Brother L. L. Brigance has written a "Reply to the Wallace Brothers" which appeared in the Gospel Advocate of August 5th, 1943. He "does not enjoy a fight," had no intention of getting into one when he nosed into this fray, and proposes to get out pronto. "I intend this to be my last word on the subject for the duration." Of course, I expect at least a couple more broadsides to be fired at me, but I have no intention of returning the fire." He thus bids us adieu "for the duration."

It is my custom when firing, to use the calibre gun, and the amount of ammunition the size of the quarry calls for. In this case I hardly think "a couple more broadsides" will be necessary. Since our brother hastens to call it quits, I'm minded to let him, as kindly as I can. I am really quite fond of Brother Brigance and am quite sure that he has not shown the New Testament sustains "the side of the question" we think we succeeded. We also think we have shown that otherwise, and does not intend to try. He does seem to die "natural." It is my custom when firing, to use the calibre gun, and honestly did my best to see that he got it.

Our brother assures us that he is more interested in his character than he is in his reputation as a historian. "If my interest in my reputation ever influenced my words or deeds, I am wholly unconscious of it. I have never given it any attention. I just let it take care of itself the best it can. But I am intensely interested in my character."

I have never heard Brother Brigance's character called in question, and should anybody be so wicked as to do so, I would defend him at the dropping of a hat. It has been widely observed that the Gospel Advocate does not mind reflecting on our's. Were I grading Brother Brigance on character I would just mark him an even hundred and pass on. We have had more than "a couple more broadsides" fired at both our reputation and our character, and we feel that, under the circumstances, both have held up fairly well.

Brother Brigance was greatly surprised, and seems to be a little hurt, that his article should have called for a reply from us. "It never one time occurred to me that anybody would reply to it. Why these brothers and brethren felt called upon to answer my article, I do not know. I did not refer to them in any 'way, shape, form, or fashion.'" It occurred to nearly everybody else that the article would be replied to, and a host of brethren would have been surprised if it hadn't been. A controversy was on at the time and it was generally assumed that Brother Brigance was doing a little scotching "on the opposite side of the question from us, and you know our 'reputation,' along that line, or should. Brother Goodpasture was not only not liking our "position" but he wasn't liking us and he was not keeping it to himself. Brother Brigance was greatly surprised, and seems to agree with us that somebody about like me would answer it. He should have known us better than that. I am not and never have been the least bit out of humor with Brother Brigance. I honestly thought he was asking for something, and honestly did my best to see that he got it.

Brother Brigance is dead right when he says that "Christians are to be guided by the New Testament and not by uninspired historians." It is too easy to stir up a big ruckus about historians. The New Testament is the inspired history of the church. We are not much impressed when somebody says that "the history of the church is against them" when he is talking about something besides the New Testament. We think it is a mistake to pay too much attention to men "of considerable prominence" or to others who "are lesser lights," and too little to the New Testament. But since Brother Brigance was minded to dabble a bit in history, we assumed the task of showing that in this instance he was historically inaccurate, and we think we succeeded. We also think we have shown that the New Testament sustains "the side of the question" we occupy. Brother Brigance admits that he has not shown otherwise, and does not intend to try. He does seem to die a little hard on history.

We accept his confession that he did not know and had not read B. W. Johnson's position. "Believe it or not, I did not know it. It was just downright ignorance. I had never read the article from which Brother Wallace quoted." Well, don't be too down-hearted about it, I'm not going to rub it in. There are some things I have never read, and I
sometimes talk too much too, without sufficient information, but it usually gets me in trouble. I know just how you feel.

I must say, however, that I cannot accept Brother Brigance's effort to fix what "Johnson wrote." Just as I was warming up to the idea that maybe he was not "on the opposite side of the question from" us, after all, he cools me off with his dissertation on Johnson and makes me think maybe he is.

"At the time Johnson wrote the article referred to, he thought it was right for Christians to take up arms at the call of the government. This article was written in 1861, when Johnson was about twenty-eight years old. Twenty-eight years later, he publishes his "People's New Testament." Commenting on Matt. 5:9, which says, "Blessed are the peacemakers," he says: "Not the soldiers of a war-king, such as the Jews expected, but men who, in the name of the Prince of Peace, go forth to proclaim peace and good will among men. Christ is the great Peacemaker." On Rom. 13:2 he says: "This implies a loyal submission to the form of government over us. It does not imply that we shall obey wicked magistrates when they command us to disobey God." (See Acts 4:19; 5:29.) These comments seem to represent a change of views after twenty-eight more years of investigation and reflection. Brother Poy may change his views on this subject when he has older grown.

I'm sure that Brother Brigance did the best he could with Brother Johnson, without arguing the case, but it is pretty weak. There is no contradiction at all in what Johnson wrote when he was "about twenty-eight" and when he was twenty-eight years older. Both are correct and I believe and accept both now. It is just another case where the main issue in this government question is ignored or overlooked. Our brother was a little late getting to Johnson and I fear he has read him too hastily and without sufficient reflection. He is not so sure of himself as it is. "These comments seem to represent a change of views." He would make an unequivocal statement yield to a doubtful statement that only "seems" to Brother Brigance to teach something different. Now, my brother, that is inching pretty close to "sophistry." The quoted statements do not represent a change on Johnson's part, and even Brother Brigance is not sure it does. But he was only twenty-eight when he wrote the article on war! Well, Moses E. Lard was about the same age when he wrote his "Review of Campbellism" when he was twenty-eight years old. Both are correct and I believe and accept both now. It is just another case where the main issue in this government question is ignored or overlooked. Our brother was a little late getting to Johnson and I fear he has read him too hastily and without sufficient reflection. He is not so sure of himself as it is. "These comments seem to represent a change of views." He would make an unequivocal statement yield to a doubtful statement that only "seems" to Brother Brigance to teach something different. Now, my brother, that is inching pretty close to "sophistry." The quoted statements do not represent a change on Johnson's part, and even Brother Brigance is not sure it does. But he was only twenty-eight when he wrote the article on war! Well, Moses E. Lard was about the same age when he wrote his "Review of Campbellism" and it is pretty good reading, and I doubt if he could have beat it anytime "later."

Brother McGarvey is one of Brother Brigance's star witnesses and greater historical lights. He signed the "Manifesto on War." His comments on "resistance" in "Four-fold Gospel" came later. Did he change? Johnson's comments on Romans 13 are not against us, but McGarvey's comments on "resistance" are against the position of out and out non-resisters.

I agree with Brother Kurfees that it was "wise and prudent" for the Gospel Advocate "to suspend for the time being all agitation and discussion of the war question in its columns" during World War I. Brother Kurfees was trying to keep the Gospel Advocate out of trouble. He knew that certain men in trying to defend the conscientious objector's position would be certain to arouse the hostility of the government. Under the circumstances it was best to keep "all agitation" out of the Advocate. Brother Kurfees' position had nothing in it to offend or hamper the government nor does our's. I think now, under the circumstances, the Advocate would have appeared in a better light, had it left off some of the "agitation" that has appeared on its editorial page even this year. "Wise and prudent" does not describe it. And remember, we did not start this scrap. We admit that we returned some fire, and still have a little extra dry powder in case it is needed.

