roman magistrates in Philippi sent word to the jailor to release Paul and Silas: "Let those men go." Paul answered: "They have beaten us openly, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out." On other occasions Paul used his citizenship to escape scourging, to avert a plot against his life, to escape an injustice in the lower courts; but on this occasion it was for none of those reasons. The beating was past; his freedom was offered; there was not, for he beareth not the presumption of guilt in the eyes of the world, not enemies who had sworn to kill him. Had they attempted to escort him to his destination to protect him from his enemies who had sworn to kill him. Had they attempted to carry out their threat, Paul knew that the soldiers would have used the force of arms, and if necessary would have killed the attackers in protecting Paul's life. Was Paul's practice here, as a Roman citizen, inconsistent with and contradictory to his teaching in the Roman letter? The answer again is, No. Paul had other realms of God's authority in mind when he penned the rules pertaining to peace in Romans 12, if the context proves anything.

Romans 13—The Christian's Obligation To Civil Government

It should be remembered that Paul did not divide the Roman letter into chapters. Romans 12 and 13 were not disjointed when he wrote the letter—i t was all one argument. In the closing verses of the twelfth chapter when he forbids a Christian taking personal vengeance, he declared that "vengeance belongeth" to the Lord. The first verses of Romans 13, which follow immediately, tell how the Lord exercises this vengeance on the evildoer. Romans 12 and 13 are all one argument. "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. For rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to evil. Wherefore ye must needs be in subjection, not only because of wrath, but also for conscience' sake." The sword is an instrument of death. The officer of the law is the officer of God when he beareth not the sword in vain. Verse six says: "For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they (the officers) are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." Administering death, or capital punishment, therefore is divinely sanctioned as a prerogative of government in punishment of evildoers. The idea that some members of the church have in these matters would also make every soldier in the service of our country a murderer. It is undoubtedly a false idea.

But the Bible says "thou shalt not kill," we are told. Yes, that is the sixth commandment. The fourth commandment said: "Remember the sabbath day to keep it holy"—so the same God that said "thou shalt not kill," in the sixth commandment provided the death penalty for violation of the fourth commandment to keep the sabbath holy! Did the sixth commandment contradict the penalty the fourth? Not at all; somebody's reasoning is just lame. If capital punishment is murder, and if peace officers and soldiers are murderers, then our government is prohibited what the other commandment required! But since both capital punishment and war, under, certain conditions, were divinely required under the same law that said "thou shalt not kill," it follows that there is a difference between both of those things and murder. Some people need to look up the definition of murder.

Brother R. L. Whiteside recently made a brief but clear and scriptural distinction on this point in answer to a question in his query department of the Gospel Advocate, which may be profitably inserted here. Read it:

The command, "Thou shalt not kill," was one of the Ten Commandments, and thus was a prohibition against murder. It applied to individuals, and not to governments. And while the Ten Commandments were in force, the individual was allowed, under certain circumstances, to take life when it was necessary to prevent murder. If the individual was making in, and be smitten so that he dieth, there shall be no blood guiltiness for him. (Ex. 22:2.) Such taking of human life is not a violation of the command, "Thou shalt not kill." God does not give a law and then license a man to violate it. The command "Thou shalt not kill," has been used as an argument against capital punishment, and yet under that law the authorities were required to punish by death many sorts of criminals. And under that law, the Lord required his people to make war on certain nations. In doing so, they were not violating the command, "Thou shalt not kill." The way some preachers, and others, argue, it would seem that they never read any of the Old Testament excepting the command, "Thou shalt not kill."

But I do not read anywhere that the Lord ever permitted any man to commit adultery for his own protection, or that a nation was required to commit adultery! It is plain that individuals are prohibited from doing some things that governments are required to do.

Brother Whiteside is right. The idea that men who are not Christians can be soldiers and officers to protect the Christian by doing that which a Christian himself could not do is about the most conveniently selfish and cowardly convenient doctrine ever propounded by good men. There is just one thing wrong with it—i t is not true.

The Two Realms—Civil and Spiritual

But again we are told that Christ said: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." According to the theory of some, the same things belong to the devil that belong to Caesar. Then it could just as well read: "Render unto the devil the things that are the devil's." It certainly would be wrong to render anything to the devil, yet we could not, honestly withhold anything from the devil that belonged to him. But Satan never owned a foot of ground on this earth. He never possessed an abstract of title to anything. Obligations are based upon value received, and if any man ever received anything worthwhile from the devil, he is obligated to the devil. We are told that the devil is ordained of God in the same way that governments and Satan is wrong, and there is nothing right about him. If that is true of governments, God could not be consistent with his divine attributes and command us to pay taxes to the government.

Some go to the temptation of Christ to show that the devil possessed the kingdoms of this world. It is said that...
if he did not possess them, his offer would have been no temptation to Christ. Very well, but did Christ want the kingdoms of this world? If so, what did he want with them? He was building a spiritual kingdom in which force would have no place. He could not salvage one thing from the kingdoms of this world for his spiritual kingdom. If Satan offered him something he did not want and could not use, how could that have been a temptation to him? But Christ was tempted, therefore, Satan did not offer him the kingdoms of this world as such. The kingdoms of this world meant what Jesus meant when he commanded his disciples to go and teach “all nations.” They did not go to the civil governments; they went to the people who composed them. Christ could use the people in his spiritual kingdom. The devil was in possession by voluntary suffering. What the devil offered was a withdrawal of opposition to Christ’s work. He could have done the thing that he offered, because he was in control of that opposition. Let us not pervert scripture to support wishful thinking on a Christian’s obligations to civil government. The theory that God uses the devil and wicked men to do some necessary evil work, such as law enforcement and warfare, so that his spiritual children do not have to soil their holy hands makes God particeps criminis to evil. To support this theory they go back to the Old Dispensation where it is said that “the Most High God ruleth in the kingdom of men, and that he setteth up over it whomsoever he will.” But under the same dispensation God commanded his own people, under certain conditions, to wage warfare. So it proves too much. If we go back there for an example of one, we get an example of the other.

