“THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH TOWARD WAR”

CLED E. WALLACE

In view of what led up to it, Brother Brigance’s article, which appeared on the editorial page of the Gospel Advocate, seems to call for some further remarks from us. My regard for Brother Brigance is such, that as far as I am concerned, anything he writes is worthy of the most serious and courteous consideration.

As a sort of diversion, the question of the “spirit” and style of our writing obtrudes, almost if not always from those who do not accept our conclusions. Premillennialists have been howling their heads off about our barbarous style and unholy spirit from the very beginning of our attack on their vagaries. Everybody knows what is the matter with them. I read an article in the Christian Standard some time back in which a writer adversely criticized Brother McGarvey’s style in his attacks on certain theories and their advocates. I knew instantly what was the matter with him. Brother Lard received an article from Brother Shackelford in reply to his article on “Should Christians Go To War?” He said the spirit and courtesy of it were faultless. To which Brother Brigance adds parenthetically (“Quite different from some of our replies today.”). We do not claim that our style is faultless, nor have our critics “commended it warmly.” We do object to him when the government calls on them to do so? It appears on the face of it that if this question were answered the way Brother Brigance would like to have it answered, it would make a murderer out of every soldier. If so, I counter by asking another question I would like to “hear” him answer. Is it an individual matter to be settled by “each one’s conscience” whether or not he becomes a murderer? Brother Brigance seems to be a little unstable in his reasoning just at this point.

As to the pioneers among us, it makes little difference. We respect them and their views but could not agree with all of them for they were not agreed among themselves. They concede Shackelford and M. C. Kurlee, who rank along with McGarvey, They gather comfort from Campbell, Franklin, Lipscomb, Fanning, Lard and McGarvey. We bend slightly but do not bow before such names. It may be that Shackelford cancels out Lard inasmuch as when he received a reply from Shackelford he “himself commended it warmly.” Were we to receive such a commendation from Brother (Continued on back page)
"THE ESSENTIAL POINT IN PREMILLENNIALISM" — No. 4

In the Chattanooga address R. H. Boll declared "that if there is ever to be a time" for certain things mentioned in the Old Testament to occur "then Christ must and will come before that time." With that bold statement he lists seven passages of scripture, three from the Old Testament and four from the New Testament, and merely asserts that they constitute and prove "the essential point in premillennial teaching." Disposition has been made of some of his citations in previous articles. The passages cited have been turned completely against him. It has been shown that these passages not only do not teach any point of premillennialism but that what they do teach is just the opposite of premillennial teaching and can be used as arguments against the whole system of premillennialism.

Sectarian debaters sometimes assert a point of doctrine and cite a blackboard full of references and with a triumphant gesture roar out, "answer these!" One of Bogard's tricks has been to reserve a great array of passages on faith until the closing session. He has them listed on a chart, dozens of them. He does not make an argument on them separately at all—he asserts that they mean faith without baptism, and demands that his opponent answer each passage separately—though he does not introduce them separately nor make a separate argument on them. In that case he has not introduced a dozen arguments—he has introduced only one argument and merely asserts that certain passages prove it.

Let it be observed that Brother Boll deploys the same tactics. He asserts that certain things must occur which he asserts have not occurred and then asserts that "Christ must and will come before that time!" To prove his bald assertions he cites numerous passages without even quoting them and with a pious gesture says "and the word of God bears that out!" Until he makes an argument on the passage we could meet his bald assertion with a blank denial, but to expose his utter disregard for the right division of the word of God and the truth that is taught in the passages he cites, we are producing the texts and analyzing each item of the Boll document.

"WHEN THE OLD CURSE SHALL BE LIFTED AND THORNS AND THISTLES SHAII CEASE" (Isa. 55: 12-13.)

Now let us read the passage cited:

"For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and the hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands. Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree: and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off." This passage is "the essential point in premillennial teaching," according to Brother Boll, and "if there is ever to be such a time as that," mentioned in these verses, "then Christ must and will come before that time." With him the passage is literal—the thorns are literal thorns, the thistles are literal thistles, the fir tree and the myrtle are literal fir and myrtle trees. Very well, then the mountains and hills, according to verse 12, will literally break forth into literal singing, and the trees of the field will have literal hands and will literally clap them. What a literal picture! When the thorn and thistle ceases, and the fir and the myrtle trees spring up to take their places, the other trees of the field will be there to "give them a hand"—the fir and the myrtle trees will be greeted with a great applause of hand-clapping as they come springing up. What a reception! A brass band parade is nothing to compare with the literal chorus of literal singing and the literal "trees of the field"—trees, all of the trees of all of the fields of the earth—will applaud them with the literal clapping of their literal hands! Brother Boll says it is literal and that it is "the essential point in premillennial teaching."

We simply insist that if Brother Boll makes the thorn and the brier, and the fir tree and the myrtle tree, of verse 13 literal, to be consistent he will have to say that in his millennium the trees of the field will have literal hands to clap. We cannot allow him to make verse 12 figurative and verse 13 literal in the very same imagery. This fact alone proves that Brother Boll has a distorted view of the passage and in his zeal for a millennium down here on the earth he resorts to perversions of God's word and misapplications of sacred scriptures never exceeded by any sectarian on earth.

What then does the passage teach—if it does not mean the millennium, what does it mean? A casual study of Isaiah 55 shows that it is a description of the gospel dispensation. Verse 3 says: "Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David." The "time" referred to in this passage is the time when God would make "an everlasting covenant" with them. We are asked if the gospel dispensation is "everlasting." Very well, we return the question: Is the millennium "everlasting"? I understood that it should be only a thousand years in duration. But the gospel dispensation has already been in progress longer than that, and certainly cannot be as "everlasting" as the lesser period of the millennium could be. Sauce for the goose—you know!

The passage says: "I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David"—even "the sure mercies of David." That proves that the "everlasting covenant" and the "sure mercies of David" are one and the same thing. What then does it refer? We have but to read Acts 13:33-34, from Paul's address in Antioch of Pisidia: "God hath fulfilled the same unto our children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second psalm, Thou art my son, this day have I begotten thee. And as concerning that he raised him from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David."

Here Paul, the apostle, says that the promise of God to give them "the sure mercies of David" was fulfilled when he "raised up Jesus again." Notice particularly the statement of verse 84 "and as concerning that he raised him up from the dead ... he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David." Therefore, as concerning the "sure mercies of David," Paul says the prophecy was fulfilled in the raising up of Jesus from the...
dead “now no more to return to corruption.” R. H. Boll says “if there is ever to be such a time-then Christ must and will come before that time.” But in Acts 13 :33-34 Paul says: “God hath fulfilled the same.”

Take the text of Paul’s address in Antioch and itemize it even more fully. Like Stephen in Acts 7 his approach to the gospel dispensation is through a brief running narrative of Old Testament history from the deliverance of Israel from Egypt to the coming of the Christ. Verse by verse he reaches the conclusions. In verse 26 he says “to you is the word of this salvation sent.” Referring to the voices of the prophets which they read in their synagogues, verse 27 says, “they have fulfilled them in condemning him.” Verse 29 says that when they took him down from the tree they had “fulfilled all that was written of him.” Verse 30 says that “God raised him from the dead.” Verses 32-33 says “and we declare unto you glad tidings, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled us their children.” Verse 34 says, “and as concerning that he raised him up from the dead … he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David.” That thought continues through verse 37, and verses 38-39 read, “be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you forgiveness of sins: and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.”

It surely must be plain to anyone not blinded by theory and prejudice that the promise of Isaiah 55:3 “I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David” is fulfilled in Acts 13:33-34 and refers to the gospel dispensation.

The remainder of Isaiah 55 is but a further portrayal of the blessings of the gospel dispensation. Verse 10 compares the gospel to rain and snow coming down from heaven and verse 11 applies it to “the word” that “goeth forth out of my mouth” declaring that it shall not “return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whither I send it.” It is then that the prophet exultantly describes the blessings of the gospel and the joys of salvation under the stirring symbols of verses 12 and 13, the mountains and the hills singing, the trees of the field clapping their hands, and the fir and myrtle trees springing up instead of the brier.

In the face of all of these plain facts compared with New Testament passages that affirm their fulfillment, it must be evident to all that, blinded as he is by his millennial theories and steeped in their prejudices, R. H. Boll cannot be trusted to correctly teach the word of God even in its first principles. A man who does not know the proper division of the word of God, and the passages that refer to it, does not know any more about the Bible than any ordinary sectarian.

When R. H. Boll applies Isaiah 55 to a millennial age and says “if there is ever to be such a time-as that then Christ must and will come before that time,” he arrays himself against the inspired statement of the New Testament that “God hath fulfilled the same unto us” and “as concerning that … he said on this wise, I will give you the sure mercies of David.” We therefore simply put Paul’s “hath fulfilled” squarely against R. H. Boll’s “must and will.”

“WHEN THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE LORD SHALL COVER THE EARTH AS WATERS COVER THE SEA.” (Isaiah 11:9-5)

Again Brother Boll merely cites a passage and asserts that it is “the essential point in premillennial teaching.” Let us look at the passage:

“And the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the sucking child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the adder’s den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of Jehovah, as the waters cover the sea.”

The document under review asserts that this prophecy of Isaiah has not been fulfilled. We are told that it points to the millennium and “if there is ever to be such a time as that-then Christ must and will come before that time.” Let us compare Isaiah 11 as we did Isaiah 55 with Paul’s address in Antioch of Pisidia, recorded in Acts 13, and with the Roman epistle, chapter 15.

The first verse of Isaiah reads as follows: “And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots.” Now read Paul’s reference to it in Acts 13:22-24: “And when he had removed him [Saul] he raised up unto them David to be their king; to whom also he gave testimony, and said, I have found David the son of Jesse, a man after mine own heart, which shall fulfill all my will. Of this man’s seed hath God according to his promise raised unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus: when John had first preached before his coming the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel.” Here Paul says that “his promise” referred to the first coming of Christ, and in the verses below, he declared “God hath fulfilled the same unto you.” Notwithstanding the fact that Paul plainly says that this “root” and “stock” of David of Isaiah 11:1 was fulfilled in the first coming of Christ in connection with John’s preaching “the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel,” Brother Boll says that it means the second coming of Christ and that “Christ must and will come before that time.”