My brother, do not get too "disheartened, discouraged, and disgusted at the efforts of disputers and wranglers to cover up their errors, ignorance, and defeat" and who "descend to personalities, sophistry, and argumentum ad hominem," for some such we shall doubtless have with us always. The Lord will render to them according to their works. We have had to put up with a good deal of that sort of thing ourselves from men of whom we expected better things. "Pret not thyself because of evil doers." "Trust in the Lord, and do good; so shalt thou dwell in the land, and verily thou shalt be fed."

Farewell, my brother, "for the duration." We hope to see you again after the war is over.

The Funniest Joke Of The Season

A Texas editor whose plaintive plea of "Send me a dollar" has been widely heard and read; who is described by-guess whom?—as "Young and powerful, bold and fearless:" whose efforts to set churches in order sometimes get his picture in the daily papers as a defendant in court; this editor has discovered something new under the sun, has broken it to the public in an editorial and does a crystal-gazing act involving things to come.

He has discovered, has he, that the editor of the Bible Banner has "an exalted opinion of himself" and "is no longer a safe guide or sound preacher;" that he is "insufferably conceited" and "headed for a fall that will put to shame the famed catastrophe of humbley dumby." He amplifies all this with some personal grievances that date back to "The Beggar's Broadcast."

Those who have followed the colorful career of "Young and powerful, bold and fearless," are at liberty to draw their own conclusions as to his humility and self-abasement, and pass on his qualifications as "a safe guide or sound preacher." When he calls on another editor by "long distance" "to route through Dallas" to see him he expects him to route or else. It seems that the editor of the Bible Banner didn't route. So it must follow that he is quite "exalted in his own mind." "Young and powerful" might have saved himself some expense and trouble had he called me instead of the editor. I could have told him that this same editor is at times a little rough on hecklers, and there are some people he is not particularly anxious to talk to, even if they do come all the way from Dallas to Houston. I suggest that next time "Bold and fearless" wants to talk to somebody, that he contact me. If he has some kindess he wants to waste on desert air, I'm just what he is looking for. I can listen and say as little or as much as the case demands. I'm not "Young and powerful." I'm old and tender-hearted, but don't take advantage of me and ask me for a dollar. I'm not going to give it to you, unless you are hungry or the contribution is necessary to get you out of town. I'd hate to have to put up with you for more than "five minutes" at the outside.

A drunk staggered up to a gentleman on a downtown street and addressed him after this wise: "I shay mister, you are in no condition to be on the street. Why you are drunk, shir. You ought to go home. Don't try to walk, take a taxi. There's two down on the corner. Be sure and take the first one. The second one's not there."

"Young and Powerful" seems to be as serious as when he is crying for a dollar. I think he has pulled off the funniest joke of the season.
THE ESSENTIAL POINT IN PREMILLENNIALISM”-NO. 6

We come now to examine the final passage cited by R. H. Boll in the outline of the Chattanooga, Tennessee, address on Premillennialism-Rev. 20:1-6. Brother Boll says “if there is ever to be such a time as that, then Christ must and will come before that time.”

The generally accepted principle of Bible study, fundamental to learning even the elementary lessons of God’s word, is to always consider “by whom and to whom” the particular language was spoken or written. This principle, generally applied to all other sections of the scriptures, has apparently not been applied to the book of Revelation.

The book of Revelation was addressed to the seven churches of Asia and it was evidently written especially for the churches named in the first chapter of the book. The early church was facing immediate persecution and trial, and the book was written for their comfort and encouragement. They were certainly in a better position to know and apply the meanings of the many symbols used than anyone could be today. Due to their position among pagan people and under pagan persecutors the things that were “signified” unto them, or set forth in signs or symbols, could not be put in plain, literal words. To have done so would have created greater opposition and would have precipitated a more immediate persecution.

A similar situation existed in the teaching of Jesus during his earthly ministry. He addressed the Jews in parables because he knew they would not make the right use of the information, and would use the teaching to further their own evil designs. But he explained the teaching to his disciples privately in plain words, “because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven, but to them it is not given.” (Matt. 13:11) That was certainly true of the persecutors of the church. But John had lived and labored with the churches to whom the Revelation is addressed and he must have known that they would understand the signs and symbols used, and that they would know the imminent nature and ominous import of his apocalyptic language.

There are many indications in the book of Revelation that the things portrayed were fulfilled in the experiences of the churches addressed. Repeatedly Jesus said, “hold fast that which thou has till I come.” This could not refer to his apocalyptic language. That was the scene of triumph and victory. Taking the souls out from under the altar, the scene of defeat, and elevating them to thrones, the scene of victory, is described as a resurrection-the resurrection of their cause. And the closing chapters of the book present the glory and ecstasy of the triumphant church, emerging in the garbs of victory out of the experiences of the period described. It is then that the Lord repeated the mission and task of the glorious church of Christ in what may be appropriately called the second great commission and the second great invitation: “The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whoever will, let him take the water of life freely.” John then closes the Revelation with the words: “He that testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come Lord Jesus.” There is no evidence that this refers to the final personal coming of Christ, but rather to his promise to come to them “quickly”-to the churches addressed-in the experiences through which they should “shortly” pass. He did come to them in those experiences, and aster-setting forth all the fury of the persecutions that pagan rulers could hurl against the cause of the early Christians.

In the sixth chapter there is the vision of “the souls under the altar”—the souls of the slain, those who had been beheaded” for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held.” Under the altar John saw souls... It was the vision, or scene, of defeat-the souls were under the altar, their cause despoiled, put down and defeated. The “souls” that have been made in every age and generation, where the same souls—the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God”—were envisioned on thrones. That was the scene of triumph and victory. Taking the souls out from under the altar, the scene of defeat, and elevating them to thrones, the scene of victory, is described as a resurrection-the resurrection of their cause. And the closing chapters of the book present the glory and ecstasy of the triumphant church, emerging in the garbs of victory out of the experiences of the period described. It is then that the Lord repeated the mission and task of the glorious church of Christ in what may be appropriately called the second great commission and the second great invitation: “The Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whoever will, let him take the water of life freely.” John then closes the Revelation with the words: “He that testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so, come Lord Jesus.” There is no evidence that this refers to the final personal coming of Christ, but rather to his promise to come to them “quickly”-to the churches addressed-in the experiences through which they should “shortly” pass. He did come to them in those experiences, and it certainly has no support in the book of Revelation, which means that it has none any where else. The Pope of Rome sits on a literal throne and rules over the Catholic world. The king of England sits on a literal throne and rules Britain and her dominions. And there are those who think that they believe that Jesus Christ will come again in the flesh to sit on such a throne in Jerusalem!
B. W. Johnson's Question – Is the Christian an Incubus in Society?  
(F. E. W., Jr.)

B. W. Johnson was a pioneer scholar of first rank. More members of the church knew him through his two-volume commentary on the New Testament that any other of his day, not excepting J. W. McGarvey. It was Johnson's contention that a Christian is either a part of the government he enjoys, in the fruition of its laws, and he “cannot refuse to sustain it in a just cause,” or else the Christian is “an incubus to his country,” in which case if the majority of the people should become Christians it would “result in national ruin.” And he asked those who held views contrary to his own if they were “prepared for the legitimate results of your premises?”

