A SURE-FIRE ROAD TO UNITY

Cled E. Wallace

A brother in The Readers’ Forum of the Christian Standard advances what he considers a sure-fire road to unity on the question of instrumental music in worship. He thinks it is the “only way to establish unity on this question and all others like it.” What he has to say is simple and understandable and might have some merit if it did not sidetrack all the difficulties in the situation as innocently as if they did not even exist. We will hear a word from this optimistic brother:

“As I see it, there is only one way to establish unity on this question and all others like it, and that is simply to stop ‘chewing the rag’ about it. After reading the debate published some time ago in the Christian Standard, I can see but one conclusion to come to, and that is there is no scripture in the New Testament either for or against the use of music in church worship. In such cases, I think we are all agreed that the local church has the right to decide its method of procedure in the case.”

As the case stands, the digressives have given up all serious efforts to establish the use of instrumental music in worship by the scriptures, admit “that there is no scripture in the New Testament” for the use of such “music in church worship” and exhort us to hush up and allow them to go ahead and so use it anyhow just because they want to. Now, that would be real nice, wouldn’t it? We are not supposed to even protest an unscriptural practice but concede that “the local church has the right to decide” to introduce an item of divine worship unauthorized by the New Testament. Where did a local church get any such right? It is not conferred by the New Testament. A New Testament church is supposed to do what the New Testament teaches and stop at that, according to the light that I have “in such cases.”

The brother goes on to explain the “method of procedure” a local church should employ when it decides to do something in worship the New Testament has nothing to say “for.” Take a look:

“For instance, if a majority of the members of voting age in the church at Leipsic would vote to discontinue the use of music in their church worship, I can’t for the life of me see how or why any other congregation would have any business to either criticize or congratulate them on their decision.”

I do not at the moment recall any reference to “members of voting age in the church” at any point in the New Testament. The brother seems to think that there are “members of voting age” and others who are not “of voting age.” The unscriptural language the advocates of instrumental music in worship constantly employ in their talk is a constant reminder of what is the matter with them. Unscriptural practice demands unscriptural language to describe it. Where the Bible is silent they go on talking and of course they cannot give chapter and verse to back up such talk. The admitted fact “that there is no scripture for the use of” instrumental music “in church worship” is reason enough for discontinuing it without calling for a vote. If God has not authorized it by revelation, the church certainly has no right to authorize it by a vote. The New Testament church is not a legislative body and has no more right to determine by vote what it shall do “in church worship” than it does to determine its terms of membership by vote. If a church should vote to receive the unimmersed into its fellowship could the brother see for the life of him “how or why any other congregation would have any business to either criticize or congratulate them on their decision”? I have an idea he could, but there is a large group of digressives who could not.

They have progressed farther along the road of digression than the Christian Standard has. The Christian Standard tries to apply the brakes here and there but they are so ill-adjusted and out of line that they screech badly and do not operate effectively. It seems that Brother McGarvey was right when he observed that the introduction of instrumental music “in church worship” was a surrender of the only principle that made scriptural unity possible.

My idea is that anybody who knows enough about the Bible to do so has the right to make it his business to criticize a congregation if it departs from the word of God in doctrine or worship and congratulate it if it sticks to the scriptures. I cannot accept the idea that a congregation can by majority vote head straight into digression and by reason of its independence claim immunity from even a friendly protest. That is carrying congregational independence too far. We protesters have some rights even if the brother cannot for the life of him see them. I suggest that he should open his eyes wide enough to form a slit for a little gospel light to shine in.

Who determines in the church who is and who is not “of voting age”? If whoever does so has the right to so determine, why cannot they go ahead and determine the matters to be voted on? Red tape is a favorite color in religious circles. A church composed of Christians with some scriptural elders and a knowledge of the Bible will not be voting to practice something there is nothing in the scriptures “for,” or on anything else. They will just go ahead and do what the scriptures teach and let it ‘go at that. When a church begins to vote, you can depend on it that it is already wrong enough to vote to do some things it oughtn’t to.
THE GOVERNMENT — CIVIL AND MILITARY

Attention is here called to an article by W. E. Brightwell on page 5 of this issue. It will answer the inquiries of some and satisfy the curiosity of others with reference to the editorial on "The Christian and the Government" in the March Bible Banner. An effort has been made in some quarters to make it appear that the article was anonymous in character and intent because it was not signed or initialed. When an article is published in editorial space it certainly is not anonymous—it becomes a Bible Banner article, no matter what the substance of it is, and the editor is responsible for it. In this instance I am glad to assume that responsibility. I accept the principles set forth in the article in the March Banner, and in the article by Cled E. Wallace in the June Banner, and in the article by W. E. Brightwell in this, the July Banner.

The Incompatibility of War With Christianity

The stand that the Bible Banner has taken on this question is regarded by some as inconsistent with a brief statement made several years ago in the Gospel Guardian on the incompatibility of war with Christianity, and that statement has been cited as "an answer" to the article in the March Banner. That could hardly be the case. The article in the March Banner was published several years later, it should rather be regarded as "an answer" to the former article. The statement referred to in the Gospel Guardian was an expression of sentiments rather than an argument. Since no argument was made there was none to answer. However, any change or modification that is necessary to make in view of the facts now under consideration I am willing to concede. I am not like the Doctor among us who said that he had not changed his mind on any question in thirty years. I was not that smart thirty years ago, nor seven years ago—and I don't think he was.

The statement that war is incompatible with Christianity does not warrant the conclusion that no Christian can under any circumstances participate in the military service. Murder and robbery are incompatible with Christianity but it does not mean that one cannot defend himself against murderers and robbers. There is a vast difference between a murderer and one who defends his life and the lives of others against the murderer. There is a lot of difference between starting a war and defending a free government against those who make a business of starting and waging them.

The mistake is made in the application of the principle. Force is incompatible with Christ's kingdom—but to say that no Christian can under any circumstances apply force would be a wrongful conclusion. The right statement would be: Force is incompatible with Christ's kingdom, therefore Christians cannot use force to promote Christ's kingdom. That is true. The nature of Christ's kingdom makes it true. That is what Jesus meant when he told Pilate that his kingdom was not of the world—he was answering the charge of sedition before Pilate by explaining the spiritual nature of his kingdom. And when Paul said that "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal," he was contrasting the nature of the weapons just as Jesus was contrasting the nature of the kingdoms. In other words, you can't shoot the gospel into a man nor force Christianity into people. The only one I know of who seems to think that it can be done that way is Doctor Brewer who, in debate on Communism with Mr. Coleman in California, dramatically called for a gun to defend Christianity against Communism! That is an example of the very thing Jesus meant when he commanded Peter to put up the sword. He was using it at the wrong time and in the wrong place and for the wrong thing.

To quote scriptures that refer to the nature of the kingdom of Christ and apply them to participation in the civil and military government of which we are a part as citizens is as bad a misapplication of scripture as the Baptists make on the Security of the Believer. Every passage they use applies to God's side of the question instead of man's. And every scripture quoted on the subject of carnal warfare applies to the nature of the spiritual kingdom. This distinction was set forth in the March Banner as follows: "Every passage used to prove that a Christian cannot participate in defensive warfare, under any condition, applies to the spiritual realm and not the material. The conclusions are therefore based on a misapplication of the scriptures used."

The Indispensability of Military Government

At this point it is timely to quote a portion of an able and convincing editorial by Brother G. H. P. Showalter in the Firm Foundation, recently reprinted.

"It must be remembered that the relation of the Christian to earthly governments are not altered or changed because the government is at war. Whatever service we render the government, whether in money, chattels or labor, we render for the general support of the government. In times of peace the government punishes law breakers, executes criminals, and we support the government in this, by performing the service the government imposes. There is no difference in war. All earthly governments are established through war and bloodshed. Also the rights of people and nations are defined and defended by the sword. When a nation commits depredations on another nation and on organized society, and the great nations of the earth impose punishment on the offending nation, it is, in no special sense different from the punishment that the nations are continually imposing on law breakers and criminals who are imprisoned or executed for their crimes committed. If we support the one, we should be willing to support the other. If one is right, why is not the other? Where did the apostle make any distinction in supporting the government in war, and supporting the government in times of peace? A Christian might not want to serve as a sheriff, and might conscientiously decline such service. So he might conscientiously decline to serve as a combatant in war, but it is certainly a poorly educated conscience, as far as the scriptures are concerned, that would cause any professsion Christian to decline to serve the government as a non-combatant. The apostle requires it, and specially at a time.
when so much is involved—when the rights, liberties, and happiness of so many millions of humanity are being tried in the balances—does it to me appear of the greatest solemnity and of the highest importance that the soldier of the nation should more carefully discharge his duty as a citizen now. In time of war more than ordinary service is required. We should be impressed with the solemnity of the sacrifice that is being made by others, and should by no means lend our encouragement to those whose influence would cripple or hamper the efforts of our rulers and the generals of our country's armies, upon whose action at the present time, so much depends in connection with the common good of humanity.