Take the example of Samuel. Among the Old Testament characters there is none that outshines Samuel for personal piety and saintly faithfulness. His consecration began before his birth. The last of the judges, and in a sense the first of the prophets, this venerable priest’s last days were saddened by the clamor for a king and by the mistakes of Saul, the first king. Saul could not tell Samuel that he had obeyed the Lord when the bleating of the sheep and the lowing of the oxen were sounding in his ears, and when old king Agag stood there before him alive! God had commanded Saul to kill them all. Saul had not done it. Whom did God ordain as a minister to complete the obedience in which Saul had defaulted? An evil, wicked man, some confirmed old sinner that was going to hell anyway? No; he appointed Samuel, the preacher and priest, one of the best men that ever lived, for that task, and he called for Agag to be brought before him! “And Samuel said, As thy sword hath made women childless, so shall thy mother be childless among women. And Samuel hewed Agag to pieces before the Lord in Gilgal.” But that was in the Old Testament! To look sure, but that is where they go to prove that God used evil men to do some of God’s evil work that good men could not do and this example proves that their argument is wrong. Here their contention is reversed.

It seems to me that some of the brethren have dipped their pens in the ink of speculation and propounded a Calvinistic theory of civil government-namely, that they are all born totally depraved! Had not man rebelled against God, they say, there would have been no civil governments. Neither would there have been any clothes worn! Neither would there have been any church-nobody lost, nobody to be saved, no gospel to save them. But man did rebel. As usual God had two institutions, operating under his authority. To civil governments he has given the responsibility of discipline as it pertains to the physical life. To the church he has committed the spiritual resources, and given the responsibility of order and discipline as it pertains to the spiritual life within the spiritual kingdom. One of these ordained institutions employ physical force because the nature of its work demands it. The other uses love and persuasion, because the nature of its work demands it.

The Individual Responsibility

The government deals with the individual. The church cannot speak for its members; and if so, the government would not accept it, but would still examine each individual in the case. The government is fortunately very reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he refuses to do anything in an emergency like this, he will be placed in a concentration camp. Appeals are reasonable. There are many branches of non-combatant service in which a conscientious objector may enlist, but if he rejects the duty of the church, the church is obligated to accept the government’s demands.
New customs have a peculiar way of creeping into the general Practice of the churches. At the beginning they are usually viewed with some alarm, often create some confusion but finally become so deeply rooted by repeated observance that it would require a major effort to dig them up. These customs may be good, harmless if somewhat foolish, and some have appealed to the fancy of some brethren which are downright pernicious. About the time I began preaching plenty of years ago, I ran into the tail-end of a controversy over the right hand of fellowship. The Practice had taken such a hold in general practice that many did not consider a man a member of the church until he had been extended the right hand of fellowship. The formal custom has been long since dropped and apparently with good reason. In some sections it was long the custom for contributors to walk up and lay their money on the table, the Lord’s money was placed on “the Lord’s table.” The change from this to waiting on the audience with baskets sent temperatures soaring and inspired a multitude of words. The passing out of the old custom was accompanied by many a heated argument. I have even seen an incorrigible stalk up to the table and lay his money down after the rest of the audience was waited on. It is easy for a mere custom to assume the place of divine law in the minds of those accustomed to it. Practice is not always accompanied by thinking of a desirable acquaintance with the teaching of the scriptures.

Some new customs in the field of incidentals contribute to decency and order and the convenience of large groups of worshippers. Sometimes one creeps in I am unable to see any good reason for, even if I do not feel justified in crying out against it. Giving thanks for the communion of the body and blood of the Lord at the Lord’s table is universally recognized as right in view of some plain scriptural references. But I had been preaching a good many years before I ever saw anybody duck his head and say a prayer into a contribution basket. Somebody started it recently, possibly the idea of stimulating the contribution spirit, it caught the fancy of the brethren, some of them, and it now occupies as fixed a place in worship as giving thanks for the bread. I have more than once observed some shocked expressions when I handed out the baskets or contribution plates without praying over them. They thought I had forgotten something. It is just a recent custom with little, and I think nothing, to commend it. A few well-placed remarks on the duty of liberality would be much more appropriate at that particular time. There is a time for prayer and thanksgiving and there is a time for admonition.

A good brother with a sizable amount of common sense suggested a very good test of good preaching. He thought the business of a preacher was to preach the gospel. He was listening to a certain preacher through a meeting. He applied this test. "I just imagined I was a sinner with little or no knowledge of the gospel and listened to see if I could learn enough from his preaching to intelligently obey the gospel. I was somewhat taken back to discover that information along that line was entirely too meager to get the job done." In a lot of present day preaching references to the plan of salvation are entirely too casual and abbreviated to properly instruct people in the right way of the Lord. Elloquent and heated lectures on the state of the nation and the decline of public morals may be interesting but pulpit autopsies of that character fall short of furnishing the information that both sinners and saints must have to establish and maintain fellowship with God. The old-fashioned Methodist circuit-rider could beat most of us at that sort of thing, but he fell far short of ringing the changes on the gospel. Sinners need to be told what to do to be saved, and saints need to be told over and over how to live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world. There is nothing that beats preaching the Bible to the people, giving to each and all their portion in due season. Sectarian preachers can preach morals and many of them are extra good at it. They can tell us that the nation is headed straight for hell without a return ticket and why. People need to know about the establishment of the church, the change in covenants, the conditions of salvation and other vital issues that pertain to life and salvation. Who is going to tell them if we become too squeamish or prudent to venture out on controversial issues? It would be a revelation to some members of the church, including some preachers, to know of the bitter battles over matters of doctrine that brought the church to its present strength which is far short of what it ought to be. If a preacher can be eloquent at all, he ought to wax eloquent over the divine offer of salvation to sinners and the conditions upon which it can be enjoyed.

