Characteristic Perversion.

In view of the serious consequences that must follow, it is shocking to note the persistent perversion of the gospel of Christ in popular organized religion. Paul was amazed that many whom he had taught the truth should be led away from it by teachers who perverted the gospel and made their perversions look plausible. "If any man preacheth unto you any gospel other than which ye received, let him be anathema." (Gal. 1:8.) The following is taken from "The Messenger of Red Bank Baptist Church," Chattanooga, Tenn., and is a characteristic example of modern perversion of the gospel.

“We trust all who are prepared for baptism will come this evening. We have quite a few who have been approved and have not yet been baptized. Baptism is not necessary to salvation, but it is necessary in order to do all the Master asked of His children. If you are a Christian, you should be a baptized Christian.”

It would be refreshing if some of these advocates of justification before and without baptism would give us the name and post office address of even one Christian in the New Testament who had not been baptized. “The Master asked” that proper baptism of such a man puts him into Christ where he enjoys the promise of remission of sins which can be found only in Christ Jesus. (2 Cor. 5:21.) He became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation. (Heb. 5:8.) “He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.” (John 3:36.)

The Messenger” further remarks that: “If you ever trusted the Lord and have not yet followed Him in the ordinance of baptism, you have thus far failed him.” And it may be further remarked in the light of some plain texts of scripture that with such a limited “trust” you have thus far failed to reach the promise of remission of sins which can be found only in Christ. “Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new.” (2 Cor. 5:17.) “For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ.” (Gal. 3:26, 27.) And in the face of all this Baptists continue to shout from the housetops, “Baptism is not necessary to salvation.” The Bible is right and Baptists are wrong.

Venturesome Reptiles.

The Austin American has a regular feature known as “The Answer Box” conducted by Frederic J. Haskin. Strange questions and sometimes stranger answers find their way into his column. Here is an instance that caught my eye:

“Q. If birds are descended from reptiles, how did they learn to fly?”

“A. Ages ago some of the more venturesome reptiles would climb trees but when they tried to come down again they sometimes fell and were killed. Soon others discovered that if they spread out their appendages they could volplane down with safety. So their appendages developed into wings.”

It is as simple as that! Since science deals in facts and net fancy, it would be out of place to ask the gentleman to supply any of the details accompanying this marvelous transmutation of reptiles into birds. We are not supposed to question the fact that a lizard can become a bird by jumping out of trees with his tail and legs spread out, if he has “ages” enough to practice in. All you have to do is to look at a lizard, gaze at a bird, jump out of a tree at a conclusion and if you escape a mental concussion you have arrived at an assured result. You must not exercise any faith for that would be unscientific! Nothing counts but facts.

This is possibly the best that men can do who start out by rejecting revelation. “In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth” is a very satisfactory place to begin. He made (Continued on Page 4)
Attention is here called to the photographed letter to a radio station at Louisville, Kentucky, on page six of this issue. Read it. It is, indeed, a very revealing letter, renouncing as it does the fellowship of those churches known to all as the churches in Louisville that stand for New Testament teaching.

A brief history of things will not here be amiss. It is known by all who are informed on the Premillennial-Boll defection, that a Boll party, a premillennial church (no matter what else it may be called), has for years been in the offing. It is now in definite formation. The evidence of its emergence appeared in the early 1930’s. It was in 1932 that a series of encyclicals were issued from the Boll headquarters in Louisville, entitled “A Doctrinal Manifesto,” by R. H. Boll, “The Latest Creed,” by Stanford Chambers, and “What To Preach,” by H. L. Olmstead. The editor of the Bible Banner was at that time the editor of the Gospel Advocate, and replied editorially to the three decrees in the order referred to. Protests came from certain of our own brethren, including G. C. Brewer and S. H. Hall, who had been regarded by many as sound and safe leaders in the church. Hall sent an air mail letter from California virtually demanding that such exposures of Boll be stopped. He and Brewer exchanged letters and held conferences on proper ways and means of disposing of the editor. They objected vigorously to continued exposures of R. H. Boll and his party. Their objections were ignored and the exposures of Boll and his party movement continued. The Winchester debate followed, in which Boll, Jorgenson, Janes, Chambers, Friend, and the whole Louisville group, rallied around Charles M. Neal to bolster up his effort to defend the Premillennial-Boll teaching and practice. This was the debate that G. C. Brewer tried to “dissuade” me from holding. S. H. Hall condemned it and would have nothing to do with it. But Boll-Neal & Company went down in defeat. From that day until now they have spent their time trying to repair their broken-down fences, and Brewer and Hall have spent most of their time trying to help them do it by criticizing all who have opposed these men, their party and their teaching.

The thing that Boll and Jorgenson have for so long sought to conceal from the church as a whole is that there has been no fellowship between them and the true churches of Christ in Louisville. Brethren in other parts who did not know these facts have extended fellowship to these men by giving them appointments and in financial contributions. Some who did know it, and do know, still do so through the influence of some of the preachers like the two mentioned herein who have tried to persuade the brethren that it was all a personal matter and should be ignored. Thus Jorgenson and Janes are still receiving a fellowship in various ways among churches over the country which they do not receive from the recognized churches in Louisville, a fellowship they do not deserve—and cannot scripturally be given from the churches elsewhere.

But the final effort to vindicate Boll, Jorgenson, Janes and party came from Clinton Davidson and his New Christian Leader movement. That movement was somewhat of the “composite beast” character—it had multiple heads and hoofs and horns and tails and toes. One of its angles was definitely to vindicate R. H. Boll and his party in Louisville and J. N. Armstrong and his school at Searcy. That movement was stopped—and it will go down in history as one of the most insidious attempts to destroy the church by propaganda that has ever been known. And now-after some of us have for several years been vilified and scandalized because of opposition to and exposure of these very things, E. L. Jorgenson himself writes the manager of a radio station, “confidentially” telling him his objections to the faithful churches of Christ in Louisville and their preachers, in a protest against their use of the radio facilities. Do you ask what is the ground of Jorgenson’s protest? Read his letter, on page six—the grounds of objection as stated by the dear, sweet brother himself are doctrinal. He wants the radio station to stop the preaching of gospel preachers like Cecil B. Douthitt, Morton T. Utley, Robert Williams—why? Because “they do not represent the churches of this area even in doctrine, much less in spirit and attitude.” Do you get that? Cecil Douthitt preaches for Haldeman Avenue church, the oldest church of Christ in Louisville—the church that M. C. Kurfees labored with and preached for over a period of forty-five years. Morton Utley preaches for the Bardstown Road church, one of the best churches known. Robert Williams preaches for Atwood, a newer congregation. These churches and these preachers are known and recognized as being loyal to New Testament teaching. But Jorgenson has now put it in the record that the barrier between these churches and the party headed by R. H. Boll and himself is a doctrinal barrier. Now, what becomes of the propaganda that the whole thing was a personal difference, just a private feud? What will Brother Brewer say now, since he has told everybody all over the United States and Canada, that would listen to him, that it was all just a personal fight, and he assured them that he knew!

Let it be further observed, in the Jorgenson letter, that the gospel preachers representing the Haldeman Avenue, Bardstown Road and Atwood churches are “repugnant” to him, and to something that he calls “a great body of disciples” in that area, meaning, I suppose, those churches controlled by R. H. Boll and himself. He refers to the loyal churches there as “a schismatic element.” He calls the gospel preachers who labor with them “dogmatic” and “sectarian” and “bitter” (along with some other “sweet” names) and brands them as being out of fellowship with him and his body of disciples “even in doctrine,” not to mention “spirit and attitude.” I should say not! If I were he, I wouldn’t mention it either!

Friends, that is E. L. Jorgenson talking—the real E. L. Jorgenson, the purveyor of the sweet spirit, with his make-up off!
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Finally, in an effort to prove that such preachers as Douthitt and Utley, and such churches as Haldeman Avenue and Bardstown Road, do not represent "a great body of disciples" in Louisville, Jorgenson says, "you can check" what he says with "Mr. Gregg, of the Council of Churches." He proposes to prove by the Louisville Council of Churches that Haldeman Avenue and Bardstown Road churches are not real churches of Christ and that Douthitt and Utley are not representative preachers of the gospel! That is E. L. Jorgenson talking now—the real E. L. Jorgenson. It is the same E. L. Jorgenson that engaged the Christian Church preacher, Lappin, to "represent him and his "great body of disciples" in a meeting with his Highland Church. He is the same E. L. Jorgenson that helps Murch and Witty in their National Unity Meetings. This E. L. Jorgenson (the real one some of you have not known before) fellowships the "Council of Churches," a denominational organization in Louisville like the Ministerial Alliance, and puts that organization on the witness stand to testify against true churches of Christ and faithful gospel preachers; and he, this same Jorgenson, fellowships the Christian Church and its preachers, like Lappin, even to the point of engaging them to hold meetings for his church—but he does not fellowships churches of Christ like Haldeman Avenue, Bardstown Road and Atwood, nor gospel preachers like Douthitt, Utley, and Williams—no, not even in doctrine! That's what his letter says. Lappin and his Christian Church, and Mr. Gregg and his Council of Churches, are included in Jorgenson's "great body of disciples" in the Louisville area, but churches of Christ like Haldeman, Bardstown and Atwood, with their gospel preachers like Douthitt, Utley, and Williams, are not included in his body of disciples. We knew it all the time, but just want everybody else to know it. Remember, it is E. L. Jorgenson speaking, explaining the difference between the Boll party in Louisville and the churches of Christ.