Yea or nay by no means an ideal condition. Neither is it an ideal condition when a nation's criminals are numerous, and executions are frequent. However, we must remember that God still lives, and that God rules in the affairs of men, that so far as human governments are concerned, "the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of man, and giveth it to whosoever he will," and that through human governments God executes vengeance on evil doers. In an enlightened nation, such as the great nation in which we live, we should be very thankful that we are given the devil's agencies crossed, for the devil was trying to kill Paul as stated in Cled Wallace's article, was therefore, an appeal to Caesar! Paul was appealing to the devil for protection when he appealed to Caesar! In that statement Paul recognized the character of our Lord, and to show in a better light their loyalty to the government. It was the boast of the church in the apostolic age, that their members were law-abiding, loyal, and faithful citizens, and that they might be depended upon to support the government under which they lived. We should not be less faithful to God and to our fellowmen.—(G. H. P. S. in F. F., June 11, 1918.)

It seems to me that Brother Showalter states the issue clearly and accurately. Civil and military government are indispensable the one to the other. And certainly, as has been stated in other articles, the civil government is altogether impotent without the military to enforce it, as impotent as a law without a penalty. Paul said to Festus: "If I have done anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die; but they cannot prove the things whereof they accuse me, and no man shall deliver me into their hands. I appeal unto Caesar." In that statement Paul recognized the right of the government to take life under certain conditions. Had he done anything worthy of the death verdict, he would not have refused to accept the death penalty. His appeal to Caesar as stated in Cled Wallace's article, was therefore, an appeal to all the powers of the government, both civil and military, and carried with it all the potentialities involved in that appeal. It involved Paul in the exercise of all the force, even to the use of the sword, necessary to rescue him from the Jews in carrying out such an appeal. It might be well for those who are contending that civil government belongs to Satan to seriously ask if Paul was appealing to the devil for protection when he appealed to Caesar in his refusal to be delivered to the Jews? If so, the devil's agencies crossed, for the devil was trying to kill Paul through the Jews but was protecting Paul through the appeal to Caesar!

Brother Showalter says: "A law-defying nation must be policed as well as a criminally disposed section of a great city. Let us think on these things." And I, for one, have been thinking on them—and I accept the conclusions. While it is true, as Brother Showalter points out, that a Christian might not want to serve as a sheriff, it is nevertheless true that a Christian could serve as a sheriff just as "conscientiously" as a Christian could call for the services of a sheriff in an emergency. The same principle applies to a soldier that applies to municipal, county and state officers—for the soldier is but a national officer, no more, no less. Our sons, therefore, the noblest and best of this generation who are being called into the military service of the nation, are not being sent on a criminal mission of murder. The soldier is not a murderer. Paul says of him, "He beareth not the sword in vain," and "he is a minister of God (not of the devil), an avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil," and "they are ministers of God's service (not the devil's) attending continually upon this very thing." It is a weak theory that assumes that Christians are set apart from society in such a way that society must perform a necessary service for them which they cannot perform either for themselves or for society. God is no such respecter of persons.

Quoting the Old Testament Commandment

If those who still insist on quoting the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," to prove that soldiers are murderers, let them be reminded again that the commandment is quoted from the Old Testament. It means in the New Testament exactly what it meant in the Old Testament. The commandment quoted can mean more in the New Testament than it meant in the Old Testament. The law that contained that commandment in the Old Testament also exacted death for various violations, and the God who gave the law that contained that commandment also provided for the protection of individual life and property by physical weapons and by 'war against enemies and invaders when their national existence required it. This fact proves that the use made of the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," is a mis-use—just another misapplication of scripture. To attempt to waive it aside by the dictum that it is "an Old Testament argument" and "is therefore out," is not sufficient, and does not answer it, for the simple fact that the commandment quoted in the New Testament carries the same meaning, no more nor less, that it had in the Old. The objectors quote the commandment to sustain an assumed point and an asserted argument against participation in military government and then reject what the commandment itself allowed! That is not only inconsistent, it is poor grace.

If it is argued that in the Old Testament the civil and the religious government were blended into one system under God, but in the New Testament the church has been separated from the state, it remains true that the civil government must perform the same functions performed when they were together and which Paul says in Romans 13 are ordained of God. It can be easily seen how the ordinances and ceremonies of the law have changed, that the Old Covenant has been abrogated—but the nature of God has not changed. It has been according to the nature of God in every dispensation to punish evil-doers through certain powers which he ordained for that purpose. The change from the Old Covenant to the New Covenant has not changed the nature of God. The New Testament itself says as much. It will not be amiss for some to "think" on that point.

Reference has been made to some of the preachers who are keeping many parents in the church upset by the constant implications in their preaching that their sons in the service either are or are about to become murderers. It has been argued that such preaching is justified on the same basis that we must preach that all who have not been baptized according to Mark 16:16 and Acts 2:38 are unsaved, even if it upsets those whose loved ones have not done it. That would be a parallel, and the consequences accepted, if the Bible teaches that our sons in the service of the government are unsaved, and damned for that reason, and are therefore in the same category of those who do not obey the gospel. That is what we do not believe and what they cannot prove, and it is doubtful if any will attempt to do so.

Civil Government and Premillennialism

This whole question of civil government appears to be in the background of the premillennial theory, if not in the foreground. It has a distinct connection with the premillennial scheme of things. Premillennialists generally hold that human govern; ments belong to Satan, hence the time will come when Christ will abolish every government in the world and set up his own
government on earth. That will be the millennial age, or rule. Russell and Rutherford taught that since 1914 all government has been usurped by Satan and is in rebellion against God. J. N. Armstrong goes them one better and says that they have **always** belonged to Satan and have always been in rebellion against God, (even if Doctor Benson, the great Economist, is trying to run this one). But Brother Armstrong is on the written record as believing that when Christ comes he will destroy all the nations with the literal sword, as Hitler is now trying to do, and having destroyed the last vestige of human government on earth Christ will set up his own government on this earth and rule for a period of time which may be “a thousand or two thousand years.” In Brother Armstrong’s theory that will be the fulfillment of Dan. 2:44. He would have Christ establishing his kingdom on earth with the sword, which flatly contradicts what Jesus told Pilate about the nature of his kingdom. The Jews had charged Jesus with sedition. Pilate took Jesus aside and interrogated him privately on the point. Jesus told him that his kingdom was not of the world—and was never intended to be. If he had planned an earthly kingdom the charge of sedition would have been true. But Jesus convinced Pilate that it was not true. “My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom hence.” Pilate believed what Jesus told him and said to the Jews: “I tell you, I find no fault in him.” This cuts premillennialism to the ground. The premillennialists are wrong in the contention that Christ came to establish a worldly kingdom, and they are just as wrong on their civil government theory.

The civil government theory of Brother Armstrong and others has in it the very seeds of premillennialism. Instead of the stand that the Bible Banner has taken on this subject having a weakening effect on our premillennial fight, as some have rather wishfully thought, it will have the opposite effect—it only strengthens our position to expose the further errors of premillennial teachers. Therefore, those who advocate the theory that civil government belongs to the devil are the ones who are helping the premillennialists.

The statement of these views has occasioned some bitter attacks from some sources. Some who think the Sermon on the Mount has been impaired by the articles in the Banner are not exemplifying its teaching by their attitude and conduct. A few new and apparently ambitious young editors, seemingly anxious to pull themselves up, seize the opportunity to attack the Bible Banner in the hope that it will give them a lift. Like some before them, in previous cases, they attempt to imitate the Bible Banner and then, thinking they can destroy it, they turn again to rend it. We shall not quarrel or argue with them. They may pass. The public usually sees through such as that and administers the silent remedy.

Everywhere the editor has gone in meetings, in the homes where he has visited, in the letters received from able preachers and discriminating brethren over a very wide area, he has been assured of their confidence and support in the views set forth in the editor’s sincerity in setting them forth. These good words and kind assurances have been deeply felt and appreciated.

So, in a final word, aside from the conviction that the position taken is scriptural and right, I have the comfortable feeling of being entirely satisfied with the company I am in both intellectually and spiritually on this issue.

**COMMANDERED**

The Tenth and Francis Church in Oklahoma City is regretfully giving up their preacher, C. E. McGaughey, to the Fourteenth Street church in Washington, D. C. The loss to Oklahoma’s capitol will be gain to the nation’s capitol. This feeling of loss is mitigated only by the knowledge that Brother McGaughey is going to a work of first importance—a strategic point for the work of the church in this nation. Reluctant as we are to do so, we are giving him up in the spirit of transferring a gospel general to another front where an able leader is needed. The Tenth and Francis church has never had with them a finer personality than C. E. McGaughey. His family likewise are of exemplary quality. Sister McGaughey possesses those essential excellencies of a Christian woman, and their two sons have all the young manliness of Christian boys.