A preaching brother was one day “glorifying his ministry” using me as an audience. He was not so hot as a writer and took occasion to disparage gospel papers among us almost to the point of contempt. “Nobody reads these little old papers of ours anyway.” I have noticed his picture in one of them more than once and have seen numerous and lengthy reports of his work, written by himself, in at least two of them. He should not blush unseen and waste his fragrance on the desert air in any such futile fashion, if nobody but a few preachers ever reads the papers. As a matter of fact more people read the papers in a year than he can preach to in ten, and he is a very good preacher at that. There is a place for both oral and written preaching. The brother should write something that rubs brethren wrong, like I do sometimes, and he may find that they read the papers all the way from New York to Pearl Harbor. I have been curried by gentlemen of the clergy, even a Bishop, from faraway places. I’ll warrant that he never had a Bishop do any squirming over his preaching. The preaching that is read in the papers may not be always the best variety, but then it is probably as good on an average as that which is heard in the pulpits. And the reader has an advantage in that he can walk out in the middle of a poor article without attracting attention.

It seems to me to be bad business and poor judgment to try to run a paper to please a soft, compromising element in the church. That sort doesn’t read the papers anyhow, especially the kind of papers designed to appeal to them. When they do read, they like to read something that stirs them up, or at least they do whether they like it or not. Some of them read the Bible Banner and we and others hear from them and what we hear would not be suitable reading in the sort of paper they profess to like. Most people will warm up to a fight and a fight is a good thing if it is directed at something that needs fighting and in defense of something worth fighting for. “Fight the good fight of the faith.” It is a mistake to confuse such a fight with a ‘personal squabble.”
In the Christian Standard, Feb. 14, 1942, James De Forest Murch had an article under the above caption. There is an adage that says: "Straws show which way the wind blows." In his article Brother Murch pitched up fifteen "straws," and the last one of them blew right smack into the digressive brand of his religious journalism, and put it next to the Christian Standard in this matter, because the Banner knew as well as the Standard did what the fruit of the "Murch-Witty Unity Meetings" would be. Before running Brother Murch's straws through the threshers again, I would like to make one change. He speaks of "noninstrument churches and ministers." Since the "instrument" is not the only bone of contention that constitutes the "middle wall of partition between the Churches of Christ" I would like to change Brother Murch's "noninstrument" to nonconviction "churches and ministers." I also want to commend Brother Murch for the arrangement of his, and Witty's pictures, that accompanied his article. He put Witty's picture at the top of the page, suggesting that he represents the foam in the "Murch-Witty Unity Meetings," and his picture at the bottom representing the current sweeping all the fruit into the digressive camps. Read Brother Murch's somewhat gloating, but not surprising introduction.

Progress toward unity is evident in the relations of "Churches of Christ" and "Disciples of Christ." The "middle wall of partition" is breaking down slowly but surely. The spirit of Christ is beginning to have its way in the hearts of hundreds. Something has been started in our annual "Unity Meetings," which will go on and on until wide areas in both groups have been brought into blessed fellowship.

We have no accurate method of measuring progress, but there are many "straws in the wind" which give us definite signs of it. I want to set down some which have come to my personal attention in the past year:

I think Brother Murch has correctly diagnosed the case of those who regularly attend the "Unity Meetings." As already stated, the Bible Banner has contended from the beginning that they would gradually soften and mix with the general pulp, of the digressive brand. It is not embarrassing to me to admit what I already knew. Substituting nonconviction "churches and ministers" for Brother Murch's "noninstrument" churches and ministers, the "middle wall of partition," separating those who attend the Unity Meetings, becomes a very thin affair, almost transparent, and when it is completely removed, about all the denominational preachers leading prayer in the meeting, and all Brother Hall did about it, was to deny it, after he left Horse Cave. It may be that "The Church of Christ at Horse Cave," was in such full fellowship with the denominations, that Brother Hall could not tell one from the other. In this event, what Brother Murch calls "our churches in Kentucky" have nothing on the denominations, in their "full fellowship," with the Horse Cave Church. I am sure this is also true with the unnamed places, in "Pennsylvania and Virginia." Since Brother Cecil Douthitt lives in Louisville, Ky., I will let him have "Straw Two," but I feel sure he is in a third group of which Brother Murch makes no mention.

Straw Three. Several of our congregations in Southern California are sending financial support to the orphans' home at Ontario. Offerings from "noninstrument" brethren have been received by several of our benevolent institutions. The doors of these homes are now open to the unfortunate of both groups.

Brother Sam Witty, a brother of Brother Claud Witty, Brother Murch's protege, founded, and I suppose still runs the orphan's home at Ontario, California. Naturally, the digressives would feel kindly toward "the home" because of blood relationship, if for no other. In fact I thought "the doors of these homes" were open to all the "unfortunate," or as many as "the home" could care for.

Straw Four. Pulpits have been opened to brethren of opposing views on "instruments" at many points in Florida, Kansas, Ohio, Michigan, California, Illinois, Kentucky and other states.

This "straw" shows that the fault of the "Murch-Witty Unity Meetings" is ripening rather fast, and the sooner Murch's group gets it gathered the better it will be for "the Churches of Christ."

Straw Five. Evangelistic meetings have been held on an exchange basis at several points. Notable among these were the Lappin-Jorgenson meetings, the Friend-Murdock meetings and the Rutherford-Crowder meetings.

Jorgenson, Friend, and Rutherford belong to the Dr. Wood, and Frank Mullins brand of premillennialists, who sat on the platform with. J. Frank Norris, in the Fort Worth debate, and gave all their influence against Foy E. Wallace in his defense of the truth., So Brother Murch you have nothing on the Baptists, that will fellowship those fellows.

Straw Six. Our Board of Church Erection and our Pension Board have made it a policy to consider applications from "noninstrument" churches and ministers. Quite a number have taken advantage of this expanded service without in any way tainting their convictions.

There have always been, and I suppose always will be, some in the church who have no convictions about whom or what they milk. So if Brother Murch's "group" is not careful they may get some leeches out of "the Churches of Christ." I don't charge you anything for this suggestion, Brother Murch.

Straw Seven. Sunday schools in each group are using literature prepared by publishing houses of the other group. The Standard Publishing Company is enjoying a fine fellowship in meeting the demand for this wider service and has, during the past year, employed the writings of "Church of Christ" brethren in its lesson quarterlies.

