The following excerpts from the virulent pens of men whose ability has had universal recognition in the church are inserted for a purpose. First of all, what they wrote is timely. Second, so far as I know they have not been convicted of being "reprobate," "diabolical" and "apostate" or of having "departed from the faith." Yet when the Bible Banner published a statement last March setting forth the same teaching a surge of wrath descended upon it and it has been called all of those things with extra adjectives thrown in for emphasis and good measure.

The extracts below cover the various phases of discussion and criticism on the government issue-civil government, military government, voting, the Sermon on the Mount and non-resistance, capital punishment, allegiance to the flag, and the attitude of members of the church toward war. McGarvey and Kurfees were ranking scholars in their day. McGarvey sets forth in his terse style the true purpose of the Sermon on the Mount as being a code of individual conduct and not a treatise on the functions of government. With the logical acumen that characterized all of his writing, M. C. Kurfees gave a full treatise on "The Law of God and Capital Punishment," which appears on pages 12 to 15 in this issue. It should be read. The insertions from R. L. Whiteside on "War" and "Thou Shalt Not Kill" are just two of several statements that have appeared along from his trenchment pen in the Gospel Advocate. The comments of C. R. Nichol on "Allegiance To The Flag" are taken from his articles in the Gospel Advocate exposing the seditions of Jehovah's Witnesses, but it is not all that he thinks or has had to say on the subject. The names of Nichol and Whiteside have been linked for a generation. They are both editors of the Gospel Advocate. They do not agree with the other editors of the Advocate on the question—this is not all that he thinks or has had to say on the subject. They have been denounced for their articles, or their views. G. H. I. Showalter has been editor of the Firm Foundation for thirty years and has probably exerted more influence in the church during that period than any other editor. He has published his views on the "Relation To Government" more than once in the Firm Foundation. Asking you to read the expressions from these brethren, I will reserve further comments until you have done so.

I. SERMON ON THE MOUNT

"Resist not him that is evil." This command which enjoins non-resistance, like most of the other precepts of this sermon, does not demand of us absolute, unqualified passivity at all times and under all circumstances. In fact, we may say generally of the whole sermon on the mount that it is not a code for slaves, but an assertion of principles which are to be interpreted and applied by the children of freedom. We are to submit to evil for principle's sake and to accomplish spiritual victories, and not in an abject, servile spirit as blind followers of a harsh and exacting law. On the contrary, taking the principle, we judge when and how to apply it as best we can. Absolute non-resistance may so far encourage crime as to become a sin. Where he might have avenged himself by the sudden death of his adversary (Jno. 18: 22, 23). The example of Paul also is given, but it is not so perfect as that of the Master (Acts 33: 2-5). Self-preservation is a law of God giving rights which, under most circumstances, a Christian can claim. He may resist the robber, the assassin and all men of that ilk, and may protect his person and his possessions against the assaults of the violent and lawless (Acts 16: 35-39). But when the honor of Christ and the salvation of man demands it, he should observe this commandment even unto the very letter. A man may strive for self-protection when life is threatened without any spirit of revenge. He may appeal to the law to protect his property without any bitterness toward the one who seeks to wrest it from him. (J. W. McGarvey, in Fourfold Gospel.)

"It is a significant fact that when the Lord placed his own teaching in Matt. 5: 38, against the ancient law recorded in Ex. 21: 23-25, which required 'life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe; he confined his modification of that law to the point of personal resentment in returning evil for evil."—M. C. Kurfees, in "The Law of God on Capital Punishment."

II. ATTITUDE TOWARD WAR

This from an Oklahoma brother: "Should not the Church of Christ come out openly against war?" In answering this question, several points are to be taken into consideration.

1. What is meant by the Church of Christ? Why spell "church" with a capital C? The church we read about in the New Testament, in its broad sense, includes all the children of God in the world. It is the family of God. Many of God's children have drifted into things the:- have no business to be in. It would be impossible to round up all of God's children..."
find out how they stand on any question. Each one would have to speak for himself, for no man or group of men has been authorized to speak for the whole family of God.

2. If we have in mind churches of Christ, local congregations, it is also evident that no man or group of men has been authorized to speak for them. Each congregation must speak for itself. Here also is another difficulty: no man or group of men in a congregation has been authorized to speak for all the members. It might be possible to get all the members to sign a statement declaring their opposition to war. But as a live congregation is continually adding new members, the statement would soon not represent all the members, unless each new member was required to sign the statement, or avow his allegiance to it. In that way only might we know how the whole church stood.

3. Some churches have formulated and published articles declaring their opposition to going to war. But this brings up another question: If a church, in order to let the world know where it stands on war, formulates and publishes one article of its faith, why not enlarge the creed so as to let the world know where it stands on all other matters of faith and practice? In principle, what is the difference between a one-article creed and a twenty-five-article creed? Suppose we apply to this war article the reasoning often used by brethren against human creeds: If this formulated and published article of faith against war contains too much, it does not contain enough; if it says exactly what the New Testament says, why have it at all? Is not what the New Testament says on war a sufficient declaration of your faith?

4. Those who formulate their creed on the subject of war should add another article, declaring their belief that a Christian should not vote or hold office, for no man who votes and takes active part in the affairs of government can consistently oppose all wars. He may, of course, oppose wars of conquest, but not of defense. You elect a man to office, and he takes oath that he will defend and protect the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, both foreign and domestic; and then you profess to believe that it is not right to help him do what you elected him to do! Our government is now waging war against domestic enemies-enemies within the government—and these enemies are well armed. It is war—an armed conflict. Is it wrong for the government to engage in this war? If so, why did you elect men to carry it on? Or did you elect men to do a thing that you think would be wrong for you to do? Would it be any different if a foreign government should undertake to murder and rob our people?

5. War is horrible, but no government can stand without using force against its enemies, both foreign and domestic. If force is not back of the vote, the vote is worthless. No effort is here made to prove that you should vote or that you should not vote.—R. L. Whiteside, in Gospel Advocate, June, 1942.

III. RELATION TO ‘GOVERNMENT’

“It must be remembered that the relation of the Christian to earthly governments is not altered or changed because the government is at war. Whatever service we render the government, whether in money, chattels or labor; we render for the general support of the government. In times of peace the government punishes law breakers, executes criminals, and we support the government in this, by performing the service the government imposes. There is no difference in war. All earthly governments are established through war and bloodshed. Also the rights of people and nations are defined and defended by the sword. When a nation commits depredations on another nation and on organized society, and the great nations of the earth impose punishment on the offending nation, it is, in no special sense different from the punishment that the nations are conti

Continually imposing on law breakers and criminals who are imprisoned or executed for their crimes committed. If we support the one, we should be willing to support the other. If one is right, why is not the other? Where did the apostle make any distinction in supporting the government in war, and supporting the government in times of peace? A Christian might not want to serve as a sheriff, and might conscientiously decline such service. So he might conscientiously decline to serve as a combatant in war, but it is certainly a poorly educated conscience, so far as the scriptures are concerned, that would cause any professed Christian to decline to serve the government as a non-combatant. The apostle requires it, and specially at a time when so much is involved—when the rights, liberties, and happiness of so many millions of humanity are being tried in the balances—does it to me appear of the greatest solemnity and of the highest importance. For my part I think that every Christian should the more carefully discharge his duty as a citizen now. In time of war more than ordinary service is required. We should be impressed with the solemnity of the sacrifice that is being made by others, and should by no means lend our encouragement to those whose influence would cripple or hamper the efforts of our rulers and the generals of our country’s armies, upon whose action at the present time, so much depends in connection with the common good of humanity.

War is by no means an ideal condition. Neither is it an ideal condition when a nation’s criminals are numerous, and executions frequent. However, we must remember that God still maintains his peace on earth, good will toward men, and that God rules in the affairs of men, so far as human governments are concerned, “the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of man, and giveth it to whomsoever he will,” and that through human governments God executes vengeance on evil doers. In an enlightened nation, such as the great nation in which we live, we should be very thankful that we are given the privilege so that we may worship God without interference, and we should not only be willing and ready to assume the service exacted by the government, but should do so cheerfully, and in the fear of God. Our relation to civil government in times of peace, is the same as in times of war, the war simply portraying the function of human government on a larger scale. A law-defying nation must be policed, as well as a criminally disposed section of a great city. Let us think on these things. There has never been a time in the history of the present generation, when Christians have been privileged to reflect more brilliantly the character of our Lord, and to show in a better light their loyalty to the government. It was the boast of the church in the apostolic age, that their members were law-abiding, loyal, and faithful citizens, and that they might be depended upon to support the government under which they lived. We should not be less faithful to God and to our fellowmen.—G. H. P. Shockey, in Firm Foundation.