In the leaving of Brother McGaughey I feel personally bereft, in that I shall be deprived of the immediate association of a personal friend and companion. I join hundreds of hearts in Oklahoma City, who regret to see him go from us, in the prayer that his work in Washington may be the most fruitful of his life. But no matter what his future success may be, I personally doubt if he will ever do a better work anywhere than he has done during his five years with the Tenth and Francis church in Oklahoma City.

When the elders were advised of Brother McGaughey’s definite decision to go to Washington, they called me into a meeting with them and advised me that my services were “commanded” for the remainder of 1942, to stay at home and preach for the Tenth and Francis church. This demand came altogether unexpectedly and I was wholly unprepared at the moment to receive it. My schedule of gospel meetings over the nation was full, but I could not see how I could properly ignore the demands of these elders over me in the Lord. My life and labors have been identified with this church since 1922. It has been a haven for my family and a refuge to me through stormy years when the shadows were dark and the waters were deep. There is nothing within my power to righteously give or do that I would withhold from them.

The reasons for which my services have been requisitioned, so to speak, by the elders, as stated by them, are several: First, in their judgment, I can do more good preaching in Oklahoma City the next six months than anywhere else, and therefore my immediate duty is there. Second, I need a recess from many years of constant preaching and continuous travel in meetings over a wide area. For twenty-five years I have preached relentlessly in meetings, and in recent years other labors of considerable responsibility have been added to that. The work in Oklahoma City will be a diversion in labor and will afford me the opportunity of being at home with my family for a time. They need me, and I feel the need of them. In consideration of all of these things, I have yielded to the judgment of the elders, in whom I have implicit confidence, and beginning with July I shall devote my time to the Tenth and Francis church in Oklahoma City for an indefinite but necessarily limited period of time.

I desire to express appreciation to the elders of the churches where I was engaged for gospel meetings the remainder of this year for the sympathetic and co-operative attitude, and to my brother, Cled E. Wallace, for his disposition to arrange his own schedule of meetings (being himself quite busy) so as to help prevent some disappointments on the part of the churches in these rearrangements. It is my purpose early in 1943 to be back in the work dearer to me than all things else, the work of holding gospel meetings, and it is my prayer that I may return to that work relaxed in body and refreshed in spirit to pursue it more faithfully and vigorously than ever before. Meanwhile, in Oklahoma City I shall give to the church I love, and to the cause we love, my very best efforts.
FOR THE VINDICATION OF THE CAUSE

W. E. Brightwell

Brave men sometimes dissipate their energies in fruitless fighting. It would be a most happy condition, indeed, if all who discuss religion knew when they have an issue. However, when the good of the cause is jeopardized, there is an issue involved. It may inhere in the question discussed, or it may be occasioned by the unwise direction which the discussion has taken. In either case, all we speak and write should be for the promotion or vindication of the cause of Christ.

It is not difficult for me to follow this rule with reference to the question of a Christian's attitude toward his government, which government would, of course, be impotent without military as well as civil power. Although I have for many years held positive views, I have very largely refrained from public discussion of them, because I regard it as an individual question. Upon such questions we may have convictions which lead in opposite directions, and may each follow his own convictions without conflicting one with another. In my judgment the present emergency is not a propitious time for discussing these matters. Personal interests are too serious to allow for calm consideration.

The Effort To Commit the Church

An issue, however, has been raised. It has been raised by the manner of discussion. The motive in dealing with this issue should be vindication of the cause. All the credit for the raising of the issue goes to those who hold that the Christian cannot obey the government's call for military service; and who, intentionally or unintentionally, have discouraged cooperation with the objectives of this nation in other forms of service, in the greatest crisis in its history. Far more articles have appeared in all of our religious papers on that side of the question. And more significant than what has been written, there have been many times more sermons preached on that side. It is a little late for such preaching. It is rather late to start trying to develop conscientious convictions in the minds of young men who are already facing the prospect of early military service. Convictions, together with the necessary record to support them, cannot be developed over night. Convictions are non-transferable. And in view of the marked generosity of the government toward conscientious convictions, and the opportunities for non-combatant service, the sentiment and heroics seem rather forced. While men are in such a serious strain of mind, we should be pushing the claims of Jesus Christ and not taking chances with the influence of the church before the world. Men should be open now to the comforts of the gospel, but their minds are critical of anything that smacks of disloyalty.

Some of our preachers are manifesting a spirit that on the surface might denote that they were trying to start a war rather than expressing their calm judgment upon a serious question. Having only one sermon to preach at a place, some have elected to speak on the war subject. Several have actually broken into their own program of preaching the gospel in a meeting conducted for the purpose of saving souls, to air their views on this question. Some have tried to deliver the "churches of Christ" bodily into the ranks of non-resisters and conscientious objectors. In addresses which went out over the air, and were even published in tract form, they have taken such subjects as, "Why the Churches of Christ Oppose Combatant Service." I flatly deny that it is a fact. There can be no point in discussing the "why" of a situation until it is established to be a fact. When they prove to me that it is a fact, they can still have their own way about the whys and wherefores. But I do not want to see the cause sold down the river upon a false assumption. That is why I am speaking this once and cannot hold my peace. I do not want to see the church as a body placed in the same category with Jehovah's Witnesses, for I know that they do not deserve and have not earned that rating.

The fact that more is being said on that side does not indicate that more of the members of the churches hold that view. I am most sure that overwhelming majority of the members do not hold that view and are just as ashamed of the effort to commit the brotherhood to it as am I. Although a few congregations in time of peace went on record with the government as opposing combatant military service, I declare it as my candid opinion that not one congregation of any size on the face of the earth could be found in which even a bare majority of the members really hold that view as a matter of conviction.

Statistics are not needed to vindicate this estimate. We can judge the whole by the part we know. My observation is that nobody holds such views except those who have attended certain schools or have read a certain book, at which and in which, a theory of civil government was taught that is just as speculative, unprovable, impractical, and damaging as any of the other theological bones which have been tossed about for centuries—that is, it is just as damaging to us; for while the brethren have not been disturbed by some of those follies, a few of them have swallowed this one, and those who have done so give audible evidence of their dietary mistake.

Again, there is no reason why a normal church member should ever reach such conclusions without the aid of a false theory. No particular intelligence is required to see the incompatibility of war with the ethical principles of Christianity; there is incompatibility between war and the normal functions of civil government. But to apply passages which teach the nature of the work in the spiritual kingdom to the exigencies of the temporal kingdom is a misapplication of Scripture. Since there is no passage that condemns the thing these brethren condemn, and the writers of the New Testament and Christ himself recognize civil governments, and make it plain that they regard military service as an indispensable function of those governments—a function without which no civil government can exist—why should it be thought a thing incredible that a Christian should be a citizen of an earthly kingdom?

Finding himself born into citizenship, a full-fledged member of society, would the average man ever think of being opposed to participation in the legitimate processes of society, without the help of a perverted theory? It is not necessary for the New Testament to reveal the obligations of citizenship, as if it were a mystery made known for their first time. The citizen naturally develops the conception through the logic of consciousness, the irresistible eloquence of reality, and the compelling power of demonstration. You would not have to describe water to a man who had been suddenly dropped into the middle of the Atlantic. This is not a parallel. This is not an analogy. This is the thing we are talking about itself.

The Government Article in the March Banner

When Foy E. Wallace, Jr., visited in my home early this year we discussed this question. We deplored the injury to the cause through the misrepresentation of a few brethren. He had carried several articles in the Bible Banner which had favored the conscientious objector theory. He expressed the purpose of writing an article along the line of what he believes, and the brotherhood in general believes, and closing the dis-
cussion for the duration of the war. I thought his purpose was natural and wise.

He had not devoted a sermon to the subject, despite many requests. I explained to him that circumstances had led me to preach upon the subject once (two sermons). This theory was being tested before the congregation where, by my preaching, and the impression was being made that the congregation endorsed the theory. I judge that this was the impression it made upon visitors, for that was the impression it made upon me, and I had no information to the contrary. In preaching upon the subject, I explained to him that I was doing so for two reasons: First, by leaving the impression upon the world that our religious conviction put us out of sympathy with the nation in this emergency, and ranked us as a peculiar cult like Jehovah's Witnesses, we would tear down all the influence we had been years in building up in the community. Second, that if the congregation was going to get in bad with the government, or before the world, I must use whatever means at my command to let it be known that I was not responsible for it. I was determined not to allow the implication of silence to place me in the wrong light in such a serious matter.