The truth is finally out—Jorgenson has told it. We have contended all the time that Jorgenson and Boll think more of the whole sectarian world than they do of the simple churches of Christ and plain gospel preachers.

The Jorgenson letter of protest is a virtual edict of withdrawal, a fiat of disfellowship. No sectarian alliance in any town or city has ever made a more underhanded attempt to get gospel preachers off the air than Jorgenson has made to get the churches and preachers off the air in Louisville. As in 1918, he drew the line of withdrawal over his own preaching of these false doctrines, he now draws that line again—this time, not against a few in his congregation who tried to save the church from his heresies, but against every faithful church and gospel preacher in the whole wide world. It amounts to that very thing. In view of these facts, established first by the evidence of a series of events and a chain of circumstances over the years, and now by the evidence of Jorgenson's own written statements, will our elders and preachers in the loyal congregations over the land continue to give appointments to E. L. Jorgenson, extending him a fellowship which he not only does not receive but actually renounces in Louisville, continue to buy his books wherever he is able to introduce it? Every order sent to E. L. Jorgenson for his "Great Songs Of The Church" places money in his hands to disseminate false doctrine and promote his destructive work in the church. The men who form the party to which he belongs have long been bent on the destruction of the church as we know it, believe in it and preach it. They should be quarantined by the churches everywhere as they have been by the church in Louisville. It is time to localize this poison.

Premillennialism as a doctrine, we are told, is now a dead issue in the church. That is not true. It is working in devious ways its heresies to promote. It is seen in the attitude of many preachers and brethren toward certain faithful men and important issues. There is a knowing understanding of certain attitudes by groups of men. There are pass-words, so to speak, an "Open Sesame" or a shibboleth that goes with certain circles, schools and sentiments, organized or unorganized. These things represent an insidious and sinister working of error and evil. There must be a constant watching. Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. It is no less the price of the truth, which is more precious than liberty, and of the church, equal in value with the precious price heaven paid for its purchase—the blood of the Sovereign's incarnated Son. To faithful men, elders in the church, God committed the trust of watching it. "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood. I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them. Wherefore watch ye, remembering that by the space of three years I ceased not to admonish every one night and day with tears." Such an appeal from an inspired apostle of the Head of the church cannot be passed up with a mere assenting nod or some insignificant gesture. It is Paul's charge to the elders, carrying even more weight of responsibility than Paul's charge to Timothy. Preachers must preach the word—but the grave responsibility of shielding the churches from influences within and without has been placed upon the elders of the churches. They dare not shift and nor shirk it. They deserve and should receive the faithful, full-time cooperation of every member in such a task now before us—a fight for the survival of the church and its purity in preaching and practice. These are not false alarms. The influences are not always readily discernible, and may lie dormant awaiting a favorable atmosphere in which to spring up and grow, but they exist as actual and potential influences. The Head of the church commands His servants, the elders, to "wherefore watch ye." How? Keep the door open to faithful men who firmly preach the plain word of God. Keep it closed to those who don't or are uncertain when they do. And against these dividers of the church and the entire party of appeasers, let us rise up together, elders and preachers, and in concert say—THEY SHALL NOT PASS!
THE CHRISTIAN AND THE GOVERNMENT

Cled E. Wallace

A correction will serve to exonerate me from the charge of accepting an honor that belongs to another. Some seem to be under the impression that I wrote a recent article in the Bible Banner which deals with the relation of Christians to the government. Thanks for the compliment, but that fine piece of work is to be charged up to the editor. Frankly, he beat me to it, for I had about all I could stand of the sort of talk that caused him to print the article, without saying something about it. It was a better job than I could have done. The position in that article is both scriptural and sensible and will stand up under the attacks that are sure to be made upon it.

The need for such an article is shown by a typical example of loose writing copied from a recent issue of a paper devoted to “sound doctrine.” Ponder this one carefully:

“A nation has as much right to command Christians to steal, commit adultery, get drunk or commit murder, as it does to command them to kill. Vengeance belongeth to God. (Rom. 12:19.) “Thou shalt not kill.” The nations or kingdoms of the world belong to Satan. (Matt. 4:1-11.) All murderers shall go into the lake of fire.”

Our nation does not command Christians, or anybody else, to steal, commit adultery, get drunk or commit murder. On the other hand, it has some rather severe laws relating to such evil practices. It is quite lenient toward “conscientious objectors” in time of war, and is so tolerant that it protects the life and liberties of misguided brethren who abuse that liberty by proclaiming from the housetops that the nation was fathered by the devil and that its armed forces are all actual or potential murderers and headed for “the lake of fire.” I suppose we should be quite thankful to the devil in this present crisis for standing between us and the totalitarian racketeers who would rob us of our right to worship God and say about anything we please about everything and everybody! He has really shown us a favor in raising up at this time a Winston Churchill, a Franklin Roosevelt and a Douglas MacArthur to command his armed forces of murder! If I felt as this brother does, which I am thankful I do not, I would be decent enough under the circumstances, to keep my mouth shut until the crisis is over. The government is good enough to respect his “conscientious objections” and he should be gracious enough to refrain from calling it a vassal of the devil and its armed forces a gang of murderers, at least while it is fighting for its life.

The brother declares that “the nations or kingdoms of the world belong to Satan.” Paul says: “Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God.” (Rom. 13:1,2.) Seriously, did Paul command Christians to “be in subjection to the” devil? “For they are ministers of God’s service, attending continually upon this very thing.” (Verse 6.) What thing? “For he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil.” No, we are not working for Satan, when we are supporting the government.

“Thou shalt not kill.” This command was given to the newborn nation of Israel. Did that nation “belong to Satan”? The laws of that nation came from God through Moses. They provided for law enforcement, capital punishment and the prosecution of war. And such activities were not murder, even if they did involve the taking of human life. But we are not under that law! True, and the brother went to the wrong place for his text. Under the circumstances it is revealing!

Humanly speaking, before me is the framed picture of my son, in a uniform of the armed forces of the United States. He is both a Christian and a loyal citizen of his government. While he is defending my right to live as a free man, I can defend him against the charge of murder. While we respect the consciences of those who are unwilling to bear arms on religious grounds, we resent the recklessness with which some of them employ their tongues and their pens. Let them “be in subjection to the higher powers” more quietly, pay taxes, buy bonds, help sharpen the sword and stop yelling bloody murder at those who use it. The martyr complex shows up in much that they say. Some of them seem to be yearning for prison, death and fiery furnaces.

“The apostles resisted the powers of the world and went to prison and to death. Daniel and the Hebrew children resisted the powers of the world and went to the lion’s den and the fiery furnace.” If we follow Christ, Paul and others, we will not have murder in our hearts.”

This is a bad mixture of irrelevant orating and begging of the question. Who is advocating murder and hate? When a criminal moved by hate commits murder, it is a screwy philosophy that concludes that the judge who sentences him and the officer who executes him, are also haters and murderers. Then when a free nation must go to war in its own defense against international marauders, then its armed forces, from the Commander-in-chief on down, become criminals if they happen to hurt anybody! Ugh! Just count me out of such twisted reasoning. I can’t take it. And don’t come around telling me the Bible teaches it! It does not.

According to the idea some brethren have about government belonging to Satan, it would be a great thing for Hitler and the Nazis if the majority of our people and other free peoples were Christians of the “conscientious objector” kind. He could just come in and take charge without serious opposition. Some brethren who have been arguing that the days of miracles are over would probably contend that in such a case the Lord would take us all out of the fiery furnace like he did the Hebrew children. And if we could convert even one whole county, it would destroy all civil government unless we imported some friendly sinners to take charge. Civil government is of the devil, you know, and Christians can have nothing to do with it! Otherwise some unfriendly sinners would invite themselves in to take charge and some agent of the devil would have to call out the National Guard to protect us. Come to think of it, maybe we had better not make too many Christians until this war has been won! Personally, I think our Uncle Samuel is being pretty nice to Jehovah’s Witnesses and some of our brethren. Satan doesn’t seem to have as strong a hold on him as he does on some of the other “nations” that “belong to” him. Of course, it would not do for Uncle Sam to become a Christian, for then he would not be Uncle Sam! And it would be mighty hard to find anybody to take his place. I’d prefer that he remain as he is rather than go into a disappearing act that would give us Hitler and his yellow “aryans.”

Some entertain the idea that if all were Christians there would be no need for civil government. It has no basis in fact. There would still be the need of the state to be kept separate from the church. Functions of the state are not to be confused with those of the church. Both are ordained of God.

THE DOCTRINE OF NON-RESISTANCE

The nation is at war against organized and militarized bandits who propose to conquer the world and enslave all free peoples. They would destroy our government and permanently black out all our institutions of civil liberty. This crisis, the most serious that the nation has ever faced, challenges Christians to do some sober thinking and to act with becoming wis-
dom. Many are perplexed and dismayed and we may expect some ill-advised things to be said and done. My friend and beloved brother, R. L. Whiteside, has expressed a timely warning in a late issue of the Gospel Advocate:

"In a time like this Christians, as well as others, are liable to become excited and say things that they may later regret. Some years ago I heard a prominent preacher say that it would be a great punishment to him to be compelled to sit and listen to someone read some sermons he himself preached during the other World War. You can save yourself such trial by maintaining a sober mind. Be sober-minded enough to realize that no one person, not even you, can lay claim to having all wisdom. Quoting a passage of Scripture is of no real value to a cause unless it is in point."