I believe this straw has let a black cat "out of the bag." What does Brother Murch mean by "publishing houses"? Does he mean that other "publishing houses," besides the Boll and Jorgenson publishing house, are selling "The Stan-
churche and that too, without their knowledge? If this exchange of literature is going on with “our” Publishing Houses, it must be solely from a monetary consideration, because surely they do not believe the “Standard Publishing House” has writers better qualified to prepare the literature for “our churches? If so, I think the churches should make the choice for themselves. If the digressives can furnish the literature for our churches, what would be wrong in them furnishing the preachers for our meetings? I would think more of “the Jorgenson-Lappin, the Friend-Murdock, and the Rutherford-Crowder meetings,” exchanged in the open, than I would of his secret juggling of literature used in “our” churches. If it is done. Our “Publishing Houses” are of age, let them answer, guilty, or not guilty.

Straw Eight. “Churches of Christ” are making wide use of books written by our brethren, such as Tomlison’s “Churches of Today” and Johnson’s “The Great Controversy.” We included a number of “Church of Christ” brethren among the contributors to “600 Doctrinal Illustrations,” and it very to make further use of their talents as opportunity affords.

There is nothing out of the ordinary about this “straw,” because any student will read anything that he thinks will add to his information. I have no scruples even in reading Brother Murch’s writings, because he is a pretty good prognosticator when it comes to the course “our” weak-kneed brethren will pursue. He will also tell us about the antics of “our” kicking, and expostulating brethren in the “Unity Meetings.”

Straw Nine was just an advertisement of E. L. Jorgen-son’s song book, and it might hurt the sale of the book to advertise it in Murch’s “lunatic fringe of religious journalism.”

Straw Ten. There have been a number of ministerial changes-men crossing the “middle wall of partition” both ways. Some of these changes have been out of conviction following a study of the historic controversial issues. In certain cases they have been accompanied by bitterness and recrimination, not to say nothing about “unfortunate rifts in congregations affected. There have been other changes, under very happy circumstances, in the interests of peace and unity. By the former instances, one may be led to doubt the advisability of continuing to promote a movement which calls to mind an almost-forgotten division in Christian history. It seems to me that it is about time “the churches of Christ” were curbing the activities of “the Bishop” if he is to represent them before the brotherhood.

While Brother Murch is nursing about the possible results of “these infusions of new blood into both groups,” I want to give him and Brother Witty a couple of transfusions of blood from two pioneer editors. I will use Moses E. Lard’s pen for the first injection. “Now in the light of the foregoing principles what defense can be urged for the introduction into some of our congregations of instrumental music? The answer which thunders into my ear from every page of the New Testament is, none. Did Christ ever approve of organ-grinding? Did any one of the primitive churches ever use it? Never. In what light then must we view him who attempts to introduce it into the churches of Christ of the present day? I answer, as an insulter of the authority of Christ, and as a defiant and impious innovator on the simplicity and purity of the ancient worship.” Lord’s Quarterly, Volume 1, page 331. On page 333, Lard says: Thus these organ-grinding churches will in the lapse of time be broken down, or wholly apostatize, and the sooner they are in fragments the better for the cause of Christ. I have no sympathy with them, no fellowship for them, and so help me God never intend knowingly to put my foot into one of them. The Christian standard is now publishing a sermon preached by Z. T. Sweeney nearly twenty three years ago, “Should Churches of Christ Receive Unmierced Into Formal Fellowship?” This sermon would have never been preached and certainly would not now be published in the standard, if Lard’s prediction had not come true, that many of the digressive churches have apostatized-gone into the open membership business. Murch and Witty are trying desperately to refill their ranks with the weaklings from the Churches of Christ. And they are getting their toboggan machinery pretty well oiled, judging from Murch’s “Straw Eight.” But I must go on with my transfusions. I will use W. K. Pendleton’s pen for my next injection. “It has been said, that nothing is so absurd but that some one will be found foolish enough to embrace it. It would seem especially true, in matters of religion. This folly of elevating organ-grinding and accompaniments in the place of apostolic worship, illustrates it. Who could have thought that with the Bible in their hand, the American people could ever have drifted into such idolatry.” (Millennial Har-binger 1868, page 41). It would certainly be disastrous to the “Murch-Witty Unity Meetings” to inject any of this pioneer blood into them. So they are using what they call “new blood.” In justice to the memory of the pioneers, I appeal to Murch and Witty to call the blood they are fusing “Quisling” blood.

Straw Eleven. The International Convention Commission on Restudy has recognized the fundamental unity existing between the Churches of Christ and the Disciples of Christ, and has given time to addresses and discussions on the subject. As a result of these meetings, Claud F. Witty has been invited to speak at Butler University, Minnesota Bible University, the Michigan State Ministers’ Meeting and before other important groups. All of which has contributed to better understanding and increased interest in the unity movement.

It is not surprising that “The International Convention Commission on Restudy,” (what ever that is) has selected Claud F. Witty for these speaking engagements. However, I think common honesty and fairness would demand that Witty at least get a statement from “the churches of Christ” in Detroit saying he is to represent them in this Chautauqua circuit. I know Brother Witty is jokingly called the Bishop of Detroit, but it seems to me that it is about time “the churches of Christ” were curbing the activities of “the Bishop,” if he is to represent them before the brotherhood.

Straw Twelve. Friction between the two groups in the mountains of eastern Kentucky led to correspondence between J. W. West, of the Mountain States Evangelising Association, and Fred L. Rowe, editor of The Christian Ledger. It was mutually understood that there could be no compromise of convictions, but it was agreed that digressives should respect each other’s legal rights and treat each other with common Christian courtesy. A tour of the Big Sandy country by these men has done much toward the solution of problems which threatened to destroy the elemental Christian faith of whole communities.