Having discussed with Brother Wallace some of the arguments which I had used, I invited him to write the article which he planned to write for the Bible Banner. I told him that I did not consider it ethical for one connected with a religious paper to write articles for another religious paper, although it is sometimes done. At that time the editor of the Gospel Advocate had talked to me about discontinuing the discussion of the question in the Advocate, with which suggestion I had heartily agreed, regretting only that the decision had not been reached before so much had been written. But despite that fact, I still did not feel disposed to write an article for the Bible Banner. But I did offer to draft some of the arguments which I had made and let Brother Wallace make any use of them which he desired. I am not explaining who wrote the article in the March issue of the Bible Banner. Brother Wallace used my notes, making such alterations, additions, and subtractions as he saw fit. I am not concerned about the authorship of that article, or its being known or unknown. I make this explanation to say that the whole point in the mind of Brother Wallace, as he expressed it to me, and in my mind was to vindicate the church from implications of a few noisy brethren who were, and still are, creating a false and bad impression of the church. I am writing now because I think that view of the question deserves the consideration of the brotherhood.

The Jewish Conception of Government

James Macknight indicates that Paul wrote the 13th chapter of the Roman Letter to vindicate, and to induce those to whom he wrote to vindicate, their religion before the heathen world, and particularly before official Rome. In his commentary he begins the introduction to the Roman Letter with these words:

Because God had chosen the Jews for his subjects, and as their king had dictated to them a system of laws, and had governed them anciently in person, and afterwards by princes of his own nomination, they reckoned it impious to submit to heathen laws and rulers. In the same light, they viewed the payment of taxes for the support of the heathen governments. (Matt. 22:17.) In short, the zealots of that nation laid it down as a principle! that they would obey God alone, as their king and governor, in opposition to Caesar and all kings whatever, who were not of their religion and who did not govern them by the laws of Moses. This turbulent disposition, some of the Jews who embraced the gospel, did not immediately lay aside. ... In that persuasion they also refused to the heathen magistrates, and by their own admission, all of their public and obedient citizens, who took of it, to such of the heathens as were willing to read it.

This view would explain why Paul said, “Be subject to.” It would seem that all would be willing to cooperate, at least until it came to the most difficult duties. But the Jews had prejudices which had to be overcome. Macknight’s comment upon the second phrase of the first verse, “For there is no power but from God,” is apt: “This was written to correct the pride of the Jews, who valued themselves exceedingly because they had received a form of government from God. The government of every state, whether it be monarchical, aristocratical, democratical, or mixed, is as really of divine appointment as the government of the Jews was, though none but the Jewish form was of divine legislation. For God having designed mankind to live in society, he has, by the frame of their nature and by the reason of things, authorized government to be exercised in every country.”

The conclusion is: The Jews thought their government the only power of God. Pak., to the contrary, said, “There is no power but of God,” thus approving civil governments, including the one under which they lived.

Until these brethren stop trying to commit the church to their foolish theory before the world, enough should be said to vindicate the church of the misrepresentation.

Civil Government and Satan

In the verses referred to above, Paul shows that we should render obedience, taxes, custom, fear and honor to civil governments. In another place he exhorts that prayers be made for the rulers. That is a pretty full program. Does the Lord require that much service upon our part to that which is bad -that over which the devil presides as the supreme head? Peter states the two-fold purpose of civil governments in these words: “For the punishment of evildoers, and for the praise of them that do well.”

According to the theory that some brethren would commit the church to, the philosophy of government runs about as follows:

1. Civil government belongs to the devil.

2. The Bible states that the purpose of civil governments is to punish evildoers.

3. Therefore, since the devil owns and operates civil government, he is busily occupied with the business of punishing himself!

Why should God place his children under so much obligation to the devil? Was the Lord so short on territory and resources that he found it necessary to house us in the slums owned and operated by the devil, requiring us to pay him board in the form of taxes and customs, but bidding us in case of fire to save our own necks, letting the property burn to the ground? Since when has the Creator of all things become so economical that he forces his children to sponge upon the devil’s preserves? The truth of the matter is that the devil never had any “preserves” in all his unholy and unhappy existence. But he does get a lot of folks into a “jam,” even including those who try to promote a false theory!

Does the devil really have any claim upon us, to demand any kind of service or concession upon our part? If he does, he cannot collect it, even in his own courts! He could not collect such claims in American courts, and if civil government is of the devil, they are his courts. Our courts require that there must be a consideration in evidence. There is no con-
consideration cited; there is none to cite; we have received nothing of value from the devil, therefore he can collect nothing.

Moveover, it is impossible for the devil to perform either function of civil government. He cannot consistently with his nature and the holding of his position in the world of evil spirits work for the protection and praise of those who do well; neither can he visit punishment upon evildoers. Every one of the preachers who hold this theory have themselves said so. Have they not used the argument of A. G. Freed about who wrote the Bible? Good men do not claim to have written it; bad men did not write it, for it condemns them; the devil did not write it, because he can never work at any turn. Could the devil then be the head of civil governments which are pledged to punish evildoers and bestow praise and protection upon those who do well? Which time is the argument true? Jesus said: “Every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation; and every city or house divided against itself shall not stand: and if Satan cast out Satan, he is divided against himself; how shall then his kingdom stand?” (Matt. 12:25, 26.)

Some Questions for Preachers

Some of these preachers are within the draft age. Have they received a deferred classification? Did the devil obtain that concession for them? He must have, if he is the head of all civil governments. Since when did the devil begin showing such consideration for the preachers who condemn him from the pulpit and oppose his kingdom? Can they afford to accept any special favors of the devil?

Have they ever called upon the government for protection from evildoers? Does the devil protect his preacher-enemies? Can they consistently ask such favors of the devil and go on calling him ugly names in the pulpit?

Have any of them purchased any new tires since the rationing began? Did the devil obtain tires for them, so that they could go to their appointments and warn men against him?

Have any of these preachers accepted old-age pensions from the government? Will any of them do so when they become eligible? Are they willing to retire upon the devil’s bounty and live upon his generosity? Can they consistently fight the hand that feeds them?

Are they under social security? If they should die before they reach the age of 65, are they counting upon the devil to take care of their widows? When did the devil become interested in supporting widows, and especially the widows of those who have spent their lives opposing his kingdom and his work? After all they have said about the devil, are they willing for their wives to be kept up by his charity?

If none of the above questions hit all, here is one that will: Are you willing to become an agent of the devil every time you are called upon to perform a marriage ceremony? Well, you do become an officer of the civil government, and if the devil owns and operates all of these kingdoms, you have to be recognized and endorsed by the devil to perform such ceremonies.

Is it necessary to go on, or is this sufficient to show how utterly ridiculous is such a theory? Does not every one know that if there were anything inherently bad about civil government, the Lord would have nothing to do with it or require us to do so? On the other hand, if there were anything inherently good about civil government, the devil could not and would not have anything to do with it. The purpose of civil government is good. The devil does not have anything to do with it. The Lord does. And the fallacy of this foolish theory ought to be patent to all.

The theory does not fit. It does not fit man; it does not fit life; it does not fit truth. Man and life and truth cannot be altered to fit the theory—the theory needs to be altered. It never has been tried; it never will be tried. The only way it could be tried would be to place all Christians on an island. Then they would have to form a civil government to keep them from biting and devouring one another. The Great Commission would have to be cast into the sea, for there would be none to convert. No outsiders would want to live there; for life would not be safe. No nation would welcome emigrants from the island, for they would weaken any country in which they lived. Then some aggressive nation would come along and wipe out the experiment, to establish a naval base, and the theory would be forgotten. Cannot we achieve the same beneficent result without all the toil and tragedy of the experiment? That’s right—forget it, brother, forget it!

“The Christian and the Government”

(The following extracts are but a few of many expressions of appreciation that were received in commendation of the much-discussed article under the above caption in the March Bible Banner immediately after its publication.)

Congratulations on the splendid March number of the Bible Banner, and especially the timely article under the caption, “The Christian and the Government.” It is the most conclusive statement in defense of a Christian’s participation in carnal warfare that I have ever read, and it should be published in every paper in the land.

My first guess is that Brother Cled is the author of the article, my second guess is that you are its author, and my third guess is that somebody else who knows the subject is its author. So you see, with but three guesses, I am correct!—P. W. Stonestreet, Chattanooga, Tenn.

The March Bible Banner is surpassing. The article on “Christians and the Government” is a classic, the best I have ever seen, and it breaks advance ground. Looks like the last word on the question. It can be defended against all comers. It had to be done and may do in that field what Campbell’s sermon on the “Law” did in another.

—Cled E. Wallace, Austin, Texas.

I want you to know that I appreciate very much and endorse fully your timely and Scriptural article in the March number of the Bible Banner on “The Christian and the Government.” I have held these views and tried to preach these truths during all of my life as a minister of the gospel. The brethren will accept these truths when they have studied this question. May the Lord richly bless you in all your good work.—Robert C. Jones, Wichita Falls, Texas.

Just read your article in the March Banner. I am delighted to see you come out this way. Congratulations, and amen! Since I put out my booklet I have had several to threaten me with you. I thought you were on the other side. I am overjoyed to see you come out so powerfully for what I have long believed to be the truth on this subject. It is refreshing to read some sense on it.—Glen E. Green, Vernon, Texas.