Loyalty to the word of God must be the watch-word of a genuine Christian at all times. That principle cannot be interred "for the duration" because the most devastating war of all history is raging. There should be no compromise of the principle that a Christian's loyalty to God comes before, and takes precedence of, his loyalty to his government even in time of war. "We must obey God, rather than men." I take it that this is common ground among us.

Jesus taught that Christians should be humble, meek, lovers of peace, pure in heart, and be ready and willing to suffer persecution for righteousness' sake. They must be willing to bear even a repetition of personal intrusions and injuries and entertain the disposition to go even beyond certain limits to return good for evil. He strictly forbids revengful retaliation for personal injuries. He set the example and demands that we follow in His steps. It does violence to the teaching of Jesus in this regard if we conclude that there should be no law to function for the suppression and punishment of crime. There are lawless men in society who must be controlled by force. Jesus was not delivering a discourse directed against the proper functions and due processes of law and government. Some years ago, I heard a prominent preacher among us say in a sermon that "patriotism is a crime." It simply isn't true and I felt ashamed of him. Another said: "All war is wrong and sinful, regardless of who wages it or why." It is sinful then, for a police force to function in protecting our homes against robbery and to accomplish spiritual victories, and not in the abject, servile spirit as blind followers of a harsh and unyielding system of government as the one Jesus had in mind in His teachings. "Without the power of the sword for this very emergency than some of them talk and write."

"Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away." Is it to be taken literally and without restriction? Keep the context in mind. I asked an all-out non-resister, a friend of mine, about this giving and lending to just anybody who wanted to take him for a "touch" and he said: "It is conditional." Exactly. A stranger, or a transient, would have about as good a chance of getting a loan from a soldier as he would from a "conscientious objector." As a matter of fact this part of the teaching of Jesus is not likely to be overdone by anybody. Even "conscientious objectors" know how to properly qualify it.

"And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." Should a devout and unlimited non-resister return to his home and find that in his absence an intruder had unlawfully taken possession, must he not appeal to the law, he must just bow out and let the intruder keep it because he has it, or just kneel in prayer. Did Jesus teach it? No, and it isn't the way "non-resisters" act either. They are more practical than their doctrine. Christianity does not antagonize proper law enforcement. Remember that law enforcement involves the use of physical resistance to the lawless. Paul asked for military interference to rescue him from a plot of assassination and got it. He appealed to Caesar and the power of the government of which he was a citizen, both civil and military. He did not violate the teaching of Jesus on the question of non-resistance. Some have simply carried that doctrine a lot farther than Jesus did. J. W. McFarvey made some cogent observations along this line:

"This command which enjoins non-resistance, like most of the other precepts of this sermon, does not demand of us abso-

mixed up in it one way or another. The man in uniform who fires the guns is not the only fighter in this fracas. Our most belligerent "conscientious objectors" who stand off at a safe distance and quote scriptures that do not apply to this situation, are hoping and praying that the current threat to our liberties may be crushed by our armed forces. The Axis powers would greatly appreciate it, if our government would adopt their theory of all-out non-resistance.

But Jesus said: "Resist not him that is evil." Take a look at the context and scope of Jesus' teaching. It is a law against the individual seeking and taking personal vengeance for the wrongs done him. It is not designed to allow a hoodlum to kidnap a child, or outrage a woman without interference by anybody who can stop it, even if he has to use a club or a gun. I take it that even most preachers would act better in an emergency than some of them talk and write.

"Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away." Is it to be taken literally and without restriction? Keep the context in mind. I asked an all-out non-resister, a friend of mine, about this giving and lending to just anybody who wanted to take him for a "touch" and he said: "It is conditional." Exactly. A stranger, or a transient, would have about as good a chance of getting a loan from a soldier as he would from a "conscientious objector." As a matter of fact this part of the teaching of Jesus is not likely to be overdone by anybody. Even "conscientious objectors" know how to properly qualify it.

"And if any man would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." Should a devout and unlimited non-resister return to his home and find that in his absence an intruder had unlawfully taken possession, must he not appeal to the law, he must just bow out and let the intruder keep it because he has it, or just kneel in prayer. Did Jesus teach it? No, and it isn't the way "non-resisters" act either. They are more practical than their doctrine. Christianity does not antagonize proper law enforcement. Remember that law enforcement involves the use of physical resistance to the lawless. Paul asked for military interference to rescue him from a plot of assassination and got it. He appealed to Caesar and the power of the government of which he was a citizen, both civil and military. He did not violate the teaching of Jesus on the question of non-resistance. Some have simply carried that doctrine a lot farther than Jesus did. J. W. McFarvey made some cogent observations along this line:

"This command which enjoins non-resistance, like most of the other precepts of this sermon, does not demand of us abso-

lute, unqualified passivity at all times and under all circumstances. In fact, we may say generally of the whole sermon on the mount that it is not a code for slaves, but an assertion of principles which are to be interpreted and applied by the children of freedom. We are to submit to evil for principle's sake and to accomplish spiritual victories, and not in the abject, servile spirit as blind followers of a harsh and exacting law. On the contrary, taking the principle, we judge when and how to apply it as best we can. Absolute non-resistance may so far encourage crime as to become a sin. .. The example given, a slap in the face, has been regarded as a gross insult in all ages, but it is not an assault which imperils life. .. Self-preservation is a law of God giving right which, under most circumstances, a Christian can claim. He may resist the robber, the assassin and all men of that ilk, and may protect his person and his possessions against the assaults of the violent and lawless. But when the honor of Christ and the salvation of man demands it, he should observe this commandment even unto the very letter. .. A man may strive for self-protection when life is threatened without any spirit of revenge."

The law of Moses said "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth." The new law says, "Resist not him that is evil." "Vengeance is mine, I will repay." It is a law against the individual wreaking personal vengeance for the wrongs done him. Even our own government has some laws to that effect.
April 16, 1942

W B EO
Program Director
Louisville, Ky.

Gentlemen:

You are, of course, perfectly free to sell radio time for religious broadcasts to any one you choose. You should know, however, that Mr. Utley's broadcasts are in no sense representative of the Churches of Christ in general in this area, but, on the other hand, are very repugnant to a great body of these disciples here.

I am told that Mr. Utley has been saying on the radio that there are only three or four churches of Christ in this city, whereas there are 20 in Louisville, and not less than 30 in the immediate Louisville area. The ministers of Haldeman Avenue and Atwood Avenue churches (Douillet and Williams) would probably support Mr. Utley and his program; that is about all. These men, together with a portion of their membership, constitute a small and schismatic element among the Churches of Christ here. They are dogmatic, sectarian, and bitter in the extreme, and it may be said that they do not represent the churches of this area even in doctrine, much less in spirit and attitude.

This letter is, of course, confidential; but you can check what I say with almost any of the thirty or forty ministers of the Church of Christ in this city, or with Mr. Gregg, of the Council of Churches.

We do not protest these programs merely or chiefly because of doctrinal differences — we realize such differences are inevitable; we protest the programs on the ground that they are bitter and sectarian, and will do harm and not good.

Respectfully submitted,

E. J. Jorgensen, Minister,
Highland Church of Christ.
THE HIGHLAND CHURCH, LOUISVILLE

C. A. Taylor

One of my best friends has called to my attention an article in the March issue of Word and Work, written by E. L. Jorgenson, titled “History of Highland Church” (Louisville, Ky.). My friend knowing, as does everyone who is familiar with the Louisville church situation, that the said article is full of untruths, chicanery, half-truths and misrepresentations, and knowing, too, that I have been in a preferred position to know the true history of that church, prior to the last few years, insists that I write to correct at least some of the false statements made by E. L. Jorgenson; hence, this statement.

To appreciate fully the motives prompting his wicked course in this matter, the reader should know that Jorgenson has been fighting for twenty-four years for recognition by the brotherhood. Ever since he and Don Carlos Janes, in May, 1918, induced the Highland Church to withdraw fellowship from the late Brother R. 0. Rubel, Sr., and the writer because we opposed their determination to use the Highland Church to promote premillennialism. Following this action, 90 percent of the brotherhood soon dropped both Jorgenson and Janes and faithful preachers have refused to co-operate with the Highland Church. Since that time these men and that church have striven desperately to regain their standing in the brotherhood. It should also be remembered that the Highland Church, in recent months, has been exposed for having S. S. Lappin (a Christian Church preacher) conduct their protracted meeting. This explains Jorgenson’s real purposes in publishing his false and misleading “history” of the Highland Church at this particular time.

Jorgenson says the Highland Church is fixed in the “great Biblical principle of speaking where, and only where, the oracles of God speak.” I wonder where the Bible speaks to tell the Highland Church to extend invitation for those present to become members of the progressive Edenside Christian Church, should they prefer that church to the church of Christ? This was done in the recent Lappin meeting.

The Highland Church lot, of which Jorgenson boasts, was given to the church by the family of good Brother R. 0. Rubel, Sr., whom he drove from that church, and the building of which he proudly publishes a picture, was paid for (R. 0. Rubel gave the first $1,000.OO) almost wholly by the forty-one members driven from that church by Jorgenson and Janes, by the withdrawal action of 1918. Very little, if anything, was paid on the building, and of course nothing on the lot, by the present membership; yet Jorgenson would have the brotherhood believe that the Highland congregation provided that lot and building because of their great generosity.

