More than one person is astonished by the unshakeable hold which Catholicism seems to have over its devotees. While Protestant churches put forth desperate efforts to persuade a bare quorum of their members to attend on Sunday mornings, and churches of Christ are little better, Catholic churches are filled to capacity, not once, but three or four times each Sunday morning.

In perplexed bewilderment the non-Catholic beholds it and wonders. Don't Methodists and Baptists and Presbyterians love their organizations just as devotedly as Catholics love theirs? And aren't Christians as truly devoted to the church as Catholics are to their institution? Then why do Catholics attend so much better than others?

To answer that question fully would involve consideration of the whole doctrinal, educational, racial and governmental backgrounds of the respective groups. It would require a book, not an article. But there is one very potent reason for the Catholic influence, which many people may overlook. And that is that modern Catholicism is the embodiment of the last lingering remnants of one of the most gripping, fascinating speculations that ever plagued the Church—Gnosticism.

To some it may sound far-fetched to say that modern Catholicism is the rightful descendant of ancient Gnosticism: but consider this description of Gnosticism as given in Foakes-Jackson’s “History Of The Christian Church,” page 1291:

“Matter being evil, the body must be evil, and consequently the duty of the true Gnostic was to show himself hostile to it. Two courses lay open to him: either to conquer its desires by ascetic practices, or to adopt the alternative of showing that he considered the body to be so contemptible that he saw no harm in degrading it by indulging in every species of sin.

Catholicism” has traditionally taken both of these alternatives. Through all the middle ages the doctrine of asceticism was practiced. Monasteries dotted Europe like mesquite bushes on a Texas prairie. Fasts and self-flagellations were commended and extolled by all the Catholic teachers as being the essence of Christianity. Existing right down to our own day are such anachronisms as the Gethsemane Monastery at Bardstown, Kentucky, and countless other similar institutions throughout the world, in which devout Catholics think they can conquer evil by imposing hardships and privations on the physical body.

But what of the other alternative—the indulgence if every sort of sin and the gratification of all fleshly appetites and lusts? Surely, someone might say, Catholics do not adopt that sort of heresy!

We are prepared to say they do.

First of all, let us understand that this is not a conscious acceptance of Gnosticism on the part of the Catholic masses. If a devout Catholic should be told that his church not only allows, but actually encourages, him to indulge the lusts of the flesh, he would be appalled and incredulous. Even the priests, and very likely the pope himself, would not admit the presence of such a hellish heresy. That’s the insidious thing about it. It has become so deeply embedded into the very structure of Catholic thinking that Catholics, most of all, are wholly unconscious of it.

In every community, however, in which Catholicism is strong it tends to compromise the standards, of moral living. Wherever Catholicism has found some practice deeply rooted in the lives of the people, even though the practice was inherently wrong, the Catholic church has not tried to remove it, but has incorporated the practice into its own religious observances, and given it the “blessing” and “sanction” of the church. Christmas is an example in point. Originally a pagan festival celebrating the winter solstice and the turning of the sun, Catholicism took over the feast and made “Christmas” of it—retaining a considerable portion of the pagan trappings and ideas that had characterized the rites from dim ages of the unknown past. Being unable, or unwilling, to teach the truth to the pagan peoples who had been “converted” the Catholic church merely permitted them to retain their former practices under a new name. A similar disposal was made of numerous other troublesome doctrines, festivals, and practices of heathen people who had been won to Catholicism. They were allowed to continue their old practices, merely doing them now in the name of Catholicism.

Basically, it is the old, old story of “We abolish the wrong by legalizing the practice,” which we’ve seen worked out many times on secular questions. There was the liquor traffic, for example. The “wets” said that prohibition wouldn’t work, that people were going to drink anyhow, and the only way possible to avoid wholesale violation of the law would be to legalize the sale of liquor.

The same argument is made with reference to betting on horse-races. Men are going to bet regardless of what the law says, we are told. So the only way to avoid illegal practices is to legalize and regulate the betting.
A TIMELY RESCUE

This is a rescue that saved a life and saved a soul. A pagan was in the very act of bringing a gory end to his life on earth and pluming his soul into eternal anguish. He was the jailor in Philippi in whose prison Paul and Silas were in stocks. An earthquake had shaken the foundations of the prison, the doors were jarred upon and all the prisoners were free. Awakened by the shock and overwhelmed by the sudden disgrace that faced him, the jailor was about to end it all in bloody suicide and was dramatically restrained by Paul's timely intervention. The heathen wretch was wracked with fear and prostrated himself before his two saintly charges and said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" They had saved a life and the opportunity demanded the saving of a soul.

"And they said, Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved, thou and thy house." He had been snatched as a brand from the burning, and the bright star of hope suddenly gleamed where there had before been unrelied darkness. The contrast between the jailor a suicide and his house in tears and disgrace, and all of them together rejoicing in Christ is one that excites. This rescue was timely and fertile. The situation guaranteed that the jailor would do all that he was told to do. It was no time to higgle about trifles or argue over technicalities. Everything mentioned in this connection must be considered important.