R. H. Boll puts his own pitiful ipse dixit squarely against what the New Testament says.

But compare Isaiah 11:10 with Paul’s application of it in Romans 15:12: “And in that day shall there be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious.”

Brother Boll says this has not been fulfilled, that Christ “must and will” come again before that time. But hear Paul in Romans 15:12: “And again, Isaiah saith, “There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles; in him shall the Gentiles trust.” Here Paul quotes directly from Isaiah 11 and declares that it is fulfilled in the dispensation of the gospel to the Gentiles. We ask Brother Boll: Do the Gentiles “trust” Christ now? Can the Gentiles “trust” Christ now? Paul says that is the “reign” the prophecy refers to-the reign of Christ in the gospel dispensation. According to Brother Boll’s theory that “Christ must and will come before that time,” the Gentiles cannot trust Christ now, and his theory takes away all hope of present salvation for the Gentiles. But it is a mere harmless theory, we are told!

The fulfillment of this prophecy is strengthened by a comparison of Isaiah 49:5-6 with another declaration of Paul in that very significant address in Antioch of Pisidia, Acts 13:46-47. The Isaiah passage reads: “And now saith the Lord that hath formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him, Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the Lord, and my God shall be my strength. And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth.” Who does it refer to, and what does it mean? Well, when the Jews would not have Paul’s testimony in Antioch of Pisidia, Paul said to them: “It was necessary that the word of God should first have been spoken to you: but seeing ye put it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles. For so hath the Lord commanded us, saying, I have set thee to be a light of the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the ends of the earth.”

Brethren, that is Paul speaking, quoting the very passages that R. H. Boll applies to the second coming of Christ and the future millennium. Paul said they were fulfilled then. He quoted these passages from Isaiah and said “God hath fulfilled the same unto you” and “they have fulfilled them in condemning
him” and “be it known unto you therefore” and “for so hath the Lord commanded us” and other like expressions, applying their prophecies to the gospel dispensation. Yet Brother Boll persists in saying that they are not fulfilled and that Christ “must and will” come again “before that time.” It is Paul versus Boll. As highly as some people seem to rate Boll as a prophet, I will stick to Paul.

The Boll assertion that Isaiah 11:6-9 refers to the millennium enforces a literal theory that would have wild beasts filled with the knowledge of God and literal animals dwelling in God’s holy mountain. He makes no allowance whatever for figurative language and spiritual imagery. But the entire prophecy is evidently fulfilled in the gospel dispensation, in the church. The first five verses point to the coming of the Messiah into the world. In verses 6-9 the characters of men are represented in figures of wide extreme and contrast. Under the transforming influence of the gospel the characters of men are changed from such as were represented by carnivorous animals like the wolf, the bear, the leopard and the lion into characters represented by the harmless nature of the ox and the lamb. Under the same figure God’s people and Christ’s disciples are called sheep. The literal interpretation of such metaphors is not even rational, much less scriptural.

“AND THE RANSOMED OF THE LORD SHALL RETURN AND COME TO ZION.” (Isaiah 35:8-10.)

A fitting climax to Isaiah’s visions of the coming of the Redeemer and the opening of the gospel dispensation is found in chapter 35:

“And an highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called The way of holiness: the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein. No lion shall be there, nor any ravenous beast shall go up thereon, the redeemed shall walk there: and the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.” (Isaiah 35:8-10.)

The whole chapter is a picture of Christ and his church. The world without Christ was a desert. When the Christ should come there would be a highway where there had been only a trackless desert. Who should travel that highway? Not the unclean “but it shall be for those” and “the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein.” The wayfarer is one who is not a permanent dweller, he is a traveller, faring on the way. The fool is not an idiot, but men who are aware that they do not know the way and need guidance. Men who are wise in their own conceits (I Cor.3:18) and devise their own ways, cannot travel this highway, neither those who are morally unclean. But the Lord’s highway would be such that a “wayfarer” though he was not acquainted with the territory, and men who, knowing their own ignorance, would accept guidance, need not err, or fail to travel this highway. This way should be plain to all of such character and disposition.

When the text says “no lion shall be there” nor any “ravenous beast” shall “be found there,” it immediately states the point of comparison—“but the redeemed shall walk there.” The contrast shows that the “lion” and the “ravenous beast” were used to denote the opposite of the “redeemed”—hence, denoted men of wicked character who had not been redeemed. But we are told that it must not be spiritualized, that it is literal, and “if there is ever to be such a time as that—then Christ must and will come before that time.” Of all the consummated folly and sublimated nonsense from anybody who knows enough about the Bible to make a prayer-meeting talk, that takes the cake.

The picture closes with this grand utterance: “And the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs and everlasting joy upon their heads: they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away.” What a glorious picture of the joys of salvation, the comfort of faith, and the blessedness of hope that we have in Jesus Christ and his church. Premillennialism takes it away. It is a system of rank materialism. It is demoralizing to spirituality and stultifying to the finer sentiments of the soul. It is a degrading anti-climax to the hope of the gospel, a flareback to the weak and beggarly elements. It is incompatible with Christianity, with the ideals of the life of Christ, the essence of his teaching, the purpose of his death, the power of his resurrection and the nature of his kingdom. It is the embodiment of sectarianism and is as false as sectarianism can be—it is a deadly system of error.

This completes the Old Testament citations of the Chattanoogan Bollistic document. In the next installment we shall in like manner review the New Testament passages one by one. We shall not allow him a single “point” in his “premillennial teaching”—not one.

“A BROTHER (FROM TENNESSEE) WHOSE NAME NEED NOT BE MENTIONED IN THIS CONNECTION.”

For gallantry and forthrightness I have never seen a stronger statement than yours in the February number of the Bible Banner relative to your 1936 and 1942 teaching. It is the very essence of consistency, whose “jewel” is consistency with truth rather than with, one’s past. It is comparable to the praise-worthy statement of that able and popular Washington commentator, Raymond Clapper, who, in substance said of himself, that he was an isolationist till he was convinced that he was wrong and then he changed. When both human experience and inspired revelation fail to change one’s convictions from error to truth, it is indeed most unfortunate.

Also, your editorial in the same number on “The Essential Point In Premillennialism-No. 2” is the most comprehensive and instructive analysis of the subject that I have seen. You thus ably expose the very points that Brother Boll’s outline conceals. And Brother McGarvey, as you quote from him, speaks exactly to the point.

I notice Brother H. Leo Boles has opened up on the subject in this week’s Advocate. And that we have anticipated them correctly, I notice he says, “sin is sin, evil is evil,” thus making no distinction between the different forms or classes of evil. Also, he says: “Furthermore, for the country to be at war does not add a single new duty to Christian conduct,” etc. I wonder if the new “Victory tax,” to say nothing of other added duties, does not add a new duty on him? Or perhaps he means that Brother Boll’s outline conceals. And Brother McGarvey, as you quote from him, speaks exactly to the point.

I notice Brother H. Leo Boles has opened up on the subject in this week’s Advocate. And that we have anticipated them correctly, I notice he says, “sin is sin, evil is evil,” thus making no distinction between the different forms or classes of evil. Also, he says: “Furthermore, for the country to be at war does not add a single new duty to Christian conduct,” etc. I wonder if the new “Victory tax,” to say nothing of other added duties, does not add a new duty on him? Or perhaps he means that a Christian does not exemplify “Christian conduct” in meeting such obligations! His teaching on that subject is untenable; and his assumed antithesis between that which is essential to civilization on the one hand, and that which is essential to spiritual life here and hereafter on the other, to the extent that it is believed, will contribute to the plea of infidels-Tennessee.
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“HICKS FROM THE-STICKS” AND THE DEAN FROM DUKE:
OR, RELATIVITY OF RELIGION

Under the caption of “Hicks From the Sticks, or, “Relativity of Morals” the Dean of George Pepperdine College, formerly of Duke University, tells us an interesting story in the Gospel Advocate “of a small-time politician, the honorable Hicks from the Sticks.” Since the character of the story did not believe in “taking sides” on anything it would seem strange that the dean from Duke could use him as a witness against anybody, as no one has ever heard of the dean himself coming out very strong on anything. Could it be possible that he is himself Hicks from the Sticks?

Anyway, Squire Hicks from the Sticks always answered every question “yes and no.” Well, that fits some of the teaching and preaching of the dean and his playmates now, who are themselves somewhat like the preacher who did “take sides” by preaching on heaven and hell because he had friends in both places!

But the dean says the “yes and no” infection is in the church and gives an example of “a minister of the gospel” who, he says, “irresponsibly lies about his brethren” and “dodges his honest obligations” and “uses abusive language (as Paul expresses it) and so on.” Apparently fearing that he himself would be charged with such an expression “abusive language” he puts “as Paul expresses it” in parenthesis—he wants us to know that it was Paul who so expressed it, not the dean, 0, no. But he charges that some brethren will actually say “yes and no” when they are asked if an irresponsibly-lying, debt-dodging minister of the gospel is all right! I am made to wonder with what kind of brethren the distressed dean has been associating, and where, for in all my travels among the churches I have never found brethren who would answer “yes and no” to such a thing, or whose “implication is that righteousness is unimportant to preaching the gospel.” The dean must have been associating of late with a crowd of profligate Joneseses and brethren, or else that dream about Hicks from the Sticks must have been a nightmare.

Personally, I think he has his illustration turned the wrong way—he has it in reverse. He has it pointed toward the wrong group. If there are any in the church who have played the “yes and no” role, it is not the ones whom he seeks to impeach and impeach in his application. Rather does his story fit that serioously immoral brothers and brethren, or whose “implication is that righteousness is unimportant to preaching the gospel.”

The dean’s article is also a “prize example” of how these denominations in Durham—yes and no, or did he answer it at all? If so or if not—Is this action right or wrong, Squire Hicks? Did you say “yes and no?” Should denominationalism be fellowshipped? “Yes and no,” says the dean from Duke. Is it right to have denominational preachers teach their doctrine to students of George Pepperdine College in chapel services? “Yes and no” says Hicks from the Sticks. Is it right to fellowship Premillennialism and those who teach it? “Yes and no” says Hicks. Hickism, indeed!

