When some periodicals circulating helter-skelter about the country poke out their tongues at the editor and me and try to do justice to our latest efforts by using such terms as “palaver,” “thin-skinned,” “trickster-effort,” “cheap-tactics,” “a blustering war-monger,” no better than “a premillennialist,” “copperhead practices” and a general charge that we have departed from the faith, and a specific charge that I have perpetrated “a slander upon God Almighty,” there is obviously too much excitement in those sources to produce a sane discussion of issues. One brother is so mixed up he is unable to distinguish between “our American government” and those of “Japan and Germany” and thinks they are “the same.” He is anxious that I “favor” him “with a reply.” I think it unnecessary. What little there is of merit these brethren have said has already been answered in the Bible Banner. We cannot waste much time trying to “define a defensive” war for the benefit of an editor (?) who writes as though he never heard of Poland, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Greece and Pearl Harbor. How is this for rare wisdom on a warm topic?

“If the world is not under the rule and dominion of the devil, then, the mission of Christ unto the world is meaningless, for he came into the world to rescue it from the possession and rule of the devil.”

He did not come to rescue it from civil government as Jehovah’s Witnesses as some of the brethren seem to think. On the other hand God ordained government to be “an avenger and wrath to him that doeth evil.” Civil government is “a minister of God to thee for good” and “beareth not the sword in vain.” Yet, a serious challenge is issued to us to “prove that war has ever been a process of justice.” I think we won’t dissolve our courts and dismiss our police just yet. Nor will we go on a hunger strike and let “Japan and Germany” take charge without going to the trouble of bringing their “guns.”

For the government is a twin-sinner with the one who uses it. If all Americans were like him, Japan and Germany could move in and take charge without going to the trouble of bringing their guns and tanks. They wouldn’t need anything but fly-swatters.

There is a type of “conscientious objector” we respect, as also does the government, when they are not too noisy about it, and most of them seem to be preachers. At least a few preachers are making the most noise. It is a question with me why some of them do not renounce their citizenship and become men without a country, assuming that they feel the same way about the church. At least a few of them seem to think that would cause any professed Christian to decline to serve the government as a noncombatant.

There is a type of “conscientious objector” we respect, as also does the government, when they are not too noisy about it, and most of them seem to be preachers. At least a few preachers are making the most noise. It is a question with me why some of them do not renounce their citizenship and become men without a country, assuming that they feel the same way about the church. At least a few of them seem to think that would cause any professed Christian to decline to serve the government as a noncombatant.

There is a type of “conscientious objector” we respect, as also does the government, when they are not too noisy about it, and most of them seem to be preachers. At least a few preachers are making the most noise. It is a question with me why some of them do not renounce their citizenship and become men without a country, assuming that they feel the same way about the church. At least a few of them seem to think that would cause any professed Christian to decline to serve the government as a noncombatant. 

That seems reasonable enough but one bright light who shines by day and night on the pages of a periodical that boasts of both its youth and its size “certainly” exhibits “a poorly educated conscience.” He avers, does he, that the man who makes a gun for the government is a twin-sinner with the one who uses it. So a Christian must not even help make the “sword” God ordained the government to use! If he had his way, he would probably Gandhize the church in this crisis as far as its members are able “to serve the government” is concerned. But this is not India and he is not Gandhi and neither the church nor the government will pay him much mind, which is as it should be. If all Americans were like him, Japan and Germany could move in and take charge without going to the trouble of bringing their guns and tanks. They wouldn’t need anything but fly-swatters.

There is a type of “conscientious objector” we respect, as also does the government, when they are not too noisy about it, and most of them seem to be preachers. At least a few preachers are making the most noise. It is a question with me why some of them do not renounce their citizenship and become men without a country, assuming that they feel the same way about the church. At least a few of them seem to think that would cause any professed Christian to decline to serve the government as a noncombatant.
The Instrumental Music Question

Cled E. Wallace

The question of instrumental music in the worship is supposed to be “a dead issue” but about the time some wishful thinker gets ready to bury it, the corpse gasps or wiggles its toes and the interment has to be postponed. The advocates of the practice agree that they want it and are going to have it, but they cannot agree on the grounds that justify its use. It is about time for them to settle on Henry Ward Beecher’s famous ox-yoke argument for infant baptism. It works and therefore it must be all right. The conflicting arguments that leaders have used have been no slight source of embarrassment. This is reflected in the rank and file, who occasionally, or oftener, break into “The Readers’ Forum” of the Christian Standard to express their views on the question. Sometime back I paid my respects to one brother who expressed himself this way:

“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.”

I think I made it quite clear that “we are” not “all agreed” to any such thing and that for good reasons. About the time I got that all fixed up in apple pie order, along comes another issue of the Christian Standard and another advocate of instrumental music in worship insists that “we” ought to “let the Word settle the question of instrumental music.” Now, according to my idea, that is the way to “settle” things like that and here is the brother’s say-so on the question:

“GO TO THE WORD”

“As we are supposed to be a people who speak where the Bible speaks, why not let the Word settle the question of instrumental music.

In Matthew 6, the Lord taught His disciples to pray, ‘Thy will be done. on earth as it is in heaven.’ Anything done in heaven must be according to the Father’s will, and as we are plainly taught there is music in heaven with instruments, would this not be a command to use instruments? Why then, can man teach the use of instruments is sin, when nowhere has it been so shown in the Word?

Let us cease teaching for commandments the opinions of men, but go to the Word for the answer which is final authority.”

One brother finds nothing in the New Testament “for” it, while another finds a plain command for it. They both use it which goes to show that it is really a waste of time to appeal to the scriptures, for even should the word be silent on the matter, he who wants it will find some sort of reason to use it anyway. As between him who appeals to the word and him who appeals to the vote of “the local church” my sympathies are decidedly with the former. He is decidedly on the right track. If the scriptures command it, then we should by all means practice it and not dare to neglect it. But it seems to me he squeezes too hard on “Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven” in an effort to force something out of it that isn’t in it. That is a bad sign, about as bad as ignoring the word altogether. If he is going to literalize the whole book of Revelation and bring everything into the church that book locates in heaven, he will have to make room for a “golden altar” and “a golden censor” to go along with the “music in heaven with instruments.” Since the word “is final authority” he ought not to neglect some of the commands of God like that. Does he burn incense on a golden altar in the church where he worships?

The brother is right who says that there is nothing in the New Testament “for” the use of instrumental music in worship. That is plenty “against” it. I’m “against” what the New Testament is not “for” in both doctrine and worship.

Dr. Frederick D. Kershner, who is always readable and often wrong, according to my lights, has some interesting things to say in a late issue of the Christian Standard about J. B. Briney, now deceased, and gives him a place in “the long list of immortals born in the month of February.” Brother Kershner’s remarks about Brother Briney are the more interesting to me, because it happens that for years I read much that he wrote and followed some of the discussions he engaged in with peculiar delight. Much that he says about Brother Briney coincides with my estimate of the man.

“Briney was tall, vigorous and active. He had a good voice and never spoke a word which he did not fully and completely mean. He never evaded anybody or anything. He said exactly what he believed and made no apologies for doing so. He was violently disliked by the anti-organ-and-society groups in the South, and was equally disliked by the radical and critical folk in the North. Briney gave no quarter to either side and never asked for any.”

A man with outspoken courage, who does not dodge a fight is likely to be “violently disliked” by some who disagree with him, whether he be right or wrong. It is the natural reaction of small souls to anybody who crosses them or steps on them. And Brother Briney was not averse at times to stepping on some. On the other hand, those who disliked Brother Briney often got “mercilessly flayed” by the anti-organ-and-society groups in the South, and was equally disliked by the radical and critical folk in the North. Briney gave no quarter to either side and never asked for any.”
gave when he locked horns with Brother Kurfees. The evidence is still in book form. In the interest of "the unity movement" which seems to be about ready for the undertaker, it may be that Brother Kershner ought to give Brother Kurfees a place among his "Comets and Constellations." Briney and Kurfees impressed me that in the midst of a pitched battle they had a wholesome respect for each other, remarkably free from personal rancor. Possibly more on both sides of the controversy than Brother Kershner knows about shared this respect.

Brother Kershner thinks that with the possible exception of John S. Sweeney, Brother Briney was "the greatest debater which the Disciples have thus far produced" since Alexander Campbell. He however observes that

"Most of his debates, however, were with the people he delighted to call 'antis' and who liked to style him 'a digressive.' He never got very far with any of these wrangles, at least if one may judge by immediate results."

It would not occur to me on first thought, or last either, that engaging in "wrangles" most of the time would entitle a man to be named the greatest debater since Campbell. I think Brother Kershner does Brother Briney an injustice. He was not a wrangler. He was a good debater and did the best work his side of the controversy ever produced on the music question. That he never got very far with any of these efforts was not Brother Briney's fault. He did the best he could with what he had to do with. He had a rough time trying to prove that the New Testament authorized an innovation in the realm of worship, or allowed or permitted one it said nothing about. This was truly an impossible task when he had a man of M. C. Kurfees' calibre after him. The results of these "wrangles" were thrillingly satisfactory to "the anti-organ-and-society groups in the South" and we are at no loss whatever to appreciate the keen disappointment the organ-and-society groups experienced. A general feeling of futility settled over them. If Brother Briney could not do it, there was no use of anybody else trying. Since Briney the fight to defend the use of instrumental music in worship has been an anti-climax and efforts have been made to win by strategy what could not be won by argument. The Murch-Witty Unity Meetings, now deceased, are a case in point. No man of Brother Briney's calibre can be found throughout the ranks of digression who will make an effort strong enough to "even irritate his antagonists." Most of them are now busy evading everything and everybody and "apologies" are the order of the day. I miss Brother Briney. I wish we had him back. We do not have enough opposition left to even keep in practice on.

As good a writer as Brother Kershner is, he sometimes drives at a nail and misses the whole plank. He says that when Brother Briney left Tennessee

"which was one of his great debating arenas, the nonprogressive so disliked him that it was impossible for any of the more liberal representatives even to establish a truce with them."

He declares that

"The nonprogressives looked upon him as the very incarnation of radicalism and an absolute demon of progressiveness, but in the progressive group proper his views were regarded as the double-dyed essence of conservatism."