It is clear that Jesus Christ is the Saviour and faith in him, is indispensable. "Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved." "But thanks be to God, who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." (I Cor. 15:57) "He became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation." (Heb. 5:9) "Wherefore also he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them." (Heb. 7:25) "Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new. But all things are of God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ, and gave unto us the ministry of reconciliation: to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses, and having committed unto us the word of reconciliation." (2 Cor. 5:17-19).

The jailor was an alien and the need was for him to be reconciled to God through Jesus Christ. Paul was a minister of reconciliation whose duty it was to work on the jailor with the "word of reconciliation." He and his fellow minister Silas immediately proceeded to take care of the matter. "And they spoke the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house." (Acts 16:32) "Verse 32? did you say? Some people would never know from some preaching that there is a verse 32, 33, and 34 in Acts sixteen. The faith only doctrine of justification receives support from the impression that "Believe on the Lord Jesus" is all that the jailor was told to do and that it is all that he did. It is further assumed, and violently so, that faith in the heart is accompanied by no physical act of obedience whatsoever, accomplished his salvation. Who teaches such a doctrine Baptists, Methodists, Presbyterians and a multitude of smaller sects in this country and throughout the world. It goes along with the doctrine of hereditary total depravity and the direct operation of the Holy Spirit in conversion.

This jailor was not totally depraved either at or subsequent to his birth and there is no evidence whatever that he received a direct operation of the Holy Spirit. The word of reconciliation," the gospel, "the word of the Lord" which Paul and Silas "spake unto him" was the power that generated faith in his heart. "How shall they believe, in whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher?" (Romans 10:14) The preachers on this occasion did their work well, even if some preachers in later centuries have made a sorry mess of things in their sectarian abuse of the record. The jailor could not have intelligently believed on the Lord Jesus had not the preach ers followed up their exhortation for him to do so by speaking the word of the Lord unto him so that he could do so. The jailor was told to do something. He did what he was told to do. What did he do? Let it be observed that the act of believing is an act of the creature, something that he does. Let it also be understood that there is no more saving merit in this act of man than in any other act he may perform. The merit is in the Lord Jesus and pardoning power belongs to God. Man can do nothing to deserve it. Pardon is an extension of divine grace, regardless of the conditions man is required to comply with in order to obtain it.

What did this jailor do? He believed. The record says as much. The same record also says this: "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes: and was baptized, he and all his, immediately." (Verse 33) We are gravely told that the jailor was baptized in the house and that "therefore" baptism in this case could not have been immersion. Many people have been immersed in houses, but this man was not. After his baptism, he "brought them up into his house." (Verse 34) So, if baptism was performed by sprinkling or pouring, why did they have been done something the same thing? "What did you see about a simple act requiring so meagre an amount of water? And, further, if baptism was considered the non-essential that many regard it to be today, was why it was attended to "immediately" at such an inconvenient hour the same hour of the night, and that hour closer to midnight than dawn? If I clung to as many errors on this question as some preachers do, I think I would either give them up, or stop at verse thirty-one also. It would be interesting to see a Baptist try to establish a vote of the church on this case. The jailor believed. The jailor was baptized. Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16:16) The jailor was reconciled to God by reconciliation of Christ. It involved the addition of a new creature. "Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature." We are baptized into Christ and into his death. (Rom. 6:3).

Among the abuses this clear bit of narrative has been subjected to is the effort to support the practice of infant rantsim by it. The jailor "was baptized, he and all his." "All his," of course must mean the babies too! The little darlings were all waked up in the middle of the night to hear Paul preach and get baptized! There must have been a bunch of them, possibly at least two sets of twins. They must have greatly enjoyed the preaching for it is said that "they spake the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house." Paul surely preached to them for it is said that they all believed, and also "rejoiced greatly."
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These were precocious infants, considering their heathen ancestry and lack of opportunities otherwise. If I ever find a baby who will get up in the middle of the night to hear me preach, believe what I tell him and do some rejoicing, I think I'll go ahead and baptize him. Since some gentlemen of the cloth are such monumental guessers, they cannot quarrel with me if I risk some mild speculations as a sort of diversion. If the jailor had any little babies, they must have all been sound asleep, or else at that time of night they would have been howling their little heads off so that their Papa and Mama could not have even listened to Paul. If they were present and quiet Paul was not talking to them. I often preach when there are babies in the audience, but I do not preach to them and they often interfere with my preaching to anybody else. Sometimes a blessed mother will sit like an idiot and let the howling little sinner on her lap ruin a whole service. Then it doesn't do anybody much any good, and surely not the baby. No, Paul did not preach to babies, and the ones he preached to were the ones who believed and were baptized. Babies do not need any preaching with all their needing and there is no scriptural reason on earth for baptizing them. Paul didn't.

The case of the jailor not only lends no support to the doctrine of justification by faith only, when fairly examined, but utterly discredits that doctrine. "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The jailor did both. And he did so because Paul told him to.-C. E. W.