“Is the Christian an incubus to his country?” This is a question for our colleges. Why? Simply because if our colleges are going to teach or encourage the teaching of such theories of the Christian's relation to government that will give to the young people who attend these colleges such a slant on things, then our colleges will make our young people misfits in society rather than prepare them for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship.

The question is also one for the parents. Why? Because if the average parent does not want his son or daughter to become an incubus in society. So it may occur to them to investigate the influence the schools are exerting over their students on these questions. They may not want to send their children to a school that will instill within them such an attitude toward the government of which we are a part and under which we live in the enjoyment of “the full fruition of its laws.” Do Christian parents want “Christian education” to make their children one-sided, their young preachers lopsided, and so far as society is concerned to produce a generation of incubuses and misfits. Think it over, parents.

The question is also one for every member of the church. Why? Because every individual sustains a relation to society and the government under which he lives. “No man liveth unto himself and no man dieth unto himself.”

If one individual can go without a government, why cannot all other individuals do the same? Where has God ordained certain ones to perform the functions of citizenship, and others to refrain from doing so?

The Practical Application

Suppose that we found ourselves suddenly without any form of government. What would we do about it? Would that situation be tolerable, or intolerable? Would we call a mass meeting of our neighbors, or attend one called by others, to consider ways and means of supplying the need? Whose duty would it be to take some steps to correct the situation?

Suppose that some brother attended such a meeting and explained his views of the “proper” attitude of Christians toward government. What if one who was not a Christian should rise and say:

“If we go ahead with the movement to organize a government, it will involve more than our local protection. The time would be sure to come sooner or later when the government would have to defend itself against foreign invasion of its rights, or even its territory. If it is wrong for the Christians to defend, then, it is wrong for all of us to defend it. If you Christians can get along without a government, so can we. We are not going to enter into an agreement that one group of us will do the fighting for all. We do not want to fight any more than you do. We will not fight unless we have to in defense of our nation. But we are not going to enter a contract in advance to let You Christians enjoy all of the benefits of the government, while we fight for both of us. In the first place, many in our own ranks might join your churches in order to escape military duty. That would neither help your churches nor the government. Besides it is your purpose and desire to bring everybody in this country into your churches. If your goal should be reached, who would defend the nation? And how ‘could the nation survive without military power? As long as there are people in the world, governments will be needed; but governments cannot be maintained without military power. Your views are not practical. A Christian nation, holding the views you express, would be at the mercy of any unscrupulous group such as have caused, and are causing, disturbance in the world. If your views are not practical for all the people of a nation, they are not practical for any of the people of the nation. So, the only sensible thing we can do is to organize a government, but write it into the constitution of the nation that no Christian can possess property in this country. In self-defense, we cannot allow our land to be occupied by those who will not defend this country against the foreign invader.”

While Christians theorize about what a Christian can or cannot do in time of war, it might be interesting to let some one who is not a Christian present the viewpoint of those who are expected to do for the Christian what the Christian decides that he cannot afford to do for himself. It is neither ethical nor logical to assume that other men should do our fighting for us. It is no more their fault than ours that we have some fighting to do. Think of a religion that prompts men to seek to enjoy the benefits of society without a proportionate share of the responsibilities. Is it fair? And can men be attracted to an unfair arrangement in the name of religion?

An Issue Growing Out of The Issue

It has been said that the government issue and the war question are individual matters. So far as the issue is concerned, that is not saying much, for everything is an individual matter—it is up to the individual as to what he is going to do about it, no matter what it is, right or wrong. But out of the discussion of these things has come a very fundamental issue—namely, the double-standard issue. Is there a double standard in morals? We are being told that it is all right for non-members of the church to do certain things that would be wrong for a member of the church to do. In the realm of morals that cannot be true. Nothing is moral that is immoral, no matter who does it. There is no such thing as certain conduct being moral to one person and immoral to another—that is, all right for a sinner to do and all wrong for a Christian to do. Is it all right for a person who is not a member of the church to commit adultery, but only a sin for members of the church to do so? That would certainly be bad doctrine to teach to our boys and girls before they become members of the church! In other words, shall we teach the young people that certain things are wrong to members of the church only, but before one is a member of the church he is free to do certain things? The doctrine is certainly a dangerous one. Think of its effect on society and on our children in the midst of society respecting moral conduct. Yet, I know of an elder in the church who recently said that it did not make any difference whether people who were not members of the church were guilty of adultery and murder or not. He was trying to make an argument again? & members
of the church going to war. There is the issue that is growing out of the issue—is there a double standard in morals?

There are a number of tracts, articles and sermons appearing in various quarters under the title: "Can a Christian Kill for His Government?" But why ask if a Christian can do that? The obvious import of the question is that to kill in that capacity is murder—yes, the use of the word "murder" in the title is intended to denote murder. If it does not, then there is no point to it. But if it does, then why ask if a Christian can commit murder for his government? Why not ask if anybody can commit murder for his government? Murder, like adultery, is murder. Adultery is adultery, no matter who commits it. And murder is murder, no matter who commits it. Why try to make such a distinction? For one reason only: A futile effort to prove that it is all right for a sinner to be a soldier but wrong for a Christian to be one, and, therefore, the sinner must perform all functions of government, and bear the sword, for the Christian!

Yet, I have been told that there are some who think that a collegiate author who wrote a tract with that title is smart! And some who are rated as being reasonably intelligent have endorsed it! The very title of such a tract or a sermon kills it.

Brother Whiteside has very appropriately said that the command "thou shalt not kill" does not refer to legal executions or government functions, but that it is a prohibition against murder. It wouldn't hurt some of the young know- was to ponder Brother Whiteside's article, and it wouldn't do the Gospel Advocate any harm to publish it.

If sinners are not under moral law how did they become sinners? The theory of hereditary total depravity assumes that they were born sinners—but we have all denied that doctrine, at least until now.

Hear Paul on this point: And you that were sometime alienated and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled." (Col. 1:21) Before these people were "reconciled" they were alienated from God "by wicked words." What were the "wicked words" of these non-members of the church, who were not Christians? Paul had the thing in reverse—he should have told me Colossians that it would be "wicked" for the members of the church to do those things, but that it would be all right for those who were not Church members to do them. According to that idea—how does one become a sinner, if he is not born a sinner?

There is no double standard in morals. If the war question is one of morals, rather than the functions of government, then nobody could "kill for his government" and it consequence thereof, we could have no government. But if it is a question of government, as it assuredly is, then it is not murder. If it is murder, what makes it right for one and wrong for another? If it is not murder—and it is not—then what makes it wrong for a member of the church to do military service the same as anybody else?

Surely, all should be able to see that such service comes under Paul's instructions in Romans 13. When the government is performing its rightful mission on behalf of its citizens, "he (it) beareth not the sword in vain." Twice in that passage Paul says that the one who bears the sword in the rightful functions of the government for good against them that do evil, are "ministers of God." The theory that a sinner can do it but a Christian cannot, means that there is, at least, one good thing a sinner can do that a Christian cannot do. And it means more than that! It means that a sinner can have fellowship with God in doing a good thing that Christians cannot have fellowship with God in doing.