Finally the dean from Duke has quite a lot of ugly things to say about others, in a “Christlike” way. He charges them with lying, dishonesty, hypocrisy, hatred, talebearing, jealousy on “questions relating to Christian life and virtue.” Then, he says “it is not implied that any great proportion of ministers or other Christians are seriously immoral.” Wonder how much immoral “ministers” or other Christians can be without being seriously immoral? Since the dean appears to be authority on “relativity of morals” perhaps he can tell us without saying “yes and no.” Again he says, “undoubtedly the proportion is relatively small as yet.” That’s encouraging. Since there are so few, perhaps he could publish the list and relieve the curiosity, as well as the suspicion, as to who these lying, debt-dodging “ministers” and other Christians are. It might turn out that the dean is himself a purveyor of gossip and is irresponsibly lying” on somebody. Personally, I am not as much concerned about what someone does who is “irresponsible,” as I am about men like the dean from Duke who are old enough to be responsible for what they do and say.

Really, “the prize example of Hickism” on relativity of doctrine and practice is the dean himself. At least, while urging others to be “Christlike in word and spirit, and in action” he might pause upon his own threshold with due deliberation and caution.

The dean’s article is also a “prize example” of how these brethren who lay claim to the “spirit of Christ” resort to the lowest of all personalities—in sionization—when their teaching and practice are called in question. History repeats itself, and with their dean from Duke, George Pepperdine College is reliving and re-enacting the experience of Abilene Christian College with such teachers as George A. Klingman and David L. Cooper.

**ANENT THE DUGGER-PORTER DEBATE**

E. C. Coffman, Houston, Texas: “In my opinion it is one of the greatest defenses of the truth I have ever read.”

Rue Porter, Neosno, Mo.: “If it isn’t a well done job, I am utterly unable to judge. I congratulate you upon the very fine manner in which you handled the truth.”

Joe H. Blue, Salem, Arkansas: “It is the best I have ever read on that subject. You have blasted Adventism from every angle and have met every argument in a masterly way. It will blast Adventism off of the globe, wherever it is read. Your first article on the first day worship is the best I ever saw.”
TRUSTING JESUS

W. CURTIS PORTER

That a man who would be saved must believe on the Lord Jesus Christ is distinctly taught in many places in the New Testament. Furthermore, for a man to "believe on the Lord" involves the idea of "trusting Jesus." But many people, including a host of preachers, have a very vague conception of what it means to trust Jesus. For example, the following quotation is taken from the pen of Ben M. Bogard in the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, of which he is editor:

"I have had many debates with Campbellites and have charged them with not believing in Jesus Christ at all but simply believing the historical facts about Jesus. They believe in Jesus Christ just as they believe in the Devil; that is, they believe what the Bible says about Jesus just as they believe what the Bible says about the Devil, and hence they have no more faith and no different faith in Jesus than they have in the Devil. They do not have faith in Jesus in the sense of trusting him, relying on him for salvation.

This statement of Bogard gives the general idea of "faith alone" advocates. They claim there is nothing for you to do in order to be saved—just put your trust in Jesus and let him do it all. If anyone has an idea that he must render some sort of obedience to gospel commandments in order to be saved, they think such is an evidence of the lack of faith. If the man "trusted Jesus," he would not think of such obedience to the gospel. The statement of Bogard, as are many of his statements, is a base misrepresentation of the people whom he styles Campbellites. Those people do not "believe in the devil" in the same sense they "believe in the Lord." Certainly they believe all the Bible says about Jesus, and they believe all the Bible says about the devil. But that does not fully represent their faith. Not only do they believe all the Bible says about Jesus, but they also believe all that Jesus says. While they also believe all the Bible says about the devil, they do not believe all the devil says. So this point of difference makes a vast distinction between their belief relative to Jesus and relative to the devil. It is not merely a question of believing what the Bible says about Jesus. We must believe what He says. We must also believe what His inspired representatives say in the Bible. Bogard, perhaps, believes all the Bible says about Jesus. (I would be willing to affirm, however, that He does not, for His "system of doctrine" is out of harmony with some things said about Jesus.) But if I should grant that Bogard and his people believe all the Bible says about the Lord, the fact remains that the Lord made many statements that they do not believe. So they do not believe all that Jesus says. How can a man claim to have faith in a person and then deny the truthfulness of plain statements made by that person? Yet that is the position of Bogard and the Baptists who claim to be "trusting Jesus." Not only do Christians (called Campbellites by Bogard) believe all the Bible says about Jesus and all that Jesus and His representatives say, but their faith in what Jesus says is so strong that it leads them to do what He commands, to obey His requirements. They do not have faith like this in the devil. They believe the facts the Bible relates about the devil, but they do not have faith in the devil. They put no confidence in the statements of the devil and certainly make no effort to obey His requirements. I wonder if Bogard, in spite of all his denominational blindness, is not able to see the difference here. There is a vast difference with respect to faith, inasmuch as it relates to the Lord on one hand and to the devil on the other.

This brings us to inquire about what it really means to "trust Jesus." And to make some effort to find out who the man is that is actually trusting Him for salvation. After all, what did Jesus say about salvation? He said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (Mark 16:16) His representatives said: "Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." (Acts 2:38) "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." (Acts 22:16) "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." (I Pet. 3:21) Bogard does not even believe these statements. He will dispute and argue with the Lord about the place baptism sustains in the plan of salvation. He will try to explain away what the Lord plainly put into the scheme of redemption. Christians believe what they say but Baptists do not believe them. Which is the greater degree of faith? In view of these statements made by the Lord and His representatives, what would "trusting Jesus" involve? One man says: "Lord, I know that you put baptism between a man and his salvation and that your inspired ambassadors said to be baptized for the remission of sins' and to have our 'sins washed away,' but I do not believe all of that is necessary. I refuse, therefore, to be baptized for the remission of my sins but just trust you to save me without my doing what you have commanded." And he sits down and waits for the Lord to do it all. Another says: "Lord, I know that you commanded me to be baptized for the remission of my sins, as well as to believe and repent of my sins. It is my desire to do all that you have commanded me. With faith in you as the Son of God, I have repented of all my sins, and am now ready to be baptized 'for the remission of sins,' trusting you to fulfill your promise in saving me when I have complied with your requirements." And he goes immediately and is baptized. Now, which of these men really "trusted Jesus"? Bogard says the first man "trusted Jesus" but the second man "believed in Jesus just like he believed in the devil." What do you say about it?

In the same article from which the foregoing quotation is taken Bogard also delivers himself in the following fashion:

"In debate with Joe S. Warlick some years ago he said if 'faith is all that is necessary to salvation, he had been saved all his life for he always had believed in (Christ.) I told him that he did not believe in Jesus Christ now, much less believe in him all his life. He answered that he 'believed everything the Bible said about Jesus Christ and what more is necessary? I answered, 'Do you not believe all the Bible says about the Devil?' He confessed he did. Then I said, 'You have no more and no different faith in Jesus Christ than you have in the devil. Campbellites believe in the devil in the same sense they believe in Jesus Christ.'

Bogard would be better to explain to Campbellites what faith means than to contend with them about the design of baptism and such like. They have never believed on the Lord Jesus Christ."

Of course, according to Bogard and the Baptists, "faith means" to deny what the Lord said about baptism and to refuse to submit to it "for the remission of sins," as the Bible commands, but to "trust" Jesus to save you without complying with his conditions of salvation. The people whom he calls Campbellites understand that "faith means" to take Jesus at his word and to do all that he has commanded, looking to Jesus for the blessing of salvation conditioned upon those commandments. In view of such it seems to me that someone should "explain to Baptists what faith means." These paragraphs from Bogard add nothing by way of argument that is not contained in the one already noticed, but I give them because of the reference to Bro. Joe S. Warlick. Whether Bogard correctly reported this debate matters not. I seriously doubt that he gave a full report of the matter, for I am sure that Bro. Warlick understood that to believe in Jesus means to trust Jesus; but I have an idea that he did not understand faith to mean to trust Jesus to repudiate his own will and save a man without doing what he commanded him to do for his salvation. And yet that is what Bogard thinks "trusting Jesus" means. But note that Bogard says concerning Christians: "They have never believed on the Lord Jesus Christ." And notice also that he told Warlick that "he did not believe in Jesus Christ now, must less all his life." When I read this
statement from Bogard I at once recalled another statement made by him when he learned of Bro. Warlick's death. It was made about eighteen months prior to the preceding statement. It is found in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, issued of January 10, 1941, and is as follows:

"There is within me a feeling of distinct loss today for I have just received a telegram that my most valiant antagonist, with whom I had twenty-three debates, is dead. He died January 2, 1941, at noon. He and I had some hard contests and we did not always get along. In our sharp contentions with each other but our personal friendship grew with the years and we became as brothers in the flesh. We actually slept together while in one of our hardest-fought debates and I shall never forget some fine help he was to me once when I stood in need of just what he could do. He could easily have refused but he graciously granted my request. No matter what it was, it was a friendly turn he gave that has never been forgotten. He has visited in my home and I have been entertained by him. My reputation was safe in his hands. In spite of his heretical doctrine, I can but believe that he at heart trusted in my Savior and I expect to meet him over on the other side and we shall have a big time talking together in that place where we shall understand."

I am not concerned about what the request was that Bro. Warlick granted Bogard. I am glad that he was big enough to do it, whatever it was. But I am concerned about his statement relative to Bro. Warlick's faith. Look at it again: "In spite of his heretical doctrine, I can but believe that he at heart trusted in my Savior and I expect to meet him over on the other side." Now, I wonder just when Bogard thinks Bro. Warlick began to "trust in the Savior." At the time of the debate which Bogard reported he did not believe up to that time that Warlick had ever "believed in Christ." He thought then that Warlick had as much faith in the devil as he had in the Lord. Just when, then, did Warlick begin to trust Jesus? It would be very interesting to have Bogard to tell us. Did he give any evidence after that time that he had faith in Christ that he had not given before? Was it the granting of Bogard's request that caused him to conclude that Warlick had actually trusted in the Savior? I doubt if it is any of these things. In all probability if Warlick were living today and should engage Bogard in debate, Bogard would still say that Warlick had as much faith in the devil as he had in the Lord. But the "feeling of distinct loss" of such a friend and antagonist, upon hearing of his death, led Bogard to make a statement that he completely forgot eighteen months later when he said concerning Warlick and others: "They have never believed on the Lord Jesus Christ."