(Brother Green’s tract is entitled, “The Relation of the Christian to Civil Government and War,” and is an able treatise on the subject. It can be obtained from the author, at the above address, at the price of 25c.)

The March Bible Banner is the best yet. That article on “The Christian and the Government” is the most cogent I have seen. Please congratulate whoever wrote it for me.—A. E. Keenan, Detroit, Mich.

We are still getting the Bible Banner and liking it fine. In the last issue “The Christian and the Government” is worth the price of several journals like some of the brethren are publishing.—J. E. Williams, Pampa, Texas.
LEVIATHAN BOGARD AND THE TOPWATERS

Elder Ben M. Bogard, Editor of the Orthodox Baptist Search-light, and belligerent, bewildered, blinded Baptist debater, often indulges in an outburst of self-laudation. It seems that he has never read the statement of Solomon who said: “Let another man praise thee, and not thine own mouth.” (Prov. 27:2.) Instead he seems to have been impressed with a statement like this: “Blessed is he that tooteth his own horn. For verily it shall be too too.” At least Bogard is much given to the tooting of his own horn. By so doing, he can be sure that his own horn will be too too. So it seems expedient to take a little time out and bombard and blast this bragging, boastful, blushing, bluffling, bombastic bulwark of Ben Bogard. To give you a picture of how he pats himself on the back, I present the following bit of self-praise that was printed in his paper.

“No Campbellite now except some little topwaters who want to have it said that they have ‘met Bogard’ can be found to debate with Bogard. The first class debaters among them won’t meet him. From the estimate that Bogard here makes of himself it must be concluded that it is quite an honor for a man to say he has “met Bogard” in debate. And it is an honor that only “some little topwaters” are aspiring to. All the big debaters among the people whom he calls Campbellites have been silenced already by the superb knowledge, outstanding ability, and powerful debating of this giant of the deep. Evidently he is a deep sea monster, a leviathan, at which these “little topwaters” are nibbling in an effort to carry away a morsel of coveted renown. It is too bad, of course, and likely a little vexatious, for such a whale of a debater to be nibbled to death by a bunch of little topwaters. Well, at least no one can accuse Bogard with suffering from an inferiority complex or of being afflicted with too great a degree of modesty in estimating his own abilities and merit. It seems hard to believe that all the first class debaters take to the tall timber at the approach of Bogard, but it must be so, for Bogard declares it to be.

Another outburst of his self-esteem and self-importance occurs in a letter which he wrote to W. E. Wells of Greenville, Florida, under date of December 27, 1941. The following lines are quoted from that letter.

“Of course I will be glad to come and meet any of your men but I tell you frankly that your leading debaters do not want to debate with me. ** * Since my debate with Hardernan, and his leading brethren confessed that he was defeated, President Armstrong, of Harding College, for instance, and J. D. Tant also, they have decided that they think it best to not meet me in debate. As to Curtis Porter, of course he will meet me in debate, but he does it because he wants the name of having met me. He is one of the worst failures I have ever met. ** * The small fry will meet anybody in debate, such as your Florida man and Porter. Both of them are the best sort of men personally, but they can’t debate well enough to make it interesting. It puts me to a disadvantage since they do not put up enough to cause me to do half my best.”

I knew Bogard was at some sort of disadvantage when we met in debate not so long ago, but it had not dawned on me that it was because he was debating with “the small fry” who could not advance enough arguments to cause Bogard to expend half his mental energy. But I would be willing to let the people who heard that debate testify as to whether that was the cause of his disadvantage, and they would be able to tell also if Bogard’s small fry opponent was able to make it interesting for him. As to the leading brethren among us confessing that Hardeman was defeated by Bogard, I am convinced that such is merely the report of a bursting bubble of self-esteem. I would not be surprised at any confession made by Armstrong about this, as he has his sympathies with the Premillennialists, and they adhere considerably to Bogard’s position on the direct work of the Spirit. But I know that J. D. Tant made no such confession. I have read the “proof” which Bogard published in his paper about Tant’s confession, and it is one of the worst garbled and twisted pieces of literature that Bogard ever penned. The statement given by Brother Tant is not even distantly related to a confession that Hardeman was defeated. Brother Tant is no longer here to defend himself. But if necessary I can expose Bogard’s claim along that line later.

Bogard says: “Curtis Porter will meet me in debate, but he does it because he wants the name of having met me.” So it still appears to be quite an honor for a man to have the name that he has met Bogard. But it looks strange that a man among “the small fry” who is one of the worst failures Bogard ever met would be willing to subject himself to such humiliating defeat in combat with such a great whale just for the sake of getting an honor which he already has. That “honor” of having “met Bogard” is already mine. I can tell to the world that I have “met Bogard.” If I suffered such defeat at his hands as he claims, why would I be willing to undergo it again for the sake of an “honor” that is already mine. I shall tell you frankly that, judging from Bogard’s work in his debate with me, D. N. Jackson can debate circles around Bogard. But, of course, I didn’t have enough debating ability to cause Bogard to do half his best. That accounts for his poor showing, and of course I had no chance to find out what a really great debater Bogard is. But perhaps sometime I shall get to hear Bogard in a debate with one of our “leading debaters” who will be good enough to cause Bogard to do at least half his best, and then I shall be able to appreciate his true greatness.

But I might give an incident that occurred in my debate with him that will show how the “Leviathan Bogard” swallowed “Topwater Porter.” In the discussion of the church I was pressing him to find the “Baptist Church” mentioned in the Bible, goading him with the fact that the Baptist Church is not wearing the name of the groom but of the friend of the groom. They call themselves after John and not after Christ. But the bride should certainly wear the name of the bridegroom. Bogard evidently felt the effect of this, although he did not have enough opposition to make it interesting, and he said in reply that the church should not wear the name of Christ as yet, for the church is not now married to Christ, and the marriage ceremony will not take place till the second coming of Christ. When he had taken this position, Porter, the topwater, called his attention to an argument he made on Isa. 54:3-9 in his debate with Harde man concerning the widowhood of the church. Concerning this passage, on page 167 of the Hardeman-Bogard debate, Bogard said:

“At no time has this picture been fulfilled except the time when Jesus died on the cross, left his church in confusion, and crushed. They thought everything was ruined, but when he rose from the dead, like a widow happy when her husband comes back, they were refreshed and had a lively hope renewed within them.”

Then on pages 186 and 187 of the same debate Bogard said:

“What did he say about the widow? I quoted from Isaiah where the church was to become a widow, and yet she would not be downcast about it, for it wouldn’t last always. ** * And I wonder if Jesus Christ didn’t actually die, and leave the church in gloom and despair, and then when he rose from the dead, and came back and the husband was restored, I wonder if they didn’t say there was forgotten within them a lively hope by the resurrection of the dead.”

So in his debate with Hardeman Bogard tried to prove by the prophecy of Isaiah that the church became a widow when Jesus died on the cross and remained a widow for three days till her husband was restored to her by his resurrection from the dead. But in his debate with Porter he said the church
not married to Christ, and will not be till his second coming; the marriage ceremony will not be said till then. So Porter, after calling his attention to this argument made with Harde-man, wanted to know how the church could have been made a widow when Jesus died if the marriage ceremony had not been said and would not be till the second coming of Christ. Can a woman become a widow two thousand years before the marriage ceremony is said? Although I perished, I could never get Bogard to make any effort to clear up this contradiction between his arguments. He would not have made this blunder, of course, if he had been debating someone who could have made it interesting for him, but as I was such a small fry who could not cause him to do half his best, he got into this hole. But honestly, I would have been glad to see him do his best in an effort to get out of this. In fact, I would like to see him try it in his Ortho-
dox Baptist Searchlight sometime. Just recently he had a report of one of his sermons in his paper in which he claimed the mar-
riage ceremony between Christ and the church is still future. Many other such interesting incidents occurred in my debate with him that could be given. He was constantly in such pre-
dicaments as this, although he boasted in the beginning of the debate that he was debating before I was born and that no one could trap him. This one incident, however, will be sufficient to show what great superiority Bogard possesses!

As to my ability to meet Bogard or any of his brethren, I am willing for my brethren to testify. There is no need for me to make any claims for myself. So, following the advice of Solomon, I am willing to let another praise me, and not my own lips. This is the reverse of the course followed by Bogard. The following statements from my own brethren will give what they think about it. Brother John A. Spears, who lives at Hulbert, Oklahoma, where my debate with Bogard was conducted, said in his report of that debate in the Gospel Advocate of December 26, 1940:

"The Porter-Bogard debate was held at Hulbert, Oklahoma, October 29 to November 2. Brother Porter's efforts in this debate were most satisfactory, not only to the brethren at Hulbert, but also to the many visiting brethren from nearby congregations. I had heard the Porter-Jackson debate at Rush Springs last year, and knew what Brother Porter could do, yet his work here far overshadowed his decisive defeat of Dr. Jack-
son. The truth will never suffer in Brother Porter's hands."