A FORMAL DEDICATION

The general run of religious people of our time and country go in strong for dedications. They formally dedicate everything from babies to pipe-organs and apparently get as much thrill out of it as a pretty lass gets out of a new Easter outfit. I clipped the following from a San Angelo paper:

"Crane, March 28, (SC)—The Rev. J. D. Mahaffey, Ada, Okla, will begin a revival meeting at the Assembly of God Church Sunday night. The new church of the Assembly of God will be formally opened Sunday at 2 P. M. with the Crane Ministers Alliance in charge. The welcome address will be given by W. V. Stell, mayor, the Rev. R. V. Wood will extend greetings from the Church of Christ, and music by the First Baptist Choir. Greetings from the Baptist Church will be by the Rev. M. M. Griggs and choir. The welcome address in charge. The welcome address will be by the Rev. M. M. Griggs and Choir. Greetings from the Church of Christ will be by the Rev. Philip Brown, and music and greetings from the Methodist Church will be given by the Rev. J. D. Mahaffey, Ada, and the Rev. L. L. Martin will bring the address for the school."

Now this "Assembly of God Church," a title unnecessarily verbose, has as much right to exist and go into the dedication business as any other modern religious setup. It is ultimately verbose, has as much right to exist and go into the dedication business as any other modern religious setup. We view the matter it is unscriptural in origin and heretical in doctrine and practice. I take it that even the Baptist Church in Crane would say as much. If the pastor of the Baptist church in Crane is willing to affirm that the "Assembly of God Church" there is scriptural in origin and sound in doctrine, he should quit the Baptists and join them. As for "the Rev. R. V. Wood" he does not claim to be "the Rev." and he did not "extend greetings from the church of Christ" in Crane or anywhere else. I happened to be in Crane in a meeting at the time and know that Brother Wood was not there when that particular church was "dedicated." Further, he did not agree to do what the program announced that he would do. He does not even hold membership in "The Crane Ministers Alliance" which was "in charge." Putting his name on such a program may be taken as a gesture of good will and friendship, and entertaining the "broad" views that are current these days, they may be at a loss to understand why we feel compelled to de-line such honors. We like people and like to be liked as much as anybody. I even enjoy being bragged on betimes and might even dish out some of it judiciously as bait. But when it comes to passing out greetings and pronouncing blessings on a religious movement which we consider sub-versive of gospel principles, there is just not enough rubber in our conscience to stretch that far. There are no doubt many excellent people in that church, as in all churches and no churches, as people are generally judged. We would not be personally rude or unkind to any of them and court their friendship and goodwill. We want them to come and hear us preach and go away feeling that they have been benefitted. We cannot, however, compromise our convictions, nor would we ask them to do so. Sectarian churches and sectarian doctrines are wrong. Loyalty to the word of God comes first. To surrender it is too high a price to pay for either fellowship or fellowship. We cannot pay the price. In view of what I know about denominations and preachers generally, I feel certain that behind all the back-slapping and greetings in a formal dedication like the one described above, some serious and disquieting reservations went unexpressed. I suspect that the preachers did not say all that they thought. I know those Baptist preachers didn't. There is too much politics and not enough religion in an affair like that to appeal to a man who gets what I do out of the New Testament.-C. E. W.

A STATEMENT TO MY FRIENDS

W. CURTIS PORTER

Inasmuch as the impression has spread across a large portion of the United States that I am a victim of tuberculosis, I wish to correct that impression. It has been determined by tuberculosis experts that I do not have tuberculosis. But many friends in many places are concerned and interested in knowing of my real condition. I therefore make at this time the announcement that it has been definitely decided that I am a victim of polycythemia. After this diagnosis had been made by my Tulsa physician I went to the Scott-White Hospital at Temple, Texas, for a complete clinic examination. In case you do not know, the Scott-White Hospital means the same to the south that Mayo, Brothers means to the north and east. When they had made many tests and examinations they confirmed the diagnosis of my home physician.

Polycythemia is a rare blood condition so rare, in fact, that of those who pass through clinics and hospitals, there is found one case in seventy thousand. There are probably less than thirty cases of it in the United States. The cause of it is unknown to medical science, and there is no cure known for it. Furthermore, it is ultimately fatal. Life-expectancy is but a few years at most. My red blood count is abnormally high, and the volume of blood in my body is twice that of a normal man. At the present time I am giving away a pint of blood each week to reduce the volume. I shall probably have to be less active during the remainder of my years if years it proves to be than. I hope the Lord will enable me to enjoy that time and do all the good possible for the cause of Christ; and if I can stretch my life into twenty years, I am determined to do it.

As the Bible tells us that "the effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much," I want the prayers of the brotherhood that the treatment which I shall use will be effective enough to prolong my life beyond that which medical science now promises me.
CRACKING LITTLE BAPTISTS
NUTS
W. CURTIS PORTER

Elder W. H. Little of Jacksonville, Texas, presents in the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, March 10, 1942, fourteen “Baptists Nuts For Campbellites To Crack.” He says he has presented twelve of these “nuts” to “three able Campbellite preachers” and “one promised he would gladly crack them, but Elder Little has waited for three months and no reply has come, and he is wondering why. Well, I and sure I am unable to tell him why. It may be that he has all Campbellite preachers’ scared, or it may be that the Campbellite nut cracker is as faulty as the Baptist nuts. And it may be that there are no such things as ‘Campbellite preachers.” At least, I have never seen or heard any. So fearing that no such preachers exist to crack these “Baptist nuts,” I have decided to use the gospel nut cracker on them and let Elder Little and his people see what is on the inside. Since these “Baptist Nuts” were gathered and shipped to the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight by Elder W. H. Little, I think I have appropriately called them “Little Baptist Nuts.” And there is another reason why, the adjective “little” should be used to describe them. That reason will become apparent as we proceed. So let us give them a little rap with the gospel hammer. God said: “Is not my word like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?” Jer. 23:29. As the word of God, like a hammer, can break the rock in pieces, I have an idea that it can also crack a few Baptist nuts. And now the nut-cracking starts. We will start with number one.