It is interesting too to note that Bogard expects to meet Bro. Warlick in heaven "in spite of his heretical doctrine." If the "doctrine" which Warlick taught was "heretical," then Warlick was a heretic, and such are not promised a place "on the other side." There are some things that men ought to understand "on this side." Even Bogard ought to understand that "heresy" is classed by Paul with "the works of the flesh," and that he says that "they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Gal. 5:19-21. He should likewise know that Peter declares that "false teachers" who "bring in damnable heresies" shall "bring upon themselves swift destruction." 2 Pet. 2:1. Furthermore, he ought to understand that Paul said: "A man that is an heretic after the first and second admonition reject, knowing that he that is such is subverted, and sinneth, being condemned of himself." Tit. 3:10, 11. Bogard thinks Warlick was this kind of man. He thinks he was a teacher of "heretical doctrine," hence a "heretic" who brought in "damnable heresies." Paul said such "shall not inherit the kingdom of God" and Peter said they will wind up in "swift destruction," but Bogard expects to meet one of them in heaven "in spite of" what Paul and Peter said. Paul ordered that such a teacher be rejected "after the first and second admonition," but Bogard, after twenty-three admonitions in public debate, still expects God to accept a heretic "on the other side."

MUSINGS FROM MOTOR CITY

A. B. KEENAN

Detroit will fit better into Michigan than Michigan into Detroit. The figure 1000 is more likely to contain the figure 100 than the other way around. The outside box of a child's set of interlocked boxes will be more capable of accommodating the innermost box than will this latter be capable of accommodating the former. The sin of unbelief is big enough to include all other sins: the sin of bearing false witness is always, in the last analysis, the sin of unbelief; but the sin of unbelief may be committed in other ways than by lying.

So which? So this: Biblical ideas of non-resistance to evil fit in with, and accommodate themselves better to, the idea of organizing ourselves for mutual protection, which the Word blesses men in doing (see Romans 13) than to ideas for the security of the community fit in with teaching that swagmen of all degrees should be merely invited to a higher plane of conduct. From the Christian, men need expect nothing but good will and the moving of heaven and earth to the removing of causes of friction between neighbor and neighbor: but there is, and must be, a limit to the use of pacific means for settling differences. We appeal unto Caesar! We, the organized members of society, in this day play the role of Caesar for purposes of self-protection. Our enemy has no excuse for moving against us; we weary not in exploring every pacific means of producing a settlement; but if that's not enough-apply Romans 13.

This great brotherhood of ours has been plagued with one "P" premillennialism-long enough; look we for yet another pacifism? Is the new order in the church to be guided by a set of cheek-turning fuehrers, and must it henceforth revolve on the Louisville-Birmingham axis?

Go to, now. We've heard enough about the A.A.A. Let's turn our attention to the A.A.A.A. These letters represent four reasons, which some have termed "weighty," for lining up with the premillennialists among us.

First comes AGE. It is alleged that premillennialism is no new wrinkle, but was widely accepted by the so-called "fathers" of the second and third centuries. But there was a strong tendency towards Catholicism in those days as well. Should we therefore endorse it?

Next comes ACCEPTANCE, the argument running something like this: "Look at the number of good and great men who believe this way. There's Bro. Bee, Bro. Jay. Bro. Oh, Bro. See, and Bro. Doubleyou." But there's a whole presbytery full of morally upright men who are endorsing Calvinism, a complete vestry of Episcopalians, and a full regiment of Salvationists who respectively embrace the positions suggested.

Next in line is AUTHORITY. "Both Brethren D. See Jay and E. El Jay proclaim this way as the key to understanding all truth. Who am I to withstand such?" Who are you, indeed! You are the one to stand alone-like Elijah and like Paul, if need be. One and God are a majority in any argument. Otherwise you are of a peace with those who accept things simply because one Signor Pacelli avers them.

Last comes ACTIVITY. "Here is a list of things they are doing. They have this school and that class. They run this and that thing like this: "Look at the number of good and great men who believe this way. There's Bro. Bee, Bro. Jay. Bro. Oh, Bro. See, and Bro. Doubleyou." But there's a whole presbytery full of morally upright men who are endorsing Calvinism, a complete vestry of Episcopalians, and a full regiment of Salvationists who respectively embrace the positions suggested.

Okay. Okay. I get it. I bear them witness that they have a sense of what will fit in with, and accommodate themselves better to, the idea of organizing ourselves for mutual protection, which the Word blesses men in doing (see Romans 13) than to ideas for the security of the community fit in with teaching that swagmen of all degrees should be merely invited to a higher plane of conduct. From the Christian, men need expect nothing but good will and the moving of heaven and earth to the removing of causes of friction between neighbor and neighbor: but there is, and must be, a limit to the use of pacific means for settling differences. We appeal unto Caesar! We, the organized members of society, in this day play the role of Caesar for purposes of self-protection. Our enemy has no excuse for moving against us; we weary not in exploring every pacific means of producing a settlement; but if that's not enough-apply Romans 13.
I attended part of the recent lectureship at Abilene Christian College. Most of what I heard was good and true to the book. Nor would I have it appear that the college authorities are responsible for the statements I propose to comment upon. I simply mention the lectureship as the place and occasion.

Romans 13 in Japan and Germany

The subject of the morning talks was “Loyalty to Christ.” One of the speakers stressed the duty of rendering supreme loyalty to Christ in the various relationships of life. He introduced the question of loyalty to the government, and said “there are those who teach that we ought to be loyal to the government above Jesus Christ in time of war, but this we can not as Christians do.” He then proceeded substantially as follows, to illustrate and enforce this assertion. Said he, “Romans 13 will read the same to Christians today in all nations, Britain, Germany, Italy, the U.S., and Japan. Paul teaches Paul says to one he says to all. ‘The powers that be, which are ordained of God,’ to the individual Christian in every land must be his own particular government; therefore, if Romans 13 is made to embrace the obligation to bear arms in time of war, for the support of any government, it would involve Christians supporting every government; hence such a construction would authorize Christians going forth in carnal war to kill other Christians. Thus the Christians in Japan, made by Brother McCaleb, if they responded to Hirohito’s draft law, could have been among the number who bombed Pearl Harbor! I was about to shed some ‘salty tears’ at the prospect of the Japanese Christians doing such a terrible thing when it dawned on me why the brother stopped there, and did not in so many words, set out the full conclusion which inevitably followed; that if Christians in the United States should respond to our draft law, and fight the attacking Japs, we would be just as dirty as the sneak gangsters who stabbed the United States in the back at Pearl Harbor, while they mouthed words of peace at Washington.

If this was not his point, then his illustration had no point. The facts of the case are, this is his point, but why did he not proceed as boldly to drive home his point as he did to lay his premise? Because when he got Bro. McCaleb’s Christians to the slaughter at Pearl Harbor, it was less dangerous to his theory to leave the picture of Christians “participating” in such butchery than to leave the picture of Christians participating in the defense this nation is making against such butchery.

As a matter of propaganda this was wise, for it is characteristic of all, who argue against a Christian employing force, to obscure the principle of “self defense”; both for the individual and the nation. They must and they do, put the murderer and his innocent victim, if he fights, in the same sack. The rapist and the victim who resists him, are in the same sack; the thief and his victim, if he resists, are in the same sack; and the Jap who assaults, and the American who is assaulted are in the same sack” according to this idea. If you fight a murderer, and both die in the fight, both are murderers according to that idea. You may argue with a murderer against attacking your daughter, you may quote scripture to him, plead and reason the cause of virtue, but the moment he resorted to brutal force, all opposition must cease, you could not lift a finger to stop it. Of course, after the event you could try to bring him to repentance! In this idea of things, there are no innocent and guilty where force is resisted by force.

This is not overdrawn. This is the thing in operation, when an attempt is made to sentimentalize Christians in the United States aiding in the defense of the nation (and it is suggested that we borrow Mahatma Gandhi’s loin cloth as an emblem of Christianity) it is necessary to show the real issue, “that defense against brutality is not the same thing.”

A Defeatist Attitude

One of the most deplorable things about this position is, that it betrays those who adopt it into a defeatist attitude toward our government. I do not say they are such intentionally; but I do say their argument is defeatist propaganda.

The speech under review paid a glowing tribute to our great government. All that heard it were bound to tingle with gratitude, for such a great government, but as the sequel proves, this was not done to show to us Christians that we should support this blessed government, in its fight for existence, but that we should not fight for its existence. Thus the conclusion nullifies the premise. It is like a son praising his father for his good home, and many blessings, and then when the father is attacked by murderers and robbers, and is fighting for life and home, this model son declares, he cannot fight for his dear father’s existence. The grateful son concedes that the bad sons may fight, nay, he will encourage them to fight, he even offers to provide arms with which to fight—but that does not change the status of his attitude one whit. Providing fighting weapons, without fighters to fight with them, is sheer nonsense. Far better would it be on these principles, to make us coffins, instead of cannons!

The why the speaker takes this attitude toward “Uncle Sam” has nothing to do with the fact of it. I am showing the necessary consequences which flow from his principles. The facts are: This government has been attacked by brutal force, therefore, this government must perish unless its citizens kill to defend it. This citizen says that he will not kill to defend it: Therefore it must go down, so far as he and his principles are concerned. This is defeatist propaganda, that plays into the hands of Hirohito and Hitler, to perfection. It makes no difference that other men will fight to defend it; and that they, do so successfully. It will not be because of their argument, or any action flowing from it, but in spite of it.

The fact that most who hold this theory about war, will in practice reverse it, by working in non-combative capacities, does not help the theory any. It just proves their practice is better than their theory. If I help a neighbor who is butchering his hogs, I am helping to butcher the hogs whether I actually cut their throats or only tend the fire! The all-out conscientious objector is the only nearly consistent man on that side of the question.

While we are being properly horrified at the prospect of American Christians committing a great sin against the saints from Japan, “who might have been among the number who rained death and destruction on Pearl Harbor,” let us not forget that the speaker also said, “God ordains all human governments alike.” Then it follows, that God’s blessing was upon the bombing of Pearl Harbor, and the brother’s deep concern, over the Jap Christians endangering their salvation by being a party to it, is wasted sympathy! They acted under the
blessing of God. For as if you say, “one government is as much ordained as another, German, Italian, Japanese, and the United States,” it follows, that this government is also under the same “blanket endorsement” and can therefore bomb right back, with the same divine blessing! 2 Cor. why not? If, as I am told, “God has ordained all governments alike,” but only in the hand of sinners, then you still have God ordaining sinners to mutually destroy one another; thus making God condemn the sinner, and ordain his act, at one and the same time! From this predicament there is no escape. It must not be denied that God has ordained civil government. Taking the Christian out, therefore, does not take God out, it only leaves God a full partner with the sinners. It only makes the Christian say: “The killing has to be done; but I am too good to do it. Let God and the sinners do it, and I will stand on the side line shouting ‘praise God, pass the ammunition, sic ‘em sinners!’”