I recognize the fact that there are extremists on both sides of any great controversy who say, feel and do things that are indefensible, and that even a near-lunatic as some deem me to be, could not endorse. But in this case if Brother Kershner was driving at a nail the head was on the wrong end, or else the nail was made for the opposite wall. It was not not dislike for Brother Briney that made "a truce with them" impossible. The issue involved ran deeper and still runs deeper than personal likes and dislikes. Some of us who rather liked the snorting old war-horse and entertained a sly admiration for him would not for a moment have considered establishing a truce with him. He was wrong in his contention. Still less would we consider establishing a truce with "any of the more liberal representatives" of digression. If I entertain any personal dislikes toward any, they are welcome to all of it. I do not like their oily, uncouth and compromising ways. I prefer somebody like Brother Briney who "never evaded anybody or anything" but said exactly what he believed and made no apologies for doing so." These "more liberal representatives" remind me of the fellow who ran smack into a cross-eyed man. Said the cross-eyed man: "Why don't you look where you're going?" Said the other fellow: "Why don't you go where you're looking?" I'd prefer to deal with a straightforward man like Brother Briney was. I did not agree with him but you could tell where he was looking.

SIGHTING-IN SHOTS

Sects are about as numerous as were gods in Athens when Paul strolled its streets. Some of them are cold and formal hangovers from enthusiastic movements of the past, the forms remaining, the power all gone. Modernism has played havoc with many of the creeds and the effects resemble sleeping sickness. There is evidence that rationalism has been more benefited by this operation than has the cause of true religion. The masses have become confused or stupefied and are not ready subjects for the pure gospel as it is revealed in the New Testament. It is hard to get them to listen and harder to get them to heed. Even so, the cause of truth moves forward. The gospel is winning its victories here and there.

A modern reaction to modernism is stranger than modernism itself. Fanatical groups have sprung up everywhere and one can only wonder at the names they bear and the emotional excesses they practice. They are not to be reasoned with, even from the scriptures, for they have a feeling somewhere down in the general neighborhood of where they digest their food that gives them all the assurance they want. Some of them have not a doubt that they can reproduce the miracles and gifts of the Spirit we read about in the New Testament. The absence of objective testimony to support their claims does not seem to embarrass them for they are intoxicated on subjective experience. They claim to devoutly believe the Bible, but why they need one, or want one, if their claims are conceded, I do not know.

Some of these modern claimants to miraculous powers are somewhat waspy. I had a long letter from one following a sermon I preached on the mission and work of the Holy Spirit. He wrote a very good hand, quoted and misapplied scriptures fluently. He was obviously not in a sweet humor as he called me a deceiver, a blasphemer, a falsifier and a dog and cited personal charges. I inferred that he could speak in tongues but noticed that he mis-spelled the word "evanglist." Possibly the modern gifts of the Spirit should include spelling as well as interpretation, or else the recipients should confine themselves to vocal activities. Then their rhetoric would betray them. The modern subjects on whom the Spirit is said to be prodigal in the bestowment of his gifts should arouse suspicion and they do when they either write or talk.-C. E. W.
BAPTIST VIEWS OF THE CHURCH

W. Curtis Porter

The Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, Ben M. Bogard’s paper, comes to my address regularly. I read much that is contained therein. It presents the views of Baptists on many subjects. On its pages a number of things have been said about the church. These reflect Baptist views of the church, and I wish to give you a look at a number of these statements. The following statement was made by T. G. Duckworth in the issue of April 10, 1942:

"Then Jesus took from that forerunner’s baptism (John a Baptist preacher) and organized his (Jesus’) church, not churches. This was the beginning of church organization. Jesus organized his church! Then the devil started to work and began to organize churches. Then Jesus, using the material prepared by John, “organized his church.” It looks strange that, after Jesus organized a church, it is the devil’s church. Of course, Jesus did not organize his own church, why did he not call it such? Why did he call it the Baptist Church? Well, the fact is, he did not call it the Baptist Church, and neither did he ever organize a Baptist Church to begin with. Modern day Baptist preachers are guilty of calling it the Baptist Church. The Bible contains not the slightest reference to any Baptist Church of any kind. This fact all Baptist preachers know, but they put on a bold front and select material with which he could build that old fashioned Landmark Baptist Church."

It will be noticed that, in true Baptist style, Mr. Duckworth refers to John as “a Baptist preacher.” However, the Bible never refers to him that way. The Bible speaks of him as “John the Baptist.” It does not call him “John a Baptist” or “John a Baptist preacher.” There is a vast difference between the “Baptist” and “a Baptist.” But Baptist preachers must make some sort of show before their people in favor of their existence. So it becomes necessary to call John “a Baptist preacher.” This will somewhat keep the blinds over the eyes of Baptists and make them think the Bible sanctions their existence. But we are told that Jesus, using the material prepared by John, “organized his (Jesus’) church.” It looks strange that, after organizing his own church, he would turn around, if he did, and call it after John “the Baptist Church.” If he organized his own church, why did he not call it such? Why did he call it the Baptist Church? Well, the fact is, he did not call it the Baptist Church, and neither did he ever organize a Baptist Church to begin with. Modern day Baptist preachers are guilty of calling it the Baptist Church. The Bible contains not the slightest reference to any Baptist Church of any kind. This fact all Baptist preachers know, but they put on a bold front and refer to the “old fashioned Landmark Baptist Church” which Jesus organized as though the Bible were replete with statements about that church. But what about the hundreds of other churches in the world? This Baptist writer tells us that the devil organized them. He tried to “rule or ruin” the church organized by the Lord, and finding he could not do that, he “fell out and laid the cornerstone for his churches, which run into the hundreds of so-called churches.” I am a little curious to know what he “fell out” of. But take it from this Baptist preacher that the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church, the Lutheran Church, and all other churches in the world, except the Landmark Baptist Church, are institutions of the devil. He is the father, the founder, the organizer of them all; and he organized them because he discovered that he could not run the Baptist Church. Yet when you read from the pen of Bogard about the Baptist stealings, Baptist robberies, and Baptist crookedness that are going on in a large portion of the Baptist Church, you would just about decide that the devil is running it and, after all, did not need to organize churches of his own. While Baptist preachers regard all other churches except Baptist Churches as institutions of the devil, they will hook up with them in union meetings and “evangelize” our cities. While they claim to be fighting the devil, they will throw up the white flag and cooperate with him in religious services conducted by churches founded and ruled by him. Of course, if all these other churches are the institutions of the devil, the members of them must be servants of the devil, for they are laboring to build up the very things the devil founded and rules, and the preachers for those churches are the devil’s preachers. But Baptist preachers will yoke themselves up with these preachers of the devil in Ministerial Alliances, Pastor’s Associations, and union religious services, and go along hand in hand with them in their diabolic work! And in addition to all of this, they will claim that the members of the devil’s churches can be saved as well as members of the Lord’s church. It makes no difference, they say, what church you belong to; church membership is unnecessary anyway; and you can go to heaven as well in the Methodist Church, founded and ruled by the devil, as you can in the Baptist Church, prepared by John and organized by the Lord himself. It begins to seem, according to Baptist views, that the devil has the advantage of Jesus. Jesus “organized his church, not churches,” and had to die for it; but the devil organized hundreds of churches, and did not have to give his life for any of them. Yet any one of those organized by the devil can accomplish as much for the salvation of men as the one that Jesus purchased with his own blood. According to this, the power of the devil far exceeded the power of Jesus. But I suppose Jesus will have the final advantage, however, for he will eventually get all of those in his own church and a big portion of those in the devil’s hundreds of churches too. So the devil fails in that the institutions founded and ruled by him will not increase the population of his eternal habitation. His members and preachers will go to heaven eventually despite his rule over them. Another interesting thing in the statement made by this Baptist preacher about churches is, the church he founded” is the old fashioned Landmark Baptist Church.” So even all other Baptist Churches except the “Landmark Baptist Church” exist by the authority and will of the devil. If you are a member of the Fundamentalist Baptist Church, the Convention Baptist Church, or any other Baptist Church, except the Landmark, you belong to one of the devil’s institutions. The only one of the Baptist churches that Jesus founded is the Landmark. But I make this pledge. If any Landmark Baptist preacher will find in the Bible any mention of the Landmark Baptist Church being founded by Christ, I will show from the same chapter that he founded all other Baptist churches too and that he organized all the hundreds of churches which they claim to be institutions of the devil. Do you know of any Baptist preacher who is willing to try his hand on this?

Another Baptist view of the church is the view of Ben M. Bogard himself. He says in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight of July 25, 1942:

“The home is God’s institution and is the most important institution on earth. It should be considered first; it is more important than the church.”

I have known all along, of course, that Baptists regarded the church as somewhat of a non-essential. At least, it is regarded as not essential to the salvation of man, But this is the first instance that I remember of hearing it proclaimed that the church is less important than the home. The home, according to Bogard, is superior to the church. It should be given first consideration. Of course, Jesus did not purchase the home with his blood-he purchased the church with his blood (Acts 9:28)—but the home is more valuable and important than the church. Jesus said: “Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness.” Mat. 6:33, But Bogard says to give first consideration to the home. Jesus exalts the kingdom or church to the place of prime consideration; but Bogard says the home should occupy that place. I suppose Bogard knows more about it than
SECTARIAN INCONSISTENCIES

w. e. P.

I have often called attention to the fact that sectarian preachers cannot preach or write without involving themselves in endless inconsistencies. They not only contradict the Bible but they constantly contradict themselves. What they preach or write on one phase of their theology is in direct conflict with their teaching on some other point. This is apparent to any one who will carefully note their declarations. Further evidence of these inconsistencies is presented herewith. Note carefully the following from a Baptist preacher:

"The Bible teaches that repentance and faith are sacred duties (in other words, repentance is something we DO, and faith is something we have), and the Bible teaches that these two graces are inseparable."  
"Repentance, in the sense that God demands repentance, is a three-fold work that we ourselves do."—James MacKrell in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

These statements relative to repentance are easily understood. Even this Baptist preacher understands that repentance is something we do, and he emphasized the word "do" by spelling it in capital letters. Furthermore he says that the kind of repentance that God demands is "three-fold work that we ourselves do." Repentance, then, according to this sectarian preacher, is not something that God does for us, but it is something we do ourselves. And being something "we ourselves do," it is declared by this preacher to be a "three-fold work." What? Repentance a work? This is exactly what this Baptist preacher says about it. He says it is a work that we do, not a work that God does for us. So a Baptist preacher goes on record to the effect that repentance is a work that men do.