This straw shows some rather unusual activities upon the part of the editor of “The Christian Ledger.” One is caused to wonder why J. W. West and Fred L. Rowe did not make this journey forty years ago, when the “Christian Churches” were stealing or taking all the property they could get from “the Churches of Christ.” The digressives were not concerned about any body’s legal rights then. J. W. West and Fred L. Rowe were both old enough to travel in those days, yet they did nothing about the legal rights of the churches. The unfortunate implication of their present journeys, is that “both groups” have not been respecting the “legal rights” of each other. Whereas the digressives have been the only culprits in this matter. So I am wondering what Brother Rowe had to say to “his group” about the legal rights of others. Their special mission seems to have been to get “the Churches of Christ”
to stack arms, and fraternize with the Progressives (?) I wonder if "J. W. West and Fred L. Rowe" would object to reading a few lines from J. W. McGarvey? Here they are. The loudest call that comes from heaven to the men of this generation is for warfare, stern, relentless, merciless, exterminating, against everything not expressly or by necessary implication authorized in the New Testament. Such is my unavering conviction; and my only regret is, that I cannot fight this fight as it should be fought." (Millennial Harbinger 1868, page 219) Brethren, these are my sentiments to-night, and I thought they would have been Brother Rowe's too. When Alexander Campbell was an old man, and had grown long gray whiskers, some one said something about his whiskers, and he replied that he had hung out the "white flag." I am wondering if Brother Rowe is growing whiskers.

Straw Thirteen. There have been numerous moves on the part of preachers to establish neighborly contacts between both groups in a given community. In many cases these efforts have been rudely spurned, but there are literarily scores of instances in which there have been favorable developments. As an example, one of our Kansas ministers was holding a series of evangelistic meetings. The young preacher of the neighboring "conservative" church attended one night. He seemed pleased with the message, and on another occasion was present with several of his people. At the close of the meetings he invited our minister to have lunch with him. During the conversation he expressed himself as follows: "I am in hearty agreement with your gospel. You preach the same gospel I preach. I see no reason why we can not fellowship with one another on that ground. I am opposed to the use of instrumental music in the worship, but I feel that it should not be made a test of fellowship. I am greatly interested in the unity movement, and will do all in my power to promote it locally." A most happy relationship now exists between the churches in this Kansas City.

This straw might be worth something to the church, if we could find out what Bible College (?) this young Kansas preacher was the product of. "By their fruits ye shall know them."?

Straw Fourteen. The recent nation-wide poll of ministers of the "Disciples of Christ," through the columns of the Christian-Evangelist and the Christian Standard, revealed a growing interest in unity. The hundreds of ministers participating were unanimous in their desire that the annual meetings continue along the same lines upon which they were initiated.

The "Murch-Witty Unity Meetings" ought to get these two groups together without much trouble. "The Christian Evangelist" is just a little ahead of the "Christian Standard," and they are both going in the same direction—away from the truth.

Straw Fifteen. An encouraging independence of thought and action regarding unity is developing among the younger ministers of the "Churches of Christ." The present center of opposition is among the older men who occupy places of prominence in the pulpit and the press of the brotherhood. A small coterie of not more than a hundred self-appointed men exercise a power over the rank and file of the ministers which is comparable to the power of the bishops in the Methodist churches.

Brother Murch is a good whistler; but his is the whistle of a man going through a graveyard at night. Since "the declaration of independence," written by the brilliant "young minister," is minus his "John Hancock," I shall not insert Brother Murch's "excerpt" from it, in this paper. I would suggest however that Brother Murch, and the "young minister," both "restudy" 1 Cor. 3:18, and 2 Tim. 4:1-5. By the way, Brother Murch, I never did hear what you said about meeting Foy E. Wallace, Jr., in an oral debate. Or did you say? If you will meet Wallace on the use of "missionary societies" and "instrumental accompaniments," in the work and worship of the church, I feel sure he will "tread" or "beat" much more grain out of your straws than I can get by running them through the thresher -the Bible Banner. I am not asking you for a "yes" or "on answer; but I do. hope you will answer so "the most capable and successful young ministers" among us can understand what you say. If that astute young minister who wrote you could hear the discussion he might rewrite "the declaration of independence" without "restudy." I thank you in advance for your candid answer.

A WORD FROM THE WEST

Dear Brother Murch:

I read with interest your "Straws in the Wind" of February 14 in the Christian Standard. I hasten to add a word and I hope you will print it to show how the wind blows among the young preachers of the Churches of Christ in this state.

I am a young preacher and I know how the young preachers of the church feel. I have been associated in school and in work with the majority of the young preachers in all of the states west of the Mississippi. Any "straws" that you have seen blowing from Detroit and Louisville do not represent the sentiment of the young preachers of the church of our Lord. To be sure there are some "straws" blowing out from the above mentioned cities, but these all come from men who could not preach in most Churches of Christ.

A good indication of how the wind blows in California could be found here in Los Angeles. There are more than 60 Churches of Christ in this city and the territory surrounding it. There is not a preacher of any importance that would encourage a single move made by the leaders of the so-called unity movement. The teachers and leaders of Pepperdine College in this city and the preachers of Los Angeles are not with the "straws" of your movement. When the "straws" are identified it will be seen that they are those who would compromise the gospel and lead the church into sectarianism. Why not give us the name of the "capable, successful" young minister you mentioned?

The younger preachers remember another famous "poll" and the 90% of preachers that favored that movement, but who were the preachers? A look at your "straw" votes would reveal them.

I hope you will print this but I really do not expect to, see you do so. Most sincerely, Glen L. Wallace.
A news item from Memphis, Tennessee relates the sad case of a thirty-six year old man who is "a hopeless victim of cancer" and has been informed by his doctors that he has only a few months to live. He has made an appeal for advice on how to spend his time. He cares letters "on what to do." It is said that he reads a great deal "especially detective stories" and listens to the radio.

This suggests that responsible people who know life, including its uncertainties, should live all the time with the possibility in mind that any day may be the last. Jesus told of a materialist who successfully cultivated the soil and reaped a plentiful harvest. He tore down old barns and built new ones and filled them. Then he boasted that he had much goods laid up for many years. He even counseled his own soul to take its ease and be merry. It never occurred to him that he did not have many years to live. "But God said unto him, Thou foolish one, this night is thy soul required of thee; and the things which thou hast prepared, whose shall they be?" The sudden prospect of death must have been terrorizing to such a man. He was wholly unprepared for what he had made no preparation for. "So is he that layeth up treasure for himself and is not rich toward God." A man who is "rich toward God" is prepared for the call to quit this life "a few months" hence, a few days hence or right now. The idea that radical changes are to be made in a life when the unexpected prospect of death appears is a confession that such a life has been unduly out of order and lived on unsound principles. Reading detective stories, listening to the radio, or even reading the literature of advice which may come in response to public appeal are not likely to set it in order in "a few months" or any other period of time.