Talk about a dangerous doctrine, the issue that has grown out of the issue—that of a double standard of morals—is dangerously bad doctrine. It is bad for everybody, in the church or out of the church, to be taught such a thing. Yet, it is but the logical consequence of a false theory of a Christian's relation to civil government that has been taken for granated by so many brethren for so many years. It is to be hoped that some of the brethren, who are so erratic on the question, can quit calling the rest of us "war-mongers" long enough to seriously "think on these things."

**Shall We Write "Finis"?**

It has been said by some that this is not an opportune time to discuss the government issue and the "war question." Whether that be true or not, the indications now are that the discussion of the questions can be discontinued within the precincts of the Gospel Advocate and the vicinity of Nashville, Tennessee.

It is out that Brother H. Leo Boles recently made application to the War Department for an official connection with the government to appoint preachers of "the church of Christ" to the official position of Chaplain in the army. Brother Boles has previously believed that it is wrong to join the army, and has held that a Christian cannot be a soldier, nor even hold a government office. But according to the letter from a Major in the army, referred to in the July Bible Banner, he recently applied for an official position in which he would be empowered by the government to appoint men to an official position in the army. A Chaplain holds the rank of an officer in the army. One of his chief duties is to build up the morale of the soldiers. Brother Boles wants the government to appoint him to appoint our preachers to be officers in the army.

It might be claimed that the position he would hold would be in the church. We merely ask how could the government appoint him to a position in the church? And why is the scripture for any such office or authority as that to be conferred on any man by the church, for the government, or by the government for the church? If the government belongs to the devil, as these brethren have contended, then it looks like Brother Boles has applied to the devil for an appointment in the church. That looks bad.

The Chaplaincy is not an office in the church—it is an office in the army, and according to a Major in the army, Brother Boles wants authority from the government to pass on the appointment of all preachers of the "Church of Christ" to that army office!

That is certainly not in harmony with his recent "challenge" for a debate on the "war question," nor with what he has previously believed and taught on the government question. Therefore, since he has now "changed" on the issues involved, we cannot expect him to reply to Brother C. R. Nichols' letter to him in answer to his own "challenge," nor to negotiate propositions with either Brother Nichol or Brother Whiteside for the debate that he appeared so much to desire, and for which he wanted to write the propositions. Just how could Brother Boles consistently debate with anybody on the government issue now? Truly, the legs of the lame are not equal!

In the time to come, when Brother Boles and the Gospel Advocate have anything to say about that debate on the "war question," we have only to remind everybody of his letter of application to the War Department. Is it not time for Brother Goodpasture and Brother Boles to write "finis" to the argument and forever hold their peace?
SIGHTING-IN ON “POST-WAR PLANS”?

(C. E. W.)

Things seem to be Brewer(ing) in two or three papers over an all-out “After-the-War Missionary Program and Other Postwar Problems.” Somebody seems to have got together impromptu or on purpose and decided on “a plan” for the gospel invasion of the whole world after the war and a frontal attack on all the problems that will then beset the distressed peoples of the earth. It appears that the first need is to “stir up a general fervor of enthusiasm for the evangelization of the world after the present fratricidal orgy is over.” I think the planners are wise in one respect, that they are not advocating a Children’s Crusade to Japan, for instance, until “the present fratricidal orgy is over.” I keep looking at that word “fratricidal”; is this “present” connection. Maybe somebody ought to tell it to the Marines.

Brother Brewer, Jimmie Lovell, Harding College, the church at Lubbock and “a number of workers who are anxious to go to Europe” appear to have already reached a specific “fervor of enthusiasm” and are already scattering incendiary bombs among the rest of us. Some will no doubt catch fire quickly, while others will be inclined to hold off the fire with some questions. The high-sounding title of “the plan” will capture some, instantaneously. Now, I’m just an individual Christian, and a member of an independent church, and I do not claim to be an expert at launching movements on “a nation-wide scale.” As “for the evangelization of the world I’m for it. Sometimes “a plan” born in a “fervor of enthusiasm” needs some critical appraisal.

“More About The Program”

“The Plan” was set forth by Brother Brewer in an article appearing some weeks ago in two papers. We have his word for it that the “article brought a tremendous response” but that “all the responses were not favorable or complimentary.” So that brought forth the “More About The Program” article. His reaction to the unfavorable and uncompromising responses is quite characteristic of him. They lack understanding, “show the usual lack of interest in any people except those of our own nation,” utter a “fallacious and threadbare cry,” set up “a lugubrious wail that goes up when we advocate sending the gospel into the foreign fields,” are heathen themselves, too “selfish” to be edified, are “afflicted with a cardiac condition that would make it impossible for it or him to receive any heavy stimulus,” are “myopic” and “cannot see afar off.” He pours a flood of scorn on a “howl, which is always hoisted for the purpose of palification of penuriousness.” It appears that the brother has little patience with anybody who questions the wisdom of his “plan” or offers any objections to it. My advice to him is to save some of his adjectives for future use for he is likely to need them. His blasts of scorn do not scare some of us in the least. We have heard him puff before. A windstorm from him does not usually send us to the cellar. Past experience should teach him that he cannot blow a house down. I suppose he will expect a vote of thanks from a grateful opposition for this magnanimous gesture: “But despite their mistaken views and sectarian phraseology, these tenderhearted brethren mean well.” Of course “The Plan” is “plain and scriptural” for Dr. Brewer says it is. All discussion should cease and everybody stoop to the task! Don’t be in too big a hurry, “these men and women who want to go for God” will have to wait until the war is over anyway, so there is time for a little talking over matters. If “The Plan” is as sound and scriptural as current enthusiasm says it is, some talking and even some questions will not hurt it. If a man cannot take some back-talk he should never repeatedly break into two papers with “A Plan” that involves all the churches, and proposes such results as the world has never seen. Even the ministers of the big church which is to operate as “sponsor for the “The Plan” cannot tell all the churches to shut their eyes and close their mouths and follow him, for he knows what he is talking about. He is not quite that important-yet. No, we had better talk it over a bit and that does not mean that Brother Brewer and Jimmie Lovell are to be allowed to do all the talking. They need to listen for a time anyhow. Jimmie says he has made lots of mistakes. I do not know that Brother Brewer has ever confessed it, but there are a few brethren scattered about who do not consider him infallible, so we had better talk things over, even if some remarks do make his eyes blaze and release his stock of lurid adjectives.