But of what value is repentance? Is it necessary to the salvation of the sinner? Can the sinner be saved without repentance? Mr. MacKrell declares in the quotations already given that repentance and faith "are sacred duties." That looks a little like they might be important. Would it be possible for a sinner to be saved and leave off his "sacred duties?" Then, too, he tells us that repentance is something that God "demands." If God demands it, it is something that must be obeyed by the sinner, unless he can be saved without doing what God demands him to do. Later in this same article Mr. MacKrell refers to the steps which he endeavored to enumerate in repentance and faith and said: "Any man or woman, boy or girl, who experiences these six steps or conditions passes from a lost state to a saved state. And this is exactly what the Bible means by repentance and faith." This shows the place that repentance occupies in the plan of salvation, according to this Baptist preacher. A sinner cannot pass "from a lost state to a saved state" unless he repents of his sins. When we put all of this together, what do we have? Simply this: "Any man or woman, boy or girl" who would pass "from a lost state to a saved state" must do something that is called repentance. So in passing from a state of condemnation to a state of salvation we must perform some "sacred duties." Salvation, therefore, comes as a result of "a threelfold work which we ourselves do." But note how consistent this is with the following statements from the same man in another issue of the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight:

"We are not saved by something we do to enable God to save us."  
"His salvation is free to everyone, not because we do anything, but this is a blessing of Christ to us and is obtainable by us through the gospel of Christ."

It is utterly impossible to make these statements harmonize those already given.
A Baptist scribe stumbles around at some length in an effort to show that "a church composed of all believers on earth" is utterly "impossible." The Baptist and Reflector is so well pleased with his efforts along that line that it gives some of his remarks first page prominence in larger type than is used for the editorials in that paper.

Dr. E. E. Folk, a former scholarly editor of the Baptist and Reflector, did not think such a thing impossible. In fact he found about eighteen references in the New Testament where the word church had no direct reference to a local congregation but included all Christians. Dr. Pendleton, author of a manual for use in Baptist churches, generally recognized among Baptists as pretty hot stuff, also discovered these references and recognized that they included all believers. A long list of Baptist scholars can be quoted to the same effect.

It has always seemed strange to me that these gentlemen can see a denomination of Methodists, or a Presbyterian denomination including all the members of that faith, or even a Baptist denomination, but if the body of Christ, including all true believers, is mentioned, they go blind, and it becomes "invisible." They insist that the church "is always the particular congregation assembled." Do Baptists cease to be Baptists or members of "the" or "a" Baptist church when "the particular congregation" is not "assembled?" Or do they go into a disappearing act and become "invisible" unless they are all "assembled" so we can look at them?

The Baptist scribe borders on the dramatic as he declaims: "In vain do we look for the word 'universal' in the Bible as descriptive of the church of Christ." Why does he say "church of Christ?" Why not the Baptist church? He must be aware that the Baptist church is not described in the Bible in terms that or either "universal" or local. That church is simply not mentioned in the New Testament. It is a human, unscriptural denomination, a plant that the Father did not plant. The Baptist brother practically serves notice on us that all efforts to show him "the church of Christ" "composed of all believers on earth" will be "in vain unless we find the word "universal." It is a strange condition for a writer to impose, who can find the Baptist church when it is not named at all. We will try a text or so on him anyway. If it glances off him maybe it will penetrate somebody else whose party armor is not so thick. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free; and were all made to drink of one Spirit. (1 Cor. 12:12-13.) "So also is Christ." "All baptized into one body." "All made to drink of one Spirit." Possibly "all" will not do. He may insist on "universal." The idea that the body of Christ, the church of which he is head and saviour, including all the people of God, cannot be "visible" unless it is physically assembled in one place, is next door to silly, or closer. "For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members have not the same office: so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another." (Rom. 12:4,5) This can be "invisible" to even an editor blinded by party doctrine. All he can see in it is a local Baptist church, although such a church is not mentioned even one time in all the New Testament.

The idea of "a church composed of all believers on earth" "has brought many evils into the world" according to this Baptist scribe. He thinks it interferes with the government, mission and "the sacred ordinances of the church" including baptism and the Lord's Supper. He starts with his premises rooted in Baptist doctrine and the Baptist church and with such an unscriptural start it isn't at all surprising that he should wind up with such twisted conclusions. It is impossible to run straight lines of reasoning from his beginning corner. The "impossible" thing with him is to either begin or end right as long as he assumes that the Baptist church is the church of Christ and that the apostles' doctrine is Baptist usage. The fact that the New Testament church is "composed of all believers on earth" leads to none of the "evils" gruesomely paraded before us. As long as the members of the body recognize Jesus as head of it and observe the things he has commanded that takes care of organization, terms of membership, "sacred ordinances" and all. It is only when members become more interested in such humanisms as "Baptist usage" than they are the law of the Lord that "evils" result. It provides for "local assemblies or congregations" and the necessary organization to carry out the Lord's will. It does not provide for a denomination larger than a local church and smaller than "a church composed of all believers on earth" such as the Baptist denomination is.

It was Paul who wrote that "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling." (Eph. 4:4) "Ye were called in one body." (Col. 3:15) This Baptist brother is wrestling with Paul. He in effect charges that what Paul taught "has been responsible for propagating the 'branch' theory of the church, regarding Christianity as a tree and each denomination as a branch of that tree. He might as well argue that the gospel is responsible for perversions of it, for if there had been no gospel, it could not have been perverted. It looks like a common sense of humor would cause some of these Baptist partisans to become amused at themselves when they reason themselves into such absurd contortions. Christ is the vine and his disciples are "the branches." The church is his body, and all true believers are members of it. Neither Christ nor true believers are responsible if men presupumptuously organize themselves into denominations and pretend that they are branches of the true vine. They are nothing of the kind. They are plants that the Father did not plant and will be rooted up. The Baptist church is one of them. Since the Baptist church admittedly does not include "all believers on earth" under what "branch theory" is it to be classified? It has itself branched out into this, that and the other, I suppose we may consider twigs. This denominational branching and dividing is all contrary to the teaching of the New Testament. "There is one body." "Many members but one body."

By the way, it has not been very long since the editor of the Baptist and Reflector rose up in defense of denominationalism. I suggested that he might advance some specific reasons for the existence of the Methodist denomination and up to date I have not heard from him on that point. The late scribe who breaks out on the front page under the head of impossibles implies that the Baptist denomination is it, not just a branch of it. At worst local Baptist churches seem to be the legitimate branches. Of what?

The trouble started when somebody assumed that a believer can be a Christian outside the church. That leaves him without church membership unless he joins something. Something in the way of a religious organization you can join after you become a Christian is not in the New Testament. When people became Christians in the days when the apostles preached, God added them to the church pronto. All were baptized into "one body." This was the church and included all believers. A general recognition of this divine procedure would eliminate all religious abuses. Baptist scribes dream and write about, and one at least none of them seem to have thought of-the Baptist church. Changing from an unscriptural denomination to the body of Christ "composed of all believers" would be a good swap, but do not attempt it invisibly.
THE LATEST MENACE TO THE CHURCH IN SOUTH KENTUCKY

E. G. Creacy

Brethren in south-central Kentucky should be informed about the latest menace to churches of Christ in this section. Abraham Lincoln said let the people know the truth and the Nation will be safe. If brethren know the truth, the church will be safe—they should know the enemies that are within the church as well as those who are without the church—hence the purpose of revealing these plain facts. The worst enemy the church of Christ has is hobbyism among some members. They are tearing out her vitals and offering them up in sacrifice to the god of their ignorant and selfish ambitions, and as a result the name of the church will become a hissing and a byword throughout the country. The combined forces of denomination-alism cannot "destroy" the church, but discord sown among the brethren by hobbyists will go a long way in "destroying" the church.

Some man-made laws are being fastened upon a few congregations by Glenn Page, discord is being sown among the brethren, and the church is divided. Of course Brother Page denies that he has caused division, but who ever heard of any "church-divider" admitting it? We hope that the churches may be freed from this "yoke of bondage," and that a better day will come when "God will remember us." This is not a personal matter with us, although Page is trying to make it personal, and is doing all he can to prejudice brethren against me. But I am not at all interested in a personal defense—it has no appeal to me; however, I will defend the church against this false teaching.

By invitation I preached at Cyclone (Monroe County) on the third Sunday afternoon in January, 1941. Page and Chas. Thomas came into the house as I began to speak. Although the congregation was disturbed on account of false teaching by Glenn Page, I made no mention of it. After the sermon was delivered, Brother Amon Jobe, who proudly boasts that he is an elder, asked the audience to be seated and stated that Page and Thomas were in the house and that we would hear from them. Although it was late and time for the people to be dismissed, I sat patiently and heard them through. Thomas ranted like a maniac for an hour on what he called the "Sunday School." To keep down further disturbance I said nothing and hurried away for home, as it was nearly night! By another invitation, I preached at Cyclone on Sunday afternoon, May 3, 1942. It was announced that "such matters are being fastened upon the church would be exposed, and a large crowd was present. I expected Page to be on hand and that he would have his followers "organized" to launch a "wrangling contest," and I had definitely made up my mind that I would not be a party to such an unscriptural affair. Sure enough, Page was present and had everything secretly arranged to conduct an ugly fracas. When I finished my sermon I called on a brother to dismiss the audience and then you all can stay all night as far as I am concerned. If Page will sign on the dotted line, and I am not going to be a party to such a fracas as you plan to have this afternoon. I will dismiss the audience and then you all can stay all night as far as I am concerned. If Page will sign up for a discussion on these issues to be conducted upon a high plain, and governed by Rules of honorable debate, I am ready." I then dismissed the audience and left for Cave City, where I preached that night. I was justified in doing what I did, and shall never regret the course I followed.

Many absurd and ugly things were said after I left Cyclone that afternoon. The charge was made that I "would not face the truth," and as a coward, I "had to run," etc. I am determined that the brethren in this section will know who the "coward" is! Many months ago the following propositions were submitted to Glenn Page:

1. It is within the realm of Divine Authority for a Christian woman to teach a class of children, under the direction of the Elders, when Christians meet to teach and learn God's word.