IV. “THOU SHALT NOT KILL”

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

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

V. ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

Give attention to the following teaching of “Jehovah’s Witnesses”: They declare that Christ returned to earth in 1874, and then began establishing his kingdom; that he has been on the earth all the time since that date, though invisible; that in the earth now are legal representatives of the kingdom who have been resurrected. The kingdom is to exist on the earth for one thousand years. They declare that since Jesus Christ is now on earth, on his throne as King, any other government on earth is that of usurpers; that the present form of government of the American republic has no more right to exist in America than does “Hitlerism.” With them is the persuasion that the government of the United States now has no right to exist. It is their view that the Lord has returned to earth, has been seated on his throne on earth, though invisible, they declare, and is the one and only authority on earth. The “Jehovah’s Witnesses” declare they will not salute the flag of the United States of America, because the Lord Jesus Christ has established his kingdom here, is here in person as the King, and that to salute the flag of the United States of America would be the act of a rebel against their King (Christ). They are rebels against the government of our land. They seek to lead men to refuse to obey the laws of the land-to recognize no civil authority on earth today. It is their view that the government of the United States now has no right to exist. It is their view that the sheriff has no right to arrest, the judge no right to pass sentence, executors no right to be enforcers of the law. In short, they believe that the officers of the United States government have no more right to enforce laws on our statute books than Hitler has to land on our shores and force his program on our people. With them is the positive teaching that Christ is now reigning King, and his law only, his law alone, should be observed.-C. R. Nichol, in Gospel Advocate.

When these and other statements of similar import were made by these brethren, nobody inveighed against them with ominous invectives. But when the Bible Banner printed an editorial last March setting forth precisely the same principles, lo, it was at once anathematized and challenged to forensic duels from “the least to the greatest” in Alabama, Tennessee, and Texas.

To me there is something strange about the bitterness and the vituperation that periodically breaks out against the Bible Banner. It makes me glad to know that it penetrates so deeply when and where it is read-which is almost everywhere by everybody. But it makes me sad to learn that some men can stoop to some levels of vindictive opposition.

The question; as ably pointed out in the above extracts, is not primarily a war issue. War, as such, is not the central point of discussion. The issue is one of government. It is not a question of “shooting a Jap” or “killing a German,” or of anyone wanting to “kill other people.” When the sheriff executes the functions of his office, it is not because he wants to kill anybody or to injure the person of anybody-it becomes a matter of law enforcement. The question of war likewise is only collateral to the question of government. By begging the question, and talking about killing people; prejudices can be excited, but the same procedure can be used against all municipal, state and national law enforcement agencies. So why argue over the war itself when the fundamental issue lies back of it. As stated before, the war views of others are controlled by the David Lipscomb theory of civil government which bars a member of the church from any participation in government, voting or holding office. This theory says that a member of the church can have nothing to do with civil government itself-save to pay taxes. Yet Paul said in Rom. 13 “for this cause ye pay tribute also.” If the relation to government included only the paying of taxes-what did the also of the verse include? Back of the whole issue is relation to government. The Lipscomb theory must be either accepted or rejected. If it is accepted then a member of the church cannot participate in government at all—civil or military. But if a member of the church can participate in civil government, he can on the same principle participate in the military. The civil government cannot exist without the military to enforce it, whether it be local or national government. Local law enforcement is domestic war, as has been ably pointed out by others; civil and military government must therefore stand or fall together.

It must be apparent to all that those who are clamoring for a debate with me on the subject must first debate with themselves to decide the issue. When they have done that my opinion is there will be no need for further debating. But the Bible Banner would not be the logical medium for such a discussion. Take the Gospel Advocate for instance. B. C. Goodpasture and H. Leo Boles are on one side of the question; C. R. Nichol and R. L. Whiteside are on the other side of it. They are editors on the same paper. Why not keep the discussion in the family? If they decline to debate the issue between themselves their reasons should be sufficient for me to decline to debate it with them. Why make the Bible Banner the goat?

As the issue stands, between combatant and non-combatant service, it appears to be just a matter of whether one can engage in the war effort a little or a lot. But there can be no difference in principle.

When the editorial appeared in the March Bible Banner, it was our intention to simply state the position set forth and let it stop at that. The Gospel Advocate had stated their position more than once. Nobody kicked up a fuss over it-when they did it. We felt that the same liberty could be claimed by us in simply stating the issue as we believe it to exist-then came the furor from certain quarters. They were evidently waiting for an opportunity to seize upon something to wage a war against the Bible Banner. But they are not getting anywhere.

Everybody knows that there is no agreement among them-they could not get together on the issue if their lives depended on it. So while they rant and rage, the brethren will do some thinking.

As for me, I beg to say once more that I do not regard my person as anything, and my fortunes, weal or woe, are insignificant. But principles are important; so is human conduct, and the regrettable thing is that the malice that is being manifested may cause someone to be lost. That is a matter that can be left only to the individual and God. As for me, I aim to just keep on keeping on.

FROM THE HOSPITAL, TEMPLE, TEXAS

As a partial explanation for the lateness of this issue of the Bible Banner, the final proofs for this issue are being sent to the printer from the Scott & White Hospital, Temple, Texas, where my wife has undergone a second major operation. It has been impossible to receive and return proofs and copy to the printers with due dispatch for this reason.

As a matter of information, and in order to simplify answering many inquiries I will state that Mrs. Wallace’s condition, though serious, is not necessarily critical. She is in the hands of the greatest surgeons in the South, and they have assured me that she will be returned home to us with prospects of good health. We covet your prayers.-Foy E.-Wallace, Jr.
A recent issue of the Bible Banner carried an editorial criticism of some things that are going on in some of the colleges both in teaching and practice, and we may add, conduct. The article carried no bitterness, but was a plain, straightforward expression of concern for the cause of Christ and the character of our young people. I have received a number of compliments on the spirit of the article from the immediate vicinities of the schools, with many expressions of hope that the results of such an article might prove wholesome.

Worthy of singular mention, however, is the reaction of the callow president of the Pepperdine College in Los Angeles, who remarked, “O, well, nobody pays any attention to Foy Wallace anyway!” That answer runs true to form, exactly what could be expected, and it proves precisely the attitude that has been charged against the youthful administration of this college. I have not wanted anybody to pay any attention to me, but if the president has an illusion that nobody pays any attention to the treatment of these issues in the Bible Banner, we suggest that he ask Clinton Davidson for some information on that point. Where is the Davidson movement? Where is the New Christian leader? After he interviews Davidson, he might hold a consultation with Murch and Witty. Where is the National Unity Movement?

Brother Hugh cannot toss these things aside with a flippan remark and a wave of the hand. High-hatting will not get anywhere on this issue. He is not dealing with a clique now that he can bend to his will with a gesture. Let him refuse to give the attention to the issues that a silent but tense brotherhood now knows they demand- and deserve and he may become disillusioned on who pays any attention to whom. The mind of the brethren is becoming more and more conscious of the importance of these things. And it has become generally known that the college is endangering the church in the far West through the influence of a dean that has all of the earmarks of a modern psychologist, and a young, president who is green enough to believe that he can ignore these issues. Remember Absalom, son. His good looks and public popularity got the best of him, too, you know.

There are many who feel deeply-concerned over the conditions in the California college. Their anxiety should be considered. Among them are the best people in the church. They are not faultfinders and cranks, but thinking, discriminating brethren who love the Cause and do not want to see it withered by departure. Already a parallel is being drawn between what is happening now in Pepperdine College and what happened in Abilene Christian College. several years ago when the college there retained George A. Klingman and David L. Cooper over the protest of many of the best brethren in Texas and elsewhere. Men of the, eminence of M. C. Kurfees warned the management of the Abilene college that these men were unsafe teachers, but the warnings were ignored and Brother Kurfees was ridiculed by some of the faculty members and charged with interference by others. Now everybody knows that Brother Kurfees was right. As a result of keeping such men in the school several young men went into modernism and-digression. Abilene Christian College has not lived over the effect of these blind blunders-neither has the church. The general impression is that the present dean of the Pepperdine College is about the same type. Such men manifest a certain deep piety and are possessed of a “magnetic personality,” but they are unsound in their general attitude toward the church and issues that vitally affect its integrity. The defiant attitude of the president of the college runs true to form. His statements sound familiar.

What business is it of mine? Just this. I belong to the church of the Lord Jesus Christ. The young men who come from the schools will not only be the future preachers but also the future elders, deacons and leaders in the churches. The young women will be the wives of these preachers, elders and deacons. The church of the next generation is in the molding. That is where the schools involve the church-and anything that involves the church is some of my business.

The things that have, been said of the colleges are true. They have not been successfully denied. It is the solemn duty of those in charge of these schools to correct the weakness in them if it requires a purging from the attic to the cellar to make them true to the principles of New Testament teaching. That would require courage, of course, but weaklings should not be in charge of such institutions. This is no time for weaklings. We need men-men with the intestinal stamina to do what is right regardless of opposition. Any man who will not do it is a time-server, and the New Testament tells us plainly what God thinks of them.

True to sound doctrine, the potentialities of the colleges are unlimited. But the converse is also true. Their active and latent influence can affect the church for generations to come. Remember—practically all of the departures in the past have centered in the colleges. If you do not believe that, you need to read history. Of course, an institution with a vast amount of money to back it can continue regardless of criticism. No one can put them out of business, no one desires to do so; at least I am very far from having any such desire. But they can forfeit the good will of loyal-minded brethren, and when that is done, they are reduced to a mere worldly institution with no good reason to exist.