“1. Where and by whom was the gospel first preached? Mat. 3:1, 2; Mark 1:1-4; Luke 16:16.”

From the outward appearance of this nut it is evident that Elder Little thinks the kernel is this: “John the Baptist first preached the gospel.” This is shown to be his idea by the application he makes of the references given. Mat. 3:1, 2 tells that John preached in the wilderness of Judea; Luke 16:16 says the kingdom of God was preached since the days of John; and Mark 1:1 speaks of “the beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ.” But do these indicate that John was the first to preach the gospel? Paul says in Gal. 3:8: “And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham.” Abraham lived a long time before the days of John the Baptist, but the gospel was preached to Abraham. Furthermore, referring to Israel on their way to Canaan, Paul says the gospel was preached to them. “For unto us was the gospel preached, as well as unto them.” Heb. 4:2. So here again the gospel was preached before the days of John. This cracks the nut, for according to Little, John must be the first to preach the gospel; otherwise, the whole system falls. But what is meant by Mark’s statement concerning the beginning of the gospel?” Mark 1:1: It was simply the gospel in preparation. The next verse shows this clearly. It was preached in promise in the days of Abraham. And it was preached in fact on the day of Pentecost in Acts 2. John never did preach it that way. But we are ready now for the second nut, which is very much like the first one.

“2. If by Peter on Pentecost, as all Campbellites teach, tell us when and how Peter came into possession of ‘re- mission of sins’ or salvation. Was Peter saved by hearing himself preach? And did he baptize himself and thus give himself the new birth?”

Just suppose the’ Campbellites, whoever they are, should admit that Peter baptized himself, that would be no worse than the fellow did who started the Baptist Church. The first Baptist Church of which we have any record was begun in 1607 by John Smyth. Benedect’s History of Baptists, p. 304. And this Mr. Smith baptized himself by pouring Vedder’s History of Baptists, p. 137. So the hull off this nut flies up and hits Elder Little in the eye. And as to when and how Peter obtained remission of sins, it is evident that he did not get it before he was baptized, for he evidently was baptized by John (Acts 1:21, 22), and John baptized “for the remission of sins.” Mark 1:4. So if Little got remission of his sins before he was baptized, he didn’t get it the way Peter got his.

“3. What use or purpose did our Lord have for John’s baptized disciples or converts? Luke, chapter 1.”

This nut is easily cracked. According to Luke 1:17, John’s work was to “make ready a people prepared for the Lord.” And one thing he did in getting them ready and prepared for the Lord was to baptize them “for the remission of sins.” Mark 1:4. And Jesus took some of these very ones and gave them the great commission that sent them into all the world, not to preach John’s baptism, but to “baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Acts 2:38. John’s baptism was not “in the name of Christ.” Acts 19:1-5. So he had another use for them than to preach the bapism of John.

“4. Was any one baptized in water between the cross and Pentecost?”

Yes, five thousand men, besides a multitude of women, were baptized between the cross and Pentecost by the pastor of the Baptist Church in Jerusalem. You will find the record of this in the next verse after the one that mentions the Baptist Church in Jerusalem. If you don’t know where to find that, write to Elder Little for the information. My! My! This nut didn’t even have a shell on it, and the kernel was rotten.

“5. It is admitted by Campbellites that the church at Jerusalem was composed of John’s baptized disciples or converts, and to deny it, to deny the Bible, and that the inspired apostles lived and died with John’s baptism and no other, and that our Savior had John’s baptism and still has it and will come back to earth with it and no other. How can the Baptist Church in Jerusalem, composed of one hundred twenty disciples at Pentecost, have added to the church a few Baptist Nuts?”

I don’t know what Campbellites will admit. They can speak for themselves. But I do not admit the “church at Jerusalem was composed of John’s baptized disciples.” A few of them had been baptized by John, but three thousand and right there on the day of Pentecost were “baptized in the name of Jesus Christ.” Acts 2:38, 41. John never did baptize anyone “in the name of Christ” as is clearly shown in Acts 19:1-5 when some who had only the baptism of John had to be “baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.” V. 5. Remission of sins, for which baptism was performed, was first preached “in the name of Christ” at Jerusalem, not in the wilderness of Judea. Read Luke 24:46, 47 and Acts 2:38. And while the apostles lived and died with John’s baptism (at least some of them did), because they were, baptized while John’s baptism was in force, yet they, through out all their ministry under the great commission, taught their hearers to “be baptized in the name of Christ.” Acts 2:38; 8:16, 10:48; 19:5. That smashes this nut into tiny fragments. So the idea that the eight thousand had John’s baptism is not a “plain fact” and does need to be “evaded.”