E. G. Creacy, Affirms. 

2. It is unscriptural to use lesson helps (uninspired literature) in the Bible class (or classes) when Christians meet to teach and learn God's word.

E. G. Creacy, Denies.

Glenn Page would not "sign on the dotted line," and he will not sign! Why? Because he has sense enough to know he cannot prove what he is teaching innocent brethren, and he is unwilling to be exposed for sowing discord among brethren.

Some of his "friends" are trying to protect him by saying that it is wrong for "brethren to debate," but Page cannot hide behind this camouflage, because he has offered to moderate for his "floating-preacher" buddy-Chas. Thomas and thus hold his coat while he does his fighting! If Brother Page is sincere, he will "sign on the dotted line," and then we will see who will "face the truth." Be it understood that the debate must be at Cyclone or at some place where Page has influenced the brethren to believe Bible classes, women teachers, and literature are sinful.

The best thing for Brother Page to do is to repent and as far as possible "make right the wrong" he has done the cause of Christ, and devote the remnant of his life to a better cause. If he persists in his present course, he will never do the cause of truth any more good, but much harm. Romans 16:17 should be respected and obeyed by the brethren. The church of the Lord where Brother Page has influence is suffering and will continue to suffer till he fades out of the picture, and this he will soon do, as the brethren learn the truth and obey it.

ANENT THE CHRISTIAN AND THE GOVERNMENT

"The articles on the government question are according to my own views on the subject."—W. Curtis Porter, Monette, Ark.

"I want to commend you for the position you have taken on the Christian and the government. I believe it is right: I believe the brethren should be taught the truth on this matter. Just keep it up. I am realistic that I and a great host of others are behind you 100% in what you wrote in the March Banner."—John G. Reese, Chil-dress, Texas.

"I wish to add my approval and commendation to the many that have commented the articles recently appearing in the Banner on the subject of the Christian's attitude toward civil government, especially in this time of martial conflict. I am unable to see how one loses his obligation to support his government and protect his liberty when he becomes a Christian."—James F. Amis, Springfield, Mo.

"Please accept my thanks for the recent articles on the war problem. They express the truth on the question. It seems to me that our brethren should junk the hands of government and try to help the government of which they are a part in times like these. More power to you."—John W. Wilson, Lazbuddy, Texas.

"Your article on the Christian and Civil Government was really good, and your admission that you are still learning is a lesson some others should know. A man may be highly educated but he is not smart until he learns to admit that he has been mistaken."—G. G. Henrv, Abilene, Texas.
Sectarians have mutilated and perverted the Bible plan of salvation, and have “turned the truth of God into a lie.” The three words at the heading of thin article are Bible terms, and it is our purpose to investigate each and show what the Bible teaches, as contrasted with the doctrines of men.

Grace may be defined as unmerited favor from our Creator. The Bible teaches, as Paul said concerning grace, “It is not of yourselves, it is the gift of God;” the fact that we cannot merit the grace of God is inherent in the meaning of the word itself, as well as in the declaration of Paul. But the fact that men cannot merit grace does not prevent them making it void or doing despite to it by their disobedience.

Paul said, “By grace ye are saved” (Eph. 2:8), hence no one can believe the Bible and not believe in salvation by grace. Our Baptist friends have exaggerated this teaching. They say, “we believe that the salvation of sinners is wholly of grace.” (Baptist Manual art. 4) They have presumptuously added the word “wholly,” for it is not in the word of the Lord, nor is it implied. The Bible teaches how one is saved by grace, and clearly shows that it is not by grace only. Please note the following lessons on salvation by grace: Paul explained his ministry “to testify of the gospel of the grace of God” (Acts 20:24), he commended men to accept “the word of his grace, which is able to build you up and give you an inheritance among them that are sanctified” (Acts 20:32); he declared that the “grace of God had appeared to all men, teaching” (Tit. 2:11), and finally “even so might grace reign through righteousness” (Rom. 5:21). None not under the reign of grace can logically claim the protection or blessings of grace, grace reigns through righteousness, which is God's law (Ps. 119:172), and we must submit to his righteousness or law to be under the reign of grace; if one is not under the reign he has no protection. To be saved “wholly by grace” without obeying the teaching of the word or gospel of grace is a strange doctrine so far as the Bible is concerned.

To further show that salvation by grace depends on man’s acceptance of God’s proffered grace, we refer you to 2 Cor. 6:1, “We beseech you that ye receive not the grace of God in vain;” also Gal. 2:21, “I do not frustrate (make void R. V.) the grace of God;” and Heb. 10:29, “And hath done despite to the spirit of grace.” These scriptures show that man can by certain offensive acts “receive the grace in vain,” “make it void,” and “do despite to the spirit of grace.” Will a man be saved in spite of his scornful attitude toward the grace? Most assuredly he will not. Those who are saved by grace, are they who hear the word or gospel of grace, accept its teaching, as the reigning and ruling principle guiding their lives; those who refuse to be taught by the word of grace make it vain and void, and by their rebellion do “despite to the spirit of grace,” and will not be saved.

Salvation by grace is “through faith” (Eph. 2:8), and it is by faith that we have “access into this grace” (Rom. 5:2). It is plainly declared that we are “justified by faith” (Rom. 5:1). That faith is a condition of salvation is stated in John 3:16, Acts 16:31, John 8:24. What these scriptures say about faith does not make void what the Bible teaches about repentance and baptism, just because these subjects are not mentioned in the verses. Denominations have perverted the Bible teaching about faith by adding the word “only.” Methodists say, “Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort.” (Methodist Discipline art. 9). Baptists say, “Justification is solely through faith in the Redeemer’s blood.” (Baptist Manual art. 5). Again you can see that men have exaggerated a divine condition of salvation by adding their idea “only,” which excludes other conditions just as divinely authorized. The Baptist position is paradoxical, with one stroke of the pen they say “salvation is wholly of grace;” the word “wholly” excludes everything else, even faith; and with the next breath they contradict themselves by saying “salvation is solely by faith;” the word “solely” is exclusive and excludes everything besides faith, even grace.

We learn from the Bible that saving faith is obedient faith; and for faith to be of value it must be obeyed. “And a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith” (Acts 6:7), and Paul says the revelation is “made known to all nations for the obedience of faith.” (Rom. 16:26). There is one faith. ( Eph. 4:5). It comes by hearing the word of God (Rom. 10:17), which is the law of faith (Rom. 3:27), and we have already shown it must be obeyed. (Acts 6:7; Rom. 16:26). Hence it is conclusive that the saved believer is the obedient believer.

To prove this beyond a possible doubt or quibble the Bible records something about disobedient believers, and shows they were unsaved. Note John 12:42-43, “many believed on him,” but they did not confess him” because “they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God;” in Matt. 10:32-33, Jesus teaches that those who do not confess him will not be confessed before the Father, and hence will be lost. These believers refused to confess, and therefore will be lost. Another example of believers not meeting the approval of Christ is in John 8:31-32. The scripture says these people to whom Christ was talking “had believed.” The conversation and teaching continued and reached its climax in verse 44 when Jesus said to these believers, “Ye are of your father the devil.” Even though they “had believed” these people were not saved, their father was the devil. In Jas. 2:17-26 the inspired apostle taught, “Faith without works is dead.” That should be enough to convince Bible believing people that men can’t be saved by faith only. But James made it plainer by saying, “Ye see how that by works a man is justified and not by faith only” (verse 24). This is the only time that the phrase “faith only” appears in the Bible and it is preceded by the negative word “not.” Methodists declare justification is by “faith only.” The Bible says it is “not by faith only.” I choose to believe the Bible and hence must reject Methodist doctrine. In verse 19 of the same chapter James tells of some more “faith only” folks, He says, “The devils believe and tremble.” So if the sectarian doctrine of salvation by “faith only” was true, the devils would be saved because they have done all the secretarians say is necessary, “they believe.” They even go a little further and “tremble.” No, friends, the doctrine of salvation by “faith only” just is not true. The Bible teaches that it is obedient believers who are saved.

We come now to the very controverted subject of works, Secretarians tell us that we are not justified by works of any kind. This is an effort to set aside what the Lord said about baptism. Jesus said, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” (Mk. 16:16). The sect argument runs like this: we are not justified by works, baptism is a work, therefore baptism has nothing to do with our salvation. This argument proves too much even for the sects, it excludes faith, for Jesus
said, "This is the work of God, that ye believe."—and ye must work the works of God." (John 6:29-30.)

Let us notice that the Bible teaches that there are two kinds of works; works that are necessary, and works that are forbidden. Note in Jas. 2:24, "Ye see how that by works a man is justified." This does not contradict what Paul said in Rom. 5:1, but it does make "works" as much a condition of justification as faith. In Acts 10:34-35, the apostle Peter tells us what kind of works are necessary, "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation, he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." To work righteousness is to obey the commands of the Lord. (Ps. 119:172; Phil. 3:9.) The righteousness which we must work is revealed in the gospel. (Rom. 1:16-17.) The following texts further emphasize the importance of God approved works: "And he that overcometh, and keepeth my works unto the end, to him will I give power over the nations" (Rev. 2:26); again, "A doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed" (Jas. 1:25); and Rev. 20:11-14 teaches that we will be judged by our works in the last day. According to these scriptures doing the works God authorized is pretty important, they determine our acceptance with God now and will decide our destiny in eternity. Baptism is a part of God's righteousness, one of God's commands, and God speaking through Peter made baptism a condition of salvation. "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." (1 Pet. 3:21.)

There are many works excluded. Paul said, "Not of works, lest any man should boast." (Eph. 2:8.) It is certain that Paul here did not intend to contradict what Peter said in Acts 10:34-35, and any such interpretation of his language is a perversion of the truth.

The works of the law of Moses are forbidden under the new covenant. Because some in the early church sought salvation by doing the works of the law it was necessary for the apostles to tell them repeatedly that they were not justified by the works of the law. (Rom. 11:6; Gal. 2:16.) The context shows that the works excluded are those of the law of Moses. But saying they were not justified by the works of the law, does not exclude the necessity of obeying God's commands in order to salvation in the new dispensation.