Doubtless certain ones will pay as little attention to this as they allegedly did to the other. But among the thousands who are reading it there are many hearts that are responsive to it and with quickened beats feel the impulse to do something about it. For the professors themselves they might read with profit what Foy Wallace said of some professors of olden times who “professing to be wise they become fools.” A man of some wisdom and education himself, in the Old Testament, also said a thing that experience has verified—“pride goeth before destruction and a haughty spirit before a fall.” The principle may be applicable to institutions as well as men-for institutions are made of men.

I love California. I love her sunny slope that stretches from the mountains to the sea. I love the people who are there, many of whom are my stedfast friends. I love the Cause you love—the church of the Son of God. It is in interest of His church—the present and the future—and not in spite that these things are said. The Cause in California is young. It is not sturdy and strong enough to sweep back the tides of compromise and digression. For men to take advantage of this lack of strength to seduce the church, and lead it away from the Lord, is a capital crime, and God will not hold him guiltless who does it, or silently allows it to be done.
THE HABITATION OF GOD

Cled E. Wallace

The people of God are “fitly framed together” and constitute “a holy temple in the Lord.” This is a divine sanctuary “which the Lord pitched, not man” and was built “for a habitation of God in the Spirit.” The members of the body of Christ should ponder often and well the divine honors they bear, the grace that is their’s. They have been delivered from the power of darkness and translated into the kingdom of heaven, the kingdom of Christ and God. Their state has been changed from one of alienation and enmity to that of reconciliation and peace.

“So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit.” (Eph. 2:19-22.)

Strangers and sojourners are aliens, essentially outsiders. When the Jews were God’s people, in the country that God gave them and under the law that God revealed to them, there were some provisions governing aliens who came in as strangers and sojourners, but they were not “the people” and the land and the law were not their’s. Human beings in this gospel age have definite rights as such even though they be enemies of God and walk in darkness. God has not left himself without witness to them in the abundance of natural blessings placed within their reach. These blessings are not sufficient to make them “fellow-citizens with the saints” or a part of the sanctuary in which God dwells in the Spirit. It takes even more than can be denoted by such a term as morality to do that.

The apostle is not vague in defining the status of those fortunate ones who enjoy heavenly citizenship. Turn to the New Testament and read the entire second chapter of Ephesians. An overwhelming fact presents itself which is in itself a eulogy on divine grace. It makes no difference at all about a man’s past, or a woman’s either. Those who are “dead through your trespasses and sins” who live “in the lusts of the flesh” and are “children of wrath,” having no hope and without God in the world” may be raised up with Christ, saved through his grace and exalted in heavenly places with him to share “the exceeding riches of his grace.” There is no handicap in an ugly past if a correct present attitude can be attained. The responsibility is put right up to the alien. He can flee the past and become a citizen and a fit dwelling place for the Spirit of God if he chooses to do so. God has through his grace made the provisions, the alien must look upon them and make the choice.

In their relation to God, aliens are “far off,” citizens “are made nigh.” This nearness to God bringing peace and all the blessings of salvation is found “in Christ Jesus” and through “the blood of Christ.” “God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself.” (2 Cor. 5: 19.) This reconciliation is enjoyed in the body of Christ which is the church of Christ. It is specifically stated that Christ took the law of Moses out of the way because it stood as “the middle wall of partition” between Jews and Gentiles. God did not propose to have a dwelling place of Jews or Gentiles as such but one consisting of the redeemed of all races. “For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek: for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him: for, Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.” (Rom. 10: 12, 13.) So when Judaism fulfilled its mission and was abolished in the blood of Christ, a new order was established, “a new and living way,” a far better way than Judaism could be at its best. It is amazing with what tenacity many clung to the old order. The Jews could not be saved by the law of Moses and the Gentiles were not under it. They did not have anything even as good as Judaism. When the church was established, expressed by the apostle as the creation of “one new man,” the new and better way was to “reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby.” This simply means that Jews and Gentiles alike were saved, and are saved, in the church. Any one who imagines that this makes void the grace of God or improperly exalts the church, knows too little of either the grace of God or the church. Paul’s teaching regarding the church as the dwelling place of God in the Spirit, and the place where reconciliation is enjoyed forms the climax of his argument on grace. “For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.” (Gal. 6: 15.) It is the same as saying that if a man is a Christian, the circumstance of his race is of no importance. If he is not a Christian, no circumstance of race or blood can count in his favor with God. He is “a new creature” only in Christ, in the body, in the church. “Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new.” (2 Cor. 5: 17.) “For ye are all sons of God, through faith, in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as were baptized into Christ did put on Christ.” (Gal. 3: 26, 27.) We can well understand in the light of all this why Jesus said: “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be condemned.” (Mark 16: 15, 16.)

There should be no hesitation on the part of any to do as the Lord directed, and none should delude themselves with the fancy that they can enjoy the promised blessings in disobedience. “He became unto all them that obey him the author of eternal salvation.” (Heb. 5: 9.)

In view of this plain teaching, it is no wonder that we find an expression like this in the sacred writing: “Unto him be the glory in the church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations for ever and ever.” (Eph. 3: 21.) Christ is the fulness of God and the church is the fulness of Christ. A man cannot honor God and ignore Christ, nor can he honor Christ and ignore the church. It was built “for a habitation of God in the Spirit.” The members of the church, the body of Christ, are addressed in this inspired language: “But ye are an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God’s own possession, that ye may shew forth the excellencies of him whom called you out of darkness into his marvellous light: who in time past were no people, but now are the people of God: who had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy.” (I Peter 2: 9, 10.)

This calls for unity among the Lord’s people and they should give all diligence to maintain it. They should speak the same things, be perfected together in the same mind and judgment and in nothing through faction or pride. Such unity and fellowship based on the revealed will of God will bear the fruits of holy living, liberal service, regularity in obedience in the lives of the redeemed. In this way alone can they be a worthy habitation of God in the Spirit.
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A number of “Simons” are mentioned in the New Testament. There was Simon, whose surname was Peter, also called Cephas, who was one of the twelve apostles of the Lord. In the list of apostles there is also Simon the Canaanite, or Simon the Zealot, as he is also called. There was also Simon, a man of Cyrene, who was compelled to bear the cross of Jesus on the way to Calvary. But the Simon of this lesson is Simon the sorcerer, whose brief history is given to us in the eighth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles.

This man was in Samaria at the time Philip went there to “preach Christ unto them.” In fact, he had been there for a long time before Philip went. His work of deception is described for us in Acts 8: 9-11. This record tells us this: “But there was a certain man, called Simon, which beforetime in the same city used sorcery, and bewitched the people of Samaria, giving out that himself was some great one: to whom they all gave heed, from the least to the greatest, saying, this man is the great power of God. And to him they had regard, because that of long time he had bewitched them with sorceries.” Thus we are told that Simon was engaged in the use of sorcery. Sorcery means the use of magic, necromancy, witchcraft, soothsaying, fortune-telling, sleight-of-hand tricks, and other such things. The use of any of these often baffles the minds of men. Whatever form of sorcery Simon engaged in—whether simply sleight-of-hand tricks, some other form of magical arts, the claim to foretell the future by the aid of divine power, or simply fortune-telling—he had succeeded in deceiving the people. He had been “giving out that himself was some great one” and had “bewitched the people” to such an extent that they had great regard for him and had concluded that “This man is the great power of God.” But it was all deception. He was not aided by divine power at all and was simply practicing “fakery” as a means of livelihood, as many others are doing today.

But Philip went to that city to preach Christ to lost men and women. In connection with his preaching he actually wrought miracles by the power that God had given him. He cast unclean spirits “out of many that were possessed with them: and many taken with palsy, and that were lame, were healed.” Verse 7. There were no tricks, schemes, artifice or deception about this. The people could see the difference between the tricks of Simon and the miracles of Philip. Consequently, they “gave heed unto those things which Philip spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did.” Verse 6. As a result, “There was great joy in that city.” Verse 8. Furthermore, Luke tells us in verse 12: “But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.” Not only were the Samaritans thus converted, Simon the sorcerer was converted too. The inspired historian informs us in verse 13: “Then Simon himself believed also; and when he was baptized, he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done.” This shows that Simon became a converted man, a child of God. It points out the fact that he obtained the salvation of his soul. Jesus had said in Mark 16: 16: “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” The very things that Jesus specified in this great commission upon which he promised to bestow salvation were done by Simon. “He that believeth and is baptized,” said Jesus, “shall be saved.” And Luke says that Simon believed and was baptized. That being true, we can be sure of the fact that Jesus bestowed the salvation as promised.

Many people do not believe that Simon was saved. They say his conversion was not genuine, that it was a sham conversion, and that he never really did what God requires men to do. Well, what do you think about it? Are you going to take what uninspired men say about it or what the book divine, says? Modern preachers say he did not believe, that he only pretended to believe; but Luke says, “Simon himself believed also.” Had it been only a pretense, Luke evidently would have revealed the sham involved. But he did not. He actually says that Simon believed. Well, that is enough to save any man, without anything else, according to modern preachers who preach salvation by faith only. But Simon did more than that—he believed and was baptized. If his belief was not genuine, neither was the faith of the Samaritans. The preceding verse tells us that the Samaritans believed, and then Luke says that “Simon believed also.” Note that word “also.” It means that Simon did what the others did—they believed; he believed also. So whatever the Samaritans did, Simon did; if their faith was genuine, his was genuine too. Therefore, he did become a child of God, for he did what Jesus said men must do to be saved.