**Government As Defined in Romans 13**

The truth of the matter is God has never ordained any particular civil government in toto, as a corporate body, but the institution of civil government as defined in Romans 13:1-7. He ordains civil government, just as he ordains marriage, but not everything men and women do in the name of marriage. Men can and do use the marriage institution as a vehicle of adultery, just as wicked men can and do get control of a given government and use the institution as a means of oppression and murderous brutality. But this abuse of the function of the institution does not invalidate the institution. It only invalidates the unit which thus operates. The way some brethren reason that a Christian cannot participate in civil government because some governments are wrong would prove that a Christian cannot marry because some marriages are wrong.

Now Paul has plainly set forth the God-ordained function of government. “For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then not be afraid of the power?” The power? The power that rules according to good, and is a terror to evil, but if a given power reverses this, and becomes a ruler which is a terror to good works and rewards the evil, it manifestly ceases to be the power Paul is talking about. We have the whole moral teaching of the New Testament to guide us in determining what is good and evil.

Now I submit, in the light of what Paul defines the God ordained function of government to be, the three great powers fighting the United States-Germany, Italy, and Japan-are by their own deeds, criminal, outlaw powers. In the hands of ambitious war lords they have been transformed into instruments of internal oppression and external aggression. By the same standard I contend that the United States government is everything they are not, and is functioning as Paul defines in Romans 13, and is therefore ordained of God. If any of my critics want to deny this, and say, “we are no better in fact than the others.” I simply ask him, if the same means were provided for his support would he rather live under Hitler, Mussolini, Hirohito, or the Stars and Stripes? This will take care of that.

This government is not perfect. Nothing human is. But it is not a criminal nation, and no peaceful nation on earth fears it. There is nothing it requires any Christian to do that New Testament morality does not teach him to do, and he being the judge, that applies to the sword question also, for the government even makes provision for the genuine conscientious objector. It even treats him better than he proposes to treat himself, for whereas, he would let the Jap “cut his throat” without resistance, the government will protect his throat from the murdering Japs.

Now to get back to Bro. McCabe’s Christians in Japan. I suggest that any Christian brethren who may be over there, size up their “imperial Japanese government,” by Paul’s specifications laid down in Romans 13, and act accordingly. They have the same book we have, and therefore should have the same moral sense and standard. It might not be out of order for them to remember who brought it to them in the first place. No opponent of mine can object to my suggesting that they refuse to correct men and kill men, because that is exactly what they say themselves. It will be no greater hardship on them to refuse to support the Japanese government because it has degenerated into criminality, than to refuse to support it upon the theory that “a Christian can under no circumstances bear arms for any government.” Therefore, if the Japanese Christians go to war under Tojo, and get killed, that is what is liable to happen to any Christian, if they run with a bunch of criminals, when justice overrides them. I deplore that possibility, and all crime and war, but I refuse to go “cockeyed” over it, and teach my brethren over here, that this nation has no more right to defend itself, than Japan had to attack it; that our nation is no more ordained of God than the Japanese nation, and that the American Christian, in order to be a Christian, must let anybody kill him that wants to!

Paul obeyed Caesar when he stayed in his God-ordained place. When Caesar got out of his place, and interfered with the religion, and the things of Christ, Paul obeyed God, and suffered for Christ’s sake. So ought we. I have never believed or taught blind servile obedience to the government, if it contradicts the law of God. There is no issue here. This issue is whether the law of God authorizes an individual who is a Christian to wield the sword of a righteous government. I say that he may. Those who say that he cannot, with the exception of the strict non-resistant, hold that the sword of government in the hands of the sinner is right, but that it is wrong for the Christian to use it. The single point at issue then is, who can use this righteous sword? They say the sinner only!

The Question of Moral Law

Now I ask the question, how can a Christian know what he can do, or not do, as a matter of moral right or wrong in anything? The answer is bound to be that he can not do that which God condemns, and he can do that which God approves as right. This is not a question of what a sinner must do to be saved, or of worship, or procedure-in the church, but of what he can do in the field of the common life of men, in the social state, which is governed by moral law. He has to settle it by the same method he settles all other such questions in life, “is the thing itself right or wrong?” If a Christian considers going into a business, or a profession in life, what does he ask? Will it violate any of the moral commandments? Does God approve it? Now, let the Christian apply the same reasoning toward this question, that he employs in all other questions of common life, and what does he find? Why, he finds that Paul has anticipated this vital point, and plainly settled it for him. “For he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.” (Rom. 13:4.)

Therefore God having settled his approval upon the “ruler sword bearer,” can the Christian who believes God have any hesitancy that he may be a sword bearer in the government, unless he is afraid of being “a minister of God for good” and “a terror to evil works”?

If a Christian boy was thinking of becoming a doctor, and was wondering whether it was right or wrong, and came to a passage in his New Testament which said, “For the doctor is a minister of God to thee for good.” I wonder if he would have any hesitancy in deciding that it was right for him to become a doctor? But if the same ‘Christian boy is wondering if it is right to become a sword bearer for the government, as thousands of ours are now doing, and he reads in his New Testament, “For he beareth not the sword in vain: he is the minister of God to thee for good;” other things being equal, would he hesitate any
longer whether he may become such or not, any more than he would about becoming the doctor? He would not, if some preacher did not rise up and say, "Oh yes, son, I know it says that but it means the "sinner only sword bearer." But the text says no such thing, and means no such thing. The man who puts "sinner only" in the text adds to the word of God. God says the "sword bearer" is his "minister," and he puts his approval upon the official ruler, and not upon the personal character of the officer, be he saint or sinner. Ruler is an official term, like priest, king, or governor, who can fill the office is another matter entirely.

When it is admitted that the thing done is right, as it is in this case, it remains that a Christian can do what is morally right, unless it can be proved that it is wrong to do what is right! That is absurd on the face of it, yet it is exactly what the "sinner only" advocates are up against. They have to Prove that it is wrong for a Christian to do what they themselves say is right!

I am wondering, too, just which variety of sinners are best qualified to fill the various governmental positions any way? I would like for some of these experts in the "classification business" to enlighten me on this head, so when I go to vote for my "sinner rulers," I can get the sinner best fitted for the job. We all know it to be a fact, that there are degrees of sin, hence greater and lesser sinners. So in rounding out this idea in a practical way, if we accept it as a principle, that being a sinner is the fundamental qualification for holding office, then it follows of necessity that the more proficient a sinner is in sin, the better fitted he is for any particular office. Therefore, the way to get efficiency in office, would be to elect experts in sin. Those who have demonstrated a sinful career, great aptitude in sin, paralleling the office they are to fill. Thus I suppose we should elect a slick confidence crook for governor, a bank embessler for treasurer, disbarred lawyers for legislators, perjurers for judges, and well seasoned murderers for sheriffs and policemen, while the common mill run of thugs thieves and manslayers who will do for the army and navy! If as I am told sin is an indispensable qualification for governmental office, then it must logically follow, that I should try to select the greatest sinners for the greatest offices, and the lesser sinners for the lesser offices. If not why not? According then to this most pious theory of "sinners only" in public office, we have made a grave mistake in putting Al Capone in prison, killing "Pretty Boy Floyd" and John Dillinger. We ought to have made "Al" president, Dillinger, vice president, and Floyd secretary of state!

I well know that those who say, "Oh yes, we admit government is necessary, and right, but God has ordained it in the hands of sinners only," always have in mind the nice, moral and courageous kind of sinners, "the good sinners." But good does not belong to sin. Good is from God only. John says that "sin is the transgression of law." Therefore, a person can not be a sinner without being a transgressor. Hence when it is said that a sinner is appointed of God to do anything, bemuse he is a sinner, as this theory does, it involves the principle of transgressing God's law, and therefore makes transgression an inherent qualification, thus the more he transgresses, the better he is qualified. There is no way to escape it but to abandon the idea.

For instance if we say “marriage is ordained of God,” but only for the virtuous, would not all agree, the more virtuous the persons are who enter into it, the better the marriage will be: Certainly so. But if we say government is ordained of God, but only sinners shall administer it, would not it be equally as true that the more sinful the sinners, the better the government? All will admit the first proposition is true, but all can equally see the second proposition is not true. Yet the same principle is applied in both cases. Why, then, the difference? Why do the advocates of the sinner only theory of government prefer the weak sinners, instead of the robust! The reason is, because their theory is false and breaks down of its own weight. The only thing sin can qualify any person for is to go to hell, not to fill a government office! The only reason any sinner is fit for anything is not because of his sins, but because of the good that is in him, in spite of his sin. The theory is preposterous, illogical, and subversive of the whole law of God.

As has been said in this paper before: “God does not have two moral laws, one for the Christian and another for the sinner.” The thing that makes a Christian is obedience to this one law, and the thing that makes a sinner is disobedience to the same law. There is nothing God commands any Christian to do that he does not command every sinner to do: to cease to be a sinner and become a Christian! Therefore, when God ordains government, for the protection of the good, and the sword, for the punishment of the evil doers, as being right, it is as right for the Christian to wield it as it is for him to do anything else, God authorizes in the moral realm.

Example of Christ and Apostles

Frequently some type of objector comes up to me with that more "holy than thou" look, and with touching pathos asks: “Can you conceive of Christ and his holy apostles, under any circumstances, killing or executing a person?” My answer is I can, and I will give you an instance of it—Acts 5:1-10.

The case of Ananias and Sapphira. They lied to the Holy Spirit. An apostle pronounced their doom. Christ executed them on the spot. And the young men carried them out and buried them. Christ killed them, and the apostles were a party to it. This is not introduced to prove anything, except the single point that Christ and the apostles are not inherently against the idea of taking human life under certain circumstances. This was a stern piece of business. It was cold death, instant retribution, stark and terrible. It doubtless would have “turned the stomachs” of some of our sweetest brethren, had they been present, who think too much of the guilty and not enough of the innocent.