The works of the doctrines of men are forbidden. If men could be saved by working or failing to work according to the plans devised by men, and put into sectarian creeds, the men who made the creeds would have something to boast about. But it is not of works which men can boast about (Eph. 2:8-9), nor by works of righteousness which we have done. (Tit. 3:5.) Note the distinction that is made between submitting to God's righteousness and establishing another plan (Rom. 10:1-3), "They being ignorant of God's righteousness" (working this is necessary to acceptance with God, Act 10:34-35), and "going about to establish their own righteousness," i.e., making systems of their own, and had not "submitted themselves to the righteousness of God." Sectarians are following in the footprints of these Jews, in that they willfully stay ignorant of God's righteousness, i.e. the plan of salvation revealed in the New Testament; they go about to establish their own standards of righteousness, i.e. making human creeds, manuals, and disciplines. Every human creed is evidence of a refusal on the part of the men who made and those who accept it to submit to God's righteousness, and an effort to establish their own righteousness. Such works of men's righteousness are forbidden. "In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the commandments of men." (Matt. 15:9.) So it is, obvious from this array of scriptures that men must "submit to" and "work" God's righteousness for the purpose God stated; and that we must leave off, absolutely refuse, the works of the law, evil works, and works of men's righteousness—the commandments of men.

A HUMBLE, TENDER-HEARTED MAN

Hubert Roach

Who is the man? Well, the one I have in mind at this time is that good king Josiah. Even by confining our thoughts to what is said of him in the 34th chapter of Second Chronicles, I believe we can get a lesson from him that will be worth while to us, especially if we would try to apply it.

Of Josiah, it is said that "while he was yet young, he began to seek after the God of David, his father." "He did that which was right in the eyes of Jehovah, and walked in the ways of David, his father, and turned not aside to the right hand or to the left."

Though we may say of Josiah that he was good, we cannot say so much for Judah and Jerusalem. Iniquity and idolatry filled the land. Read Jeremiah 1-12. And what did Josiah—the humble, tender-hearted man—do about all this? It will be of interest to see how such a man will act—what he will say and what he will do under conditions like this.

Here is what he did. "He began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places, and the Asherim, and the graven images and the molten images. And they brake down the altars of the Baalim in his presence; and the sun-images that were on high above them he hewed down; and the Asherim, and the graven images, and the molten images he brake in pieces, and made dust of them, and strewed it upon the graves of them that had sacrificed unto them. And he burnt the bones of the priests upon their altars, and purged Judah and Jerusalem." Who did this? Josiah, a humble, tender-hearted man.

When he had purged the land, he began working to "repair the house of Jehovah his God." "And the men did the work faithfully." During this time "Hilkiah the priest found the book of the law of Jehovah given by Moses." When Josiah had heard the words of the law, "he rent his clothes;" and said, "Great is the wrath of Jehovah that is poured upon us, because our fathers have not kept the word of Jehovah, to do according unto all that is written in this book."

And Jehovah said: "I will bring evil upon this place, and upon the inhabitants thereof, even all the churches that are written in the book which they have read before the king of Judah. Because they have forsaken me, and have burned incense unto other gods, that they might provoke me to anger with all the works of their hands; therefore is my wrath poured out upon this place, and it shall not be quenched" But to Josiah he said: "Because thy heart was tender, and thou didst humble thyself before God ... I will gather thee to thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered to thy grave in peace, neither shall thin eye see all the evil that I will bring upon this place, and upon the inhabitants thereof." What a fine obituary this was.

Friends, do you not admire Josiah for his courage and tenacity? I believe that after having studied this character, I can see more of what it means to be a man of God. I believe I have a clearer conception of what a humble, tender-hearted man is. And as "destructive heresies" and "lascivious doings" flood our country. I believe I know more of what I should say and what I should do about such things to be a humble, tender-hearted man of God.

A DUAL CITIZENSHIP

"The July Bible Banner is the best yet. It marks the beginning of a new epoch—not a new truth, but a new appreciation of an old truth—in which a comprehensive, tenable and practical dual citizenship for the Christian is realized. ... Yours and Brother Brightwell's articles on this subject are timely contributions to religious thought and practice."—P. W. Stonestreet, Chattanooga, Tenn.
GIANT-KILLERS AT WORK

T. B. Wilkinson

Old Caleb, hale and hearty at eighty-five, wanted the land where the giants lived as his portion in Canaan. This was commendable in old Caleb, and must have put many of the younger men to shame. We still have some giants to kill, spiritual giants, and we still have giant killers looking for a job.

The book of Revelation is one of these giants, and many giant killers are hacking away at its battered carcass. Strange as it may seem, each young giant killer considers himself a young David with his slingshot and able to crack the skull of Goliath. Young men just out of school, and who have not yet reached the whisker age, but full of ego, make the best giant killers; they are so sure of themselves. Like Joe Smith of Mormon fame, they have found a golden key, and that is all they need. Age, experience, wisdom, study, maturity, these do not count in giant killing; they have found the key and with it they unlock all the mysteries of Revelation.

Eugene S. Smith is one of these giant killers and he proposes to kill this giant over his radio just as long as the brethren are willing to pay the bill. Like an old fogy will, I listened to his broadcast, decided he did not understand the book he was trying to explain, and wrote him a letter in which I pointed out some of the reasons why he should defer these lectures until he had time to study the book a little longer. I suggested that with further study he might wish to modify some of his conclusions, and even hinted that men might be held responsible for teaching error on this book.

He did not bother to answer my letter, thinking no doubt that I was just another of these old fogies who have outlived their usefulness to the church, and should be shipped away to some happy hunting ground to make more room for young men who are doing things, even if they ask the brethren to pay well for it. I do not object to his broadcast, nor to brethren who pay the bill, just as long as the gospel is preached over it, but the book of Revelation is a different matter. If he will wait twenty years and study the book prayerfully all the time, he will then understand what I mean. But he has a key and it requires no great wisdom to use a key, just slip it in, give a turn, and there you are— it is very simple.

I quote from his folder as follows:

“There is no doubt that in the study of this book a key is needed, and I am sure that one of the essential things is to remember that the book does not run consecutively from first to last. Instead we have three series of seven symbols and then a final summing up of the matter. Thus as we come to the seventh symbol we have come to the fullness, or completion, of the age, and the narrative drops back again to begin at the first and traces a parallel line through the history of the world. More than this, it is apparent that in doing so the narrator many times goes back to things which had already happened and speaks of them in introducing the events which are to come. Thus the book is a study of things which were, which are, and which shall be as of the time of the writing.”

This is the key by means of which Brother Smith means to open up the mysteries of John’s book to us, and make it plain. If it is the right key he might open up something, but if not then the things he does open up will be the wrong things. I propose now to show that his key is wrong in every essential point.

First, it is essential, he says, to note that the book does not run through consecutively from first to last. He offers no proof on this point, and I wonder why he is so sure of the fact. This will enable him when he gets bogged down in some swamp of speculation to go back to the beginning, or to some other point along the line, and make a new beginning by finding something back there that his theory will fit into.

But I find the book does have a beginning point, there with John on Patmos, and runs through to an end, the end of all things, and to the judgment day. There is no other way a story could be told so that it can be understood. If the story does not run consecutively, then it skips, and hops, turns back, twists, advances, and then retreats, weaves in a little history covered up in symbols, mixed in with prophecy, also covered in symbols, and one man’s guess would be as good as any other as to what the writer is talking about. This skip and hop method of studying the book is responsible for most of the confusion that we meet from men who try to explain Revelation.

Why mix history with prophecy and cover the whole with symbolic language, anyway. I think even a natural man would know better how to write a book of prophecy than to make such a mess of it as to mix up history with his prophecies, much less an inspired man like John. He says the book treats of things that “were, which are, and which shall be.” But where did he get that word “were,” which we admit is essential to his theory? Not from John, or Jesus—he just had a need for it and slipped it in.

John was to write the things “which thou hast seen, and the things which are, and the things which shall be hereafter,” but not one word about him writing some history of past events. The things which John saw that he was to write were the visions shown to him, the things which are, that he was to write were the things concerning the seven churches at that very time, and the things that shall be hereafter, are the prophecies that begin with chapter four, verse one: “Come up hither and I will show thee things that shall be hereafter.” Now I am sure that both Jesus and John knew better what they would write than Brother Smith does, and this is a fundamental error in his key that will lead him into confusion and bog him down.

John is not writing history, not even the history of the church back of the day the book was written got into it. Jesus took the church just as it was that day, good and bad, told John what it was like, had him write it out, and told him how the errors could be cured, and then began with its future. (Rev. 4:1.) It is there and you need no golden key to find it.

But this is not the worst feature of this key as I see it. He says further:

“We have three series of seven symbols and then a summing up of the matter. Thus as each time we come to the seventh symbol we have come to the fullness, or completion, of the age, and the narrative drops back again to begin at the first and trace a parallel line through the history of the world.”

Naming these three series of sevens for him they are first, the book with seven seals, then seven angels with golden trumpets, and lastly seven angels with seven vials filled with the last plagues, and each of these, he says, begins at the beginning, and the things that shall be hereafter, are the prophecies that begin with chapter four, verse one: “Come up hither and I will show thee things that shall be hereafter.” Now I am sure that both Jesus and John knew better what they would write than Brother Smith does, and this is a fundamental error in his key that will lead him into confusion and bog him down.

John is not writing history, not even the history of the church back of the day the book was written got into it. Jesus took the church just as it was that day, good and bad, told John what it was like, had him write it out, and told him how the errors could be cured, and then began with its future. (Rev. 4:1.) It is there and you need no golden key to find it.

If he is correct in this key then the numbers in the three different series of seven would correspond with each other, the first seal would tell the same story told by the first trumpet, and the second series of seven correspond with the first trumpet, and the third series of seven correspond with the second trumpet, and the first series of seven correspond with the third trumpet, and correspond with the second series of seven. (See Rev. 1:6.)

But this theory of a thrice told story is without one word of proof and the figures not only will not fit each other but will also contradict the facts, which a very little study will show. (See Rev. 6:1.)

When he had opened the seventh seal there
was silence in heaven for the space of half an hour. And I saw seven angels which stood before God, and to them were given seven trumpets.” Here it is positively stated that the angels with the seven trumpets do not come until the seventh seal is opened, and they are the things that happened under the seventh seal. All of the seals up to the seventh belong to the period of history covered by papal Rome.