“6. Since the church at Jerusalem had John’s baptism and the churches of our day, known as the Church of Christ, do not and will not have John’s baptism, how dare any Campbellite to claim their church or churches to be a sister church to the one at Jerusalem.”
The conclusion reached in this "nut" is derived from a false premise in the preceding one, for only a small part of the Jerusalem church was baptized by John. But in order for Elder Little to have a shell for this nut, we will just grant that he states it correctly. Then we will just turn the nut over and let it crack under its own weight, after this fashion: "Since the church at Jerusalem had John's baptism which was 'for the remission of sins,' and the churches of our day, known as Baptist Churches do not and will not baptize 'for the remission of sins,' how dare any Baptist to claim their church to be a sister to the one at Jerusalem?" Selah!

"7. We learn from Mark 14:6-9 and Mat. 24:14 that John's gospel and baptism were to continue to the end of the world, and we learn from Paul, Rom. 1:16, that he preached the same gospel that John preached, thirty years after John had preached it and twenty-seven years after Pentecost. John's gospel was prospective, pointing to the cross; Paul's gospel and ours of today is retrospective, pointing back to the cross."

It is strange how Baptist preachers can learn from certain text things that are not even mentioned or hinted at in the texts. Mark 14:6-9 and Mat. 24:14 say nothing about "John's baptism and gospel." Yet from these passages Elder Little learned that John's gospel and baptism would continue to the end of the world. What a vivid imagination he has! Neither does Rom. 1:16 say a word about Paul preaching the same gospel John preached. But Elder Little learned it from this text. This nut is so little that it seems strange that any Baptist preacher would ask any body to crack it. But the fact is that Elder Little cracked it himself before he turned it loose. Note his language: "John's gospel was prospective, pointing to the cross: Paul's gospel and ours of today is retrospective, pointing back to the cross." Well, then, they are not the same, unless prospective and retrospective mean the same. "Pointing forward" and "pointing backward" must mean the same if John and Paul preached the same gospel, even according to this little Baptist preacher. So he handed this nut to us with the shell already cracked and the kernel ruined. If the apostles preached the same baptism John preached, why did Peter refer to the word which began in Galilee "after the baptism which John preached" (Acts 10:37)? Why did he not say: "After the baptism which we all preach?" The language shows conclusively that the apostles did not preach the baptism which John preached.

8. Will some wise Campbellite please tell us how they learned that the gospel and baptism that John preached and administered ended at the cross?"

I don't know just how the Campbellites learned that, but I imagine they learned it, at least in part, by the fact that the only recorded case of John's baptism being administered after the cross was nullified by the apostle Paul when he re-baptized the twelve men at Ephesus. Acts 19:1-5. I have an idea that Paul knew pretty well what to do in the case, and if John's baptism had still been valid, he would have accepted it at Ephesus. Paul's action on that occasion fully shatters this "little Baptist nut,"

9. I have been convinced for most forty years that no Campbellite on earth believes that the books of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John were a part of God's inspired word, so now I have it by seemingly good authority that one of their leading preachers said, "It made no difference what Mark 1:1 said, because Mark was not inspired anyway." All can see that the so-called 'Church of Christ' folk are a fine set of gospel preachers. If the true gospel of the Son of God could be personified and they were to meet it in the road, they would not know what it was."

This doesn't even seem to be a nut; perhaps it started out to be a nut, but it failed to mature. It doesn't even need to be cracked. But it matters not to me how many "leading preachers and debaters" of the Campbellites say that Mark was not inspired, nor on how "seemingly good authority" Elder Little received the information. They would be just as far wrong as a bunch of Baptist preachers who have been saying that Mark 16:16 is not inspired. Elder Little, do you know of any Baptist preachers who say this? Church of Christ preachers may not be such a "fine set of gospel preachers," but I guarantee if they were to meet in the road a "personified gospel" which was carrying a Baptist Church under one arm, they would know that it was not the gospel of the Son of God, for a Baptist Church is nowhere mentioned in all that gospel. That is more than any Baptist preacher I have heard of would know.

10. How can you claim to have obeyed your Lord in baptism, at the same time denying the baptism that your Lord has?"

I think a man could reasonably claim he had "obeyed his Lord in baptism" if he had obeyed the baptism his Lord commanded. Well, my Lord, through his apostles, commanded me to "be baptized for the remission of sins." Acts 2:38. That is the way I was baptized. But Elder Little was not baptized according to that commandment. Can a man "obey the Lord" without "obeying his commandment?" John also baptized "for the remissions of sins" (Mark 1:4), but my Lord had no sins to remit; so his was an exception to the usual practice of John. Mat. 3:15, 16. But Baptists baptize "because of the remission of sins." Christ was not baptized that way; neither did he ever command any one else to be. So I ask Elder Little: How can you claim to obey your Lord in baptism when you have not received the baptism your Lord received, and neither have you obeyed the Lord's commandment to be baptized "for the remission of sins?"