Jorgenson says that my good friend, Sister W. C. Priest, “this great good woman,” endorsed and promoted premillennialism, which he was teaching and featuring, during the beginning of this movement in the Highland congregation. That statement stands out as the boldest falsehood in his so-called history of the Highland Church, and is an insult to the memory of one of my closest and most loyal friends. No one in that church (and I challenge even Jorgenson to deny this) enjoyed so fully, so close, so long and so intimate, a church association with Sister Priest as did I. She not only did not endorse his premillennialism and his course in pressing that doctrine, but when he first came to that church she questioned the wisdom of employing him, giving to me as her reason his connection with R. H. Boll, and warned me later that my opposition to Jorgenson would prompt him to attack me personally. From what followed it appears that she was almost a prophetess. I resent with all my strength his cowardly falsehoods about that noble Christian woman.

Under a subhead—Cell Division—Jorgenson writes: “Highland Church has swarmed three or four times;” then he lists Beuchel, South Louisville, Ormsby and Bardstown Road as churches resulting from that “swarming.” Bees swarm because they become too numerous for their house. This is what he wants the brotherhood to believe about the Highland Church, but everyone in Louisville church circles knows this is not the reason why a single one of those congregations was started.

Buechel is a village about five miles from Louisville and a few members wanted to worship closer to their homes. South Louisville was started by the Portland Avenue Church and not by the Highland Church. When D. H. Friend left the Highland Church some members of the church followed him to South Louisville, but there was no “swarm.” Ormsby was started because Don Carlos Janes wanted to buy an empty churchhouse at a bargain and not because of a “swarm.” The Bardstown Road Church was started when Jorgenson and Janes split the Highland Church over premillennialism.

Sometimes to suppress a truth is just as wicked as it would be to tell an out-and-out falsehood. Jorgenson’s list of regular preachers who have served the Highland Church are characterized by two things. First, he listed complete those who served the congregation regularly before he and Janes introduced premillennialism. Secondly, he carefully omitted from his list of regular preachers the following, who also served that congregation as their regular minister. I will let the reader draw his own conclusions as to why the following were omitted.

Earl Smith, who soon after leaving the Highland Church, went to the Baptists, and is now teaching in a Baptist School. Virgil Smith, who is now in Brazil, belongs to the Pentecostal Baptist Church and fellowships all denominations and uses instrumental music on the street to attract people to his street services.

0. E. Phillips has gone to the Christian Church. Wallace Cauble, one of “R. H. Boll’s boys,” is now holding forth in Louisville as “pastor” of the Open Door Church. A former member of the Highland Church tells me that Cauble informed some members of the Highland Church (before he was employed) that he believed men are saved before they are baptized. This former member says Cauble was asked to leave, not because of his beliefs but to prevent some of the older members leaving, who were dissatisfied with Cauble’s teaching.

Jorgenson says the Highland Church “enjoys the full confidence and fellowship of no less than twenty-five or thirty sister churches in this immediate area—Louisville and adjacent territory.” Well, I do not know just how far “adjacent” extends but the Louisville directory lists only fifteen churches of Christ, and I know that the preacher for the Highland Church (E. L. Jorgenson) is never recognized in five of these churches. I also know that everyone of the other ten have as their preacher, R. H. Boll, E. L. Jorgenson, Claude Neal (brother of Chas. M. Neal), D. H. Friend, all of whom are premillennialists, or one of “Boll’s boys,” who are also premillennialists.

There is only one church in New Albany and only one in Jeffersonville; both cities are immediately across the river from Louisville and I know that neither Jorgenson or Janes are recognized in either of them. That makes seven churches out of the seventeen located in what business men in Louisville call the “Greater Louisville,” who have no fellowship with either the Highland Church or its preacher. That “adjacent” area will have to extend a long way to find “twenty-five or thirty” churches who fellowship Jorgenson and the Highland Church, for the further you get from Louisville the fewer “premillennial” churches you will find.

(Continued on Page 9)
An epidemic of certain kinds of sickness is sweeping a portion of the brotherhood. Brother Janes must have had an attack, when he read my effort on "Menaces to Mission Work."—Brother Janes got so sick that he vomited a tirade of assertions and accusations in my direction. The root of Brother Janes' trouble is lack of proper regard for God's authority; there are two prominent heresies springing from this same root: i.e., a one-man mission society and premillennialism. Coming from this same root (lack of respect for the word of the Lord), and breaking to the surface now, is union with Christian Church digression in its entirety.

In the first place the one-man society sponsoring and promoting gospel work is unscriptural within itself. This system practiced by Brother Janes is contrary to the New Testament order, hence his activity is impure in its beginning. There is in Brother Janes' missionary maneuvers an inherent unscripturalness, and there is just no way to fix it or remedy the situation without abolishing the de-facto society. Only an arrogant disregard for divine authority will allow a man to perpetuate such work; and it is not at all surprising that Brother Janes holds the premillennial speculation, which is just another symptom of the same disease-lack of respect for God's law and His authority.

The article written by me sometime ago and printed in the Bible Banner on "Menaces to Mission Work," brought forth the following wail, which wail merely reveals the weakness and unscripturalness of a certain portion of our so-called missionary activities. The following letter is given in full to show the disposition, attitude, and position of one of the biggest promoters of mission work in the church. The letter is its own accuser, and carries with it its own condemnation, to the brethren who think and desire to be scriptural; and there is not much hope for those who don't.

Dear Brother McElroy: Under the title, "Menaces to Mission Work," in the Bible Banner, of June 41, you write:

"Sometimes premillennialists are sent as missionaries to new territories. * * * Personally I had as soon see a Methodist who believed in infant baptism sent,"

Though good and sincere brethren may honestly differ on what the Bible teaches on some matters (as on the eldership method), personally I had as soon see a Methodist who believed in infant baptism sent.

Being a "pre-millennialist" would not prevent a missionary or other men from teaching all the Bible contains on how to come to Christ, the nature, organization, and purpose of the church, brotherly love, grace, patience, morality, chastity, honesty, contending for the faith once for all delivered to the saints, or any other Bible doctrine. It would only serve to help him in all these and give him a quality which would not likely be present in anyone fighting the millennial teaching of the Bible—(pre-millennialism) would tend to warm his heart, brighten his hope, keep him on the alert to be accepted of the Lord at all times and would otherwise be beneficial without in any way being detrimental. Nor should there be ill feeling, misrepresentation or non-fellowship merely because of some of God's children are not agreed on what the exact Biblical teaching on this topic. Even if the pre-millennial teaching were an error, it would not properly be the occasion for a war on its holders, and those who busy themselves to stir up strife against those who now hold and teach "pre-millennialism" which the apostles also taught commit sin.

It would be well for you to consider also that as good, able, honorable and useful men as the Restoration movement of Campbell and Stone has produced were and are pre-millennialists or sympathetic toward pre-millennialists. Brethren writing in your strain are opposing the truth, the orthodox teaching of the first churches of Christ and condemning Christian men, past and present, of the church for uncertain periods, or the men deciding themselves and God and committing the sin of sowing discord among brethren. There should be no unholy contentions about this matter, and no schisms over understanding or mis- understanding certain aspects of prophecies. Please be exhorted to use caution and discretion and allow the orthodox doctrine of the church to stand without misrepresentation or condemnation. Yours in Christ, Don Carlos Janes.

The letter is a bold admission that its author, Don Carlos Janes, is a pre-millennialist; and likewise an admission that many of the "missionaries" (?) are of the same stripe, and the letter is a weak effort to justify the doctrine and those who hold it. Nothing but sheer assumption is offered in the letter to support the premillennial doctrine; an attempt is made to excuse the heresy on the ground that there are other heresies just as bad-Brother Janes says they are worse. The grounds (assertions) offered to support the doctrine and the faction have been exposed many times in the Bible Banner, therefore I shall not enter upon a repetition of that in this article.

I have not contended, neither has anyone else that I know of, that premillennialism was the only heresy in existence, or that it was the only matter upon which a man might be unscriptural. One heresy or false doctrine is just as bad as another, and gospel preachers will fight for one scriptural truth just as quick as they will for any other. The reason that we have fought on the premillennial issue is because a group of brethren espoused the heresy, and outraged the purity of the church on that ground. That was the point of attack, and that is the issue where they were met and defeated.

Brother Janes appeals to the ante-Nicene Fathers, secular and ecclesiastical histories, and asks if we may believe them. In answer to that I will say that neither the Fathers nor the historians are to be used as the Christian's criterion of faith; the New Testament thoroughly furnishes the man of God unto everything that is essential. (2 Tim. 3:16-17.) And when a doctrine cannot be supported by the New Testament, it is not true, and should be forsaken.

The assertion that the apostles were premillennialists is a flight of fancy and stretch of the imagination; brought about by wishful thinking, not by the study of the word-a study of the word shows that the inspired men did not believe the premillennial speculation. When the desire is the mother of the thought, men are likely to come to any conclusion; and this is how Brother Janes reaches the conclusion that the apostles were premillennialists.

Brother Janes says, "Therefore all the apostles (Greek for 'Missionaries')—this assertion is not true, but suppose it was.
I observed in a previous article that the words “mission” and “missionaries” are not in our common Bible. I used the words in what I thought was their common usage. I thought it was the language of Ashodod, to express the idea of preaching the gospel in a virgin field, but according to Brother Janes, the expert missionary promoter, I was mistaken in the meaning of the word. He says “apostles” is the Greek for missionaries. Since the word “missionaries” is the English for the Greek word “apostles,” if we have missionaries today, we have apostles today, because according to Brother Janes the words are synonymous, one Greek and the other English, and the Mormons are right if Brother Janes’ definitions and claims are correct. Most missionaries (English for the Greek apostles) today have a promoter, this is Brother Janes’ official capacity; it would be interesting if he would point out to us who occupied this capacity with the apostles.