The doomed man, "a hopeless victim of cancer" is reported to have said: "It's a tough feeling, sitting here waiting to die." The very nature and certainty of death insures a common interest and curiosity regarding the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen: for the things which are seen are temporal: but the things which are not seen are eternal. For we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens." Believing that does not create "a tough feeling" but a flood of triumph surging in the heart.

A man "waiting to die" would do well to ponder the fact that he is going somewhere. Non-existence is not the blind alley that terminates human life on earth. A man's body is carted off to the city of the dead, but not the man himself. He goes somewhere. We have it from Jesus that "except ye believe that I am he, ye shall die in your sins" and "whither I go, ye cannot come." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my word, he shall never see death." "Jesus saith unto her, Thy brother shall rise again.

Multitudes of Christless and therefore hopeless men are dying all over the world. Prolificanish philosophy cannot exercise the dismal fact of it. The story is told that when Walter Scott was dying he asked an attendant to bring him "The Book." When asked what book, he replied that there is only one Book, the Bible. It is the inspired revelation of human origin, duty and destiny. The Christ of the Bible is the sole hope of humanity. "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life: no one cometh unto the Father, but by me." "Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new." "There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus." "And I heard a voice from heaven saying, Write, Blessed are the dead, who die in the Lord henceforth: yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors; for their works follow with them." "Sitting here waiting to die" would be a very short time to do some extensive reading along this line and a little book called the New Testament is honey-combed with it. He who lives and dies out of Christ sinks into abysmal and fathomless despair. "Lord to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life."
THE LORD OF THE SABBATH

CECIL H. DOUTRITT

"For the Son of man is lord of the sabbath" (Matt. 12:8); therefore he is Lord of God's commandment. This puts him on an equality with God; this proves his divinity.

The primary purpose of the first four books of the New Testament is to prove that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God and the Savior of men. John states the main objective of all four of these books when he says, "These are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name" (Jno. 20:31).

Many kinds of proof were presented, the testimony of many witnesses was given, and many arguments were made by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John to establish the divine sonship of Jesus. One argument was used by all four of these writers to prove that Jesus was "equal with God" (Jno. 5:18), and therefore was everything he claimed to be; namely, that he was Lord of the Sabbath. To prove that he could set aside or abolish the Sabbath law is to prove that he is Lord of the Sabbath. If he is Lord of the Sabbath, he is Lord of a commandment of God. If he is Lord of God's commandment, he is divine. If he is divine, he is everything he claimed to be.

In their zeal to prove that the Sabbath law is still binding, Sabbatarians do not seem to realize they are attacking an argument used by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John to establish the divinity of Jesus.

That the significance of the statement, "The Son of man is lord even of the sabbath" (Mk. 2:28), may be more fully appreciated, attention is directed first to

TEE SABBATH LAW UNDER THE OLD COVENANT

1. To whom, when, and why given.

The word sabbath, meaning cessation from labor, was first applied to the seventh day of the week in Ex. 16, about 2500 years after creation, when the Israelites were forbidden to gather manna on that day. "Tomorrow is a solemn rest, a holy sabbath unto Jehovah." God's purpose in this first Sabbath commandment was, "That I may prove them, whether they will walk in my law, or not" (Ex. 16:4).

The sanctity and the significance of the Sabbath was not revealed to any man until the law was given on Sinai, when it became the fourth commandment of the decalogue. "Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, .. and madest known unto them thy holy sabbath" (Neh. 9:13, 14). God had rested on the seventh day of creation week, and some time later (we know not when), he "blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made" (Gen. 2:3). The Sabbath is not a "memorial of creation,"; God created anything at any time, but because "he had rested" on that day.

The law given at Sinai revealed the sanctity of the Sabbath to the Israelites, and made known unto them its meaning as a memorial of their deliverance from Egypt. There they were told, "Thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and Jehovah thy God brought thee out thence by a mighty hand and by an outstretched arm: therefore Jehovah thy God commanded thee to keep the sabbath day" (Deut. 5:15). It could not be observed as a memorial of the deliverance of the Israelites from bondage until that event had occurred; therefore the covenant containing the Sabbath was not made with the fathers before the exodus from Egypt (see Deut. 5:2,3). The Sabbath was a "sign" between God and the Israelites (Ezk. 20:12), and nobody else, because they were the only people delivered from Egypt.


Work in the Sabbath was forbidden for both man and beast. "In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou" (Deut. 5:14).

They were forbidden to carry so much as an arm load through the gates of Jerusalem or out of their houses. "Take heed to yourselves and bear no burden on the Sabbath day, nor bring it in by the gates of Jerusalem; neither carry forth a burden out of your houses on the sabbath day, neither do ye any work" (Jer. 17:21, 22).

They could not kindle a fire on that day. "Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath day" (Ex. 35:3). It is well to observe just here that "the sabbath was made for man, and not man for the sabbath" (Mk. 2:27); therefore it was never made for men who live in the coldest climates. A commandment that forbids a man's kindling a fire in a cold climate could not be for man's good. That would make man the servant of the commandment rather than the commandment the servant of man. No fire was to be kindled "throughout your habitations"—the Israelites' habitations. They never lived in a real cold climate.

They were forbidden to buy or sell on the Sabbath. "And if the peoples of the land bring wares or any grain on the sabbath day to sell, that we would not buy of them on the sabbath" (Neh. 10:31).

3. Penalty for Violation

Death was the penalty for violating the Sabbath law. "Whosoever doeth any work on the sabbath day, he shall surely be put to death" (Ex. 31:15). "And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness they found a man gathering sticks upon the sabbath day .. And Jehovah said unto Moses, The man shall surely be put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him to death with stones; as Jehovah commanded Moses" (Num. 15:32-36).