Brother Joe H. Blue, who will doubtless be recognized by Bogard as one of our leading debaters, in reporting in the Gospel Advocate of December 5, 1941, my debate with W. E. Sherrill, said:

"Brother Porter was master of the situation in every respect. He defended the truth and exposed error to the satisfaction of all the brethren. He is fully prepared to meet any sectarian on earth. The brotherhood need not be afraid to call him to defend the truth at any time."

Brother Rue Porter, Neosho, Missouri, another one of our leading preachers and debaters, but not related to me, said in a recent letter:

"I have said it so many times to others that I am not at all embarrassed to say to you that I count W. Curtis Porter as the equal of any man living as a defender of the truth in debate, and far superior to many who consider themselves quite capa-
ble."

Brother Foy E. Wallace, Jr., Editor of the Bible Banner, in a letter to Brother Joe Laird, said:

"Curtis Porter, in my opinion, does the job just a little cleaner and better than anybody I know. He has a winning way, stays in a fine humor, is original and quick, and has a repartee that never fails to land his punches."

I have had many such statements from many of my brethren. While I appreciated them all, I have made no effort to keep them permanently. I am certainly willing for the hundreds of brethren who know me to say whether I am a topwater when compared to Ben M. Bogard.

---

**A PROHIBITED SALE**

_ John W. Hedge_

"Buy the truth, and sell it not." (Prov. 23:23.) A thing might be offered for sale for at least two reasons. First, it could have served one's purpose and he has no further need of it. Second, the amount invested in a thing might bring greater returns if invested in something greater and better. In either case a sale would be in order. But why does God prohibit men to sell the truth?

"The truth as it is in Christ" is the only means provided and offered by high heaven to free us from sin. "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." As long as "sin reigns" over man just that long will he need the truth to deliver him therefrom. The truth, the gospel of Christ, has not, as some contend, "served its purpose." We do not need "another gospel" in "our modern world." There is neither a divine nor human reason why we should "sell" the "old Jerusalem gospel" for the "modern gospels" as preached by "seducing spirits." It is downright infidelity to offer it "for sale" and those who do so might as well throw their Bibles away. If the gospel as preached by the apostles served only the generation of that day and time and will not fit into our program today, why has it been preserved? And more, why do these modern infidels continue to carry their Bibles around and "pretend" to believe it? I do not carry the "book of Mormon" around and "preach from it" because I don't believe a word of it.

There is nothing in which we may invest "our all" that will bring greater returns than the truth, the gospel of Christ. This truth is said to "purify" our souls, to "sanctify" our hearts, and make us "free from sin." Could you invest in anything else which would bring greater returns? Who makes the claim that those so-called "modern gospels" or doctrines of men accomplishes this much for us? Do not those who "teach for doctrine the commandments of men" tell you that you do not have to accept such to be saved? Yes. And they also will tell you that you must believe the gospel of Christ to be saved. So they being witness what they "teach for doctrine" is not the gospel, the truth. If it is not "the gospel" then it is "another gospel" and the curse of God comes upon the one who teaches it.

Among the things that brought about the terrible condition of the race of mankind as represented by Paul in Rom. 1:21-32, was that "they exchanged the truth of God for a lie."

Searcely had the inspired agents of God given the world the gospel of Christ till some began to "sell" it for error. The "seducing spirits" went forth "teaching for doctrine the command-
ments of men" and as a result denominationalism was born. Truth was crushed to earth and the prophecy of Amos was fulfilled: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord God, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord; and they shall wander from sea to sea, and from the north even to the east, they shall run to and fro to seek the word of the Lord, and shall not find it. In that day the fair virgins and young men shall faint for thirst." (Amos 8:11-13.) The night of the "dark ages" came on as a result of men selling the truth for error, and ignorance, superstition, and sin reigned. And it was not until the Bible was returned to the masses and its principles believed, loved and obeyed, could men hope for the ending of that night. The pioneer preachers of "the restoration move-
ment" are entitled to the honor of inducing men to again "buy the truth, and sell it not." That plea continues unto this day on the part of those who love the truth. If we have those who are so "soft" and "kind" in our midst, who "have men's person in admiration" more than they admire the truth, we may well expect this thing of selling the truth to continue. But woe unto those who violate God's prohibition!
The mixing of Christianity with everything else in the early centuries produced Catholicism and Protestant Denominationalism. There has always been a strong pressure by the unconverted who imagined themselves in the church to make the church more like the world. They think that the church should be made over to fit the people rather than converting them to the New Testament pattern. We frequently see church members trying to get some man to cast his lot with us because his wife is a member. Many times some person who has married out of the church strives to put a muzzle on the preacher because the husband or wife does not relish Bible teaching on certain points. Members of the church will sing with the instrument and even sing in the choir at the sectarian church, who claim they would not approve of it in the church of Christ. About three-fourths of the church in this generation oppose religious controversy and in this way lay down the gap for all kinds of false teaching. They want the church to be influential because of the fine church house, the rich members, or the numerical size of the congregation rather than by difference of doctrine and practice.

Abraham would not take “even to a shoe latchet” of the inhabitants of the cities of the plains for he did not want to be under obligation to them, and he went right on keeping that separateness which alone was pleasing to God. The enemies of Nehemiah, who were also the enemies of God, after trying to hinder the work by every other means to no avail, invited him down to the plain of Ono to a kiss-and-make-up party. The principal fault of Jehoshaphat was that he “joined affinity with Ahab” (2 Chr. 18:1), and was reproved in the following words: “Shouldest thou help the ungodly, and love them that hate the Lord? Therefore is wrath upon thee from before the Lord.” (2 Chr. 19:2).

I am a friend of education and have no more objection to brethren operating schools than I would to their operating a grocery store, or any other legitimate business, so long as they do it as a private business and not as a church institution. But I think I see some of these increasingly powerful agencies setting the precedent for the young preachers and future elders they are now training, for too much fraternity with institutions which have always been uncompromising enemies of the New Testament church. David Lipscomb College was the Nashville Bible School during the lifetime of David Lipscomb, and if I remember correctly, before his funeral the name was changed. Along with the change in name came a change of policy and character. Where David Lipscomb stood like a stone wall against the innovations of the Christian Church so that one of the leading champions of that movement declared that there would have to be some first class funerals before conditions would be right for them. His predictions proved to be correct, for just a few years ago, David Lipscomb College put on a campaign to raise money in which some of the most prominent Digressives were leading actors. Can you imagine the Digressives of thirty-five years ago contributing to Nashville Bible School? Is it reasonable to think that they would now contribute if they thought that David Lipscomb College would continue David Lipscomb’s fight on them? Can David Lipscomb College, after receiving their money, fight them as David Lipscomb did? Will the young preachers who are now trained there be inspired to fight them? No. The new “Unity Meeting” is now the consistent thing.

Harding College feels called upon continually to restate its position with reference to “Premillennialism.” Those in control of its affairs would like for those who oppose that theory to believe they also oppose it. But everyone who thinks can see that they love those who teach it and hate those who oppose it. This shows unmistakably where their sympathies are. There is a fact that shows the reason for this great sympathy. The president of that institution admitted to me that they received considerable sums of money through the good offices of Clinton Davidson. It is not reasonable that Harding College can be financed by Premillennial money and at the same time fight that theory. It will not be done! In the days when the “Ku Klux” were a spectre to be reckoned with, preachers received purses as they were presented by a hooded visitor in their meetings. It could not mean anything if it did not mean that the preacher was a member of that cowardly organization, or was being paid to keep his mouth shut! The organization would not give money and the preacher would not receive money without at least an implied obligation.

Sometimes when brethren build a house they solicit funds from the public generally. When they do so there is an implied obligation to go light on denominationalism.

Abilene Christian College received a great sum from a Baptist. So I am not expecting them to fight the Baptists like J. A. Harding did when he was head of Nashville Bible School.

There can be no truce or fraternity between the New Testament church and denominationalism. Solomon said, “Every man is a friend to him that giveth gifts” (Prov. 19:6). Daniel said to the king, “Let thy gifts be to thyself.”

Who Should Teach Our Young Preachers?

One hundred years ago nearly all denominational leaders were believers in the divinity of the Bible, who had no difficulty believing that “all things are possible with God,” and accepted without question the verbal inspiration of the Bible and its stories of miracles. Today it is rare that we find one who so believes. Theological schools are grinding out professional preachers intended to be superintendents of social centers, superficial sycophants who scoff at the Bible. Whether it is Catholicism or Communism, it is known that those in possession of the schools mould the next generation. It has been the history of religious schools that they have been hot-beds and nurseries for heresy. Schools in metropolitan cities in the early centuries of Christianity played a dominant part in the development of Catholicism. Nearly all the great church schools of early American history have long since outgrown their swaddling clothes have kicked off their religious parentage have played the prodigal and are now in the hog-pen of atheism. Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Vanderbilt, in fact, practically every private college and university in the land were once church schools established by those who loved the Bible and religion enough to leave the civilization of Europe to brave the dangers and hardships of the new land of America that they might read the Bible and practice its teaching in peace.