Brother Janes has, set himself forth as a premillennialist, and a promoter of premillennial workers in foreign fields; this brand his work as unscriptural, but his society-like activity would be unscriptural even if he had not espoused this heresy. Whoever sets himself up as a collecting and distributing agency by and through which to do gospel work, occupies the position of a mission society. All such societies are unauthorized by the New Testament, but Brother Janes, the one-man society, is not authorized by anybody. I believe that 2 Jno. 9, 11, applies to Brother Janes’ unscriptural de-facto missionary society, and that those who contribute to his schemes are bidding him God’s speed, and become a partaker of his evil. Brethren how long are we going to tolerate this disgraceful racket, which is re-proaching the church of the Lord, and hindering pure gospel work? It is time to cut off contributions to such unscriptural work.

**PRICE BILLINGSLEY TO DESTITUTE PLACES**

Brother Price Billingsley and wife have their membership in the Arlington Heights Church of Christ, and expect to reside indefinitely in our midst. This congregation is delighted to sponsor the plan many of his friends have suggested concerning his future work. Upon the suggestion of these friends he decided that he may accomplish more good by preaching in the destitute fields than in any other kind of preaching work. This was the way he established many of our present flourishing congregations in years gone by. He is alert in mind and is anxious to be active in this work by preaching in school houses, from house to house and as opportunity affords. All who are interested will offer suggestions and provide openings for this work should write us as soon as possible.

We’re glad to take oversight of this work to the extent of receiving, acknowledging and properly disbursing contributions, through a special treasurer, for this timely mission work. This congregation is in full sympathy with this kind of work. Brother Billingsley is unwilling that contributions be sent to him direct and desires that they come through our congregation. Some brethren have mailed in their contribution. Others will be glad to volunteer. Our congregation prays that all that is done in this good work will be to the glory of God and the upbuilding of His church; and that all who hear the Gospel in its purity and fullness will know assuredly that only love for God’s truth and the souls of men prompts Brother Billingsley in all that he says and does. We ask for the prayers of all humble and God-fearing brethren that Brother Billingsley and all our congregation may be governed by the highest wisdom in the furtherance of this work, and that we may love all brethren with pure hearts fervently.

Any individual or congregation that will make regular or special contribution to this work should mail it to the address below. Prompt acknowledgment will be made.

**HIGHLAND CHURCH-LOUISVILLE**

(Continued from Page 7)

Regarding the members of the Bardstown Road Church (where I worship) Jorgenson says: “We have made every possible advance and overture toward better understanding,” but the truth is that the Highland Church has done nothing of the kind. The only thing they have ever done regarding our relations is to attempt to induce the members of the Board&amp;own Road Church to ignore or to forget their evil deeds, and they have tried repeatedly to trick Brother Rubel and the writer into an admission of “factious conduct” so that they could thereby justify, in the eyes of the brotherhood, their wicked withdrawal action of 1918. In both of these efforts they have signally failed.

Only the lack of space prevents mentioning many other false and misleading statements found in Jorgenson’s history, but enough has been recorded here to convince any fair minded person that E. L. Jorgenson is far more interested in seeking to escape the condemnation under which he rests, because of his wicked course in 1914-1918 and by reason of his premillennialism, than he is in telling a true history of the Highland Church, whose destiny he has directed since 1918. And it should now be quite evident to any reasonable person that under the dictatorship of Jorgenson and Janes the Highland Church has been for twenty-four years, and is now, just a radical, premillennial group of people who are willing to fraternize with the sects and permit any kind of preaching in their pulpit, provided everything done there will advance their pet hobby-premillennialism.

**SIGHTING-IN SHOTS**

(Continued from Page 1)

the world and all things therein, he, being Lord of heaven and earth” explains more things to the man of faith than venture-some reptiles falling out of trees.

Speaking of facts, here is one it will do well to ponder. It is the business of science to discover and deal with realities and study their relations. Hq should stick to the facts in his field of study and research. When a scientist turns from his facts and begins to theorize about origins and guess about beginnings, he spreads out his appendages and changes into a philosopher a lot quicker than a reptile can change into a bird by jumping out of trees. Philosophy has never been able to discover God because its limitations are too great. “The world through its wisdom knew not God.” “The Lord knoweth the reasonings of the wise, that they are vain.”

The world is greatly indebted to men of science for their study and application of the facts and laws of nature for human betterment. The cause of true religion has suffered great harm when they turned from their facts and soared into the field of vain speculation.
WHICH BAPTISTS BELIEVE ALL THE BIBLE?

W. Curtis Porter

A Baptist preacher recently reporting a meeting which he conducted in the Panhandle section of Texas declared there is—

"Not a single Baptist in the whole section that believes all they see in the Bible."—James MacKrell in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

This charge, according to a later edition of the same paper, raised quite a howl among Baptist preachers of that section of Texas. But I see nothing in it that should create much disturbance, unless it is the implication that some Baptists somewhere believe all they see in the Bible. I have traveled rather extensively over the United States and have come in contact with many Baptists, including a large number of Baptist preachers, but I have the first Baptist to find yet who believes all he sees in the Bible. Since, then, this Baptist preacher implies that some Baptists believe all they see in the Bible, I am asking the question: Which Baptists believe all the Bible?

The very fact that men are Baptists is proof that they do not 'believe all they see in the Bible, and that they believe a lot they do not see in the Bible, or they would cease to be Baptists. After all, no Baptist has ever seen in the Bible anything about a Baptist Church; nor has any one of them ever seen where the members of the New Testament Church were ever called Baptists. These are some of the things they believe that they do not see in the Bible. The only person to whom the term "Baptist," is ever applied in the Bible was John, the forerunner of Christ, and he was called "John the Baptist." (Matt. 3:1) This statement is easily seen by any Baptist, not only in this passage but in a number of other New Testament references, but what Baptist today believes it? I have never found any who believe it. Even their preachers will constantly refer to him as "a Baptist" or "a Baptist preacher," when the Bible expressly calls him "the Baptist." There is a vast difference between the meaning of the two statements. Baptist preachers want to refer to him in such way as to make room for a lot of other Baptist preachers. Yet they do not "see in the Bible" anything about these other Baptist preachers. And remember this: John the Baptist died before the Lord ever built the church. It was after the death of John that Jesus said: "Upon this rock I will build my church." What do Baptists say about this when you make them see it? They say that baptism is only a figure of salvation, that it does not save us at all, and that men are saved before the water ever touches them. But the fact remains that Peter says "baptism saves us." But Baptists say it does not. Does this look like they believe what "they see in the Bible"? The statement, "baptism saves us," is in the Bible, is it not? Oh, yes. Can Baptists see it? Certainly they can. Do they believe it? If you know of one who does, send me his name and address. That men are "baptized into Christ" is also a statement that is easily seen in the Bible. (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27.) But all the Baptists I have ever known say that men get "into Christ" without baptism at all.

Perhaps this lack of belief in what can be seen in the Bible has caused Baptists to write creeds and manuals as declarations of their faith and practice. Mr. MacKrell furthersays in the same issue of the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight:

"This thing makes my blood boil. I have long been a devotee of the Baptist Way Book. When I was led into Baptist ranks I first sought out Dr. Calvin B. Waller of the Convention and Dr. Ben M. Bogard and asked them for a book that set forth the distinctive doctrines of Baptists. Dr. Waller gave me a copy of 0. S. C. Wallace's 'What Baptists Believe' and Dr. Bogard gave me a copy of the Way Book."

If Mr. MacKrell had "long been a devotee of the New Testament" instead of the Baptist Way Book, he would never have been "led into Baptist ranks" in the first place, for the New Testament makes no mention of "Baptist ranks." Whenever a man is "led into Baptist ranks" he must be led by something else besides the New Testament. Certainly if a man takes "the Baptist Way Book" for his guide and follows it, he will be "led into Baptist ranks," for that is the purpose of the Way Book. But the New Testament is the "Way Book" of Christians, and it never leads anybody to be a Baptist. In fact, there were no "Baptist ranks" to be "led into" at the time the New Testament was written. Such ranks came into being a long time-many centuries in fact-after the New Testament was written. And when Mr. MacKrell asked Dr. Waller and Dr. Bogard "for a book that set forth the distinctive doctrines of Baptists," I wonder why the Doctors did not give him a copy of the New Testament. The fact that they did not shows that they knew that the distinctive doctrines of Baptists are not "set forth" in that Book. If you are going to give a man a book that sets forth the distinctive doctrines of a church, you will surely give a book that makes some mention of the church. And since the damned." But what group of Baptists today believes that? You will hear them all saying that the man who believes will be saved whether he is ever baptized or not. Such statements clearly show that they do not believe what Jesus said. And Peter, on the day of Pentecost, told inquiring sinners "to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." (Acts 2:38.) I wish some one would trot out the Baptist who believes that, They all say that baptism is not for the remission of sins but because of the remission of sins. Why even if one of their preacher should start preaching it as Peter commanded it on the day of Pentecost and would tell the sinners of his audience to be baptized for the remission of sins," he would be turned out of the Baptist Church for preaching hereby. Even James MacKrell does not believe that baptism is "for the remission of sins," for he is constantly claiming that sinners are saved before and without baptism. Why, then, criticize the Baptists of the Texas Panhandle for not believing all they see in the Bible? He is right in the boat with them. He does not believe this part of it any more than they do. Do you know of any Baptist who ever saw what Peter said in 1 Pet. 3:21? Yes, I know many of them have seen it, for I have shown it to them, but I have yet to see one of them believe it. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not...ing away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer 01 a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." What do Baptists say about this when you make them see it? They say that baptism is only a figure of salvation, that it does not save us at all, and that men are saved before the water ever touches them. But the fact remains that Peter says "baptism saves us." But Baptists say it does not. Does this look like they believe what "they see in the Bible"? The statement, "baptism saves us," is in the Bible, is it not? Oh, yes. Can Baptists see it? Certainly they can. Do they believe it? If you know of one who does, send me his name and address. That men are "baptized into Christ" is also a statement that is easily seen in the Bible. (Rom. 6:3; Gal. 3:27.) But all the Baptists I have ever known say that men get "into Christ" without baptism at all.