“Sponsoring Post-War Plans”

In his superior air, Brother Brewer castigates the “sectarian phraseology” of a brother who has responded unfavorably to “The Plan.” He has no patience whatever with inaccurate phraseology,” especially if it squints in the general direction of sectarianism. Perhaps, then, he will tell us where we can find something in the New Testament about “sponsoring Post-War Plans” with one church acting as “sponsor” for the whole brotherhood. Seems as though I have read something about some developments this side of the New Testament in which some big churches got the idea that they ought to “sponsor” the affairs of smaller churches, and it led to everybody knows what. Of course the idea looked insufficient enough at the start. Now just who and what is a “sponsor”? Here are some leading definitions. “One who binds himself to answer for another’s default; a surety.” “Eccl. One who at the baptism of an infant or child professes the Christian faith in its name, and guarantees its religious education; a godfather or godmother.” Now, this infant “Plan” born somewhere out in the West, where the birth-rate of “movements” appears to be mounting, is about to be christened and needs a godfather or a godmother. The Broadway church in Lubbock, Texas, proposes to be it. It evidently regards itself as “A church with a competent preacher and a qualified eldership,” and its preacher points his finger accordingly at the whole field through the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation, and with the air of a prosecuting attorney demands: “Then what is your church doing toward getting ready for the execution of this plan? How much money are you saving? How many missionaries are you preparing?” Now, maybe “your church” is doing nothing toward getting ready for the execution of this plan. Maybe it has a plan of its own, conceived and put into operation before some brilliant minds ever thought up this new one. My idea is, from reading the New Testament, that a church is an independent body and has the right to select its own field of operation, raise its own money, choose its own workers and “sponsor” its own activities generally without the handicap of a foreign “sponsor,” even if it is a “A church with a competent preacher and a qualified eldership.”

Naturally, if a church is advanced as the “sponsor” of “The Plan” for the evangelization of the world,” then it is in order to set forth its qualifications for the job. It looks as though the best thing to do would be to hold a general election. There might be other likely candidates for the sponsorship. But since the Lubbock church seems to have been selected, when or by whom, is not quite clear, we will look into its qualifications as they appear in the papers.
I held a meeting for that church a few years ago and I have some first-hand information. Here is what I read in the papers. It has "a competent preacher and a qualified eldership." It "probably has a hundred persons in its membership who are college graduates; it has at least a dozen who hold the master's degree, and some three or four who can boast (if they were disposed to boast, which they are not) of holding a doctor's degree." Its "competent preacher," who is also a doctor, and not "disposed to boast," of course, also very modestly relates the hundreds of dollars per month the church is spending on various activities including missionary work. Now, that is fine, but it occurs to me that it wouldn't do any harm for that great church to confine its "sponsorship" to its own program. Just what authority does it have to "sponsor" a "Plan" for somebody else? No, but we are told that the churches are to train their own missionaries, raise their own money and run their own affairs, that the church at Lubbock does not want money sent to it, and does not want to select or hire the missionaries etc. Then what are they "sponsoring"? Are they merely endorsing "The Plan"? Then all the church work will be sponsored too. The "competent preacher" of the Lubbock church is very particular about the "phraseology" other people use, but there seems to be something a little loose about his own particular about the "phraseology" other people use, but there seems to be something a little loose about his own phraseology, ideas or something.

"The Post-War Problems"

The sage of Lubbock can perform some amazing feats. He is the sworn enemy of Catholicism, Communism and "sectarian phraseology." As for "premillennialism," well -you know Brother Boll is a mighty good man, and Brother Jorgenson is a mighty fine singer, and brethren should use them in meetings! I would not say that Brother Brewer is a chameleon for he only has two legs, unless you count his doctor's degree, but he can change from Pollyanna to Gloomy Grover while you are standing looking at him. He is the sworn enemy of Catholicism, Communism and "sectarian phraseology," the world has never seen! Then he testifies as an expert on "Postwar Problems" and gives us to understand that a hypochondriac like that is not qualified to be press agent for a movement for world evangelization. He is most likely to have a demoralizing influence over them. Healthy minds do not like to feed on morbidity.

"A Ray Of Light"

After a dive into Gloomy Grover's "dark prospect" in which I nearly smothered, and the smell was terrible, I came up for some fresh air and sunshine, something reasonable and healthy, and found it in-The Baptist and Reflector. It reasonably offers some "ray of light on the horizon." The article on "America, Friend of All Mankind" originally appeared in the Baptist Observer. It at least shows a balanced outlook and is free from the ranting and raving of the "competent preacher" of the Lubbock church.

"We have no desire to detract the least iota from the sacrifice, the bravery, the heroism, and the all-out devotion of the various commonwealths in the British empire, and certainly we stand proudly at attention and salute the heroism of the people for the sake of the lives they have sustained and won the Battle of Britain. But would the United Nations today be blasting at the sates of Italy and Germany with an assurance that the day-of-victory for the Allied powers and the deliverance of invaded and occupied people is not far off, were it not for the help accorded them by this giant of the West? We have sent them men, we have sent them ships, we have sent airplanes and munitions of war, we have sent them food, we have conveyed their precious cargoes across the seas, and we have heartened and encouraged them in a thousand different ways and, best of all, we are with them heart and soul until victory is won and peace is accomplished. Do they know and appreciate what America has done for the Allied Cause? Winston Churchill does! Anthony Eden does! The military leaders do, and the British people are profuse in their appreciation of the help we have given them. The people in the occupied countries of Europe do! China does! And even our enemies know that the United States has no imperialistic designs and no desires for revenge in this war, but a sincere desire that the blessings and freedoms we enjoy shall become the heritage of all mankind.

Of course, America is not without sin and there are many abuses that need to be corrected. The way the legalized liquor traffic is allowed to run riot and deceive American youth is a sin and disgrace as black as hell. Political corruption and the gouging of defenseless citizens is a crime worse than any black market. Lawlessness and the frustration of justice is a national disgrace that demands immediate attention. Juvenile crime and delinquency are rapidly increasing and fore-shadow evil days ahead. The breakdown of the home life and the disintegration of the family are to be deplored, the remedy for which
can be found only in morality and religion. But the American people are well aware that the American way of life is a heritage bequeathed from the past to the present, and this heritage is in danger. The rising generation is showing a great deal of interest in religion, and this interest is reflected in the growing number of young people attending religious services and studying religious texts. The American people are also aware of the importance of religion in shaping their values and beliefs. They are committed to preserving their heritage and passing it on to future generations.

America possesses a subsoil of religion that is a heritage bequeathed to us from the past. The United States was born and cradled in religion, and this early religious trend has colored and influenced the life of America through succeeding generations, as the Gulf Stream has colored and influenced the waters of the Atlantic even to the coast of Europe. The early religious fervor has been modified somewhat by material prosperity which is never conducive to spiritual development, and also by immigration from southern Europe. We may not flock to the churches in great numbers for formal services of worship, but in the hearts of most Americans there is an abiding faith in God, a reverence of sacred things, and a recognition of religious obligation. They know that this is considered a Christian nation and they have no desire for it to be otherwise. The present war has brought this religious subsoil to the surface and Bible reading and prayer are being mentioned without apology in the experience of officers and men in the armed forces in the training camps and on the various battlefronts. America is, indeed, the friend of all mankind. In the providence of the God of nations, it was brought to the world to give to the rest of mankind the Four Freedoms, but also to give to the rest of mankind the gospel of redemption through faith in Jesus Christ.