No law can be of any force unless there be a penalty for violation of that law. To abolish the penalty for violation of a law is to abolish that law itself. If the Old Testament penalty—death—has been abolished for violating the fourth commandment of the decalogue, then that Old Testament commandment has been abolished. The New Testament fails to give any penalty for violating the Old Testament law; therefore we conclude that the law of Moses has been "blotted out," even as Paul said (Col. 2:14).

JESUS AND THE SABBATH

Jesus intended all the time to abolish the Sabbath law,. which he did in his death (Col. 2:14-16). Nine of the ten commandments were to be included in changed form in the New Covenant, but the Sabbath law was not to be included in any form; therefore Jesus must prepare his disciples for its removal. Then he can serve a two-fold purpose in proving himself to be Lord of the Sabbath: it will establish his divinity; it will prepare the disciples for the abolition of the Sabbath law. This aroused the hatred and bitter opposition of many of the Jews. Their hostility and their persecution of Jesus can be traced in all the first four books of the New Testament to his apparent disregard for the sanctity of the Sabbath law.
1. At the Pool of Bethesda.

On the Sabbath day at the Bethesda pool (Jno. 5:1-18), Jesus commanded an impotent man: "Arise, take up thy bed, and walk." It was unlawful for this man to carry his bed on the Sabbath day (Jer. 17:21), and the Jews told him so (Jno. 5:10). When they learned it was Jesus who had told the man to take up his bed and walk, they persecuted Jesus because he did these things on the Sabbath (Jno. 5:16).

On this occasion Jesus made no denial of a breach of the Sabbath law. He did not try to explain that the law provided for what he had done, for it did not. The law said "thou shalt not do any work;" Jesus answered his persecutors with a bold confession that he had worked (Jno. 5:17), and a public assertion of his equality with God (Jno. 5:18). This demonstration of his lordship over the Sabbath has an important bearing on the discourse of his claim of equality with God, which immediately followed (Jno. 5:19-47). Modern Sabbatarians do not understand the fifth chapter of John. Jesus later referred to the events of this chapter and gave circumcision precedence over the Sabbath law (Jno. 7:21-23).

2. In the Grainfields.

While passing through the grainfields on the Sabbath the disciples of Jesus plucked ears, and did eat, rubbing them in their hands (Lk. 6:1). Again the Pharisees charged them with violating the Sabbath law. Jesus justified what his disciples had done, not by denying that it was contrary to the Sabbath law, but by two illustrations: (1) David and his men entered the house of God and ate the showbread, which it was not lawful for them to eat, but only for the priests (Matt. 12:4). The need of David and his men was more important than the sacredness of the showbread, and this justified their unlawful procedure. Then the need of the disciples of Jesus who is Lord of the Sabbath (v. 8) is more important than the sacredness of the Sabbath, and this justified their unlawful procedure in gathering and rubbing out the grain.

(2) The priests profaned the Sabbath in performing their duties in the temple, and were guiltless, because the temple service was greater than the Sabbath (Matt. 12:5). Then the disciples of Jesus, who is Lord of the Sabbath and greater than the temple, can profane the Sabbath and remain guiltless (Matt. 12:6-8).

In the two illustrations of Matt. 12:1-8 Jesus teaches that human needs are superior to the sanctity of the Sabbath; that the burnt offerings of the temple service justify profaning the Sabbath; that he is greater than the temple, therefore greater than the Sabbath which is inferior, to the temple service and sacrifices.

3. The Woman Healed.

Because Jesus had healed on the Sabbath a woman who had been afflicted for eighteen years, a ruler of one of the synagogues was moved with indignation and ordered such work to cease on the Sabbath day (Lk. 13:10-17). In his reply Jesus told these opposing Jews that they themselves gave the thirst of an ox or an ass greater importance than they gave the sanctity of the Sabbath. Then he reasoned that surely the health of this woman was of greater importance than any Sabbath law.

We conclude from the teaching of Jesus concerning the Sabbath that it was never "the great" commandment of the law. Jesus taught that it was inferior to everything in the law of Moses with which he compared it: the hunger of men (Matt. 12:1-4), the law of mercy to 'an ox or an ass (Lk. 13:15), the law of circumcision (Jno. 7:21-23), the burnt offerings of the temple service (Matt. 12:5), the health of an afflicted woman (Lk. 13:16), and the recovery of a sick man (Jno. 5:2-18); all were more important than the sacredness of the Sabbath, and for them the Sabbath could be and was set aside. This proves that the Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath; that Jesus is Lord of the Sabbath, and therefore can remove it when the good of man requires; that being Lord of the Sabbath-Lord of a commandment of God-he is equal with God who gave the commandment, and therefore divine. It also prepares his disciples for the final abolition of the Sabbath law which was accomplished in his death on the cross (Col. 2:14-16).

THE END OF THE LAW

A new covenant was necessary because the old covenant was weak, faulty, against us, and contrary to us. The old covenant had to be removed before a new covenant could be given. Sabbatarians seem unwilling to accept the fact that the old covenant was weak and faulty, even though God himself did say so. "For there is a disannulling of a foregoing commandment because of its weakness and unprofitableness" (Heb. 7:18). "For if the first covenant had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for a second. For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, That I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah" (Heb. 8:7, 8).

To say that the law of Moses is faulty is no reflection on God. The trouble was with man, not God. God could have given man a perfect law at Sinai; but man was "not able to bear it." Jehovah gave man a weak law because of the weakness of the man to whom the law was given. Jesus said (Matt. 19:7, 8) that was the reason why the law of divorce and remarriage (Deut. 24:1-4) was included in the old covenant. For this same reason God said nothing in the ten commandments or the rest of the law of Moses to prohibit polygamy. Because of their faulty spiritual nature God gave the Israelites a law that tolerated polygamy (II Sam. 5:13; 12:8), until man could be made ready for a law that would not tolerate polygamy, nor divorce and remarriage for every cause. A born babe is given a very weak food, not because a stronger food cannot be supplied, but because the weakness of the child requires a weak food.

No law is perfect which permits polygamy, divorce and remarriage for every cause. These things were permitted under the old covenant. Therefore the old covenant was not perfect.