Perhaps this lack of belief in what can be seen in the Bible has caused Baptists to write creeds and manuals as declarations of their faith and practice. Mr. MacKrell furthersays in the same issue of the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight:

"This thing makes my blood boil. I have long been a devotee of the Baptist Way Book. When I was led into Baptist ranks I first sought out Dr. Calvin B. Waller of the Convention and Dr. Ben M. Bogard and asked them for a book that set forth the distinctive doctrines of Baptists. Dr. Waller gave me a copy of 0. S. C. Wallace's 'What Baptists Believe' and Dr. Bogard gave me a copy of the Way Book."

If Mr. MacKrell had "long been a devotee of the New Testament" instead of the Baptist Way Book, he would never have been "led into Baptist ranks" in the first place, for the New Testament makes no mention of "Baptist ranks." Whenever a man is "led into Baptist ranks" he must be led by something else besides the New Testament. Certainly if a man takes "the Baptist Way Book" for his guide and follows it, he will be "led into Baptist ranks," for that is the purpose of the Way Book. But the New Testament is the "Way Book" of Christians, and it never leads anybody to be a Baptist. In fact, there were no "Baptist ranks" to be "led into" at the time the New Testament was written. Such ranks came into being a long time-many centuries in fact-after the New Testament was written. And when Mr. MacKrell asked Dr. Waller and Dr. Bogard "for a book that set forth the distinctive doctrines of Baptists," I wonder why the Doctors did not give him a copy of the New Testament. The fact that they did not shows that they knew that the distinctive doctrines of Baptists are not "set forth" in that Book. If you are going to give a man a book that sets forth the distinctive doctrines of a church, you will surely give a book that makes some mention of the church. And since the
New Testament does not mention the Baptist Church nor its distinctive doctrines, the Doctors gave Mr. MacKrell some books that do mention such things; one of them giving him “What Baptists Believe” and the other giving him the “Baptist Way Book.” After examining these books carefully, Mr. MacKrell says:

“I settled on the Way Book and studied it day and night for weeks, checking and rechecking every statement.”

The reason for this is evident. Had he “settled on the New Testament” and had he “studied it day and night for weeks,” even to the point of “checking and rechecking every statement” found in it, he would have known no more about “the distinctive doctrines of Baptists” than he knew before he started. Since MacKrell did not believe “all he saw in the Bible,” either before or after he was “led into Baptist ranks,” it was but natural for him to settle on some other book. It was just as well that he settled on the Way Book as on What Baptists Believe. But if a man wants to be a Christian and reach heaven at last, he would better settle on the New Testament.

THE PROOF PRODUCED

G. K. Wallace

Sometime ago I preached on the “Difference Between the Church of Christ and the Christian Church” at the University Place Christian Church in Oklahoma City, Okla. This sermon was taken down in shorthand and published by the Christian Worker Publishing Company, 205 Mathewson Avenue, Wichita, Kansas. In this sermon I read and commented on the following words taken from the Christian Evangelist, the official publication of the Christian Board of Publication. Someone challenged the statement and wanted proof that such an article ever appeared in their paper. I did not have the number of the issue and could not give it. It looked as if I were on the spot. I then wrote the Christian Board of Publication asking for the date and number of the paper in which the article appeared. I received a reply saying that such was not published by them. Too, they said they would not likely print such an article. But read the article and then their letter to me.

“Before a blue silk backdrop, solemn-faced and nervous, fifteen bare-footed girls of Christian College, Columbia, Missouri, presented dancing interpretations of familiar hymns like “My Faith Looks Up to Thee,” and “Hark, the Herald Angels Sing,” at the regular Christian Students congregation meeting in the educational hall of First Church in Columbia, C. E. Lemmon, pastor, on Sunday, March 10. Asked not to applaud were 300 people who attended.

“Garbed in draped gray silk and plain silk tunics and trousers, the church dancers, under the direction of Mrs. Eleanor Minton Rhynsburger, went through ensemble formations symbolizing supplication, humility and prayer.

“A renaissance of religious dancing and accepted form of Christian worship centuries ago, the interpretation sent the audience away apparently pleased. President of the College Board of Trustees, Lieutenant-Governor Frank G. Harris ‘thought it was wonderful.”

“Predicted Mrs. Rhynsburger: ‘Later we plan to attempt a dancing interpretation of a Biblical story as a regular part of the church service.’

“Prior to the dancing, Pastor Lemmon chortled: ‘We will not include dances as a regular part of services until I have had an opportunity to observe their character and the attitude of the girls who dance.’

“In reply to my letter asking for the date and issue of the paper in which the above appeared I received the following:

“August 12, 1940. Mr. G. K. Wallace, 944 Perry, Wichita, Kansas. Dear Brother Wallace:

“In reply to your favor of the 7th inst., we would say that the clipping sent by you did not appear in The Christian-Evangelist or any other paper published by this house.

“If you had been familiar with The Christian-Evangelist, you would have seen that the type used in that paper is not the same as the type face on the clipping you sent. It is not likely that The Christian-Evangelist would have published an article of this kind.

“Sincerely yours, W. P. Shelton, General Manager.”

Last year while I was preaching in Anderson, Indiana, I went to Indianapolis in company with Brother J. T. Marlin and we went to the Butler University, a Christian Church school, and asked to look through their copies of the Christian-Evangelist. On page 355, Volume LXII, No. 11, the March issue of the Christian-Evangelist in 1935, the above article appears just as I represented it.

Surely the general manager, Mr. Shelton, did not know what appeared in his paper, or was trying to embarrass me and lessen the force of the sermon delivered.

The above article, brethren, shows the extent to which these brethren have gone and yet there are some among us who desire that we have Unity Meetings with them. Such actions as the, above article describes have never been condemned by the Christian Church. To fellowship the Christian Church is to fellowship such dancing shows as mentioned above.

But the point here is: The above article in spite of their denial was published and endorsed by the Christian Board of Publication. If anyone questions it just get the March 14th issue, 1935, and turn to page 355 and read for yourself.

THE TEST OF A SERMON

G. K. Wallace

The test of a sermon is not its length. Often we hear men making fun of the little sermonets. What is a sermonet? Surely it is a short sermon. But is the length of a sermon always the true test?

Recently someone told me about a young man-just a fresh-man in College-who went out to a place to preach in the afternoon on a certain Lord’s day. The young man came back rejoicing with great joy. He was now as big a preacher as Brother “H” and “B”. “I preached an hour,” he triumphantly announced.

Surely a man may use an hour and say nothing. Some sermons I hear remind me of the hay that ought to be baled.

Suppose you are riding along the road and meet a farmer with a load of hay. The load of hay is so big that it takes up most of the road. You can hardly pass the load of hay without being upset in the ditch. Now if the farmer would bale that hay he would have just as much hay and it would not take up so much space. Many sermons are like the load of hay. They need baling. There will be just as much food for thought and less time will be used by the preacher. Loose hay has thrown many a church attendant into the ditch and he has never returned to be treated to another feeding. Bale your hay, my brother, and remember that you will likely have another chance to preach. When you have the hay baled there are three good rules to remember: 1. Be sincere. 2. Be brief. 3. Be seated.
There are three institutions of society “ordained of God”—the family, the state, and the church. God has clearly stated His purposes in the establishment and existence of all three of these units, and He has assigned a work to each.

Christians are members of all three of these institutions. It is not only their privilege, it is their duty also, to participate in the work which God has assigned to the three groups of which Christians are a part.

All the work which God has assigned to the family, or the state, or the church, is just and right and honorable. None of the work is cruel, oppressive, or evil. It is contrary to the will of God, and therefore sinful, for any one or all of these groups to do wrong, and the Christian becomes guilty in the sight of God when he participates in any wrong done by his family, his nation, or the church. Under no condition can a Christian say, “Let us do evil, that good may come.” (Rom. 3:8.) It is always wrong for a Christian to fail to do what he knows to be right, regardless of what his family, nation or church may think or command. “To him therefore that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin.” (Jas. 4:17.)

Parents are the divinely constituted authority in the home, and it is right for the children to obey them. (Eph. 6:1.) However, children who are old enough to be accountable to God are under an authority higher than the parental authority. Sometimes the command of a parent is contrary to the command of Christ. Under such conditions the child must obey Christ rather than the parent.