In Romans 13:1-7 the same Christ has ordained the sword of punishment for those who deserve it. Judas Iscariot is often brought up as an example of God using sinners for some special work. He seems to be the favorite example of the "sinner only theory of government. That the sin of Judas played a part in the ordained plan of salvation is not denied. So did all the others who participated in the Lord’s death, but what they did was wholly wrong, and they were condemned for it, while the good connected with their acts was not due to their sinful deed but through God’s intervention. But the sinner in civil government performs a good act in bearing the sword, and what he does is right and God approves it. If things are parallel their essential points will fit. But there is not a single circumstance in the case of Judas that fits the case he is supposed to model. Let us compare them. In the first place, the sinner who is to administer the government, performs a deed that is right, the punishment of the evil doer, but Judas performed a deed that is wrong, the betrayal of Christ. Second, the sinner of Romans 13 is an official in the government, but Judas was only a stoedge accepting bribe money from the government. The sinner of Romans 13 is supposed to be appointed because he is a sinner, but Judas was appointed an apostle, and only became a sinner after he was in office (unless we turn Baptist and say he was always a sinner).

Finally, when a government sinner dies in office, another sinner is supposed to take his place, never a Christian, but when Judas died in office a Christian, Matthias by name, was appointed to take his place. Therefore, they being the judge, the sample sinner example winds up on my side of the proposition! As a model of sinners serving in civil government, he turns out to be as big a traitor as he was in life. No wonder if old Judas knew at the time that he was intended to be the great type of the "sinner only theory of civil government," when he saw what a sorry flop he had made, went out and hanged himself!
THE DIVINE MISSION OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT

P. W. STONE STREET

By its classification of the different forms of evil, the New Testament defines the divine mission of civil government as it relates to God’s punishment of evil-doers. Its mission is revealed through the following inspired method of investigation: “Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.” (2 Tim. 2:15.) Accordingly, we observe:

1. The evil involved in failing to obey doctrine that relates exclusively to God and to the subject of obedience, because of its very nature, is not the evil to be opposed by civil government and referred to in Romans 13:4. Other than a scriptural interest in the saving of souls, no one (saint or sinner) is concerned with one’s obedience to the doctrine of faith, repentance, baptism, prayer, the Lord’s supper, etc. Such doctrine can only be obeyed from the heart; hence, only the figurative sword of the Spirit is to be used in dealing with the evil of rejecting such doctrine. So by thus mentally dividing the word of truth according to the nature of that truth, we may know that dealing with this class of evil has not been assigned to the mission of civil government. This deduction narrows our inquiry down to the moral realm.

2. The evil involved in violating certain aspects of moral principles relates only to God and to the subject of obedience or disobedience. This class of evil embraces certain private violations (some of them purely mental) with which one’s fellow-men are not personally concerned and on which civilization does not depend. Inasmuch as this class of evil can only be corrected through the heart of man while force deals directly with the acts of man, we may know, by its very nature, that dealing with this class of evil has not been divinely assigned to God’s minister of force, the civil government. So this, another deduction provided for in the divine division of the word of truth, brings our investigation to a definite focus.

3. There is another form of evil that is in a class by itself. We may know it is a special class because God calls for a special treatment of it. Evil of this class is not merely subjective; it is objective. Unlike other forms of evil, the results of this class of evil are not confined to the evil-doers themselves and to God; all normal human-kind is vitally concerned with this class of evil. It is an evil that challenges inalienable rights divinely bestowed upon mankind. They are but common rights; freedom within the limits of what is allowable in the interest of the public weal; a freedom that recognizes its just limits and involves the free moral agency of man. These are rights on which civilization and peace on earth depend. And inasmuch as there are no other rights to be defended by force and no power but civil government divinely assigned the mission of military force, therefore, we very decidedly identify the defense of these rights with the divine mission of civil government. Hence, it is its mission to exemplify and preserve this class of rights.

Evil-doers in this realm go far beyond principles that relate only to themselves and to God; therefore, the literal sword, instead of the figurative sword of the Spirit, is divinely assigned to dealing with this class of evil. Evil-doers in this realm are enemies of all principles of the gospel, and no teaching of the gospel calls for the figurative sword of the Spirit in dealing with this class of evil. They are enemies of the golden rule; they would even prohibit the right to teach it. But God so estems the golden rule and all other divine rules, that He ordains the iron rule to defend the right to teach such rules. (The reader will please distinguish between the golden rule on the one hand, and the right to teach that rule on the other.)

We are dealing with such common rights, whether they pertain to religion or to anything else. Hence, when these rights are assailed by an individual, a band, a nation, or a group of nations, it is the divine mission of civil government to administer God’s punishment and vengeance against that form of evil. “For he (‘it’-margin referring to government) is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil.” (Romans 13:4.) The “evil” referred to in that verse is definitely the very evil with which the United Nations are dealing in this global war; the “him that doeth evil” referred to in that verse is anybody on the face of the earth who assails common rights, whether they pertain to religion or to anything else.

While Christians are admonished to “abstain from every form of evil” (1 Thes. 5:22); yet, unlike a current religious school of thought, the God of heaven does not solely depend upon that admonition to correct one form or class of evil, but has assigned it to force. Evidently the philosophy of that school of thought fails to observe that God’s punishment and vengeance, through human agency, begins in this life or age, against the particular form of evil under discussion. And just as no virtue attaches to the human agency exercised in God’s power of conversion, so no guilt attaches to the human agency exercised in God’s power of punishment and vengeance. And whoever can prove that human agency assumes the prerogative of God in one act but not in the other, will deserve a medal. The assumption that vengeance on the part of human agency is intrinsically wrong, runs counter to the text which says it is “to thee for good.” The truth is that a religious dogma has erected a standard of good and evil and God has also revealed a standard of good and evil, and the two standards do not agree. This writer endorses God’s standard.

Evidently the divine mission of civil government against a particular class of evil has been over looked by many students because of the general confusion of all forms of evil; they have been searching for a concrete description of it, whereas it is only revealed by the divine method of deduction from the com- posite of all that is said of evil in “the word of truth.” Thus evil, by “the word of truth,” classifies according to its very nature and various results. Proof that many students are thus confused on the subject is seen in the not unusual expression of ascribing war to “sin.” It is comparable to a diagnostician ascribing all deaths, caused by some physical disorder, to “disease.” One is just as enlightening as the other! Both are too indefinite to be enlightening. Thus that theory ignores the very truth that is essential to understanding the Scriptures on the subject.

It is accounted for on the ground that habit and grooves of thought are easily formed. Evidently some sincere religious teachers, and otherwise able men, have dealt with evil through the hearts of people so long that they imagine that is the only approach for them that has divine approval. On ethical grounds, this writer does not stress the dire consequences of the logic of that school of thought; instead, he attacks the logic itself. This course is respectful of their consciences, while Christian charity does not call for respect for their logic on all questions.

Finally, let us ever distinguish between the divinely assigned mission of civil government on the one hand, and the commands of men on the other hand-men who may also be a personnel of government. If a command is in harmony with that divine mission, it is backed up with an inspired command to “obey”; if a command is not only foreign to that divinely assigned mission but also subversive of God’s economy, then and only then, in the language of the apostle Peter and for the same reason, it would be scriptural to reply: “We must obey God rather than men.” (Acts 5:29.)
A young preacher in the West has been having trouble with elders—rather, I imagine, the elders have been having trouble with him. He appeals to the erudite Jimmie Love11 for comfort, consolation—and advice. When it comes to talking about the elders of the church, Jimmie Lovell is full of advice. The fact is, he does not like elders. He has never been able to get along with them for any length of time in any church. It is a matter of knowledge that he could not get along with the elders of the Central Church in Los Angeles, and they could not get along with him any better than he could with them. They just wouldn’t do a lot of things Jimmie wanted them to do. So Jimmie up and leaves the Central Church, goes to another congregation in the city where he announced publicly that his reason for so doing was that the elders of the Central church would not “let him work”! The truth was, of course, that they would not let him “work” only. In a little while Jimmie was not getting along with the elders of that church. He threatened to leave it, and start one where he could work. Finally, he did leave it (it seems) as his reports of what “we” are doing now bear date lines from a congregation in Hollywood. Maybe they will let him work!

In his paper Jimmie says, “I want to read you a letter”—and he passes on the weeping and wailing of some young preacher who couldn’t get along with the elders of the church. Then Jimmie repeats a great statement he has been making “for the past twenty years,” namely, that the greatest “draw-back” to members of the church, especially preachers, that want to “work,” is “unqualified leaders”—yes, he shouts it—UN-QUALIFIED LEADERS! But the catch to that is, first, they are all unqualified when they refuse to let Jimmie do the leading; and, second, it is not elders that Jimmie wants—he wants leaders, yes, LEADERS in capital letters. Give us “leaders” that will “let” Jimmie Love11 “work”!

After all of this, commenting on the young preacher’s forlorn letter, Jimmie Love11 says the young man’s letter is “representative of hundreds of churches” whose members have been “sitting for years watching the whole congregation go to the devil”—why?-listen to his language—“allowing some pig-headed, stubborn elder” to block everything he and the like of him want to do! And he adds that it is “a downright shame and disgrace”!

In the same article Jimmie says that even when we fight the devil we ought to fight him “in the spirit of Christ.” But in the same paragraph he calls elders in the church “pig-headed” and “stubborn.” That is Jimmie Lovell’s true size. That is actually how he feels toward elders in the church. That is the amount of respect that he has for elders of the church. Pig-headed elders-elders of the church, how would you like to have Jimmie Love11 in the congregation over which you rule? I know a preacher—who has been doing church work in churches and his behavior toward elders, coupled with reckless writing and tall talking, they will realize that our criticisms have been reasonably reserved, duly directed, and the half has not been told.

The demand grows for leaders. The New Testament says elders. What authority has any preacher to set up “a board of leaders” in lieu of elders? When a congregation selects and appoints leaders they have set up something—an organization of their own mind, not known to the New Testament. If it is right to set up such an organization of leaders, who are not elders, the New Testament would have provided for the set-up. It appears to me that a little respect for the New Testament arrangement is in order. At least, when a man can get the consent of his mind to talk about “pig-headed elders” his heart is not right in the sight of God. He should be told to “repent of this thy wickedness and pray God if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee.”