But following that obedience to the will of God Simon committed sin. His sin is revealed to us in verses 18 and 19 of this chapter, the eighth chapter of Acts. I trust you will read it with me. Here is the way the passage reads: “And when Simon saw that through laying on of the apostles’ hands the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost.” Incidentally, this shows us how miraculous gifts were bestowed on men. It was not through the “laying on of the disciples’ hands.” That is the way modern-day-healers would have it. But it was “through laying on of the apostles’ hands.” Just any disciple could not lay hands on others and give them the power to work miracles. No one could do that but the apostles. That explains why the apostles Peter and John were sent from Jerusalem to Samaria. Philip, the evangelist, was already there, and he had been able to work many miracles; but he could not lay hands on others and give them the Holy Spirit. He was not an apostle. So two of the apostles came from Jerusalem to lay hands on the Samaritans and give them such power. Hence, when the last apostle died and the last man died on whom they had laid hands, the gift of miracles must have ceased. No man lives today who ever had the hands of an apostle laid on him; consequently, no man lives today who has the miraculous power of the Holy Spirit. But Simon wanted that power and offered to buy it from the apostles with money. This also shows that such power did not belong to all disciples, for if it did, he would have had it already; and there would have been no occasion for him to try to buy it with money. But he did not have such power. None did except the apostles. So he tried to purchase it; but in doing so, he sinned.

In referring to this sin Peter said in verse 21: “Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God.” And at verse 25 he said: “For I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness and in the bond of iniquity.” This statement does not read as I have heard men quote it. Preachers sometimes quote it like this: “I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitterness and still in the bond of iniquity.” It is quoted this way for the purpose of proving that Simon was never really converted, that it was all a matter of pretense, and he had never been freed from his former sins. This would, of course, set aside any possibility of his being a case of apostasy. It would prove that he did not fall from grace. And all of that would be true, of course, if the passage said: “Thou are yet in the gall of bitterness” or “Thou are still in the gall of bitterness.” Surely that would prove that his old sins were still clinging to him. But it just so happens that the words “yet” and “still”
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CHRISTIANS: BY CONVICTION OR CONVENIENCE

HOMER HAILEY

The struggles of the early Christians shall be an inspiration to children of God in all ages. The things they endured, the sacrifices they made for Christ, have stood as a monument to their firm and unshakable conviction of the truth of the gospel. Their hope was begotten by the resurrection of Christ from the dead, a matter with them of proved fact; but their ultimate hope of glory rested upon their “holding fast the beginning of their confidence, firm unto the end.”

However, their faith was not tried, proved, put to the test by severe trials, as “suffered Peter, ye have been put to grief in manifold trials, that the proof of your faith, being more precious than gold that perisheth though it is proved by fire, may be found unto praise and glory and honor at the revelation of Jesus Christ.” (1 Peter 1:6-7.) So shall the faith of ever Christian be tried; he is not to consider trial as a “strange thing” (1 Peter 4:12); but that “all that shall live godly in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.” (2 Tim. 3:12.) God tests the faith of his children to determine whether it be genuine. Such testing usually determines one point in particular: whether the individual is a Christian by conviction or convenience.

When Paul reasoned before Felix, the governor desired a “convenient season,” but such could not be found. There is no such thing as a Christian by convenience. A Christian is one, who, in his conviction of truth, has rendered obedience thereto. Probably one of the most loosely used words of today is the word “Christian,” which has come to mean the average person, anything from merely being a citizen of this country, to one who is simply religious after a fashion. But in the New Testament the word designated a relationship to Christ which stood for all that Christ procures, and that discipleship incurs. A relationship which resulted from the obedience of the individual to Christ, “from the heart.”

The actions of early Christians were with a definite end: They “turned unto God from idols, to serve a living and true God.” Unto-from for a purpose. It was not a matter of mere sentimentality, and of convenience. Their convictions with regard to the principles of the gospel became to them dearer than property or life itself. Of some Hebrew Christians it is said, “Ye endured a great conflict of sufferings, being made a gazing-stock both by reproaches and afflictions, and ye took joyfully the spoiling of your possessions.” (Heb. 10:32-34.) Of certain Christians from among the Gentiles, it is said, “So that we ourselves glory in you in the churches of God for your patience and faith in all your persecutions and in the afflictions which ye endure.” (2 Thess. 1:4.)

Men do not endure such things simply because it is “convenient”—but because the principles involved are dearer than life, and their “convictions” in these things are deeply rooted. Men and women today who are Christians out of conviction to principles find no place to compromise at any price. With them it is “yes” when “yes” is the answer; it is “no” when “no” is the answer. These realize that to “deny him” is to have him “also deny us”; that “he abideth faithful; for he cannot deny himself.”

Convenience is a mere compromise, Satan’s most subtle weapon. When Pharaoh offered Moses a compromise with regard to the Israelites leaving Egypt, it was in the form of a more convenient way to serve God. It was more convenient to “Go ye, sacrifice to your God in the land”; or “I will let you go ... only ye shall not go very far away”; or “Go now ye that are men, and serve Jehovah,” which would leave the little ones; or finally, “Go ye, serve Jehovah; only let your flocks and your herds be stayed,” than to let them do exactly what God had commanded. Moses saw through the whole thing; he was not looking for a convenient way to serve God, nor was he to be deterred from his course by compromise. With him it was obedience to God, the result of conviction that God’s way must be honored.

Today when individuals are members of the church because it was the convenient thing to do, they usually have little or no conviction with regard to things sacred. They have yet to learn that Christianity is more than crying “Lord, Lord”; that it demands a conviction that puts Christ above all things held dear to human affections. “If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple,” said the Christ. (Luke 14:26.) It is a conviction that “takes up the cross daily, and follows” Him.

Consider today, the number in the church who “grew up in it,” so to speak, and were baptized simply because they had been brought up that way, and their parents were members of the church. Whatever may have been the conviction of the parents in their earlier years, these of the second generation oft-times are the most worthless, compromising members in the body. Too many of them do not know “whether Christ was crucified on Calvary, or shot on Bunker’s hill,” as Brother Arceneaux would express it. Their religion is simply a matter of convenience, not of conviction. The church made up of such is sure to become soft, compromising, and end in apostasy, unless these are taught, and grounded in the truth “as truth is in Jesus.”

Another addition by convenience is that of the unbeliever who marries a member of the church, and then “joins the church,” (that is what he does), because the companion is in it. There is no obedience unto God unless the motive goes much deeper than that. Sometimes it is a compromise by a couple who can not decide on Ye religious faith of either, so they seek a third. This would not please God, even if both were baptized by a gospel preacher into the church. Such would be no matter of conviction, or of obedience from the heart; but merely a compromise of convenience.

The church is growing large in many communities, and as a result, in some places becoming popular. The church should have “favor with all the people,” to be sure, but that favor should be a whole-hearted respect for it because of what it stands for, and stands against; not favor just because it is popular. Some preachers may seek to make the church popular by becoming professional back-splatters, but they need to learn that preaching the gospel is not running a popularity contest. One baptized because he likes the preacher, and finds him to be sociable and jovial, will have little conviction on moral issues, and none on doctrinal points, when that preacher is gone, or the real test comes.

Every Christian should be deeply anxious to see people obey God, but that desire should be to see them obey God, and not merely “be baptized.” It should be a desire to see them become Christians because of their deep conviction in the matter, and not because it is a convenient “soul salve,” easily applied.

Right here the future of the church shall be determined. If our preaching and teaching for the next few years baptizes
only a few, but these few act out of conviction, the future triumph is secured. But if we should baptize large numbers, but only because the season should be convenient, it will end in disastrous compromise, for convenience compromises at the very first real obstacle and test that it meets. Let the church be enriched, then, with Christians of conviction, and not impoverished with members by convenience.

GIANT-KILLERS-No. 2

T. B. WILKINSON

Another Giant-killer has appeared, and set up camp, right in Oklahoma City. He kills giants by night in “Doctor” Webber’s tabernacle, and by day over the radio, as long as the people will pay the bill, by keeping the donations coming.

This giant-killer was imported all the way from Philadelphia, or somewhere, to kill giants for “Doctor” Webber. He is a “Doctor” too. But he is a Jew Doctor, I think, at least all the medicine I have heard him prescribe is strictly for the Jews. He hints that it is specially prepared for them in his own laboratory, or wherever it is that he manufactures his dope. He reminds me of a doctor I heard about one time who decided to learn to doctor by experience. He would try out a remedy and if it worked he would write it down in his book, and give it to the next sick man. He tried out a remedy one time and the sick man recovered very promptly. He wrote his prescription down in his book. When the next sick man came along he gave him the same prescription, and he just as promptly died. This puzzled the doctor but he investigated and found the first man was an Irishman, and the second man was a Jew. That fixed it. He wrote in his book “this prescription will cure an Irishman, but it will kill a Jew.”