A Christian boy or girl who lies and steals is a thief and a sinner in the sight of God, even though the parent did command it, and no authority on earth can make it otherwise. On a few occasions parents have forbidden their children to be baptized. But children who are old enough to be responsible to God for their deeds will not receive impunity on the ground that their parents forbade their obedience to the gospel. People must obey the gospel regardless of any parental command to the contrary. This is accepted generally.

That which is true of the Christian’s relation to parental authority is also true of the Christian’s relation to the authority of the “higher powers,” or civil government, which are “ordained of God.” Christian citizens must obey the authorities of their nation to the same extent that Christian children must obey the authority in their home. When a command of “the powers that be” runs counter to a command of Christ, then Christians must “obey God rather than men.”

In every dispensation “higher powers” have been “ordained of God” to bear the sword as “an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil.” The “powers that be are ordained of God” for a terror “to the evil” and guilty; not for a terror to the innocent and good. While performing this duty “they are ministers of God’s service.” This is not an evil work; it is just and right. (Rom. 13:4.)

In Gen. 9:6, God stated a principle that appears in one form or another in His law for each dispensation: “Whoso sheds the blood of man shall have his blood shed.” If this principle had not been included in the New Testament, God would not have said that the “higher powers” are ministers of his service while bearing the sword, an instrument of death, against the evil and guilty. The policemen who protect the innocent by means of deadly weapons, and the soldiers who protected Paul, the prisoner, by means of deadly weapons, are doing the very work for which God appointed or ordained the “higher powers; and God never “ordained” any unit of society to do wrong. Therefore it is right to terrorize the guilty and protect the innocent with the sword, an instrument of death.

On many occasions the “powers that be” have become a terror to the innocent and good. They were not ordained of God for that purpose. They were not doing “God’s service” while destroying the righteous and persecuting the innocent, but were in rebellion against God. No Christian can participate in that kind of work, even though the “higher powers” command him to do so. He must refuse and take the consequences.

Jesus experienced a six-fold trial-three Jewish and three Roman. He was crucified by order of the “powers that be.” But those who crucified Him were murderers nevertheless. (Acts 2:23; 3:17.) Therefore it is possible for one to be a murderer, even when carrying out the orders of the civil authorities.

The “higher powers” in the city of Jerusalem were “ordained of God” to punish the guilty and to be an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil.” But they were not “ordained of God” to punish the innocent, imprison the apostles, and slay Christians. When they did that, they were in rebellion against God, and every citizen and every officer who participated in carrying out the wicked orders of the “rulers” was guilty before God. Saul of Tarsus had a part in that kind of work for a time. After he became a Christian he made no claim of innocence upon the ground that he was only following the orders of the powers that be; he frankly confessed guilt and that he sinned against God in partaking of the evil work of the “powers that be.” (Acts 22:3-5; 1 Tim. 1:13-16.)

Old Herod was one of those “higher powers” “ordained of God” to punish the guilty. But God never ordained him to kill innocent children. He was not doing “God’s service” when he murdered those children of Bethlehem. (Matt. 2:16.) And Joseph was not guilty of “withstanding the ordinance of God” by fleeing to Egypt with the infant Jesus. Killing the innocent is sinful, even when the “higher powers” command it.

Pharaoh was another one of those “higher powers” “ordained of God.” But God did not ordain him to drown the innocent children of the Israelites. Of course, Pharaoh thought the nation of Egypt was resisting the “powers that be.” He was wrong, and God blessed him for refusing to obey the wicked edicts of the civil rulers.

PETER and John boldly refused to obey civil authority when obedience to that authority would cause them to fail to do what they knew was right. (Acts 5:29.) Daniel, the three Hebrew worthies, and a few other Biblical characters could be pointed out to show that citizens of a kingdom of this world are always justified in refusing to obey the wicked edicts of civil rulers.

King George III was cruel, oppressive and unjust toward certain of his subjects on this continent. It would be hard for any man to prove that the American colonies were resisting the “ordinance of God” in resisting the oppression of that fanatical ruler and establishing an independent government of their own.

The government of Japan is numbered among the “higher powers” that are “ordained of God.” A few of its subjects are Christians, and if they are called to serve in the Japanese army, they should refuse to drop deadly explosives on innocent women
and children and open cities far removed from any military objective, even when ordered to do so, and take the consequences. For God does not order Hirohito, or Hitler, or any other ruler to kill the innocent. The plea that national security requires it has no more foundation than Pharaoh's plea. (Ex. 1:10.) Since the beginning of the civil war in Spain it has been proved over and over again that the killing of civilians avails nothing.

It is one thing for a policeman while shooting at an armed and barricaded criminal to accidentally hit an innocent bystander; it is quite a different thing for that policeman to deliberately aim at an innocent bystander. It is one thing for a soldier to aim at a military objective of an aggressor and accidentally kill innocent civilians; it is quite another thing for that soldier to deliberately aim his bombs at innocent civilians, as has been done many times by the armies of the Axis powers.

How anyone who knows anything at all about the teaching of the New Testament can conscientiously argue that a Japanese Christian, or a Christian of any other nationality, can kill the innocent and remain guiltless on the ground that the "higher powers" ordered it done, is rather hard to understand. One may well argue that a Christian boy or girl may lie and steal and remain guiltless on the ground that the parent ordered it done; for obedience to civil authority is no more binding than obedience to parental authority.

A political set-up that orders faithful Christians to kill one another just because they happen to live on opposite sides of the Mason and Dixon line, or on opposite sides of any other boundary, is contrary to everything taught in the New Testament by Christ and the apostles. Being a soldier is not a license to commit crime by the authority of the civil government.

The church, like the family and the nation, is ordained of God to do a good work (Eph. 3:10), not an evil work. All the members can and should participate in the good work. When the church does an evil work it has departed from its God given purpose, and every member who partakes of that evil work is guilty before God, and every member who refuses to participate in that evil work is innocent and blessed of God. The church at Sardis (Rev. 3:1-6) became evil and every one who partook of that evil work was guilty in the sight of God. But there were a few names in Sardis that did not defile their garments" and the Lord said of them, "They shall walk with me in white; for they are worthy."

God never loses sight of the individual in the family, nation, or church. In the judgment at the last great day each must stand or fall as an individual.

THE WAY THEY SAY "NAY" TODAY
Edd Holt

The "New Christian Leader" did not live long. It reminds me of the story of the man in a fast moving car who said, "This is 8 pretty town, wasn't it?" and never missed a verb. The "New Christian Leader" is just what some people want, wasn't it? It was born of a questionnaire-born to be all affirmative. Its progenitors made it after their image and in their likeness. It was a paper after their own heart, because it was not negative. It was all "pro" and no "con;" all "for" and none "against;" all "yea" and no "nay." There was to be no knocking.

A good farmer "affirms" his crop by tilling the soil and fertilizing it. He "denies" the weeds and insects. The net results are constructive. A good sculptor is good at knocking. He denies all that he does not affirm. He constructs from the stone the desired image by knocking away the undesired.

The preacher of the gospel is like a sculptor. The word of God is the hammer—"like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces." By well directed blows error is separated from the truth. There must be a denial of yourself before you can say, "It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me." Before the world can see the Christ in you, there must be the negative work of chipping away of the old man.

I know that "in Him is yea" (2 Cor. 1:19, 20) but out of Him is "nay." In Him is the "amen" but out of Him is the "God forbid." In Christ is the affirmative, out of Him is the negative. We must love God and hate the devil. We must love the right way and hate every false way.

But we are told that the New Testament is altogether affirmative. That it does not say "Thou shalt not." Those who say "Don't" don't practice what they preach. They are against being against error.

I have just read the word of the apostles and prophets of the New Testament, to see the way they say "nay" today. I found not less than one thousand passages in which their teaching was negative. And by subjects, I'm presenting some of them to you.

Subject: GOD

"He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living." (Mark 12:27.)

"With God nothing shall be impossible" ("No word of God shall be void of power"). (Luke 1:37.)

"He left not Himself without witness" to the Gentiles. (Acts 14:17.)

"God ... dwelleth not in temples made with hands." (Acts 17:24.)

"Neither is He worshipped (or served) with men's hands, as though He needed anything." (Verse 26.)

"We ought not to think that the Godhead is like gold, etc." (Verse 29.)

"There is no respect of persons with God." (Rom. 2:11.)

"There is no power but of God." (Rom. 13:1.)

"There is none other God but one." (1 Cor. 8:4.)

"But with many of them (the Israelites) God was not well pleased." (1 Cor. 10:5.)

"God is not the author of confusion." (1 Cor. 14:33.)

"God is not mocked;" (Gal. 6:7.)

"Dwelling in the light which no man can approach. ...Whom no man hath seen, nor can see." (1 Tim. 6:16.)

"God ... cannot lie." (Titus 1:2.)

"God is not unrighteous." (Heb. 6:10.)

"God cannot be tempted with evil." (Jas. 1:13.)

"If God spared not the angels that sinned ..." (2 Pet. 2:4.)

"Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father." (1 John 2:23.)

"Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God." (2 John 9.)

Subject: CHRIST

"Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets. I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." (Matt. 5:17.)

"I am not come to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." (Matt. 9:13.)

"He taught them ... not as the scribes." (Mark 1:22.)

"The Son of Man came not to be ministered unto. ..." (Mark 10:46.)

"For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them." (Luke 9:56.)

"I am not alone I do nothing of myself ... neither came I of myself ... I have not a devil ... I seek not mine own glory." (John 8:16, 28, 42, 49, 50.)

"No man cometh unto the Father but by me." (John 14:6.)