These schools at first were manned by God-fearing believers, No others would have been tolerated. Today in any of these schools a professor who dared defend religion and the Bible would be subjected to scorn and probably would be summarily dismissed as a disgrace to a scholarly profession.
Human nature is about the same the world over and the tendency toward departure from true religion has been experienced over and over among us during the last hundred years. Unfortunately, almost all great and powerful things are capable of a bad as well as a good use, and the devil’s agents make more effective use of them than the children of light. If a thing has been tried over and over for thousands of years with only one final result, it is not very hopeful that we can achieve a more desirable end. Since schools have always finally been productive of more evil than good for the cause of Christ, this seems an exhibition of divine wisdom that no such means have been specified in the perfect law of liberty.

The Harding Bulletin taught that those operating schools could draw safer conclusions on religious questions. If this is true, then the Lord is guilty of leaving out the greatest agency he had to hand on the theme may only be a work of supererogation, or, in plainer speech, carrying coals to Newcastle.

At the risk of wasting the gentle reader’s time, who may have already digested the full contents of the ample dish served him by my undivulged brother, I shall attempt to set down in order my impressions of what the Scriptures teach on the subject of the use of physical force to suppress lawlessness.

First of all, entrance into Christ’s kingdom on earth does not take one out of this world: if he has married a wife, he cannot leave her; if he has agreed to make payments on a radio, the contract is not cancelled; if he has a job, he cannot quit it for the life of Rile; if he has a debt to pay to society, he is not released from that obligation. The ordinary duties of life continue, and one of these, when one’s homeland is wantonly attacked, is to defend it with every power he has at his command.

When I became a Christian back in January, 1918, I needed the safeguards of human life in a large city to continue: the fireman to stand by in the station house, the policeman on the beat, the city chemist to keep testing the community’s water supply. These all were the servants to Caesar. Yet my existence depended upon them, and still does. If the human government is conceived in sin and born in iniquity, and all its servants the Devil’s flunkies, then comes to pass a hard thing for me to get through my noodle: “How can my well-being in life, my freedom to worship and serve God, depend on someone else’s going to hell?” This doesn’t make sense in any language, including the Scandinavian.

Allow me to introduce what is perhaps the first bit of speculation ever to be admitted to the columns of this periodical: But that good Samaritan, that man who picked up the speculation ever to be admitted to the columns of this periodical: But that good Samaritan, that man who picked up the...
ON THE SIDELINES
Cled E. Wallace

Number One Shekel-Rouser

Sometime ago the editor of the Bible Banner voiced the disgust a lot of brethren feel over “The Begging Broadcast,” purporting to speak for “the churches of Christ.” It stirred up quite a tempest and the wind is still blowing. I’m not exactly an impartial observer but feel at liberty to make some remarks on the storm as viewed from here. Our Number One Beggar and shekel-rouser is still releasing vociferous gusts. Send me a dollar, please, and hurry, hurry, hurry! It is “your final opportunity.” The next call may be for a dollar and a half or even two dollars! One brother describes it as “circular letters begging, radio begging, promotion schemes, all using the church as the goat” and remarks that it “is fine business, but not for the Lord.” The wind promoter advertises himself as “Young and Powerful. Known as Firm and Fearless from Coast to Coast.” It reminds me of the remark the old colored man made to his wife and baby, but if I kill that intruder I do what the Testament forbids.”

He sho’ do recommend his’elf, don’t he?” Is humility no longer a virtue? The church does not deserve to be plagued with a J. Frank Norris and a Frank B. Robinson of “Psychiana” fame all rolled into one “Young and Powerful.” If you think it does, why send him a dollar?

“For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus’ sake.” “For neither at any time were we found using words of flattery, as ye know, nor a cloak of covetousness, God is witness; not seeking glory of men, neither from you nor from others, when we might have claimed authority as apostles of Christ. But we were gentle in the midst of you, as when a nurse cherisheth her own children: even so, being affectionately desirous of you, we were well pleased to impart unto you, not the gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were become very dear to us.”

So spoke Paul “the aged.” The radio is an instrument of great harm to the cause of true religion when it is employed by shekel-rousers motivated by a sense of profit and self-praise.

Making Progress

A brilliant young brother, not too young at that, has told us in a leading journal what a Christian should do in wartime. The Sermon on the Mount must be observed to the very letter and he must under no circumstances take human life. The church does not deserve to be plagued with only whips as weapons. It would be unique but some use might be found for such a company in the regular army. Personally, I do not believe that the kingdom of God is to be advanced, or defended, either by the sword, or by whips, but I have a lot of confidence in “the sword” as a weapon for defending our shores against invasion. Jesus was not taking the sword from government in the Sermon on the Mount, nor did he limit our brother to whips in the defense of his wife and baby. He needs to burn a little more oil on that document.

He is Stepping Out

An erstwhile admirer and supporter in Alabama is stepping out. Sometimes may recall that a while ago he caught fire with zeal to wage a holy war on the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation. Recent salvos from heavy guns have been directed at the Bible Banner editor and me. Brother Showalter and some other men who were defending the truth before he was born, also got raked with shrapnel. Casualty lists should begin to appear. “We are all out for Sound Doctrine in our religious journals” and it looks as though the New Jerusalem might be removed from Nashville to Montgomery. Brother Murch has the Bible Banner out on the “lunatic fringe” of journalism on his chart and I’m curious to know where he is going to put “Sound Doctrine.” We would hate to have to move in toward the center of the board. The brother thinks that “Brother Wallace cannot by his alert mind, sophistry, or sarcasm, satisfy thousands of supporters and admirers.” Is this a threat or what? My impression is that Brother Wallace is not trying to satisfy thousands of supporters and admirers.” I think his whole career is a sufficient answer to the charge that he is seeking popular favor. If he fails “to get where the New Testament is” and fails to stay there it is an obvious case of mistaken judgment and not a depraved heart.

The young brother has him a paper and he announces the opening of a Bible school. This is to be an “Accredited High School” and a “First Year College.” It includes a “Special Preachers’ Course.” It so happens that he has expressed the conviction that about all the ills that beset the church have swarmed out of Bible schools. His, of course, is to be different. I’m not qualified to say in advance.

As the manager of a school to train preachers and a paper to defend “sound doctrine,” he ought to go places. He is stepping out. We wish him well and hope he may not be dismayed by the raging of the heathen and the vain imaginations of the people. Who knows but that some day even I may be the editor of a paper, or the manager of a school? For the present I’ll just string along, observe the scenery, and furnish fuel for more chat.
A NEW CHURCH IN AKRON, OHIO

Boyd D. Fanning

The Thayer Street Church in Akron had out-grown its building. The main floor and balcony will seat about five hundred and fifty. Besides filling every seat, many extra chairs were used, and the overflow was sent to a large basement room, where the sermons and songs could be heard over a speaker system.

We were faced with the necessity of enlarging our building or starting another congregation. We decided to swarm. In December, 1941, a large tabernacle at 1835 Brown Street was offered for sale at $23,000. We offered them $10,000 cash and finally agreed upon $12,200. Thayer Street Church had $5,000 on hand. Announcement was made that we needed $4,000 more and it was suggested that each member contribute what he could at the regular service on the first Lord's day of 1942. The collection amounted to more than $4,300. The building and seven lots were purchased, and the new congregation was begun with only a small debt, which it can easily pay.

On the first Lord’s day of February, 1942, the Brown Street Church was formed, and met in its new location. Three hundred of our members formed the new church, among them one of our elders, four of our deacons, one of our experienced song leaders, and several of our most competent teachers. Thus the Brown Street Church was born full-grown, and has the greatest possibilities of any new congregation that I know. Their attendance has already exceeded five hundred on several Lord’s days.

For about three months I preached for both congregations. This was made possible by the splendid cooperation of the elders and brethren at Thayer Street, who were willing to change the time of our services to accommodate the Brown Street congregation. I preached at Thayer Street at 10:30 and left immediately for a service at Brown Street at 11:30. At Thayer Street at 5:30 p.m. and back to Brown Street at 7:30. We also have a weekly radio program. This broadcast has been conducted for more than two years and has borne much fruit.

The Brown Street tabernacle is of steel, stone, tile and concrete construction. It is in good condition. It will seat eight hundred people. The brethren are planning to install a baptistery, and build several class rooms. It is located in Firestone Park, one of the best sections of our city. The large tract of land purchased with it affords ample parking space. Brother Paul Wallace, of Coleman, Texas, is coming to labor with them in June and enthusiasm is running high.