11. If Christ and the apostles were here today, what church could they affiliate with? their Baptist baptism?"

I am certain Christ would not affiliate with a church which he did not establish, of which he is not the head, and concerning which he said not a word of indorsement in the New Testament. So he could not affiliate with the Baptist Church. Furthermore, the Baptist Church would not allow the apostles to affiliate with them, for every one of the apostles were baptized "for the remission of sins." Elder Little and his brethren would require them to give an experience of grace, be voted on by the church, and then be baptized "because of the remission of sins," for it is a fact that not one of the apostles ever had what my friend calls "Baptist baptism." They would be perfectly welcome to affiliate with the brethren where I preach, for they were all (except Paul) baptized by John who made the Twelve as a prepared people. But neither Elder Little nor any of his brethren were ever baptized by John. We could not accept them; they will have to do what Paul required the twelve men at Ephesus to do.

12. Would it not be a little embarrassing to you so-called 'Church of Christ' folk to reject membership to the God of heaven and the inspired apostles or else have them to submit to baptism at your hands?"

It would be "a little embarrassing" to me, even if I were a member of a Baptist Church, to talk about "the God of heaven" having membership in any church, much less one his word knows nothing about. Christ is the head of the church (Col. 1:1) Christians are members of it (1 Cor. 12:27), and God sets the members in the church (1 Cor. 12:18). But God is not a member of it. I think Elder Little ought to be a "little" embarrassed for sending in such a nut to be cracked. But the God of heaven cannot obtain membership in the Baptist Church without being (Turn to Page 8)
WE STAND WHERE THEY STOOD

JOE W. CRUMLEY

Cold, hard, and glaring is the historical, journalistic and Biblical testimony, attesting first; the furtherance of general apostasy, and second, the unmistakable, conscious, avoidable and inexcusable inconsistency characteristic of the Christian Church of the past thirty years. Of this the youth of the body is not fully cognizant; but the aged among them, for the most part hark back to the previous and more healthful, days when gospel, not current events were the sermons, when congregational singing rather than cantatas were in vogue, and when men were the overseers and not figureheads guided as puppets by the wealthy, political, or personally ambitious women.

E. B. Barnes in the January issue of the Christian Standard, 1910, gives under the caption of “The Weakness of Union Evangelism,” a scathing, yet scholarly denunciation of union meetings. Expressive of the “Standard’s sentiment of 1910, it is diametrically opposed to the policy of that same paper today.

Here is where the digressives then stood.

“In every union meeting there are two serious defects which are without justification, and at the same time, they are essential to a union meeting. The first is the preaching of a partial gospel. When, as Barnes’ conscience considered? He was offended when truth was smothered and theory made the paramount issue. If whether or not people become offended is to govern the course of present-day efforts at “unity,” why aren’t our ‘feelings given at least some consideration?—If we could employ “one twentieth of the time” devoted to social mush, back slapping, and flowered compliments, in exposition of Eph. 5: 19 and Col. 3: 16, such meetings might accomplish some good. But these scriptures are relegated as though they are part of Christianity or Unity. Such attitude was met with stern opposition by the Christian Church in 1910. Hear Barnes: “There is little difference between the higher critic who reduces the Garden of Eden to an allegory, and the critic who reduces any important command of scripture to ‘unity.’ ”

Do they insist that they believe Col. 3: 16 and Eph. 5: 19 are “important scripture commands?” Then as such they are important to “unity,” and should be freely discussed in the meetings for that purpose. Will they say that discussions on such scriptures are detrimental to their purpose in the meetings? Then we insist that if scripture, “handled aright” is detrimental to our purposes and endeavors, our purposes and endeavors are unscriptural.

With reference to “union” or “unity” ‘meetings, we, as Barnes, ‘feel that if some vital matters were emphasized more, and some fine speculation held in reserve, the meetings would have been (and will be) more profitable.” But it is self evident that the silence of vital matters is in keeping with denominationalism. A good example of this is seen in Horse Cave, Kentucky.

The “Christian Standard” in 1910 severely condemned “Union Meetings” principally on the ground that it necessitated an “expurgated gospel” and “the church being ignored.” They withstood sectarianism with holy vigor, and exhibited indignation at the suggestion of restricted speech in such meetings. But they fell into sectarian conformity as Eve into her disobedience. Now they would give to us, as Eve to Adam, the fruit which they eat, but by themselves once forbidden. “But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so our minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ.” 2 Cor. 11: 3. They want us to eat what they refused, in disgust, in 1910. We are not so gullible as were they, neither do we “trim our ways to seek love” of denominationalism. We now stand where Christian Church preachers admitted they should stand, according to Barnes, in the Christian Standard.

Hear him again: “A union meeting sounds good to the ears of our people. It promises great things. but when every such meeting closes, every disciple confesses to a sense of disappointment” So with the “Witty-Murch” Trojan Horse. The sound of clashing armor within the beast will be bound for disappointment. Witty-Murch and cohorts regret the unfortunate and unexpected clashing of that armor and are aware that failure rather than success will be the end of their schemes. Their victim has been forewarned. The “straws in the wind” article evidences forcibly their recognition of this fact. It reminds one of the colored boy whistling his way past the grave yard to keep up his courage.