This new Doctor says the Jews need a different kind of medicine to other people. He has found the very “dope” for them, and is manufacturing it by wholesale. He said the first kind he used when he was a member of a denomination that won’t admit it is a denomination, would cure an Irishman, but it would kill a Jew. Now he has a kind that will cure the Jew, and he will send it under a money back guarantee, no cure, no pay, but you pay in advance.

This new dope is about a new kingdom *1*, is soon to be set in old Jerusalem, and he extols its virtues very highly in his sermons over the radio. Now, I want to take a look at this new prescription, strictly for the Jews, but a Gentile can get into it if he will be good to the Jews. He says the Lord is coming right away to set it up, and we had better get busy, and keep posted, or we will be left out in the cold with the unbelievers.

It is a glorious kingdom that he tells about, with all thrills that go with it, and it will break in pieces, and destroy all earthly kingdoms the very day it comes. The others will simply fold up tent, and abscond, when it comes, for it will come with a blaze of fire, and a blare of trumpets, and a great company of angels, and a great white throne will come sailing down through the sky, and be set down in old Jerusalem, and the glory of it will fill the earth, not gradually, but instantly when it comes.

I can hear him over the radio every morning if I care to listen, and I do sometimes, and he never fails to tell us how he was a member of the church of Christ once, but he quit it for the glories of this new kingdom which is soon to come, mostly for the Jews, who will all become royal members just because they are Jews, and they will be set to rule over the other nations. He belittles the church of Christ, says it is a denomination but the members are not smart enough to know it, or are too mean to admit it. They have got a creed too, but deny it, but he found it in a paper he read one time.

He belittles the church of Christ because it preaches the truth about the kingdom just like Paul did, and John, and Peter on the day of Pentecost, and they expose his speculations about a kingdom yet to come, for the Jews first, and then for the Gentiles, if they will believe what he is preaching. But for the Jews whether or no, for all the Jews will believe this time, or accept their king when he comes, seated, not upon an ass, or a colt the foal of an ass, but upon a great white throne surrounded by all the angels of heaven.

This kingdom he is dreaming about is no small affair, I can tell you, not if it is like he says. All the dead saints will be raised, and the old patriarchs, and all the dead Jews, and all the Jews now living upon the earth, and all the living saints will be changed, and all of these, with millions of angels from heaven will go marching back to Jerusalem to crown their king, with palms in their hands, and crowns upon their heads. Of course, any man drunk on such wine as this cannot see any beauty in the kingdom set up at Pentecost nineteen hundred years ago, such dope as that might do for the Irishman, but it will kill a Jew, just as it did back there.

This kingdom he is preaching about is not the one that Daniel foretold. That one had an humble origin, it was a little stone cut out of the mountain without hands, and it had to grow into a mountain to fill the earth. But the Doctor’s kingdom does not need to grown, it is born full grown, is a mountain when it comes, and fills the whole earth the day of its birth.

Neither is it like the one Jesus told about, it was like a grain of mustard seed, the smallest seed of all, and it had to be planted, and come up, and grow, to become a great tree so the birds could come and lodge in its branches. But the Doctor does not like a kingdom of this kind, it is just a denomination to him, and has got a creed, an unwritten one, and so he apostatized from it when he learned about the glories of this new kingdom that some one told him the Lord would set up, mostly for the Jews, but a Gentile can make the grade.

Just look at the difference in the manner of the coming of the king in the old kingdom as compared with the royal descent of the king of this new kingdom. The first king came to Zion, “seated upon an ass, and a colt, the foal of an ass,” but this next one will come down through the skies with all of the angels of heaven, bringing his throne along with him. No wonder the Jews rejected the first king, if they knew about this one the Doctor is preaching to them, that first king was not the kind they wanted.

It is different to the kingdom Paul preached, too. He said it was through great tribulation that we must enter into the kingdom of heaven, but these Jews will enter theirs without tribulation, or trouble, of any kind, their king simply brings it to them, and shouts, here it is, come and get it. John, too, was in the patience, and tribulation, and the kingdom of Jesus Christ, but in this new kingdom there is nothing to do but reign over the nations, break them, and bang them, and make them be good. No wonder this Doctor apostatized from the church of Christ when he got a whiff at wine so delicate in flavor. The church has labors, and tribulations, and need for patience, in the kingdom of the Lord, but none of these things will harrow the tender soul of this Jew Doctor while it is filled with such visions of glory and grandeur as this. No wonder he apostatized from the faith when his soul became filled with materialistic glories, and quit the church of the Lord for his new found love.
This principle is equally true and applicable in the following exchange between P. W. Stonestreet and the Bro. Stonestreet is a business man, an elder of the church, and a worthy nephew of the late M. C. Kurfees. The editor of the Advocate some time ago complimented Bro. Stonestreet in another connection for having an "observant eye and alert mind." The articles below indicate that his mind is still alert and his eye is on the editor of the Advocate.]

**"WE MUST OBEY GOD RATHER THAN MAN"**

P. W. STONESTREET

The general command to be in subjection to the government is plain from Rom. 13: 1-7. That it is more inclusive than the universally-accepted duties, such as paying taxes, buying war bonds, etc., is plain from verse 6: "For for this cause ye pay tribute also; for they are ministers of God's service," etc. Note the word "also" in the text implies that paying tribute is in addition to the previous general command. And that the Christian's divine obligation to the government involves more than mere passive submission is plain from Tit. 3: 1, where we are commanded "to be in subjection to rulers, to authorities, to be obedient, to be ready unto every good work," etc.

Thus the government has a divine mission. Therefore to resist its divine, civil military power is to resist an ordinance of God. The converse is necessarily implied: To obey the government, within the limits of its divine mission, is to obey God. Hence, as to whether or not the command of the government is also a command of God depends entirely upon whether its command pertains to its divine mission, and not on the nature of that mission, for God is the author both of the mission and the nature of the mission.

But the title of this article is in point here. It is the often-quoted statement of the apostle Peter found in Acts 5: 29. Fortunately, God has revealed to us not only the mission of the government, but also the mission of the church, and one is no less significant than the other; and there is no clash between the two divinely assigned, though they are of widely different natures and should not be confused. But just as human practice in the church is sometimes out of harmony with its mission, so does human practice in the government sometimes transgress its divine mission; and this was especially true when the Roman authorities commanded the apostles not to teach any more in the name of Christ, which prompted Peter's decisive reply in the words of the title of this article. Why, the government's divine mission was to oppose evil—not oppose good, (See text). Hence, that command of the Roman government was purely the words of men. No wonder Peter replied as he did. He knew the prohibition to teach in the name of Christ was not a prerogative of government as divinely assigned, but was simply man's word. This principle is equally true and applicable in the matter of obeying parents and elders, for all authority divinely vested in the human element of government, whether home, church, or state, is relative; and no violation of this principle can in the least logically vitiate the principle.

Hence, above all, let us pray to be more logical than to indiscriminately apply the apostle's statement to a command of government that is exactly in harmony with its divine mission, for the apostle was replying to a command wholly outside the government's divine mission. True, outlaw nations care nothing for their divine mission. That is the very reason they are outlaw nations. And their manifest evil is an occasion for a high appreciation of the wisdom, justice, and mercy of God in making provision for its opposition and overthrow by other of God's ordained governments, of which Christians are citizens and also in a spiritual sense citizens of heaven, inasmuch as inspired men exercised the former and declared the latter. The former being understood, there was no need to declare it as there was for the latter. So Christians in all countries and islands of the sea may observe the divine mission of government and compare it with the course of their respective governments and be governed accordingly. That mission is quite simple to understand, however difficult to perform.

Of course since military force cannot control the heart of evil men, the government's divine mission is, therefore, limited to enforcing just that part of the moral code that relates to the rights of others in the world, leaving the heart with all that it involves to be governed by the influence of the gospel as it may contact and arrest the volition of man's will. And, in harmony with this principle, it is significant that the distinguished Tennessean and brilliant Secretary of State, Cordell Hull, in his recent world-wide radio speech, so aptly and discriminately specified the enforcement of "Christian morality" as a war aim, thus scripturally, and therefore wisely, limiting the function of government to that realm with which all humankind is vitally concerned and which can only be corrected by force of arms.

Hence, according to what our text says in particular and the Scriptures say in general as they relate, respectively, to the spiritual and temporal governments, only the government's divinely-assigned mission marks the limits of the Christian's duty to bear arms at the government's call, except as conscience may protest.

And while conscience is God-given, unfortunately it is not always God-instructed. It is the divine urge to do right, but is dependent upon further instructions for knowing what is right. The word conscience coming from the Latin, meaning "to know together," is thus a counterpart of knowledge of good and evil from whatever source known "together." Hence, it is not strange that it varies so widely in what it dictates; its instructions do not always come from the same source of authority. And since it may be only a facsimile of spurious knowledge, its dictates may not be scriptural and can never be any more infallible than knowledge of good and evil. Yet, since its possessor assumes it to be genuine, it should be respected, as the Scriptures teach, regardless of its lack of genuineness, lest it become seared and thus be insensible to impressions of good and evil from any source. So our government again scripturally and wisely distinguished between what is and what is not a function of government and made provision for conscientious objectors accordingly. And on this phase of the subject the Gospel Advocate, in its issue of August 6, 1942, carries editorially a most timely lesson, which is here commended.