Then the seventh seal comes this side of that point and deals with the period of history covered by papal Rome, and it is subdivided, like the first, into seven periods, but it is told under the symbols of the seven trumpets. These seven trumpets take us through the Middle Ages and under the trumpets we see the rise of the great apostacy.

The seventh trumpets, like the seventh seal, is a long one, and covers the whole of time to the end. But it is also subdivided like the other two periods for our convenience into seven, and we find this story symbolized by the seven angels with their plagues, and the seventh in this series also reaches to the end of time. Thus we see how they all can end concurrently, but did not begin concurrently, and therefore did not run concurrently.

But when it came time for the seventh trumpet to begin to sound John holds up the story while he gives us some other pictures of the great apostacy which could not be told under either of these symbols for the simple reason that it runs through most all of them, and was the chief factor in making world history what it has been so far as the church of the Lord is concerned.

The apostacy was a movement that could not be discerned at first for it was a gradual drift in the church, and such drifts are very hard to see even in our day.

The book of seven seals covers the first struggles of the church under papal Rome, the seven trumpets cover the Middle Ages, and the seven last plagues cover modern history, and the seventh plague will bring an end to these wicked powers, and we hope a better time for the world. But none of this will work under Brother Smith’s key, and I apologize for having taken this much of your valuable time to mention these facts.

I AM THE TRUE VINE

G. K. Wallace

Isaiah used the vine as a type of Israel, planted and tended by the Almighty as the husbandman. (Isa. 5:1.) Israel was not the true vine. Christ is the true vine. (Jno. 15:1.) In John 14 the Lord had just said to the disciples, “Arise, let us go hence.” He had just eaten the last supper with the apostles. He said that he would not drink of the fruit of the vine again on this earth. Likely on the table from which they had just risen was the fruit of the vine. And now he says, “I am the true vine.”

In the first eight verses of John 15 we find the following outstanding lessons about the vine and the branches.

1. That morality alone cannot save.
2. That there is but one true church.
3. That we should get in Christ, stay in Christ, and stay out of everything else or be lost.

Jesus said, “Apart from me you can do nothing.” Morality alone cannot save. Men can be morally good apart from Christ. Yet apart from Christ they can do nothing. There is no spiritual life apart from Christ. Cornelius was a moral man apart from Christ but he was unsaved. (Acts 11:14.) If morality alone can save then Jesus died in vain. There were just as good men morally to be found in the Mosaic age as there are now. If a man can be saved by his own goodness then Jesus died for no purpose at all. Why did he die if they could be saved by their own goodness? Let the moral man remember these words, “Apart from me you can do nothing.” There is no spiritual life apart from Jesus Christ, the true vine.

Thus we see that one must get into Christ to be saved. Paul says that we are baptized into Christ. That makes baptism necessary to salvation in Christ Jesus. You cannot do anything apart from Christ but you can’t get into Christ unless you are baptized. (Gal. 3:27.)

This “true vine” is the true church. The vine is the spiritual body of Christ. The church is His body. (Col. 1:18.) There is one body. (Eph. 4:4.) There is but one body. (1 Cor. 12:20.) Paul does not say “churches” but “the church.” If one desires to be united with Christ let him obey the gospel and thus be added to the “one body,” the church, the “true vine.”

The objector says that Christ is the true vine and all the denominations are branches. Christ said, “I am the vine and “ye” are the branches. “He” that abideth in me. Note the use of the personal pronoun. Do men refer to churches as “he” and “ye”? Is that the way they talk when you live? Is that the way your preacher talks? Would you say about the Baptist Church—“he is a large church”? The use of the personal pronoun shows that Christ was talking to his disciples and not to “churches.” Individuals are the branches and not organizations.

But just suppose for a minute that the branches are churches. In what branch are you? You say that I am in the Baptist branch. Yes, but wait, Christ said abide in “me.” You should not abide in a branch but in the vine. If you are in a branch you ought to get out of it and get in the vine. Get out of the branch and get in the vine. “If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch and is withered; and they gather them and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.” Abide in the vine or be burned. Do not abide in a branch. You cannot abide in a branch. A branch is a disciple or a Christian. Individuals are the branches and not denominations.

Did God set denominations in the vine? If so, which ones did He put in? If God set denominations in the vine it is strange that He never said anything about it. If He did mention them will someone please tell where?

For one to claim that denominations are the branches is an apology for something they know that is not mentioned in the Bible and a rank perversion of the fifteenth chapter of John. Denominations came into existence hundreds of years after Christ. They are of human origin and no one has a Bible right to belong to any of them.

The “true vine,” the church, was established by Christ and all Christians are members of it. (Jno. 3:5.) The church is God’s house. God’s house is His family. (1 Tim. 3:15.) God has no children outside of His family.

From this chapter we learn that we must bear fruit to please God. “Herein is my father glorified that ye bear much fruit; and so shall ye be my disciples.” You cannot bear fruit apart from the vine. To bear fruit you must be in the vine. How does one get in the vine? He must believe. (Mk. 16:15-16.) He must repent. (Acts 2:38.) He must be baptized. (Gal. 3:27.) These steps put one into Christ. Yet it is not enough to get into Christ. In Christ the branch must bear good fruit. The fruitless branch (disciple) will be lost. He will be cast forth and be burned. (Jno. 15:6.) Our duty in regard to this is clear. We must get in Christ, stay in Christ, and stay out of everything else.

Someone may ask, “Can a man be saved and go to heaven and stay out of the vine?” No, for Christ says, “Apart from me you can do nothing.” It is Christ or nothing. It is the true vine or no vine. It is the true church or no church. Christ here teaches that you cannot be saved out of the church and you cannot be saved unless you stay in the church.
THE SITUATION IN THE SCHOOLS

EDITOR

ANYTHING ABILENE COLLEGE SPEECH

It is reported that Doctor G. C. Brewer has made another speech at Abilene Christian College. The gist of the report, by one who heard the speech, is that he had on his fighting clothes. He told of a man in Lubbock six-feet-seven who was rejected by the Army because of his height. It was assumed that the Army thought that being so tall his head would be a target for the enemy. The report is that Doctor Brewer likened himself to this man six-feet-seven that is, Brewer stands so tall among his fellows that some whom he termed “so-called big preachers” are always sniping at his head. Brethren, behold the man! Six feet-seven, so to speak! “Upon what meat has Caesar been feeding that he has grown so great?”

After this self-eulogy our LL. D. from Harding College giant among men proceeded to say with great emphasis that he would fight—yes, fight to the last breath—what? Ah, the value of it—for Christian education—and for “J. N. Armstrong,” who he said has been “so ruthlessly and unjustly attacked.” So that is what our brother who has grown so great in stature is now going to fight for! It will be a great relief, indeed, to know what it is. He is quite willing to fight for some things. He will fight Communism in California; he will fight Catholicism in Lubbock; he will fight for Christian Education in Abilene; he will fight for J. N. Armstrong where his friends are; but nobody has ever heard him fight a premillennialist, rather he comforts them and fights those who fight them.

It was in 1934 that G. C. Brewer made that other famous speech at Abilene, and as in this case, from the college platform. It will be remembered that it was R. H. Boll for whom he was then fighting to his last breath. Boll was his friend, he said; Boll had entered his life at a crucial hour, he averred; and he would not desert Boll now nor throw him down, etc., etc. The way to treat such men as Boll and Jorgenson, he advised, was to have them hold meetings for us and his confidence in them was such that he just knew that they would not teach their doctrine.

That was 1934. The president of the college was called upon to repudiate these utterances, but he did not. It is now 1942 that he speaks, as before, from the college platform, this time in open defense of another avowed premillennialist—J. N. Armstrong—in an apology for what these men are teaching and doing. Who ordered this speech? Will the president now repudiate it or, like the former president, side-step the issue?

It is just another incident that reveals G. C. Brewer. He has these spells very frequently. But it also indicates which way the wind is blowing in Abilene. There is a general feeling that the pledge to purge A. C. C. of the weaknesses that have been embedded there, doctrinally, spiritually and morally have not been fulfilled. One thing is certain: If confidence in Abilene Christian College is ever to be restored it will not be done by repeating ever so often the speeches and apologies of G. C. Brewer, and others like him, who have for too long been a favored lot at Abilene.

HAS HARDING COLLEGE IMPROVED?

It is known to all that Harding College has in the past been a hotbed of premillennialism with all of its by-products of compromise and softness. The present administration has sought many devices and inventions to publicly overcome this obvious obstacle, which has admittedly been a heavy handicap to their publicity program. Several months ago Brother Batsell Baxter was added to the faculty as teacher of Bible. As usual an effort has been made to capitalize upon Brother Baxter’s recognized soundness on the issues that have made Harding College such a doubtful institution in the minds of loyal brethren. The question remains: Does adding a sound man to the faculty make the institution sound? The answer is, that the degenerative school at Cincinnati, and R. H. Boll’s school at Louisville, or any other unsound school in the land would not only be willing but eager to add a man to their faculties considered sound by loyal churches, if in so doing they could compromise the issues by quieting the opposition. They would gladly allow the man to teach what he desired, leaving him free, and at the same time they would be free to offset his teaching by their own precepts and examples. They could well afford to do so for the gain they would derive from a quieted opposition.

No one doubts Brother Batsell Baxter’s personal soundness, so far as I know. I do not doubt it. He was my teacher at old Thorp Spring College in Texas. He was sound then, and I believe him to be personally sound now. But I also believe that he is in the wrong place and that he is being used by designing men. In the summer of 1940 Brother Baxter and I were in California together. He told me then that he was aware of the weaknesses that have been embedded there, doctrinally, spiritually and morally have not been fulfilled. One thing is certain: If confidence in Abilene Christian College is ever to be restored it will not be done by repeating ever so often the speeches and apologies of G. C. Brewer, and others like him, who have for too long been a favored lot at Abilene.
That Harding College has not only been the hotbed of premillennialism in the past but that it is still the hotbed of premillennialism, in the very present, the following facts supplied by men in direct touch with the situation, who know whereof they speak, are submitted:

1. Dean Sears to Brother Gilbert Copeland, Jan. 26, 1942: “He (Brother Armstrong) does definitely believe that the ‘heavenly period of Christ’s kingdom and rule will begin at his return.’ Dennis Allen, the boy who caused so much trouble out for it. and 90 percent of them were openly on Allen’s side. It’s just like we figured, give them the chance and they will commit themselves every time.”