The Thayer Street elders and congregation have set a wonderful example here in the matter of establishing another congregation. So many churches are started through division, strife, and a loss of fellowship. Thayer Street gave up more than half of its members without a complaint, making heavy financial contributions for the purchase of the property. When everything was in readiness to start the new church, Thayer Street had only $500.00 in its treasury, and our elders gave $250.00 of this to the new church for a working capital. We also divided our song books, Bibles, and communion set with them. The fullest of fellowship and cooperation prevail. Brethren, this is the way to start another congregation!

Thayer Street Church is coming back, and fast. Our attendance is now approximately four hundred and soon we shall use our balcony again. Yesterday (May 24th) five were baptized, three were restored and one was added by transfer of membership. There is also a church of two hundred members in South West Akron, at Ninth and Florida Avenue. Brother Lewis F. Mills is their full time evangelist.

The future looks bright indeed for the cause of Christ in this great industrial metropolis. We press on with determination.
AN INTERESTING TOUR

(Recently, I chanced to see the following write-up by Brother J. W. Akin in a Longview Texas, newspaper, of an interesting tour made from Longview to Washington, D. C. and the editor can personally vouch for the genuine hospitality of Brother and Sister Sturgeon, whose names are mentioned in the story. There are references in the story also to places and events connected with the needs of the Lexington, Kentucky, work as set forth on the opposite page.-Editor.)

MR. AND MRS. JOHN W. Akin RELATE INTERESTING DETAILS ABOUT RECENT EASTERN TOUR

The following story in regard to a recent trip made by Mr. and Mrs. John W. Akin of Longview will be read with interest by their many friends here.

The interesting account written by Mr. Akin is as follows:

On Monday morning, July 18, Mrs. Akin and I left home for an extended trip which took us to many interesting places in the East. We stopped over in Memphis the first night and the next afternoon rode into the home of Brother and Sister N. B. Hardeman, Henderson, Tenn. After a pleasant night in their home, we made our way through Nashville, with our first stop at Hodgenville, Kentucky, where we visited the farm and birthplace of Abraham Lincoln. It is quite interesting to see the log cabin in which he was born and to walk about the grounds of his early days. I had a drink from the well where Lincoln’s father watered his cattle. We then went west and entered the Secretary of State’s building and through Brother Hardeman, Henderson, Tenn. After a pleasant night in their home, we were joined by those two and went on our way through Fredericksburg, where Mrs. Hardeman went into the home of Washington’s mother. From here, our journey was west through Chancellorville, the Wilderness, Salem church, at all of which battles were fought and the Traveller never failed. About a week from here is the home of Thomas Jefferson, which of course, we visited. One cannot stand on these grounds and recall the life of this great man without due regard for the wonderful service rendered during the trying days of our Civil War. Lee, from Fredericksburg is a monument erected to the memory of Stone-wall Jackson, where he fell from his horse, “Little Sorrell,” mortally wounded by his own men. Going on still further west, we reached the beautiful state of Kentucky. Here we stayed three pleasant days in the home of Brother and Sister Hugh Anderson, Tennessee, and spent six nights and a day in the home of the famous horse, “Traveler.” Nice remem-

Among the places visited in and around Washington were the White House, the capitol, the library of congress, the Lincoln memorial and the old Ford theatre in which Lincoln was shot, and the theatre Lincoln entered when he died. We entered the Secretary of State’s building and through Brother Hardeman’s former acquaintance with Secretary Hull, we were invited into his private office and there talked with him for a few minutes. He is quite a big man of letters and really quite an interesting person. Brother Hardeman delivered two sermons while there.

On the same spring used by them. From here, we went on our way through the Potomac river and beheld the Lincoln memorial, Washington monument, the capitol and the library of congress. One of the sad reflections here was to think that Lee, having been called upon to make a decision between the north and the south, elected to cast his destiny with the state of Virginia. He mounted his famous horse, “Traveler,” and rode away from this beautiful estate never again to return.

We left the city of Washington on Tuesday morning, July 26th, and drove south to Fredericksburg, where Mrs. Akin and Mrs. Hardeman went into the home of Washington’s mother. At this home we were welcomed by two and were shown around the house where she attended school, four of her aunts, several cousins and other things belonging to that age still stands. It was a real thrill for me to see the very spot where the Traveller never failed. About a week from here is the home of Thomas Jefferson, which of course, we visited. One cannot stand on these grounds and recall the life of this great man without due regard for the wonderful service rendered during the trying days of our Civil War. Lee, from Fredericksburg is a monument erected to the memory of Stone-wall Jackson, where he fell from his horse, “Little Sorrell,” mortally wounded by his own men. Going on still further west, we reached the beautiful state of Kentucky. Here we stayed three pleasant days in the home of Brother and Sister Hugh Anderson, Tennessee, and spent six nights and a day in the home of the famous horse, “Traveler.” Nice remem-
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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


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

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

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

Order from

THE MARION DAVIS COMPANY

P. O. Box 162  Fayette, Ala.
For All Bible Classes and Home Study

Lessons Prepared in View of the Needs of Your Bible Class

By Cecil B. Douthitt

Old Testament Studies
Contains Twenty-Six Lessons in the Old Testament, Prepared for Use in All Bible Classes and Home Study

Is the Old Testament hard for you to understand? When using a course of study too hard for the average student, it is difficult to build up class attendance and interest. These lessons are not difficult to understand. They are designed to make it easier for the student to acquire a knowledge of the events of the Old Testament, and to remember the things “written for our admonition.”

A short historical background is given at the beginning of each lesson, followed by a series of questions with the Scripture reference for the answer after each question. The answers to the questions are found in the Bible; it is strictly a study of the Bible.

Many of the questions are worded so as to give information in addition to that called for in the questions. For example the following question is taken from one of the lessons:

6. How was Gideon’s army of thirty-two thousand men reduced to three hundred?

Ans. Judg. 7:2-7.

Notice that the question itself reveals three things: (1) that Gideon was the leader of this army; (2) that he originally had thirty-two thousand men; (3) that his army was reduced to three hundred men. Then the Scripture reference tells how it was done. This is a valuable feature; it saves time for both pupil and teacher; it makes the answer easier to remember because the question itself carries a part of the information found in the answer to the question. Thus many of the questions are instructive as well as the answers.

New Testament Studies
Contains Twenty-Six Lessons in the Life of Christ and New Testament History, Prepared for Use in All Bible Classes and Home Study

Some have attended weekly Bible classes for years and still do not have a very thorough knowledge of the consecutive events in the life of Christ and the history of the early church. This often is due to the poor arrangement of the lessons in the outline used. Why continue to use a course of study that helps so little? These lessons make it easier for one to learn and to remember the greatest and most important events of all history.

Each lesson contains an explanatory background and a series of questions. A Scripture reference for the answer follows each question. Answers to the questions are found in the Bible: it is strictly a study of the Bible.

The questions are written in the language of the average student. They are not shortened and abbreviated at the expense of clearness. They are so plainly stated that the student gets the answer at one reading of the Scripture reference. This is important; if the questions in a course of study are not worded properly, it is difficult, if not impossible, for the student to see the connection between the question and the answer given.

These lessons provide an excellent means for promoting Christian education in the church and in the home. They are designed to help the student acquire a knowledge of the great and lasting truths of the New Testament. Systematic education in the life of Christ and His church would remove much of the present day unrest, make home life happier, and the church stronger in the faith.

Bible Topic Studies
Contains Twenty-Eight Lessons on As Many Bible Subjects as Desired, Prepared for Use in All Bible Classes and Home Study

These lessons have been used by Bible classes since 1932, and have grown in circulation and popularity each year. Scores of letters have been received from teachers who have used this book; they commend it highly. Harris J. Dark says, “This book is the best I have seen in its field.”

These studies were prepared in view of the needs of the preacher, the personal worker, the lecturer, and the Bible class.

Teachers have found this book to be of great help in guiding their classes into a knowledge of just what the Bible says on religious questions, rather than what men have said about these subjects.

Those who teach by the lecture method have found these studies to be a thought provoker and time saver in the preparation of lectures on many subjects.

The Christian worker knows the value and the need of an inexpensive guide that will help the honest inquirer in his private study of the fundamental topics of the Bible. Christian workers have found Bible Topic Studies to be the long-wished-for booklet to place in the hands of those who really want to know the truth.

In the compilation of Scripture references the preacher will find material for a series of sermons on many subjects.

The scriptural answers to about seven hundred questions on twenty-eight of the most important Bible subjects should be of great help to any Bible student.

Order These Books Now and Make Your Bible Study More Profitable and Your Class-Work More Interesting

Single copy 35c
Three copies 1.00
Six or more copies, 25c per copy

Cecil B. Douthitt

402 Wallace Ave. LOUISVILLE, KY.