It is not necessary to accord this article from the Baptist Observer the place of an oracle, or accord its author the role of an inspired prophet to appreciate it. It is balanced, realistic, patriotic and reverent. There is some hope in it and the trend of it is constructive. It is in marked contrast to the soap-box type of harangue lugubriously wailed at us in the Gospel Advocate by Gloomy Grover. It is neither patriotic nor sensible "with not even a ray of light on the horizon." I like this country of ours. It is the greatest country in the world. It will be greater and "the Four Freedoms" will march on. I anticipate no prospect of being "liquidated" for preaching the gospel. I even anticipate prosperity and growth for the church in this and other lands. Freedom will be so great that Calamity Howlers can cater-waul to their hearts' content without danger of any more violent reaction than amusement or scorn. Of course that will be serious persecution to them. I tremble when I think what will happen to Gloomy Grover if his dire predictions fail of fulfillment. He will probably sit somewhere outside the walls under a gourd and ask the Lord to please take him home. However, as a prophet I do not rate him with Jonah. He appears, however, to share the contempt for this country that Jonah had for the Ninevites. "Doest thou well to be angry?"

TOO LATE FOR THIS ISSUE

The latest editorial in Gospel Advocate concerning "A frantic search for a change," and other frantic matters, appeared just as the Bible Banner went on the press. The "ace writer" will give the article proper treatment but the readers will have to wait until the next issue for it. As for "searching for a change" we merely call attention again to H. Leo Boles "change" on the Boll question which does not have to be "searched for" but which the "frantic editor" continues to ignore. We shall not let them for it.

Such As The World Has Never Known

(G. E. W.)

When "Publicity Director"—whatever that is-Jimmie Lovell comes down tooting a horn for a Committee, and Groaning Grover Brewer breaks out into multifold columns of two papers with a "Plan" for a "world-wide effort," of which the church he is the "competent preacher of" is to be "sponsored," then we may expect things to happen among us such "as the world has never known." I had a premonition that when Gunpowder Jimmie flashed up with something on "a nation-wide scale" that called for a Committee, Groaning Grover would soon see the need of something on a world-wide scale that called for a "sponsor," whatever that is in religion. Now I'm unable to see how Jimmie is going to find a wider field to operate his Committee in than Grover has to operate his Plan in, unless he inspects possibilities in hell, but his scouting resources must not be under-estimated. Now Jimmie and Grover are beyond question a matched and spirited team hitched to this new missionary wagon, but there are signs that somebody ought to hold a tight rein to keep them from running away and wrecking the whole shebang. The Gospel Advocate is traditionally conservative about such matters but it has changed policy again. It now has an editor who seems inclined to drop the lines and apply the race-track and the gallery for such a race as "the world has never known." I'm just wondering if the gallery is going to get its money's worth.

By day and night Jimmie shrieks without intermission that the churches are in a deplorable plight with their unqualified elders and selfish, lazy preachers, while the world with its rotten "isms" is Grover's specialty. "Is that a dark prospect? It is indeed! There is not even a ray of light on the horizon. The only reason the writer can see for changing this view would compel him to make it even darker by saying that no nation will be receptive to the gospel and that there will be a universal return to paganism." Thus groans Grover, the "Plan," will in all probability fail then even with a "Sponsor." Suppose we just call the whole thing off. Grandma doesn't enjoy talking about her "rheumatiz" as much as Grover enjoys talking about things "even darker." One would think he loves darkness! He does brighten up a bit when he begins to talk about himself and the Lubbock church. That is a relief, such as it is!

Now we expect and are prepared for somebody to get excited and charge us with being opposed to preaching the gospel to the heathen, being "anti-missionary" and all that sort of thing. We think we can take care of that too, when the times comes. We are for "missionary work," or what can be expressed in more scriptural language. Some people however, who are constantly prating about "missions" and "missionary work" give an uneasy feeling that they are talking about something I have been unable to find in the New Testament, and with all my faults I have quite a bit of respect for that inspired volume. It invariably puts me on my guard when somebody introduces a Committee a Plan or a Sponsor and begins to question the brethren and the churches on "a nation-wide scale." "Then what is your church doing toward getting ready for the execution of the plan? How much money are you raising? Why should anybody get ready for anything, but an everlasting smash, if "there is not even a ray of light on the horizon?" If the churches conclude that Jimmie and Grover are "dark prospects" and decide to run their own business without the aid of a Committee and a Sponsor, nobody
The present issue is Volume Six, Number One. The reception that the Bible Banner has received by thousands of loyal people in the church from the beginning has been very gratifying to us, and nothing short of amazing to others who did not believe that the Bible Banner could ever succeed. We are grateful beyond words, and as we begin the sixth year with an increasing tide of enthusiasm in responses from friends and readers over the whole nation, we pledge ourselves to an unrelenting devotion to the defense of the church against all errors and innovations.

For the information of those who have recently sent in their renewals, we wish to state that it has not been possible to get the date-lines on the address labels changed from the old date to the new date. This explanation will save some inquiries from subscribers. It is impossible to acknowledge receipt of the renewals, but in due time your date-line will be changed. Should you receive a notice before this is done, disregard it. Mistakes occur, but if you have sent the renewal, you will likely see your label properly changed to the proper date after an issue or two, then drop us a card, and it will be done.

In acknowledgement of the divine providence and the generous support of personal friends, which has made possible the publication of the Bible Banner, may I always be, Faithfully and fervently yours,

—Poy E. Wallace, Jr.
MORE ON PRONOUNS AND TENSES
(F. E. W., JR.)

In the Gospel Advocate of recent date under the heading of “‘They’ or ‘We’” a brother thinks he discovers a glaring inconsistency in a speech delivered by the editor on the subject of “Premillennialism,” and his argument from Rom. 13 on the government issue.

He wants to know by “what authority” do we change “he beareth not the sword in vain,” to “we” or “I” in Rom. 13:4? It was by the authority of the law of the mind—a simple step in logic. It did not occur to me than any hearer could not make the transition by one simple step that would not even throw them off balance, or interfere with their train of thought. If the brother cannot span the stream, it will require but a few moments to build him a footbridge.

When Paul asserted that the “powers that be are ordained of God,” did he limit the statement to the then existent powers? If so, Rom. 13 has no bearing upon any question of the Christian and his attitude toward government today, unless it might be used merely as an illustration of what Paul taught at one particular period. When Paul said, “There is now power but of God,” did he mean that only at the particular moment in history when he was speaking, the statement was true? But prior to or subsequent to that time the powers were not, and are not, of God? If so, by what authority does this brother and others contend that Christians today should even “submit” to the government, by paying taxes, or in any other way acknowledging any obligation whatever to the government?

According to his argument on the pronouns and tenses in Rom. 13, by what authority does the brother teach men to repent and be baptized today? If he cannot vary the pronouns and the tenses of the commands spoken by Christ and his apostles, how can he apply the gospel to men today? Do we not expect an audience to make the same simple thought-step every time a gospel sermon is preached?

It reduces itself to the question of what part of that which we read about in the New Testament can be applied to us today, and what cannot be thus applied. The statement, “They lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years,” appears in the midst of the figurative language of a Book of prophecies and symbols. There is nothing leading up to it in the plan or salvation; there are no duties or commands growing out of it. There is no obvious application to ourselves today.

On the other hand, there are definite duties and commands respecting the government, and an obvious application to those who would serve God in their attitude toward them. We know there are governments; we can see the manifestation of them daily. We can study their history; we can perceive their nature and functions. Paul instructs the Romans as to what their attitude should be toward their government, and speaks of the “powers” that be, even asserting that there is no power—that is, governing—unless he has taken some step to repudiate his citizenship. If he does not consider himself a citizen, he should in common fairness make known his attitude to the government.