2. Again Sears says: “I do not doubt that some things Brother Armstrong may have said in his classes have led you to the conclusion you have formed, etc.” Here is one of the conclusions he had reached. “I shall entertain the idea that those who agree with Dr. Brents and those who hold the idea that the second coming is not the announcement of the end, but that it is the time for the kingdom’s establishment, or even a changing scene or a re-adjusting of things for a continuation of the kingdom that was set up (one phase of it) on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Christ believe, at least, one phase of premillennialism. According to Brother Armstrong and you, that is what he believes.”

3. “But why say that he (Brother Armstrong) has never taught it? I know he has. Will you say that you know he has not?” If so, then I ask, “how do you know since you were not in the classes I was in?” (This man is a graduate of Harding.) Remember Brother Sears, Bro. Armstrong’s son-in-law, said the above about Bro. Armstrong.

4. Here is another letter from Searcy, written April 30, 1942. Hear this part of it, “Finally got a debate on premillennialism the other night. Dennis Allen, the boy who caused so much trouble out for it. and 90 percent of them were openly on Allen’s side. This young preacher is the son of Brother Allen who is a member of the Board of Harding College and they are rank premillenialists. This boy is preaching it all over that section and in this place referred to in the letter he was teaching premillennialism at the time. Dennis Allen, the boy who caused so much trouble on the mountain last fall, finally mustered up enough courage-after being prodded on every hand-to debate one of his Greek classmates, Arthur Moody, *...*. The most outstanding thing about the debate was that although it was supposed to be a practice debate, about fifty persons turned out for it and 90 percent of them were openly on Allen’s side. It’s just like we figured, give them the chance and they will commit themselves every time.”

5. Still another letter from Searcy: This time it is a man who has no connection with the school but who is alarmed over the premillennialism. He says the same as the above letter.” Brother Blank is coming back to the truth. He told me yesterday (November 10, 1941), that more than half (50%) of the members in Searcy believe premillennialism.” This man who said that is one of the outstanding leaders in Searcy. He told me and the other two men here one Sunday night that they tried to get them to have a premillennial preach and hold them a meeting, and he said NO.

6. But listen to this letter, April 20, 1942: “Sherrill even committed himself the other day by saying that he himself would debate that R. H. Boll should not be disfellowshipped because he had not said ‘don’ t’ is too late. They had him in his vocabulary. In short, the trouble is in having a young president that is ‘carried about by every wind of doctrine’ and a modern dean who is not grounded in the truth, and both of them ‘flirting with the denominations.’

7. Here is a letter from one of our outstanding young men in this state who has been two years in Harding College: “Should you like to use my name along with others who have heard Brother Armstrong teach phases of premillennialism in his classes. you are at liberty to do so. Construct the tract as you please, “but it might be impressive to have testimonials from some who have been in his classes and who know that he teaches this doctrine.”

8. Now we have all of this together with the fact that Clinton Davidson is an active board member of Harding College. That makes at least two active board members who are premillennialists, Allen and Davidson, with Brother Armstrong openly teaching it in his classes.

These are but a few of the facts that show definitely that conditions are worse than ever at Harding College.

DISTURBING REPORTS FROM THE WEST

When a report is a matter of rumor it should not be repeated much less printed to the hurt of an institution. But when the things said are verified by men of integrity, they should be given necessary and impartial attention. We should not be respecters of institutions any more than of persons. The high regard that this editor has for Brother George Pepperdine, recognition of his fine character, unquestioned integrity and genuine sincerity, have all been affirmed with emphasis in this paper. This personal attitude toward the founder of George Pepperdine College and faith in his pure intentions, are here reaffirmed. But the philanthropies of Brother Pepperdine are being directed away from the interests of the Cause of Christ, due largely to the fact that his agencies and institutions have been in the hands of men who themselves are not grounded in the fundamental principles of the Church and in the knowledge of the truth.

The reports from sources that have been verified as trustworthy are as follows:

1. That most of the guest speakers at chapel services have been sectarian, denominational guest speakers-Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Jew, and Catholic. That the plan of rotating the city preachers puts members of the church, gospel preachers, very much in the minority, as much so as in any public school adopting that plan of chapel services.

2. That the president of the college introduced the denominational guest speaker as “Reverend.” Upon one occasion a Presbyterian minister was allowed to teach in chapel exercises his theological doctrine of Calvinism without reply, but later a member of the faculty, who is a member of the church, was rebuked for reading a text on baptism and commenting on it for his chapel talk. The president of the school called him down for doing it.

3. That students have left the school because of low standards of conduct, worldliness and lack of spirituality in the school.

4. That some of the things being done are defended on the ground that the college is a secular and “not a church school.”

5. That the main source of trouble seems to be in having a young president who craves popularity and publicity, belongs to many clubs and organizations of social, political and religious nature, and is so full of the “Dale Carnegie” idea of selling himself that he can do nothing except “pat every one on the back.”

6. That the president of the college spoke for the Methodist Church on Easter Sunday and excused it on the ground that “he spoke as a representative of the college and did not represent the church.”

7. That the Dean is a “modern” from Duke University, with ideas of the “new approach,” does not believe in discipline, and the word “don’t” is not in his vocabulary. In short, the trouble is in having a young president that is “carried about by every wind of doctrine” and a modern dean who is not grounded in the truth, and both of them “flirting with the denominations.”

8. That a number of faculty members are plainly distressed with the conditions, some have quit, others are trying to make things what they should be, and that young preachers who have gone out from the college do not give it their support, and that unrest and confusion prevail in faculty and student body.

9. That the college conditions have been transferred to the church because the president and faculty members preach for...
the church, and in one instance have attempted to depose elders and replace them with men who were favorable to the college and its policies. This congregation, near the college, has had endless trouble from men who have collaborated to bring the congregation under the domination of the college. They have maintained that the church is a democracy and should be ruled entirely by the majority vote of the members and not by the elders. They asked the elders to resign, contending that any decisions should be made by the whole group of members and not by the elders. The men so doing are all faculty members of the college, including the president and dean, with the exception of one, and he is Jimmie Lovell.

The Bible Banner has no desire to harm any worthy institution nor hinder any legitimate endeavor. But public institutions that involve the Cause of Christ and affect the future of the church through young people influenced by them, should not be shielded from criticism when conditions become as sadly and badly mixed up as they appear to be in the California College.

If Brother Hugh Tiner, the President of the college, wishes to distinguish himself by service to the Cause of Christ rather than popularity with the California public, he will set himself to the task of rectifying these conditions. If it is denied that these things exist, then we can only say that something exists that has disturbed and distressed some mighty good people of both mental and spiritual discernment, in and out of the college. It would be difficult to make the public believe that there is nothing to it.

If the colleges among us continue to look to the members of the church for patronage and support, it is their solemn duty to make these schools worthy of the trust and confidence of all Christian people, rather than the objects of distrust and suspicion.

---

**OBJECTIONS, TO HARDING COLLEGE**

(Continued from Page 15.)

Board, is a premillennialist, and his son is a premillennial preacher, and has scattered Boll's paper all over the state of Arkansas where he has gone.

7. Those who oppose R. H. Boll and premillennialism have never been welcome at Harding College, while Boll and his crowd have been treated royally on every occasion.

8. After the Hardeman-Bogard debate in Little Rock brethren Armstrong and Sherrill told Bogard and some other Baptists that he (Bogard) defeated Hardeman, because Hardeman is a "legalist." They further said they wanted Bogard to know that there were some preachers in Arkansas who did not believe like Hardeman, Harper, Wallace, et al. Brother Sherrill asked Bogard not to tell that he made such a remark lest it should hurt him with his brethren in Arkansas.

9. Every year some of the young preachers from Harding come to town for help on the "kingdom question." The School either leads them to believe it is in sympathy with premillennialism or else confuses them. In not one instance have they clearly set forth the New Testament teaching on this subject. On the other hand I have numerous letter from different students stating definitely that the School teaches premillennialism.

10. Some who are connected with the school have admitted that the bulletin issued against me should never have been published. Without recounting the charges lodged against me I simply want to deny every one of them, and am ready to face each and every one before any fair tribunal and show that they are false. This includes my action in the more recent agreement of three years past. I did not repudiate it but can prove that Harding did. None of them will meet me publicly before the brotherhood on these things.

If I have mistated any fact I am ready to withdraw it, when pointed out. On the other hand, I cannot support Harding College unless and until these defections be removed.
THE OBJECTIONS TO HARDING COLLEGE

E. R. Harper

Since it is a matter of general knowledge that I have been in disagreement with Harding College, now located at Searcy, Arkansas, the public has a right to know why. I am asking this opportunity therefore to state my reasons. In a recent bulletin issued by the College against me, and circulated throughout the entire brotherhood, a belabored effort was made to show that I had an ambition to “run” the school. I was charged with being a “politician,” a “Hitler,” a “dictator.” I shall not attempt to refute such platitudes and absurdities. I have too much confidence in the wisdom and integrity of my brethren to think they can be duped by such fantastic accusations. In order that all may know this is not a personal grievance and in order to keep the record straight let me recount here some facts in which you will be interested.

A short time before moving to Little Rock, nine years ago, I was asked to become a member of the Board of Trustees at Freed-Hardeman College. I declined this invitation on the ground it would reflect upon Harding College, then located at Morrilton. I definitely stated that I planned to support the Arkansas school in every way that possibly could. I had not been preaching a great many years, and up till that time I did not know anything about the criticisms which had been offered against the school. As soon as I was located in Little Rock I got behind the school with all my power. When I learned that Brother Armstrong had never been asked to speak at the Fourth and State Streets congregation I thought that he should be asked to come and speak for us and he came. By this time I had begun to hear some of the reports concerning the College, and particularly concerning Brother Armstrong’s attitude toward premillennialism. I discounted these reports in the belief they were biased and prejudiced. When I secured time on the radio and began my regular broadcasts I announced all the Harding College programs on the air, and gave the school all the favorable publicity that I could. When Brother Benson became President of the school I arranged for him to speak at 4th and State on the radio and urging every one to receive him cordially. In short, I gave him all the support that I could.