(Joe Crumley is one of the many capable young preachers of this decade, the son of the late and loved J. W. Crumley of Oklahoma, than whom there was no stronger defender of the faith. It will surprise Murch and Witty to learn just how many such strong young men there are in the church who are unmoved by their propaganda and who regard Murch’s “straws” as utterly ridiculous. —Editor).
ANENT MINISTERS' ALLIANCES
Dear Mr. Cate:

Your card of March 14 and letter of April 3 addressed to me as “Rev.” Jimmie Bays has been received and I feel that I would be unknow if I did not answer, giving you a reason for my not being able to accept membership in above mentioned association.

1st. You will agree that we have nothing in common in religion and our teaching is as far apart as the poles.

2nd. If a gospel preacher states that each is God’s power to save. Rom. 1:16. I plead with sinners to mostly from elsewhere. I find the people willing to take the lead. We are fortunate in that in some towns your members have been advised by your “pastors” to stay away from the Church of Christ.

3rd. You will not affirm even what you do teach; and pray and work to cause division despite the fact that my Lord prayed that believers in Him might be One. John 17. It seems that all of you are seeking sectarian distinction instead of gospel unity.

 Yours truly, meetings are always held in opposition to the meetings of the Church of Christ, and I am aware that in some towns your members have been advised by your “pastors” to stay away from the Church of Christ.

If you can “cooperate” and ask God to bless fellow denominational “pastors” in their sectarian work and worship, why not help them do so sectarian work? Is it right to ask God to bless and help a denominational preacher in his baby-sprinkling program, “confirmation service,” “close communion,” etc., unless you are willing to help do it too? Show your faith by working with the baby at the next sprinkling, service in your community while your fellow preacher administers the water. “He that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.” 2 John 11. In the fellowship of the Ministerial Association I would have to participate in the above mentioned work. Eph. 5:11 says to “Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of fellowshipship the program of denominational names and organizations; the program of Catholic trans-substantiation, of Lutheran consubstantiation, of Baptist “close communion,” the program of Baptist doctrine of “once in grace, always in grace;” the program of Methodist sprinkling, of “faith only” in nearly all denominations, and of “direct operation of the Spirit” among “Holiness” people; the program of inheritance to Jacob, or Calvinism, of salvation before baptism taught by most all denominations; the program of “modernism” of Congregationalism, of “getting religion and joining the church of your choice,” and of nominal “unionism;” the program of one church being just as good as another’ of being saved out of the church.

Would it not require quite a stretch of imagination to fancy the Apostles matching strides in a parade with the Scribes and Pharisees (false teachers)? Indeed it would. It is my desire that you read this at the next meeting of the association, but I really do not expect you to.

Most Sincerely, Jimmy Bays.

NORTHERN ARIZONA

On October 17th I came to the Verde Valley of Northern Arizona, to work with the few Christians living in this district. About twenty members have been meeting for sometime in the American Legion Hall in Cottonwood. Cottonwood is one of tri-cities. Jerome and Clarkdale being the other two. Jerome is the home of Phelps-Dodge Copper mine, Clarkdale, located at the foot of the mountain, two thousand feet below, is the location of the smelter. Cottonwood is where the people do most of their trading, and is the best location of the three for a church building. Since my arrival, we have had almost 100 per cent attendance at the morning services and about forty at the evening services. The radio station is located in Jerome; and so far as I know it is the only radio station in the northern half of this state. I am sure there is not another gospel preacher on the air in all the country from Phoenix to Salt Lake City. Only one other preacher in the northern two thirds of the state Mack Kercheville, at Winslow, and he is doing a splendid work there. Within reach of our broadcast there are at least three towns of perhaps five thousand population each, that would be fine. Places for preachers to do some good work. Prescott, the county seat of the county in which I live, Yavapai county, has wonderful opportunities, and there are already about twenty members there. Some of them are meeting in homes, but the outlook is not very bright for them unless some one comes to their aid to preach the gospel, and work with them. They come over to Cottonwood occasionally for the Sunday night services (32 miles) and have asked me to preach some for them. I intend to do that as soon as I can, but feel that most of my time should be spent here until things are on better footing. Flagstaff, and Williams also offer similar opportunities. They are both good towns and both have a few members meeting in homes. At least Flagstaff has, I am not sure about Williams.

Of course the brethren are not financially strong enough in any of these places to assume the responsibility of paying a preacher enough to live on. He would have to be supported mostly from elsewhere. I find the people willing to do what they can here in the Verde Valley, and I'm confident that sentiment prevails generally, among those who are meeting for worship. As usual, there are sdme in all these places that have quit trying. They were "go-getters" back home; but when they came west and found the sledge rough, no nice building already paid for and the work already being carried on by an efficient leadership, they thought it a fine chance to "retire" from service and rest on their laurels (?) and so did. We have some good talent here. Brother Curtis, a school teacher in Clarkdale, is a song leader, and several of the men can be depended upon to take the lead. We are fortunate in that respect. They have assumed all local expenses, such as rent on the hall, radio programs (two each week) and advertising. Since I came we have purchased two lots near a fine location, and they have raised enough money, that by the time the deed is ready, we will be able to pay cash for the lots. My support is coming from churches in Texas. We are aware that this is not the only field that needs new light, and there are already about twenty members meeting in homes. At least Flagstaff has, I am not sure about Williams.