A point worthy of repetition is that the very preacher who argues that the pronouns and tenses of Rom. 13 do not include the Christian as a part of the government, reverse their claim by their practice. As has been shown, they themselves function as civil magistrates every time they perform a marriage ceremony. Marriage licenses are issued by “the powers that be” and it is written on the face of the license that the officiating officer is an agent of the government, acting by the authority of the State. Every preacher who has the credentials necessary to perform marriages is a civil magistrate in the exercise of such credentials. In that capacity he does not act as “a minister of Christ” or “the minister of the church,” he acts wholly and solely as a minister of the government, an officer of the State. But I have heard of gospel preachers who solemnize the rites of matrimony in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit! What kind of an illusion or delusion is it that makes a preacher think the Holy Spirit has appointed him to execute marriage licenses issued by the State? It so happens that it is not the “seal of the Holy Spirit” on that particular legal instrument, but the seal of the State, and the preacher’s credentials to execute them are on file in the county court house instead of being on record in the New Testament.

On this point we are sometimes told that Paul said that his citizenship was in heaven. Yes, the citizenship that he referred to in that passage was in heaven, but Paul’s Roman citizenship was not in heaven. When Jesus said to Pilate, “my kingdom is not of this world,” he was merely emphasizing the nature of the kingdom of Christ in contrast with the material kingdom. If the statement that his “kingdom” is not of this world means that a Christian cannot be a part of a government of the world, then Paul’s statement that “the kingdom of God is not meat and drink” would mean that a Christian could not eat and drink! Those passages do not deny the privileges of the earthly government, they merely emphasize the nature of the spiritual kingdom.

It is claimed that the statement in Romans 13 that the “he,” the government, is a minister “to thee” just puts the Christian on the receiving end of the line! Here we are told that the Christian pays for that protection in taxes, or tribute. But the part of society that furnishes him the protection pays itself function as civil magistrates every time they include the Christian as a part of the government, reverse their attitude to the government.

If and when this brother comes to recognize the fact that the government is composed of the people living within the scope and influence of it, he will be in a position to advance to the thought that those born within the scope of the government, and who continue to dwell therein, are inherently in possession of citizenship in the government—unless he has taken some step to repudiate his citizenship. If he does not consider himself a citizen, he should in common fairness make known his attitude to the government.

We can help men to understand what they see; but we cannot see for them. We hope the brother can see this fact, for it is a very visible one.

It resolves itself once more into the fact that this theory of civil government makes it right for a Christian to claim equal privileges of citizenship, but wrong for a Christian to bear the equal responsibilities of citizenship. Romans 13, according to that idea, does not bar a Christian from all the blessings of the government but does exempt him from its responsibilities! The doctrine looks worse every time I see it.
BIRDS OF A FEATHER

(G. E. W.)

The Bible Banner tries to keep up with the times in at least one respect. We believe in the ancient order of things in religion as established by Christ and his apostles, and it is a part of our business to observe and comment on developments and rapprochements in religious groups which affect that divine order.

What is commonly known as the Boll Movement has from time to time been analyzed and criticized. Its center of influence is in Louisville, Kentucky and it has cast its shadow over adjacent territory. It threatened for a time to spread rapidly among the churches and got a toe-hold as far as Dallas and Abilene, Texas and in some of the schools. The opposition to this materialistic theory among us has been so effective, that most of the defenders of Brother Boll spend so much time assuring everybody that they do not believe his future-kingdom theories, they have little time left to talk about him. At times they have shown more of a disposition to jump on us than they have to defend Brother Boll, which is quite natural under the circumstances. All the talk about his character, how devout, humble and scholarly he is, is beside the point. Some prominent Baptists and other graduates of the Moody Institute can be found to match him in these virtues. What does all that have to do with the issues involved? Nothing! Some seem to think that the issue can be settled by telling the world how good Brother Boll is, and how bad we are. Personally, I'm inclined to view things rather calmly, even in a fight, and I have never accepted the thesis that Brother Boll is as transcendent as some of his friends claim he is, or that we are as devoid of principle as some of our enemies declare that we are. I have an idea that Brother Boll is lovely to them who agree with him, and some who disagree with us have been subjected to a hearty shaking. Of course some who are being tousled about a bit are crying "foul" and complaining that we are "nasty" about it, but that is to be expected and can be arbitrarily charged up to the dishevelled condition of their nerves. Some personalites are unavoidable, because they are bound up in issues. They should be dealt in without malice, even if circumstances make them sharp at times. The issue is the thing.

There is no secret about how the Boll influence got a toe-hold in Dallas. Brother Boll himself has made many visits to that city "since 1901." He was touted as a scholar, a paragon of piety, an advanced thinker along Bible lines, and the set-up was so impressive that many seemed inclined to think such a man could not be wrong about anything. Many, who have since had their eyes opened, went for him in a big way.

Really, the antics of some of Brother Boll's followers had more to do with the decline of his influence in Texas and elsewhere than they have been given credit for. Some of us have exposed the weakness and falsity of his theories, but it has been left for him and his admirers to demonstrate the dangers of them. They have shown where such things lead to. For one thing, it is impossible for an out and out "pre-millennialist" not to be an extremist and in many instances the fruit of it, a bit over-ripe perhaps, is downright fanaticism. The extremes to which some of his admirers have gone in forsaking the fundamentals of revealed truth and going off into this, and that and the other, appear to be more than a coincidence or an exception to a general rule. With them "premillennialism" seems to the thing and if a "premillennialist" happens to be a Baptist, a digressive, or what have you, such a circumstance may be considered unfortunate but not necessarily a fatal handicap to fellowship. It was shockingly noticeable in the Fort Worth debate when our editor met J. Frank Norris, a "pre-millennial" Baptist, that Dr. Eugene Wood and others of Brother Boll's persuasion, were scotching for Dr. Norris throughout the debate. They were not nearly as enthusiastic over the truth about baptism and apostasy as they were over the error of "premillennialism." When our editor met Chas. M. Neal in Winchester, Kentucky, the whole Boll shebang was there and their coalition with digressive forces in that affair is a matter of record. They deprecate a sectarian spirit, with their lips, and uplifted hands of protest, but have unmistakably shown that spirit when they have been faced with the smoke of battle. Brother Boll himself became so exercised as an observer at the Winchester debate, that at times he could not keep his seat. Chas. M. Neal has followed some of the other Boll followers clear out of the church, while Foy E. Wallace (Jr.) is still preaching the truth of the gospel with his accustomed power. And I might add so is Foy E. Wallace (Sr.)