My support of the school went further than this. I borrowed money from the bank-money that I repaid from my own pocket-to help send three young men to Harding College. This help was continued even after the school refused to allow me to speak in the building. Furthermore, when the school asked some outstanding men to speak for them I called Brother Benson at the expense of the congregation I served and asked if he would like for me to arrange to have the speeches broadcast which were made to the student body. He eagerly accepted, yet he would not so much as permit me to offer a prayer in the school building. Despite all this I continued to befriend the College and sought every way that I could to show that I wanted to do the right thing. When Brother Benson delivered an address over KLRA on pre-millennialism, at his request I made announcement of it over KARK. This was against the rules and policy of the station-as one station never announced a program over another station. All this time the school never did anything to show its appreciation for what I was doing. Instead, the Administration sought all the time to destroy my influence. At our lecture program in 1938 I asked eight men from Harding College to appear on it, including Brethren Benson, Armstrong, and Sears. When Brother Hardeman met Dr. Bogard in debate here I asked all who were from Harding College to stand and introduced them, as I did those from Freed-Hardeman College. I made no distinction between the two schools whatever. I arranged places for all to stay without any partiality. On another occasion we even bought one young man a suit to wear when he graduated at Harding. These are but a few of the things I have done to show my attitude toward the College, now headed by Brother Benson. I could go on enumerating incidents. But these should be enough to convince the most obtuse that I had no intention of either “running” or “ruining” the school.

Briefly let me now state my objections to Harding College. The trouble first started when I refused to give the school my unqualified endorsement for soundness. A committee came to see me and asked that I give them time on my radio broadcast to advertise the “Harding Rally Meeting.” Furthermore, they asked that I get out and speak in the interest of this meeting. Because this seemed to be asking quite a bit of me I felt it only fair and right that every teacher on the faculty should write a brief article showing clearly his attitude toward premillennialism-and particularly toward “Bollism.” This proved to be the spark that set off the fireworks. Not only was my request refused but I was placed on the “must go” list.

It was some five or six years after moving to Little Rock before I publicly voiced any criticism of Harding College. I did not want to believe the school was in sympathy with Boll and premillennialism. And, although there had been differences between us, I kept working, hoping these differences could be worked out satisfactorily. Long after some of my best friends had deserted the institution, I still sought for a better understanding and a sounder policy. I was severely criticized because of my tolerance of the promises and policies of the school. Not until I was thoroughly convinced that it was impossible to get the Administration to take a definite stand for “the old paths” and definitely renounce “Bollism,” did I give up the effort. Overlooking all personal differences between the school and myself, here are the objections that I have.

1. Brother Armstrong is a premillennialist. He teaches that Christ is coming back to earth again to “conquer his enemies, re-establish his divine authority over all the earth and have nothing but the reign of Christ with his saints on this earth” (this is his language). How long will this earthly reign continue? Oh, here is the catch. He says he does not know about this, but it may be “two thousand years.” Does this not sound like “Bollism?” “Well, if it is not, there is one thing sure, it would never cause any disturbance in the ‘Boll camp.’

2. Brother Benson in a signed statement says, at the time he became president of Harding College, and for some time thereafter, he did not believe the devil was bound, or would be bound until the millennium, sometime in the future. If he has changed I do not know it.

3. Brother Armstrong and his “crowd” has run with the “Boll crowd” so long that one must conclude they are in general agreement on their peculiarities. There is an old saying that “birds of a feather flock together.” For a long period of years R. H. Boll and his satellites have been frequent visitors and lecturers at the schools which Brothers Armstrong has run-all the way from Odessa, Missouri to Searcy, Arkansas. And even now Brother Armstrong goes to Louisville, Kentucky and he worships with and speaks for the Boll and Jorgenson congregations.

5. Clinton V. Davidson is a member of the Board of Harding College, and his son is now professor of Business and Economics. Moreover Benson’s publicity man, I understand, is one of Davidson’s, right-hand men and has been for some time. He is definitely in sympathy with Bollism and premillennialism, or that group at least, according to those who know him intimately. The truth is, Clinton Davidson is now directing the policy of the school.

6. Brother Allen, another member of the Harding College (Turn back to column 1, page 14.)
THE "DIABOLICAL" AND "APOSTATE" BIBLE READER

Cled E. Wallace

The printed reaction to some of the things we have said in the Bible Banner is more in the way of an exhibition of bad manners than an enlightening discussion of an issue. Some of these men who have been loud in their praise of us and the paper to the point of extravagance appear to now be chocking with rage and vying with one another in the selection of adjectives that will do justice to our depravity. You should compose yourselves, gentlemen, for we cannot run with you in these excesses. We might even feel inclined to excuse the greenness in judgment of some of them due to their youth. The editor and I have sons older than some of them, yet they airily refer to "Cled" and "Poy" and contumaciously refer to other men as "cowardly," men with long records of service and old enough to be their grandfathers. It reveals a disqualifying lack of equilibrium. There is such a thing as a young man looking into the mirror of his self-esteem and getting the reflection of an image that is "young and powerful, firm and fearless." Youth is addicted to such dreams, but it is unfortunate when they are taken seriously, reduced to print and circulated all over the country and the dreamer strains himself to act the part. It often leads to a lot of bluff and bluster that is everything but edifying. Some editors would do well to read the book of Proverbs, with particular attention to those parts that deal with wisdom and the use of speech. All of them could do so with profit. It should be compulsory for young editors, especially the kind that are "firm and fearless."

Youth is not entitled to all the blame when it comes to excesses and bad manners in writing. Some older men are virtually acting as godfathers to some of these ranting, tearing youngsters and setting them bad examples in name-calling and tantrum-writing. Why all the recent pyrotechnics against the Bible Banner from our erstwhile friends, some young, some old? An old one who esteems himself as one of the best friends the editor ever had or ever will have will resort to such terms as "diabolical" and supposes we are afflicted with "a case of religio-politico hydrophobia." Of course "diabolical" is a nice word meaning "devilish; outrageously wicked; impious" and whatever else the brother says we have "a case of," the reader will have to figure out for himself. I went through Scott and White Clinic in Temple, Tex., a few months ago and the doctors couldn't find anything wrong with me. Maybe only the editor is afflicted with this peculiar "case of." He had a couple of operations and maybe the surgeon sewed up something in him they should have removed. A vocabulary is useful but it should not be allowed to have running fits.

Now, Brother "Young and Powerful, Firm and Fearless" charges that the editor is an "apostate from the truth," and takes particular pains to see that the issue of the paper he is editor of and which carries the personal charges against the editor of the Bible Banner is given wide circulation in localities where he thinks it will hurt him. Another tender shoot in the editorial free-for-all calls us war-mongers and no better than premillenialists and follows the same tactics in circulating his paper. Now seriously, what have we done to these gentlemen, young and old and former friends, to cause them to attack us so intemperately and with such reckless abandon? Why have we so suddenly become traitors and apostates with their "diabolical" implications? Why, we crossed them, simply disagreed with them and advanced a position they cannot accept. Did we cross them on the gospel? Oh, no, we just happened to run athwart one of their hobbies, a pet notion of theirs. And they are bombarding us with adjectives, all the way from hell to hydrophobia. I have heard of men who were distressingly weak in argument to try to make up for it in meanness, but I am not going to think this of my former friends unless they force me to. We propose to exercise our rights to express our honest convictions on public questions even if it brings a barrage of bad-smelling adjectives converging on us from Montgomery, Birmingham and Dallas. We are so sure we are right in our contention that we are not tempted to return the ugly feelings some of our friends seem to have suddenly developed toward us, and shall decline, as we have done before in similar cases, to match adjectives with them.

It so happens that we have taken issue with a theory of Civil Government advanced by Brother David Lipscomb. That isn't lese-majesty. A lot of brethren smarter than we are, and with as high a regard for Brother Lipscomb as we have, did that. Brother M. C. Kurfees was one of them. Brother Lipscomb's theory on government was not inspired. Brethren generally have not taken to it very seriously. It is even claimed that enough brethren vote in Tennessee to decide who the governor will be, or to swing a close mayor's race in Nashville. Even Birmingham and Montgomery brethren cannot be held to the theory.

Even though teapots are singing in Birmingham, Montgomery and Dallas, the Nashville front is rather quiet. The editor of the Gospel Advocate has raised a timid voice in behalf of conscientious objectors. He wants us all to be sure and know 'that there are really such persons" and quotes the First Lady of the Land to prove it. He thinks they should be respected as Mrs. Roosevelt says and "not ridiculed, as some seem to think." Very well, I agree with Brother Goodpasture and Mrs. Roosevelt on this point and I suspect I can go along with her farther than he can. There are some "conscientious objectors" I can respect more than I can others. For instance, I have never been able to work up much of a lather of respect for the kind that will not even put on a uniform and enter "non-combatant service" but hies himself off to some sectarian refuge and wants the brethren to take up a collection to support him, while others with better-educated consciences are working and fighting for the country. I hope it will not be considered disrespectful or ridiculous if I refuse to pass the hat. If Uncle Samuel can stand that sort of thing, I certainly ought to, I surely do not want to be "un-American, unconstitutional, and, in this case, unscriptural" all at the same time. But right here and now, I want to rise up in meetin' to observe that because these "conscientious objectors" even though they are "wrong," are "due some consideration," that does not mean that they are entitled to hog all of it. We have some "deep convictions" of our own in this matter. Are they being respected? If Mrs. Roosevelt ever comes my way, I'm going to ask her to make a speech and point out how some of our "conscientious objectors" ought to make less noise and show more "respect" for those of us who are willing to wear a uniform and lend active support to the armed forces of the government. They demand respect for their consciences but behold how little some of them are respecting ours. Mrs. Roosevelt certainly did not mean that "the fact that there really are such persons as conscientious objectors" justifies them in claiming a monopoly on this thing called respect. We do not think they ought to demand respect of us while they insult us. If I can get Mrs. Roosevelt to make the speech on our behalf, I shall insist that Brother Goodpasture give it editorial attention and pass along the suggestion that even we "are due some consideration." I believe it would be "un-American, unconstitutional, and, in this case, unscriptural," for him to fail to do so. Of course if he fails to find anything he can say for us that he can prove by Mrs. Roosevelt and the Constitution, we shall try to take the scriptures anyhow and do the best we can in our own behalf.