In the same issue of this paper Jimmie agrees with a brother out there who says (1) that we should stop fighting over nonessentials and (2) start working with the denominations toward unity. In deep thought Jimmie adds: “Truly our people are thinking.” But it might surprise him to know what most of them think about such spurs as that from his quill. Just think James L. Love11 suggests that we ought to start working with the denominations. May be that is the kind of “work” some of the “pig-headed” elders have hindered Jimmie so much in doing.

It is quite in order now to insert some “humble” admissions found in the same issue of his paper:

Brethren you MUST get this: I but finished high school. I am no Bible student, public speaker, and the least of all “editors” among us. Most every one of you can find fault with me and especially my way of expressing what I mean. In practically every case about which I am criticized, I find that the error is my own, but I’ll not stop. Peter made messes of things too. Please forgive me. My motive is right.

So Jimmie admits that he is no editor, writer or preacher—is no student of the Bible and is always wrong about everything—but he can advise young preachers exactly what to do and tell all the “pig-headed” elders exactly what is wrong with them and the churches. But, after all, he does not think he is in too bad a fix even if he doesn’t know anything about the Bible and is nearly always wrong, since the apostle Peter also “made messes of things” like that, too! It is hard to tell whether he puts himself in the apostle Peter’s class or whether he puts the apostle Peter in his class. Anyway, since he has admitted that he can neither write nor talk decently and is not even a student of the Bible, for heaven’s sake and the brethren’s benefit, he ought to “stop” talking and writing and dictating and let the elders of the churches in California carry on their work without being molested by his meddling. If he would do that, brethren could “forgive” the “messes” he has made.

Just recently we have it that Jimmie made the statement that even if Don Carlos Janes and the Louisville party are premillennialists, they are doing missionary work, and he had decided to coordinate his “work” with them. That is more proof of how little he knows or cares about the integrity of the gospel, and the evidence of his utter unreliability in matters pertaining to the church. I do not hesitate to say, let any criticise it who may, that the church would be a lot better off if Jimmie would stick to his last-selling Dupont gunpowder (which he says is right to sell but wrong to shoot)—and quit trying to run all of the churches in California and up and down the Northwest coast.
"THE GOSPEL DIGEST" — W. CLARENCE COOKE, EDITOR

A personal letter from my friend and fellow, Clarence Cooke, brought word of the prospective publication-The Gospel Digest. Later the first copy of this new periodical came to hand. Knowing the editor and publisher of it as we do, we have no doubt as to its aims and purposes to aid gospel digestion. It has been the privilege and pleasure of this editor to fight side by side with W. Clarence Cooke in many hard and hot battles for the truth. We know his mettle. He has the temper of a fighter, and is a wise general as well. That all may know the purpose of Gospel Digest we give in full the editorial statement of Brother Cooke in its first issue. Good fortune has come to the cause in Denver, Colorado, in the coming of W. Clarence Cooke to that city, and we wish for him and his work the greatest success, and for his publication a hearty reception and a wide circulation. Read his editorial:

"For some time this scribe has felt the need for a concise gospel publication as a medium through which the many fine articles from our gospel papers might be preserved in condensed form and given to the public. A condition exists today among readers of religious literature that exists in our preaching; few congregations will listen without becoming restless, to an hour's discourse, and few readers will read a long-drawn-out article on any religious subject. Therefore, it shall be the purpose of the Gospel Digest to give its readers a digest of the articles that appear in our gospel papers dealing with the fundamentals of New Testament Christianity.

"The selection of an article from any one of our publications is not to be understood as an endorsement. without reservation preacher have made possible the publication of this first issue. Good fortune has come to the cause in Denver, Colorado, in the coming of W. Clarence Cooke to that city, and we wish for him and his work the greatest success, and for his publication a hearty reception and a wide circulation. Read his editorial:

"A policy that is sound scripturally, even though it demands the calling of names in marking those who teach speculative doctrines, is a safer, sounder course than one that seeks to avoid controversy between brethren.

"The Pioneers had to fight for every inch of ground they gained and this ground has been defended, protected and kept by men who dared to stand against the evils of speculation within the church and false teachings without its borders. Men like David Lipscomb, M. C. Kurfees, F. W. Smith, E. A. Elam, J. C. McQuiddy, and many others, were men of courage and conviction; while they were kind and considerate, when the need for reproof and rebuke arose, and when false and speculative teaching had to be exposed, there came from their lips and their pens some of the severest language this editor has ever heard from the pulpit or read in a religious journal. They had a battle to fight and there was no place for the soft-peddling and compromising baby prattle and boisterous talk which is now seen in some of our religious journals.

"Their courage and convictions as evidenced by their preaching from the pulpit and their writings in the religious journals have been an encouragement to the writer of this first editorial in the Gospel Digest, and he shall through the year endeavor to "stand where they stood" on the fundamentals of the gospel. To that end this little paper is dedicated.

Our Setup

"The Sherman Street Church where the editor preaches, and the West Cedar Church with Brother Luther G. Savage as preacher have made possible the publication of this first issue. We are depending on our friends over the country to keep it going. It will serve as a tract that can be used as a sort of reference by preachers, and to congregations, a medium through which to follow up their local teaching program. It will be designed to follow up radio programs of the local church. Brother Savage will be associate editor and circulation manager. He is a young man of considerable ability and foresight, consecrated to the cause of Christ.

"Other preachers in Denver will from time to time contribute to the pages of the Digest.

"The subscription rates are the very lowest possible for the West Cedar Church with W. Clarence Cooke in its first issue. Good fortune has come to the cause in Denver, Colorado, in the coming of W. Clarence Cooke to that city, and we wish for him and his work the greatest success, and for his publication a hearty reception and a wide circulation. Read his editorial:

Price $1.00

Order From

W. CURTIS PORTER

Monette, Arkansas

THE DUGGER-PORTER DEBATE

Off the Press—Ready to Mail—Orders Filled Immediately
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PROPOSITIONS FOR DEBATE

1. The Scriptures teach that the seventh day of the week as a Christian sabbath is enjoined upon God's people in this age of the world.

2. The Scriptures teach that the first day of the week as a day of worship is enjoined upon God's people in this age of the world.
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To me, this week’s editorial page in the Gospel Advocate looks like a “nice” piece of propaganda deliberately designed to reflect on your defense of the church against the perniciousness of the premillennialism. First, the inuendo of the editor (and from some former editorialists, I thought he did not believe in such), then an article on premillennialism. Some strategy! Incidentally, it seems to me that the proposition should be reversed and someone should be requested to send the scripture which says that “human governments (such as the United States and the United Nations) are guilty of murder in ‘executing wrath against the evil-doer’ in defending the rights of free peoples against the unwarranted aggression of the Axis.” I know they do not attempt to meet yours and Cled’s arguments, and the reason is obvious to reflecting minds.

The war and premillennial question, while intended no doubt to change the issue, from premillennialism to war, presents an alliterative caption for a dilemma on the proposition—“Premillennialism or Predestination.” Either, as the premillennial contends, all human governments are evil-of the devil, and will ultimately be abolished, or God has ordained them, but predestined those who should serve them, so that a Christian can have no part in them-neither of which can be sustained by truth.-Chas. M. Campbell, Bowling Green, Ky.

Since reading Brother Goodpasture’s article on “Support For The Conscientious Objectors” in the last issue of the Advocate I was immediately impressed to write you and express my gratitude for the courage displayed by you in setting forth your convictions on the Christian’s relation to civil government in time of War.

There is a vast difference in the style and mood employed by Brother Goodpasture in this article and the few instances he has felt the urge, or necessity, of writing on the pre-mil question. I do not recall that he ever in reference to Boll and his followers became sarcastic in the use of descriptive adjectives and titles. But evidently he was in a frame of mind when he made his short recent discovery that provoked him to be free in releasing some pent up fury. He has been so pious in his dealings with Boll and his theories that one would hardly suspect that he would write as he did in his last try.

I trust nothing will hinder you on the courses of action you so wisely chose and have so ably defended. Though you may be a man of “financial wizardry” you are my ideal type of gospel preacher and writer. I look forward for many more of your timely discussions of pressing and vexing problems.-W. H. Green, Brilliant, Ala.

I have been reading with pleasure your recent numbers discussing the Premillennialism and the War questions. I am in complete agreement with the positions you and Cled have taken. There ought to be some level-headed thinking done. We who have lived through fifty years of service in the Cause of Christ well know how likely many are to go to unwarranted extremes in interpretation and application of the Scriptures. May God help us to think carefully to the logical end of our contentions and let reason and right prevail.-S. A. Ribble, Carlsbad, New Mexico.

I believe you are right in your attitude toward war and civil government. The man who thinks it is all right to buy bonds and pay taxes but does not believe it is right to bear arms against an outlaw reminds me of the old colored fellow that got religion. He was plowing in the new ground and the roots were breaking and hitting him on the shins. He wanted to cuss the mule but happened to think that he had got religion. Another colored fellow came along and the old darky gave him fifty cents to cuss his mule. It seems that some of the brethren are willing to pay someone else to do their fighting. They, of course, would be opposed to capital punishment (?) Individuals may so act to deprive themselves of the protection and blessings of society and even the right to live. What is true of the outlaw is true of an outlaw nation.-Will M. Thompson, Okmulgee, Oklahoma.

I enjoy your timely and enlightening teaching and I would not want to be without the Bible Banner. I have been deeply interested in your and Brother Cled’s articles on the government question, and I feel that they are rational and in complete accord with God’s word. The question as to how much a Christian could indulge, “a little or a lot,” was most challenging, for I am quite sure we are all contributing in some measure to the gigantic effort. ... Keep the good work going and be assured that the church at Huntington stands foursquare behind you in preaching the truth and combatting error.-L. C. Nicely, Huntington, W. Va.

Let me tell you again that I appreciate the fine work you have done and are doing through the Bible Banner. It is well worth all of the effort you put into it and the sacrifice you make for it in the good that is accomplished through it for the Cause of Christ. I believe your and Cled’s work on the war question has been exceedingly fine and has kept the church from being swept into the ‘creed-making business on that question as well as along other lines. May God bless you and yours always is my prayer.-Roy E. Cogdill, Dallas, Texas.