Finally, there has never been a time since the first function of civil government on the plains of Shinar that the God of heaven could not have destroyed every one of them, but instead
he ordained them to their divine mission. So there can be no constant rivalry between the spiritual and the temporal governments as they are divinely ordained for their respective ends, despite the fact that the word “kingdom” applies to both. For the same reason there can be no scriptural incongruity in the exercise of citizenship in both. And the prophecy of Dan. 2: 44 only shows on this point that God contemplates a time when he will have no further use for temporal governments, and they will then be destroyed. But the prophecy has nothing whatever to do with the Christian’s relation to them in the meantime. And may we all meet our responsibility to God, to one another, and to the government under his teaching.

Second, the king-

And he very aptly observes: “If the prophecy in Dan. 2: 44 contemplates only a future disagreement and clash between the kingdom of God and ‘all these kingdoms’, then some interesting considerations follow. First, this portion of the great image seen in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream and described as the legs of iron and feet of iron mixed with clay as is generally understood to have reference to the Roman Empire, is the Roman Empire. Second, the kingdom of heaven was to break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, even smite the image upon its feet that were of iron and clay and break them in pieces. Third, the Roman Empire fell in A.D. 476. Fourth, if Dan. 2: 44 contemplates only a future disagreement and clash between the kingdom of God and ‘all these kingdoms’, then some interesting considerations follow. First, this portion of the great image seen in Nebuchadnezzar’s dream and described as the legs of iron and feet of iron mixed with clay is generally understood to have reference to the Roman Empire, the Roman Empire. Second, the kingdom of heaven was to break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, even smite the image upon its feet that were of iron and clay and break them in pieces. Third, the Roman Empire shall be smitten and broken into pieces, then it follows that the old Roman Empire must be restored. If not, why not? How can the image be smitten on the feet of iron and clay, in the future, if Rome is not restored? How can the kingdom smite a nonentity? This interpretation of Dan. 2: 44 demands the return of the Roman Empire. In other words, it is at this point premillennial!”

With the foregoing I agree and I was unfortunate in not more definitely qualifying my statement in the article according-ingly. Of course Daniel’s statement, while prophecy when made, has been history ever since its fulfillment, and I only meant that, to the extent that it is now held to have a future fulfillment, it has no bearing on the Christian’s relation to civil governments nor suggestive of any constant rivalry between the temporal and the spiritual governments.

But in thus failing to qualify the statement according to history rather than according to prophecy, I am in good company, for in an editorial in the Gospel Advocate of August 13, 1942, the editor himself says on Dan. 2: 44: “What kind of relation between the kingdom of God and ‘these kingdoms’ does this prediction suggest? Since the former is to ‘break in pieces and consume’ the latter, are we to conclude that there is no antagonism between them?”

Of course I accept the editor’s more recent statement on that text and of course he will charitably accept my more recent statement on it. So whether Dan. 2: 44 is read in the light of history or prophecy, antagonism between the temporal and the spiritual of necessity will be at a time when the temporal is not divinely ordained for God’s purpose on God’s part, and at a time when it is not performing its divine mission on its part. Finally, it is encouraging that there is manifest agreement on what has been said on “conscience,” which is the basis for mutual consideration on the part of conscientious objectors and conscientious approvers.

EDITOR’S NOTE NOTED

P. W. STONESTREET

In his very courteous observations on an article of mine in the Gospel Advocate of Sept. 17, 1942, the editor succinctly says: “Nothing which is intrinsically wrong can be made right by mere civil legislation.” Exactly; and conversely, nothing is intrinsically wrong when it is a part of the divine mission of a thing, even though it is also civil legislation.

He also says: “The nature of the thing involved or commanded will determine whether there is a clash between Christ and Caesar.” That is the very point to be proved and the burden of proof rests on the affirmative. In the meantime it is respectively denied that there can be a clash between Christ and Caesar within the limits of Caesar’s divine mission.

He says further: “Paul enjoined obedience to the powers that be, yet died in disobedience to them.” Certainly, but he did not die in disobedience to their commands that were in harmony with their divine mission, nor did he die at their hands in their performance of their divine mission. No claim has been made that the powers that he will not sometimes transgress their divine mission, precisely as the church sometimes transgresses its divine mission; But errors do not vitiate missions.

The humorous feature of the foregoing exchange between the editor of the Gospel Advocate and Brother Stonestreet is that so recent as August 13th, Brother Goopasture himself cited Dan. 2: 44 in support of his present position of antagonism between Christianity and civil government. He can see premillennialism in Brother Stonestreet’s use of it, but he could not see it in his own application of it! But if Brother Stonestreet’s adaptation of Dan. 2: 44 is barred because the prophecy is of past fulfillment, then Brother Goopasture’s application of it in the Advocate of August 13 is barred for precisely the same reason. Verily, the legs of the lame are not equal! The fact is, Brother Stonestreet alluded to the same text (Dan. 2: 44) because it had been used on the other side of the question by the editor of the Gospel Advocate himself. So the editor’s note got noted, and I guess that makes a noted editor! But up to the time of this writing the Advocate editor had not published the reply to his note.

The statement that “Paul enjoined obedience to the powers that be, yet died in disobedience to them” constitutes a new charge against Paul. He is not here to defend himself against (Continued on Page 16)
"THE LAW OF GOD ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT"

M. C. KURFEES

In view of the very serious and startling crime situation in the United States, the author of this production was led, in the fall of 1924, to deliver a sermon to the Haldeman Avenue Church, Louisville, Ky., on "The Law of God on Capital Punishment." At that time, he had no thought of its publication beyond its oral delivery to the church and community; but the Louisville Christian Ministerial Association, composed of the ministers in Louisville and the surrounding region including southern Indiana, and which meets monthly in Louisville, having heard of the sermon, sent in a courteous and urgent request to put it in the form of a paper and read it before that body. The author gladly consented to do so and read it before them in their January meeting in 1926.

Since that time, there have been repeated and urgent requests from different persons to publish it in permanent form for general distribution, but numerous other duties have so monopolized the author's time that he could not consistently do so till now. In the meantime, the crime condition becoming more and more alarming in some parts of our country, he availed himself of a more extended study of the subject and hence, in its present form, though the position taken and defended is the same, it contains some quotations from authorities which were not used in the sermon as originally delivered. So far as the settlement of the question is concerned, the author appeals to and relies exclusively on the word of God, but the average reader will be interested in what different men and different countries have said and are saying on the subject, and hence some significant facts are given along these lines. It is hoped that the entire argument will be carefully studied, but in view of the inexorable laws governing premise and conclusion, I see not how propositions drawn from different persons to publish it in permanent form for general distribution, but numerous other duties have so monopolized the author's time that he could not consistently do so till now. In the meantime, the crime condition becoming more and more alarming in some parts of our country, he availed himself of a more extended study of the subject and hence, in its present form, though the position taken and defended is the same, it contains some quotations from authorities which were not used in the sermon as originally delivered. So far as the settlement of the question is concerned, the author appeals to and relies exclusively on the word of God, but the average reader will be interested in what different men and different countries have said and are saying on the subject, and hence some significant facts are given along these lines. It is hoped that the entire argument will be carefully studied, but in view of the inexorable laws governing premise and conclusion, I see not how propositions drawn from

I. Passages of Holy Scripture which Specifically State God's Law on Capital Punishment.

1. Passages cited. Such a statement of that law, both in the Old Testament and in the New, with some general references to it, is found in the following passages: "And surely your blood, the blood of your lives, will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it; and at the hand of man, even at the hand of every man's brother, will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God made he man." Gen. 9:5-6. "Thou shalt not kill." Ex. 20:13. "He that smiteth a man, so that he dieth, shall surely be put to death." Ex. 21:12. "And if an ox gore a man or a woman to death, the ox shall be stoned, and its flesh shall not be eaten; but the owner of the ox shall be quit. But if the ox was wont to gore in time past, and it hath been testified to its owner, and he hath not kept it in, but hath killed a man or a woman, the ox shall be stoned, and its owner also shall be put to death." Ex. 21:28, 29. Moreover, ye shall take no ransom for the life of a murderer, that is guilty of death, but he shall surely be put to death. And ye shall take no ransom for him that is fled to his city of refuge, that he may come again to dwell in the land until the death of the priest. So ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are; for the blood it polluteth the land; and no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." Num. 35:31-33. "Thou shalt not kill." Deut. 5:17. "And behold, one came to him and said, Teacher, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, why asketh thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good; but if thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? And Jesus said, Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, honor thy father and thy mother; and, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Matt. 19:16-19. "And behold, a certain lawyer stood up and made trial of him, saying, Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life? And he said unto him, why asketh thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good; but if thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments. He saith unto him, Which? And Jesus said, Thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not bear false witness, honor thy father and thy mother; and, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Matt. 19:16-19. And he answering said, Thou shalt love thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right. This do, and thou shalt live." Luke 10:25-28. "Owe no man anything, save to love one another; for he that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law. For this, Thou shalt not commit adultery, thou shalt not kill, thou shalt not steal, thou shalt not covet, and if here be any other commandment,
it is summed up in this word, namely, thou shalt love thy
neighbor as thyself. Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; love
therefore is the fulfillment of the law.” Rom. 13: 8-10. “How be
it, if ye fulfill the royal law, according to the Scripture, Thou
shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, ye do well; but if ye have
respect of persons ye commit sin, being convicted by the law
as transgressors. For whosoever shall keep the whole law, yet
stumble in one point, he is become guilty of all. For he that
said, Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if
thou dost not commit adultery, but killest, thou art become
a transgressor of the law.” James 2: 8-11.