The Sabbath law was one of those "ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us: and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross... Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath day: which are a shadow of the things to come" (Col. 2:14-17). This is the only reference to the seventh day Sabbath, which was made by Paul in any of the books written by him. And here he listed it with the meats and drinks and feast days and new moons and the other shadows of the law.

But how could the Sabbath law be against us and contrary to us? Much in every way. First, it made no provision for the kind of work which Jesus did (Jno. 5:8, 16, 17; Matt. 12:1-8); if so, where? Second, because it made no provision for the operation of the law of mercy to man and beast (Lk. 13:10-17); if so, where? Third, because the people of the extreme northern regions would freeze to death, if they were bound by it (Ex. 35:3). Therefore when Jesus challenged the law of Moses in Matt. 5, he challenged the whole system, decalogue and all.
those ‘things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God’ (Col. 3:1). ‘Baptism thus stands between the Christian and the risen life with Christ.

Returning to the Roman letter, there is yet another reference to baptism in the sixth chapter, following closely upon the declaration that “we are buried with him by baptism.” It is verse 17: “But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness.” Obeyance to the form of doctrine stands between the sinner and freedom from sin. But baptism is the form of death, burial and resurrection, which Paul says is the doctrine delivered (1 Cor. 15:1-4). Being baptized then is obeying the form of the doctrine—and Paul says, being then made free from sin. When do you say? Paul says then, and then means when, and that means freedom from sin comes when one is baptized.

The One Baptism—Eph. 4:5

One frequently hears the expression “modes of baptism.” There is no such thing. As well talk about shades of white! White has no shades and baptism has no modes. Baptism, being a noun, stands for one thing: and baptize, being a verb of action, cannot denote several actions. Grammatically, it is impossible for the noun “baptism” and the verb “baptize” to denote several things and actions. But Paul settles the argument scripturally when he says: “One Lord, one faith, one baptism.” That cannot mean two in kind (Holy Spirit and water) nor three in form (sprinkling, pouring and immersion). As to the form there being but one, if sprinkling is baptism, pouring is not. If pouring is baptism sprinkling is not, and if either is baptism, immersion is not; and if immersion is baptism neither sprinkling nor pouring is. The process of elimination will decide the point, since all the world has admitted that immersion is baptism. Paul, knowing the how and the what of it all, said: “We are buried with him by baptism.”

It is often argued that these passages on baptism in the epistles refer to Holy Spirit baptism. This is done in an effort to escape the apostolic teaching on the design of baptism—that it puts one into Christ. If that be true, the antecedent admission is the elimination of water baptism, for Paul says there is one baptism (which cannot mean two) and if Holy Spirit baptism prevails, there is no such thing as water baptism, and all such has been but a wet, meaningless ceremony, without New Testament authority or sanction. But most of those who preach Holy Spirit baptism, practice water baptism also. We wonder why. When water baptism is established, Holy Spirit baptism is eliminated—Paul being the witness.

It should not require a tedious or devious argument to arrive at the right conclusion. If the Great Commission is now in force-water baptism is in force. Jesus commanded the apostles to teach and baptize men (Matt. 28:19). The apostles could not administer Holy Spirit baptism. Paul preached to the Corinthians and they were baptized (Acts 18:8). Paul baptized some of them, and other men baptized the others (1 Cor. 1:14-16). So the Corinthians were baptized by men: but men cannot baptize with the Holy Spirit: therefore, the baptism of Corinthians was not Holy Spirit baptism. Hence, when Paul said to the Corinthians, “For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, the Spirit was the agent and not the element. By one Spirit, by the authority of, as commanded by Christ in the Commission.”

To the Ephesians in chapter four, Paul said: “There is one baptism.” But in chapter five, he said: “Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word.” Surely, Paul would not tell the Ephesians that there is but one baptism in chapter four (if it refers to the Holy Spirit) and then enjoin water baptism in chapter five! The one baptism of chapter four, therefore, is the water baptism of chapter five. This baptism is said to be “by the word” in Eph. 5:25 and “by the Spirit” in 1 Cor. 12:13. The word is not the element of baptism. In Eph. 5 and the Spirit is not the element of baptism in Cor. 12. It is “by” the word and “by” the Spirit that men are baptized “with the washing of water.” This being the one baptism in Ephesians, it is the one baptism in all the books besides. Holy Spirit baptism was special, never general; its purpose was inspiration, never obedience. No man was ever commanded to be baptized with the Holy Spirit. But the Bible commands men to be baptized; and there is but on baptism: it follows, therefore, that Holy Spirit baptism does not prevail today.

Then, is the one baptism essential or nonessential? Read Ephesians 4:4-6 and pick out the non-essentials: “There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling on Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all.” Out of these seven things, is there but one non-essential? This ought to expose the weak and feeble claim of denominationalists that baptism is non-essential.

The Like Figure, Baptism 1 Peter 3:21

As Paul in 1 Corinthians 10 compared our baptism into Christ with Israel’s passing through the sea, so Peter compares our salvation by baptism with the deliverance of Noah’s family by water. He said: “Wherein (the ark) few, that is eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” Leaving out the parenthetical clause, the passage simply states that “baptism doth now also save us by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.” That should be plain enough.

First, it is argued that baptism is just a figure, because Peter said “the like figure...” But when Paul referred to Israel passing through the sea as a figure of our baptism into Christ, and the drinking of the rock in the wilderness as a type of Christ, “and the Rock was Christ”—does that make Christ figurative? The text says that “baptism doth now also save us by the resurrection of Christ.” The salvation is actual, and the resurrection of Christ is actual—why not baptism? The comparison is that God used water to deliver Noah and his family from the old world, its corruption, and environment; and God uses water, even baptism, to save us, to deliver us from sin. The figure is in the comparison—not in the thing done. The meaning of the passage must be evident—that as water delivered Noah, so baptism saves us—and any explanation that says baptism does not save is not an explanation, but a contradiction.

But we are told that Noah was saved by staying out of the water! Then, if that be the point of comparison, the antedeluvians were lost by getting into the water. That sinks the Baptist claim. Peter was wrong—for baptism damns, instead of saves, per the conclusion of the objector. Such objections serve only to reveal and to expose a class of arch-perverters of the word of God.