"Without me ye can do nothing." (John 15:5.)

"Soul was not left in Hades." (Acts 2:31.)

"Christ pleased not Himself." (Rom. 15:3.)

"Other foundation can no man lay." (1 Cor. 3:11.)

"Above ... every name ... not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." (Eph. 1:21.)

"But made Himself of no reputation. ..." (Phil. 2:7.)

"Philosophy and vain deceit ... not after Christ." (Col. 2:8.)

"He cannot deny Himself." (2 Tim. 2:13.)

"Thy years shall not fail." (Heb. 1:12.)

(Continued on Page 16)
THE WORK AT LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

RECAPTURING SOME LOST BASES
May I have a few words in regard to the church in Lexington, Kentucky? Seventy-five years ago my father and mother were baptized by a godly, faithful preacher in those parts. In 1839 my grandfather and grandmother Taylor were baptized by one of those pioneer preachers in Butler County, Kentucky. For many years these churches, known only as churches of Christ, worked and worshipped under the direction of the New Testament. Then came a flood of soft-talking, men-pleasing preachers; and through the influence of the school and the missionary society the churches were captured in wholesale lots. The digressives have them until this time throughout that country. The church of the Lord has been and is being badly treated in all that fair land. This evil influence could never have accomplished its mischief had there been in the later years more strong contenders for the faith once for all delivered.

If one of those old churches in those parts which may feel a desire to do something worthwhile but does not know what to do, would assume responsibility for the re-establishment of a church in Lexington that will stand for everything that is right and against everything that is wrong, they would surely have the approval of the Lord of heaven. Of course, they could expect a lot of snapping and growling from weak brethren all around, but a firm and continuous stand for the truth will overcome all of that.

There are some good Christian people in Lexington and they have assumed the right attitude, but it will take years to do the work, without outside help, and this work should be going on now.

There are about eight digressive churches in Lexington. There is also one of those other things that spends time promoting unity with a false off-shoot that long ago denied the faith, and in promoting a kingdom theory contrary to all that Christ and His apostles taught on the subject. This group, though still known as a church of Christ, is nevertheless one of the greatest enemies to the church in that section and will doubtless do more to hinder the work in Lexington than any other opposing element.

To me, Lexington, Cincinnati, and all of that good country offers a sad picture. I hope that there are enough courageous churches and preachers left in those old states to recapture the bases lost years ago. It can be done, but it is not a job for a coward or an appeaser. It is a task that belongs to those who know and believe the New Testament. What are we going to do? In love,

AUSTIN TAYLOR,
Uvalde, Texas.

THE WORK AT LOUDON AVENUE, LEXINGTON, KENTUCKY

As a member of the congregation at 190 Loudon Avenue, Lexington, Kentucky, I can say that in purchasing a building a real need has been met. When the congregation located in the eastern part of the city adopted premillennialism a few of the brethren met in a hall downtown. Afterward they met for some months in the Community Y. M. C. A. With a view to enlarge-
A LETTER TO TIMOTHY
James T. Amis

Dear Brother __________

I received your communication of 22nd ult., requesting certain information regarding mission work in Missouri. There are some evangelistic efforts being sponsored by the churches in this state, and much more being carried on by individual efforts and sacrifices of consecrated preachers of the gospel. Yet, it must be admitted that the work is of small moment compared to the need and the opportunities. I fail to get much of a thrill out of your proposed book which is being sponsored by local preachers and others connected with the Abilene College. So far as opportunities for evangelistic work is concerned, everyone knows that there is not a neighborhood in this great country of ours that does not need a great work of Christian evangelism. Every village and hamlet, every country school house, every grove and park, offers an opportunity for a gospel preacher to save souls.

It seems to me that it would be a much more laudable work, and a much better expenditure of effort and money, to be preparing and distributing good gospel leaflets, tracts, pamphlets, etc., in advantageous localities, instead of spending time preparing a book of data that cannot possibly be of benefit to anyone. A description of the needs and efforts in one locality will almost fit any locality to which it might be applied. All any young Timothy needs to do to acquire a workable opportunity to preach is to just return to his own home town or rural vicinity, find a school house or a vacant building, and go to preaching. Or, if he prefers a new field, he can select his location anywhere in the United States, and find the cause crying for laborers. Your book cannot reveal anything new to any observant Christian.

You may be ready to plead that some arrangements for support must first be analyzed before launching out on such a venture. Of course, that is necessary. Paul did not overlook that phase of the work, but took with him a lucrative trade by which “his hands ministered to his necessities, and to them that went with him.” He thus left an example that will appeal to every young evangelist who is not afraid to “endure hardships as a good soldier,” but is determined to fulfill his mission as a minister of the word. Paul accepted assistance when it was forth-coming, but lack of it did not deter him from carrying on. Your book will be much like some of our government statistics that cost great sums of money and are of no profit to anyone, and read by a very few who have nothing better to do.

Any young preacher can go into a “destitute” place, earn his living for a time at secular work, preach a great deal, but take with him a lucrative trade by which “his hands ministered to his necessities, and to them that went with him.” He thus left an example that will appeal to every young evangelist who is not afraid to “endure hardships as a good soldier,” but is determined to fulfill his mission as a minister of the word. Paul accepted assistance when it was forth-coming, but lack of it did not deter him from carrying on. Your book will be much like some of our government statistics that cost great sums of money and are of no profit to anyone, and read by a very few who have nothing better to do.

You may be ready to plead that some arrangements for support must first be analyzed before launching out on such a venture. Of course, that is necessary. Paul did not overlook that phase of the work, but took with him a lucrative trade by which “his hands ministered to his necessities, and to them that went with him.” He thus left an example that will appeal to every young evangelist who is not afraid to “endure hardships as a good soldier,” but is determined to fulfill his mission as a minister of the word. Paul accepted assistance when it was forth-coming, but lack of it did not deter him from carrying on. Your book will be much like some of our government statistics that cost great sums of money and are of no profit to anyone, and read by a very few who have nothing better to do.

You may be ready to plead that some arrangements for support must first be analyzed before launching out on such a venture. Of course, that is necessary. Paul did not overlook that phase of the work, but took with him a lucrative trade by which “his hands ministered to his necessities, and to them that went with him.” He thus left an example that will appeal to every young evangelist who is not afraid to “endure hardships as a good soldier,” but is determined to fulfill his mission as a minister of the word. Paul accepted assistance when it was forth-coming, but lack of it did not deter him from carrying on. Your book will be much like some of our government statistics that cost great sums of money and are of no profit to anyone, and read by a very few who have nothing better to do.

You may be ready to plead that some arrangements for support must first be analyzed before launching out on such a venture. Of course, that is necessary. Paul did not overlook that phase of the work, but took with him a lucrative trade by which “his hands ministered to his necessities, and to them that went with him.” He thus left an example that will appeal to every young evangelist who is not afraid to “endure hardships as a good soldier,” but is determined to fulfill his mission as a minister of the word. Paul accepted assistance when it was forth-coming, but lack of it did not deter him from carrying on. Your book will be much like some of our government statistics that cost great sums of money and are of no profit to anyone, and read by a very few who have nothing better to do.
FOR SPIRITUAL AND SCRIPTURAL SONGS

SEND FOR

OUR MOST POPULAR SONG BOOK

THE COMPLETE CHRISTIAN HYMNAL

Compiled and Edited by
Foy E. Wallace, Jr.-Marion Davis

288 Pages-325 Hymns and Gospel Songs

THOUSANDS IN USE FROM COAST TO COAST

This book is intended to be just what its title suggests-A Complete Christian Hymnal. Realizing, therefore, the power and influence of song over men, we have spared neither time, money nor labor in collecting the songs in this book, having secured many popular copyrights from the leading publishers of America. The most popular new songs and the most popular old songs that have stood the test. We have sought the richest, sweetest, truest, and best. This book has worked its way into some of the largest congregations in the brotherhood in such cities as Dallas, Chicago, Washington, D. C., Nashville, Oklahoma City, Tulsa, Houston, Birmingham and hundreds of others.

SPIRITUAL AND SCRIPTURAL

Foy E. Wallace, Jr., editor and publisher of the Bible Banner, was requested to read every song with editorial detail in order to detect all error in teaching which is frequently found in songs of sectarian writers and publishers. He read every line of every song, marking the errors found. Considerable expense has been incurred by changing plates in order to make corrections necessary in the elimination of all such errors.

COMMENDED BY LEADING EVANGELISTS

Letters of commendation have come from such men as L. L. Brigance, G. A. Dum, Sr., Jasper Dunn, E. R. Harper, O. C. Lamperl, C. R. Nichols, Tillitt, Teddile, Austin Taylor, N. B. Hardeman, Chester Estes, Rex Turner, Jack Meyer, W. C. Graves, C. M. Pullias, Gus Nichols, Dr. B. H. Murphy, Eugene Smith, Clarence Cooke and many others.

EXPENSIVE IN APPEARANCE-YET LOW IN PRICE

Strikingly beautiful artistic blue waterproof cloth board binding with the title stamped in gold. Unbreakable edge allowing book to lie flat when open. Printed on 70 lb. first grade book paper with red edges.

Prices: 50c per copy; In dozen lots or more, 48c per copy.

Also offered in limp binding, printed on 60 lb. first grade book paper and bound in strong manila covers.

Prices: 35c per copy; In dozen lots or more, 30c per copy.

Order from

THE MARION DAVIS COMPANY

P. O. Box 162

Fayette, Ala.