2. Love. Let us note the very prominent and significant place
here assigned to love. It is the one great and universal anti-
dote against all wrong. Not only is it true that neither murder
nor any other crime would ever be committed if love were
properly esteemed, but it is here distinctly declared that it
comprehensively covers the entire ground of human obligation—
“He that loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law.” The word
“neighbor” here is an imperfect translation of the term used by
Paul. It literally reads: “He that loveth the other (τον οικετή)
hath fulfilled the law.” That is, anybody and everybody, whether
in one part of the world or another, is to be the object of our
love.

3. Three Statements Selected. Now, from these plain and
unequivocal passages, I select three statements which succinctly
and incontrovertibly set forth God’s law on murder:

(1) “Who so sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood
be shed, for in the image of God made he man.”

(2) “He that smiteth a man so that he dieth. shall surely be
put to death.”

(3) “Ye shall not pollute the land wherein ye are; for blood,
it polluteth the land; and no expiation can be made for the
land for the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him
that shed it.”

And we may add here that the vital principles underlying
these legal enactments existed long before the “thunders and
lightning” peeled from the smoky summit of Mt. Sinai and
when, at the divine presence, “the whole mount quaked greatly
and “the voice of the trumpet waxed louder and louder”; but
on this momentous occasion, these principles were embodied in
specific legal form.

II. The Law Contained in These Passages.

1. The divine law on murder is universal in its application.
Now, let it be carefully observed here, first of all, that there is
not even the remotest intimation of anything in these inspired
declarations that is local, national, racial, or temporal. They
apply equally to all places, all nations, all races and all times.
They were not spoken of the Jews in particular nor of any
other nation in particular, but of mankind in general as found
in all nations, in all ages and at all times. Neither is there the
slightest intimation that they will not be in force as long as
mankind exists on the earth.

2. The force of the reasons assigned for the divine law.
Moreover, the reasons which God himself assigns for this law
are of a nature that makes them coexistent with man. They
certainly should appeal seriously to all thoughtful persons.
These reasons are: (1) that man is “made in the image of
God”; (2) that “no expiation can be made for the land for
the blood that is shed therein but by the blood of him that shed it.”

3. The reasons assigned for the divine law examined
in detail. That we may see their solemn import, let us now
examine these reasons. (1) The first is stated in these words:
“For in the image of God made he man.” Is that reason any
less true today than it was when first uttered? Most assuredly
it is not. In other words, is it not just as true now as it ever
has been that man is created “in the image of God”? Most
assuredly it is. Hence, the very same identical reason which
God himself assigned for the law on capital punishment exists
today with all the force it had when he first assigned it. In my
humble judgment, no living man can answer this argument. It
is simply unanswerable, standing on the sacred page as an
impregnable rock. Hence, according to God’s own specific
declaration, as long as it is a fact that man is in the divine image,
that long will this law on capital punishment be in force. (2) In
like manner, let us look at the second reason for God’s law on
murder. It is stated in these words: “No expiation can be made
for the land for the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood
of him that shed it.” Here again let us inquire, was that state-
ment true when God first uttered it, but is not true now? If so,
why so? Is it not just as true now as it was when God first
said it that “no expiation can be made for the land for the
blood that is shed therein but by the blood of him that shed it”?
If not, why not? Whoever says it does not assumes the logical
obligation to tell why it is not. Here again, in my humble
judgment, no such reason can be found in the whole universe
of God because of the fact that it does not exist.

4. Human sentiment and the divine law on murder. I am
fully aware that when we come to consider the different nations
of man and their legal enactments on murder, we shall find, as
in all other things submitted to man for decision, that human
sentiment fluctuates and is marked by various and ever-changing
turns. A few illustrations will suffice. For example, many years
ago, in Belgium, as given in the American Statistical Associa-
tion, Vol. IX, pages 307 and 308, we have this statement:

“From early in the reign of Leopold I until 1835, capital
sentences were systematically commuted to life imprison-
ment with hard labor. This, no doubt, was due to the influence
which in matters of severe punishments the first queen of the
Belgians, Marie Louise, wife of Leopold I, exercised over her husband
and her son, the present King. Her attention had been drawn to
the cases of several persons who had been beheaded for crimes of
which they were subsequently proved innocent. It was at
the same time brought to the notice of both the King and his
legal advisers that such miscarriages of justice were by no
means rare either in Belgium or elsewhere. Moreover, it was
found that capital executions were not necessary to the preser-
vation of life and property in Belgium. Judicial statistics for
the period of clemency preceding 1835 showed that grave crimes
had actually decreased. But in 1834 the number of capital
sentences was augmented by a transgressor of the law for God made
for all ages. Moreover, God’s law on capital punishment is not
in accord with present civilization. In Maine, where the death
penalty was abolished in 1887, there is pending a bill to re-establish it.”

Here, I grant most freely and gladly that the community
may very properly and should outgrow “the rack, the whipping
post and the stake.” You are asking me to argue that outgrow
the whipping post and the stake” any other form of cruelty de-
vised by man, but it cannot properly outgrow a law of God made for
all mankind and for all ages. Moreover, God’s law on capital
punishment is hot, like the rack, whipping post and stake, to
punish and make men suffer, but to rid society of them. He does
not say treat them cruelly and this should never be done. God
sends put to them death. The sentiment of communities is sometimes against God's law on different matters, but we should always, nevertheless, stand by the latter. Moreover, in the realm of morality, principles are unchangeable and do not vary with the changing sentiment of men.

Hence, the importance of teaching to the youth of our land God's own law on murder and even teaching it in the schools of our country was emphasized some years ago in a speech on “The Death Penalty,” delivered by Dr. George B. Cheever in a debate with Wendell Philips and others and reprinted in Vol. 133 of the North American Review. From this memorable speech, I quote the following statement:

“And the more effectively God's law and a future final retribution are denied or obscured in the murderer's consciousness by his never having heard of these truths in the common schools through which he graduated, and by the legal and social habit of denying the authority of the Scriptures and of God over both government and people (a habit which the exclusion of positive religion from the state, its constitutions and its schools, fosters from childhood), the more rational and right thinking officer of Christ, who takes care only of himself, no matter what becomes of others. He has never been taught that God requires murder to be punished by death, much less that there is an endless retribution, in another world, for crimes committed here. Had the state done its duty in his education, he would never have been a murderer. It is moral assassination by the state to have let him grow up in such brutality. A law so benevolent and illuminating as that of God against murder, with its very reason grounded in the immortality of man and his accountability to God, and his obligation of love to his fellow man in God's image, binds the government to teach its whole meaning, and to proclaim it with all the light thrown upon it from God's successive revelations from the preceding broadening down through ages, and from the final teachings of Christ. Government, therefore, in the name of its authority to punish, is bound to flash the whole lightning of the state to the uttermost depths of society, till its divine meaning penetrates the entire mass.”

And we may add here, that as long as murderers in any degree, and especially such as are savagely brutal, atrocious, villainous, fiendish and diabolical, accounts of which so often penetrate the entire mass,”

5. Harmony of the Decalogue and the divine law on murder. The claim sometimes made that capital punishment for murder is forbidden by the sixth commandment of the decalogue, which says “Thou shalt not kill,” is easily met by the fact that such a claim makes God squarely contradict himself. Assuredly he would not give specific directions in a number of places in his word to put men to death for certain crimes, and then in the decalogue, forbid it to be done. I think we shall see that there is no conflict here at all. Let it be observed here, first of all, that there are different kinds of killing mentioned in the Bible, and when it is done unwares or unwittingly, the protection of the slayer is distinctly provided for and he must not be put to death. See Numbers 36: 9-16; Deut. 19: 1-10. Again, there are at least seven different Hebrew words used in the Hebrew Bible and at least that many Greek words used in the Greek New Testament, all substantially meaning, in some sense, to kill; and while, so far as I have ever been able to see, the facts in neither Testament warrant the conclusion that the idea of murder inheres in any one of these words in either language, to the exclusion of the others, it is, nevertheless, a fact that in each Testament a number of crimes, in each language is ordinarily used when murder is the idea to be conveyed. That word in the Hebrew language is the word used in the decalogue in the commandment, “Thou shalt not kill” which, strictly rendered, means, “Thou shalt not commit murder”; or, as stated by Brown, Driver and Briggs, “murder, slay; with premedita-