We pass the Bible Banner around, for its stabilizing effect is needed among all of the brethren. Besides its common place in church journalism, it has the distinction of no competition in its sublime work of eradicating the millennialistic evils tending to grow up among us, and also of (correcting) the anti-civil and anti-military (government) tendencies. There is a homage (duty) which all men of God should exercise.-W. N. Bohannan, Fullerton, Calif.

Enclosed find money order for subscription to Bible Banner for the year 1943. It is a great periodical and true to all scripture. The article by Brother Cled Wallace on the church and civil government was fine and I was glad to read it. Success to your paper. I am always glad to receive each issue as it comes off the press.-Thomas D. Buteman, Detroit, Mich.

I certainly do enjoy reading the Bible Banner. Especially do I enjoy reading your and Brother Cled’s pieces on the Christian’s attitude toward the war.-Mrs. W. I. Foster, San Antonio, Tex.

You have certainly dealt the future kingdom folks a haymaker. In many parts of the country they have almost gone out of business, or they are ashamed to let the public know where they stand.-Oscar Smith, Houston, Texas.

I have enjoyed reading the articles on “The Christian And The Government.” I have a son who is a prisoner of the Japanese government, if he is even alive. He was in Bataan, Philippines. ... My son was a fine Christian boy, being a member of the church of Christ. Please pray for my poor son over there in the hands of one of the cruelest peoples on earth. I have asked some of our preachers to pray for my son and they look at me like I am crazy. Forgive me for saying so much. I shall be glad to get the Bible Banner again. God bless you in the wonderful work that you are doing.-Mrs. A. T. Schooley, Houston, Texas.
I have just finished reading the Banner issued this month and for me to say that I am pleased with your answer to the Advocate concerning Civil governments is putting it entirely in too mild a form. Brother Wallace, you answered them as a Christian gentleman and I can give you my hand on every argument you made. I thank God that we still have men, both in and out of the pulpit, that are not afraid to defend a government when it is in trouble that they thank God for in time of peace. I never did think much of a man that will thank God for something that he is not willing to defend. I know there are many that are saying unkind things about you and Brother Cled to your back regarding this matter. But let me assure you that there are many, yes many, that are with me in saying that we are with you one hundred percent in the stand that you have taken in this matter. May God bless you in your fight for what is right.—J. C. Roady, Sullivan, Indiana.

I appreciate the stand you take on the war question. I have no connections in the army so do not appreciate your stand because it eases my feelings. It is just that I admire your ability to think things out and to stand up for what you think. More power to you.

I appreciate the paper coming to a number of the members of the Niagara and Manning congregation of the church where I preach.—D. W. Dryden Sinclair, St. Catharines, Ont.

The latest issue was fine. You did a fine job in reply to the challenge for debate on the war question, as well as in your other articles too.—W. Curtis Porter, Monette, Ark.

Wife and I are in full accord with Cled E. Wallace’s articles in regard to the Christian’s relation to our government.—John Lynch, Bell Buckle, Tenn.

Into the hat it goes! Keep the Bible Banner coming, boy. I surely do enjoy it. Don’t want to miss a copy.—W. D. Black, Levelland, Texas.

Keep your chin up, and that Banner waving. It is one Banner that the light of investigation does not daunt—it flies in the light, and investigation is its own element.—L. Wharton, Clovis, New Mexico.

The teaching through the Bible Banner has been a revelation to me and has lifted a burden in explaining the question of Christians engaging in the war. This alone has been worth to me many times more than the cost of my subscription, to say nothing about the “rock founded” teaching against our family deserters who want another chance (the premillennialists)—and I once again commend Brother Foy and Brother Cled for their courage in defending the word of God against many. May God bless each of you through many years.—Jonathan Moore, Siersville, W. Va.

I have been reading everything in the Banner and in everything else. You have put out some good stuff during the past year. I am glad you are treating R. H. Boll’s doctrine the proper way. Those fellows who leave the New Testament and misapply the Old Testament, to the disturbance of the whole church ought to be called to account. I don’t care how rough you get with them.—Austin Taylor, Uvalde, Texas.

The Banner gets better and better.—Paul L. Wallace, Akron, Ohio.

Keep the good work going. I think you are doing a great job.—J. M. McCarty, Houston, Texas.

You have waged a great fight against error.—J. E. Walker, Dallas, Texas.

J. D. Tant — The One and Only

In response to many requests I am preparing a book on the life of my father, J. D. Tant. I would like to ask the help of Bible Banner readers in gathering material of interest about him. If he ever held a meeting in your town, or if you know any incident connected with his life, any witticism, humorous tale, or other item that might be worth the telling, I would be most grateful for your help. Please make as accurate and as detailed a story as possible. Send your letters to Farming Yater Tant, 1623 Fargo Avenue Chicago, Illinois

REVELATION STUDIES

Twenty-six Lessons Covering the Entire Book of Revelation Prepared for Use in All Bible Classes and Home Study

The purpose of these lessons is to help the student acquire a knowledge of what the Revelation actually says. They contain no speculation and they give no encouragement to the “interpretation” of symbolic and prophetic utterances which the Lord himself did not reveal; rather they are a definite warning against such.

Harry Pickup says, “This study is written in the question and answer style which has proved so successful in other studies by the same author. Its value as a treatment of the entire text of this difficult book is inestimable.”

A study of the Book of Revelation is much more important than some think. Blessings are promised to those who read and hear and keep the things written in the Revelation. (Rev. 1:3) It is sinful to neglect the study of it, because it is the “Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave him to show unto his servants.” (Rev. 1:1)
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“REVELATION STUDIES” will help the teacher build up class attendance and interest.
THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH TOWARD WAR

er H. Leo Boles, or the editor of the Gospel Advocate, we would think the war was about over.

As to that manifesto on the Civil War, it was drafted and signed by some illustrious men, but one of them Brother Brigance relies on rather heavily, said that sentimentally his answer was NO but intellectually, he had to admit that the argument was on the other side. He said that his heart said NO but his intellect conceded the argument. That was in the midst of a civil war between the States. Had it been now when the whole nation is united in defense of its existence, his heart would undoubtedly have joined his intellect.

As for Alexander Campbell, he voted and held office. He was a delegate to the convention from Virginia. He helped write the constitution of Virginia. If he framed it, could he help maintain it? He further conceded that it was moral and right, even necessary, for a government to make and enforce laws, and contended that capital punishment is both right and expedient and proved it by the Bible. He is not much comfort to those who hold the view that government is of the devil and Christians cannot afford to participate, in its legitimate functions, if indeed they are legitimate.

Benjamin Franklin “argued it as a question of Christian morals, aside from the particular issue of any war.” In the light of the “issue” of this war, will Brother Brigance contend that it is immoral for our government to defend its position, existence, and the liberties of its citizens against the encroachment, the immoralities of the Axis powers? I trow not! And I do not think he thinks that if a Christian makes it “an individual matter” to help do it, he thereby becomes immoral. And this is about all we have contended for all along. And we do not think that contending is going to cause a division in the church. We have too much confidence in the good sense of the brethren for that.

McGarvey signed a Manifesto against war during the Civil War and he also wrote this:

“Self-preservation is a law of God giving right, which under most circumstances, a Christian can claim. He may resist the robber, the assassin and all men of that ilk, and may protect his person and his possessions against the assaults of the violent and lawless.”

McGarvey did not mean resisting him by reading the Sermon on the Mount to him, or kneeling before him in prayer. Brethren who like to quote the pioneers on war and think becoming a soldier is enlisting for murder can get little comfort from McGarvey. He was discussing some specific New Testament references on the “doctrine of non-resistance” when he wrote that.

A good writer recently went to some length to prove that the mission of the church in time of war is the same as it is in time of peace. Of course, I thought everybody knew that. I have not heard of any intention to ask the church to take over its task. Members of the church are also citizens of the government. It is no business of the church to run farms, schools, oil refineries, or munition plants, but Christians may work on and in them.

The “inopportune” part of Brother Brigance’s article in which he lapsed into “a discussion of what should be the attitude of Christians toward war” carried him to the New Testament. Now that is better
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We accept that and I’m sure Brother McGarvey, one of Brother Brigance’s “pioneers” did also when he made his remarks on “self-preservation.” The New Testament also teaches that civil government is ordained of God and bears the sword to keep order in society and that Christians should submit to it. Its legitimate functions are not evil or immoral. This discussion always comes back to where it belongs— the functions of government. The manner in which it is ignored by some is revealing.

We are told that there is no example of a Christian becoming a soldier and ergo, he violates what the New Testament teaches if he does so. Then where goes the contention that “it is an individual matter, a matter of each one’s conscience,” and should not be discussed because it will “foment strife, dissension, and alienation”? My impression is that what the New Testament teaches should be discussed regardless of the consequences. Brother Brigance cannot have it both ways. If the New Testament teaches it, it is not an indifferent matter for the individual to settle by his own conscience.

Paul, the Christian, requested and received an armed escort. Could a Christian have been one of the number that escorted Paul? The chief captain said that “great violence” was used. Paul asked for great violence. He accepted great violence. Could a member of the church have, given what Paul asked for? If not, where does that put Paul? Was Paul loving his enemies while he was asking for violence to protect him from them? I’m sure Paul knew all about “the gospel of peace instead of war, of love instead of hate, of saving life instead of taking life,” and he was “under the leadership of the Prince of Peace.” Was Paul, the advocate of war, preaching the doctrine of non-resistance?”

The New Testament leaves the Eunuch in a cabinet position and Cornelius a soldier. We find him one, and we leave him one. Cornelius was an army officer. Peter went to tell him what he “ought” to do. If one cannot be a Christian and a soldier, could he become one? and be a soldier? Is it not remarkably strange that the New Testament leaves Cornelius a soldier, an army officer, if it was necessary for him to quit murder to become, or be a Christian? Does the record leave out an essential of what he “ought” to do? Peter either did not tell him, or he did not tell us, and we ought to know it, too, if it is true. It is not enough to get Cornelius out of the army by assuming that he quit. That begs the question and we do not yield to begging.

Finally, we are not calling for, nor do we want any strife, alienation or division. We do not desire any of the evil consequences Brother Brigance fears. We are not even forcing an issue. We are only defending our boys and others against the charge of being murderers because they wear uniforms in the, armed service of our country. We are told in substance: “Our soldiers are in the business of murder, but don’t reply to it or you will be agitating. It is an individual matter, the boys are murderers, but you must not cause division by denying it”! We deny it! And there won’t be any division, just a little moaning here and there,