Most Sincerely, Jimmy Bays.

Luther Blackmon
Box 781, Jerome, Arizona.
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What these men have ‘done with public law and practice, the Catholic church has done with religious law and practice. She has discovered the things the people like to do, and has them incorporated them into her church life, and given them the “blessings” of the church.

A few illustrations might demonstrate the justice of this charge. For one thing, dancing has been practiced in the Catholic church for many years. Catholic leaders saw that many people, liked to dance; churches generally would not permit members to dance and remain in good standing; so the Catholic church began to sponsor dances in its own halls and buildings. For another, there is card-playing. Long before respectable people would permit a deck of playing cards in the house, the Catholic church had been sanctioning card parties in the church.

Gambling could also be mentioned. Many people have a weakness along this line. But they know it is frowned on by most of those who profess Christianity. So what happens? Why the Catholic church gives “Bingo” parties, offering prizes as rewards, and sells tickets to raffles at which everything from pocket knives to automobiles are awarded. It permits members to dance and remain in good standing; not get uneasy, though, for he will never seek membership in it.

There is also the matter of drinking. The practice may not be general, but in these sections, Catholic churches have been known to raise no small amount of money by selling beer at their church parties. Believing that people are going to drink beer, regardless, the Catholic church has decided the best policy is to give the “sanction” of the church to such a practice.

Although there may be no way of proving it, it stands to reason that the same attitude likely prevails in Catholicism as regards the moral question of relations between the sexes. Since fornication is a popular diversion, is it not reasonable to assume that it is much more prevalent among those people who teach that it can be forgiven most easily—by a confession to the priest and the performance of whatever “penance” he may impose?

In short, and to sum up the matter, Catholicism has let the people indulge in almost any sort of life they cared to follow, only provided that they “remain loyal to the church.” She has satisfied the innate hunger of the average man for a religious sanction to his life; and she has given this sanction without demanding a corresponding moral character. And in doing this she has fallen under the curse and condemnation pronounced against an earlier generation of Gnostics, “turning the grace of our God into licentiousness, and denying our only Master and Lord, Jesus Christ.” (Jude 4)

Here, in part at least, we have the explanation for her hold upon the masses. She gives them that for which they hunger—the comfort, security, and hope of heaven provided by religion-without demanding that they give up any of the worldly and sinful practices to which they are addicted. She allows them to “eat their cake, and have it, too.

In every church there are some people who are very pious and devout. In every church there is also another group of people who belong to the church only as a sort of “insurance against hell.” The Catholic church is such that the premium on its “insurance policy” is the most attractive in all the earth for the person to whom religion is only a means of escaping hell. It requires of the member that he attend mass every Sunday, but does not require of him that he do much by way of moral character and clean living. The Protestant churches so Ear have not been able to compete with this sort of an offer. There are signs that they are beginning to do so. If the Protestant churches, and the church of Christ can ever lower their standards to the same level as the Catholic church, undoubtedly they will be able to offer some competition in the matter of attendance. But until they do, they may expect to continue discouragingly unfilled. “Wide is the gate, and broad is the way that leadeth to destruction, and many are ‘they that enter in thereby.”

LITTLE BAPTIST NUTS
(From Page 5)

baptized by a regularly ordained Baptist preacher. Do not get uneasy, though, for he will never seek membership in it.

“13. If all saved people are in what you call ‘The Church of Christ’ as you teach, how do you harmonize Rev. 7:9, where John said he saw a great multitude of blood washed saints which no man could number. Is it possible that no man can number the membership of the so-called ‘Church of Christ’?

“Is it possible” that my friend thinks the membership of the Church of Christ is no larger than its living membership? The Church of Christ has existed for more than 1900 years, and membership through all the centuries would make a vast throng. Besides all these, the righteous people of past ages were redeemed by the blood of the lamb too. Heb. 9:15. So an innumerable multitude can be there without including any of the present denominations in the religious world.

“14. Do you not think and will you not admit that a little common sense thinking, coupled with a right division of the word of truth on the part of your preachers would be a great asset to your people?”

Yes, I think that a “little common sense thinking” and a “right division of the word” on the part of anybody’s preachers would be a great asset. But no amount of common sense thinking and right division of the word will ever make the Bible say: “The Baptist churches salute you.” Rom. 16:16.

I am glad for the privilege of cracking these “little Baptist nuts” for my friend. When he undertakes to eat the kernels he will find them bitter. I shall be glad for some one to send him the container that holds the cracked nuts (this issue of the Bible Banner). Three years ago I cracked a cluster of Baptist nuts for him in a public debate at Troup, Texas, and as a result a number of Baptists, including the daughter of a Baptist preacher, were “baptized for the remission of sins.” Many others will do the same thing as soon as they learn that Baptist nuts are not made up of gospel elements.
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