6. Comparison of the case as it exists in different countries. That the reader may further see the crime situation in our own country with its lax execution of the laws in comparison with the situation in other countries, I here give a list of significant quotations from leading newspapers and other sources of authority on the question. It will be seen that some of these are speaking out with no uncertain sound in favor of the divine law. From the facile pen of Dr. S. Parks Cadman, of New York, in the Christian Herald of May 29, 1926, in “A Searching Discussion of the Crime Problem,” we have this statement:

“The heavy indictment stands against the United States that it is the most criminal nation in Christendom. It is useless to deny a condition that facts demonstrate, and which imperils the very welfare and safety. Side by side with a large majority of our citizens who desire the abolition of injustice, oppression, needless poverty and war, is a growing and brazen body of armed and desperate criminals who have become the scandal and the inward menace of the nation. ... It is necessary to understand the magnitude and the difficulty of America’s crime problem. Few respectable and lawful Christian people do understand the problem. They lament its symptoms and are amazed at its consequences, but seem impotent to arrest its causes. ... Laws can become so burdensome as to defeat their own intent by their sheer number or triviality. The ancient saying that “the more laws a democracy has, the more corrupt it is,” applies to the present condition. There are more than 100,000 statutes of our legislative codes of our State and Federal governments. These statutes are not known in their entirety to the most learned legal authorities in the land. How then can they be known to the layman in matters of the law? ... The second cause of crime is the bad nature and weak administration of criminal law. The larger percentage of murderers in this Republic escape the prescribed penalty for their deed, and other hardened offenders evade legal punishment in ratio. Of course justice should be blended with mercy, but it ceases to be either just or merciful when it indirectly encourages lawlessness and crime. One criminal advocate, whd has an enviable record in this respect, asserts that the death penalty need not be suffered by any murderer who has sufficient wealth to employ clever counsel for his defense. In nearly every county, city and state of the Union is some notorious practitioner, who can be relied upon to cheat the hangman’s rope of its lawful prey. ... During the coming year at least 9,000 to 10,000 people will be murdered in this country. Its burglaries and other forms of robbery and illicit depredation cost it the staggering total of nearly ten billions of dollars annually. Four billions of this incredible amount can be charged off to losses from crime alone; the balance to the expense of maintenance for police, criminal courts, prisons and places of detention. The annual crime loss and penalties paid for criminal operations in the United States during 1923 was three times the amount of the national budget for that year.”

From the official records of Louisville, Ky., the following figures were handed to me. From September 1, 1926, to August 31, 1926, there were 68 murders in Louisville. Of this number: 2 were executed; 4 sent up for life; 12 sent. up for 2 to 16 years; 40 either found not guilty or dismissed by the grand jury, or were not apprehended.-a few not yet tried when these figures were submitted.

Hence, according to all the facts and figures now before us, we are face to face with the appalling and significant situation that where there is one murder in all England and Wales to every 100,000 of the population, there are ten and sometimes more than ten in the United States; and that in Philadelphia, in 1923, with a population of about 2,000,000, there were 54 more homicides than in the whole

Dominion of Canada with a
population of about 10,000,000! Then, added to this is the equally significant and increasing crime record in Chicago in which city alone, as we have seen from the different authorities quoted, there were in 1918, 222 homicides; in 1921 there were 352; in 1923 there were 389; in 1924 there were 509; and in 1925 there were 562! That is certainly a ghastly and shocking record. And in Philadelphia there were thirteen murders the first nine days of May, 1926! Or, as viewed from another angle, in all England and Wales with a population only a little less than half the population of the United States, there were in 1923, as already cited from the Literary Digest, 200 deaths from homicide, but about 10,000 at the same time in the United States! Thus, as revealed in the Digest quotation and previously stated, the figures present the ratio of about four murders per million of the population in England and Wales, and 102 per million in a majority of the large cities of the United States! The situation in this country is not only alarming but the vast difference between it and the situation in England should wake up our citizens to the perils of the hour.

But why such difference between the murder record here and in England? The reason is found largely in the fact, already quoted from the New International Encyclopedia, that “in the United States where murder is punished by death with comparative infrequency the crime is far more common than in England where conviction for murder is usually followed by execution.”

That is what tells the story. Of course lack of child training in the home and elsewhere is, no doubt, the primary source of all wrong, but next to it, lax execution of the laws and particularly the lack of enforcing God’s law on murder, if not the primary, at least one of the leading factors in the whole crime situation in the United States. If the murderer knew when tempted to commit the terrible deed that, if he does it, his own life, as God’s law distinctly and imperatively requires, will be the unfailing penalty, then in probably ninety-nine cases out of every one hundred, he would be restrained from the fearful act. God’s law is always best for men and when civil governments properly recognize this fact, it becomes a deterrent to crime.

Beyond all question, if crime in all its multifarious degrees and phases, were promptly met and properly punished, improvement in the situation would soon become general all over the country. Hence, a most serious responsibility rests upon the courts and upon all persons legally empowered to bring criminals to justice; and Christians as well as all other citizens share in this responsibility and should, within the limits of proper conduct, exert all possible influence, both from the pulpit and from the pew to aid in the effort to check the deplorable tide of crime.

7. Christian modification of the Mosaic Law. It is a significant fact that when the Lord placed his own teaching in Matt. 5: 38, against the ancient law recorded in Ex. 21: 23-25, which required “life for life, eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe,” he confined his modification of that law to the point of personal resentment in returning evil for evil. Paul teaches the same thing when he says: “Rejoice not to no man evil for evil” and “Avenge not yourselves ... for it is written Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord.” Rom. 12: 17, 19; Deut. 32: 35. Again, concerning “brother going to law with brother,” he said: “Why not rather take wrong? Why not rather be defrauded?” I Cor. 6: 7. Hence, if a man smites his fellow man, the latter must not smite him in return. Yea, if he smites him to death, neither a member of his own family nor anybody else is permitted personally to take vengeance upon him for his crime, but Paul distinctly says: “The powers that be are ordained of God,” and that they are “a minister of God, and avenger for wrath to him that doeth evil.” Rom. 13: 1, 4. This should help us to appreciate the fact that, when Christ died on the cross, while the entire ceremonial law was, by that tragic and momentous event, taken out of the way or, as Paul expresses it, Christ “abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances” (Eph. 2: 15); and “having blotted out the bond written in ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us; and he hath taken it out of the way, nailing it to the cross” (Col. 2: 14); nevertheless the entire decalogue is reincorporated in the New Testament and is in full force under Christianity, with the single exception that the fourth commandment enjoining the keeping of the seventh day holy is modified by the revelation that, as to the sanctity or holiness of days under Christ, men, as set forth in the Roman epistle, may “esteem every day alike.” See Rom. 14: 5.

Finally, in the light of all the facts now before us, it seems clear and conclusive that the question here presented is not to be settled by either the philosophies or the sympathies of men, but by the word of God; and hence, I respectfully suggest in closing that, since the fact that man is created “in the image of God” remains today, so far as we have any means of knowing, precisely as it ever has remained unchanged, and since the additional fact that “no expiation can be made for the land for the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it,” remains equally unchanged, the conclusion is simply inevitable that God’s law on capital punishment is still in force and will remain so while man as man remains on the earth; and it well becomes us as children of God, striving to follow divine wisdom and leadership, to ponder these facts in the fear of God.

EDITOR’S NOTE

(Continued from Page 11)

such a charge now but under similar indictment he once denied the charge: “For if I be an offender, or have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die: but if there be none of these things whereof they accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Caesar.” Paul recognized the right of the state to take his life if he had been an “offender” or if he had done anything for the execution of that penalty. He demanded the proof of that charge from his accusers, and they could not prove it. If the editor of the Advocate had been there perhaps he could have furnished them the proof they needed against Paul. Really, was disobedience to the law the reason for the death of Jesus Christ and his servant Paul? I believe that I would think a long time before I would put that statement down on paper.
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Use In All Bible Classes
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Is the Old Testament hard for you to understand? When using a course of study too hard for the average student, it is difficult to build up class attendance and interest. These lessons are not difficult to understand. They are designed to make it easier for the student to acquire a knowledge of the events of the Old Testament, and to remember the things "written for our admonition."

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

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

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

Ans. Judg. 7:2-7.

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

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

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

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

These lessons provide an excellent means for promoting Christian education in the church and in the home. They are designed to help the student acquire a knowledge of the great and lasting truths of the New Testament. Systematic education in the life of Christ and His church would remove much of the present day unrest, make home life happier, and the church stronger in the faith.
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Contains Twenty-Eight Lessons On
As Many Bible Subjects, Prepared For Use In All
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These lessons have been used by Bible classes since 1932, and have grown in circulation and popularity each year. Scores of letters have been received from teachers who have used this book; they commend it highly. H. B. Bark says, "This book is the best I have seen in its field."

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

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

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

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

In the compilation of Scripture references the preacher will find material for a series of sermons on many subjects. The scriptural answers to about seven hundred questions on twenty-eight of the most important Bible subjects should be of great help to any Bible student.
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