And now I come to a late episode in the career of Brother Boll himself. He has been and still is the chief apostle of a subversive movement among us, writes manifestos denouncing the secretarian spirit among us, and this late episode may be construed as an effort on his part to demonstrate to the rest of us just how to behave in a non-sectarian way. His latest visit to Dallas, one of his many comings "to Texas on Bible tours since 1901" is heralded in a display advertisement in a Dallas paper. The two things that instantly catch one eye, then the other, then both, is Brother Boll's picture at the top and "CENTRAL BAPTIST CHURCH" at the bottom. Luther C. Peak, LL.D. the Baptist pastor, and a dyed-in-the-wool "Premillennialist," embellishes the picture with some lengthy remarks about Brother Boll. It makes interesting reading and I'm passing it on to the readers of the Bible Banner, free of charge. Unfortunately, we do not have Brother Boll's picture to go along with it. He has never sent us one. Incidentally, it is a very good picture, and reveals Brother Boll as a very benign looking old gentleman, with hair just about as gray as mine. He smiles with his eyes, as though enjoying the prospect of meeting a huge Baptist audience in thorough sympathy with all he would have to say. It has been reported to me that he did not smile that way at Winchester. But here is how Dr. Peak introduces Dr. Boll to the people of Dallas, and what the Baptist pastor has to say about Boll himself:

In connection with the church at 712 Parkview, we are happy to present a Bible lecture, THE WORLD OUTLOOK IN THE LIGHT OF GOD'S WORD, by Dr. R. H. Boll, editor and publisher of The Word and Work and one of the outstanding Bible teachers of America, Sunday evening 8:00.

1. It is always a joy to bring to our audiences men who have a stirring testimony and message true to the Word.

2. Dr. R. H. Boll is such a man; a Bible teacher of rare skill, known and loved by thousands for his work's sake; he has been coming to Texas on Bible teaching tours since 1901.

3. Brought up in Europe, a Catholic until he was 29, he speaks out of a life, mature and rich in experience and deep in sincere devotion to God.

4. Dr. Boll has never claimed to be a minister of any sect that might be called the "Church of Christ," but he recognizes the true Church, of the Lord, the Body and Bride of Christ to which all Christians belong.

5. Through the years he has labored incessantly, preaching the doctrines of Grace, and the Second Coming of
our Lord, as taught in the Scriptures.

6. His magazine, The Word and Work, is known and read throughout the world and has been the means of enlightening thousands in the things of God.

7. We say, without hesitation, that Dr. Boll is one of the most scholarly, humble, saintly and Spirit-filled men we have ever known. All Dallas will do well to hear him Sunday night.

Luther C. Peak, LL.D.

CENTRAL AUDITORIUM
Opposite Medical Arts Building on St. Paul St.

Dr. Boll’s message, advertised above, will be stenographically reported and published in The Evangelist. This weekly paper will come to you for a whole year for $1. Remit by cash, check or money order to The Evangelist, 1014 S. Ervy St., Dept. T-H, Dallas, Texas.

“The Unity of the Saints in Heaven With Those Upon the Earth” will be the pastor’s subject for the Sunday morning message at 11:00.

Bible School classes at 9:45; then the morning hour at 11:00, when there are always conversions; auditorium filled Sunday after Sunday in Dallas’ most victorious church.

The Bible broadcast hour will be heard Sunday, 10:05-10:45, direct from the church auditorium...

CENTRAL BAPTIST CHURCH

Now, Dr. Boll really knocked Dr. Peak over, so to speak! I know what the gospel preachers in Dallas and churches of Christ in Dallas think of all this. I have been to Dallas too, “since 1991.” The Boll movement in Dallas has been so closely cornered that if it gets much attention it has to look to the Baptists. It is obvious in what direction it breaks out when it has to, or smother. Do the “signs of the time” portend a new rapprochement? We shall see and comment from time to time accordingly. I have no desire to misrepresent Brother Boll, or anybody else, but I’m willing to lend some assistance, in view of his “outstanding” position, in getting him before the public as he is. Even he should not object to that. I’m just helping Dr. Peak advertise him.

Baptists are a queer people in some respects and traditionally sectarian. In view of the battles of both past and present, they naturally look with suspicion on “any sect that might be called ‘Church of Christ.’” Brother Boll must have reassured Dr. Peak along that line and he passes it on to his own people. It appears that “any sect that is called the Baptist Church or Baptist denomination scares Brother Boll a lot less than “any sect that might be called ‘Church of Christ’” scares the Baptists. It is generally known that Baptists are not overly insistent on Bible names for Bible things. If the thing they belong to was a Bible thing, they would not be under the necessity of giving it a denominational name. Dr. Peak goes out of his way, and pays advertising rates to do it, to assure his public that Brother Boll is a very broad man and will not invade their sectarian rights in any way. Of course “he recognizes the true church of the Lord, the Body and Bride of Christ to which all Christians belong.” Well, that is the church of Christ-and God. It is not a “sect.” It does include all the people of God. That is what I am a “member of.” It is not the Baptist, or any other, denomination. Dr. Peak seems to be under the impression that Brother Boll thinks the Baptist denomination is a part of it, and evidently Brother Boll has not gone out of his way to teach him any different. I am afraid he was so busy preaching “premillennialism” that he did not get around to it in that lecture he delivered in “Central Auditorium.” Obviously, Dr. Peak wants to get the idea over that anything, currently called the church of Christ, is a “sect” and Dr. Boll has nothing whatever to do with it. And it looks like Brother Boll is smiling as benignly at the Baptists as he did at the camera.

Dr. Peak is a pretty shrewd sort of a fellow. He doesn’t like “what Baptists generally designate as “Campbellism.” He is an avowed “premillennialist.” He knows his “premillennialists.” That is the reason he cabbaged on to Brother Boll. Don’t think for a minute that Dr. Peak did not scan all the angles of the case. “The Second Coming of our Lord, as taught in the Scriptures” as Dr. Peak views it, is “premillennialism” pure and simple. Dr. Boll is a twin-pea in the same pod on that question. But Baptists hold rather violently to “doctrines of Grace” that exclude baptism, or any other act of obedience, as a condition of salvation. Salvation by grace with them means a direct, operation of the Holy Spirit on the heart of a totally depraved sinner. Dr. Peak virtually told the people of Dallas in a paid advertisement that Dr. Boll agreed with him on “the doctrines of Grace.” He doubtless knows that he doesn’t, but he also knows that when a “premillennialist” faces an audience to speak on his hobby that he has a one track mind. He knew Brother Boll would not let him down, and I ‘spect he didn’t. He no doubt embellished the occasion by handing out another bundle of the same sort of tares they had regularly been getting from Dr. Peak from the pulpit and over the radio. A fitting climax to such a session would have been for Dr. Peak, Baptist, and Dr. Boll, Christian to have put their arms around each other and sung a duet. “When We ALL Get To-Jerusalem.” The hope “whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel” is “laid up for you in the heavens.” Christians look for “an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you.” The Peak-Boll coalition in Dallas is revealing, even if it is not very surprising. Wonder what sort of a speech Dr. Brewer of Lubbock, Texas could make about it? Wonder if he still thinks the churches should use Brother Boll for meetings? If Brother Boll doesn’t watch his step he may embarrass some of his friends.

Dr. Peak advises the public that “Dr. Boll’s Message, advertised above, will be stenographically reported and published in The Evangelist.” The Evangelist is Dr. Peak’s weekly paper. It occurs to me that “the doctrines of Grace, as taught in the Scriptures” rate some importance as well as “The Second Coming of our Lord, as taught in the Scriptures.” Since Brother Boll is “a Bible teacher of rare skill,” it might be well for Dr. Peak to hold him in Dallas awhile longer and give him an opportunity to develop “the doctrines of Grace” and explain fully “the true church” he is a “member of.” It would be interesting to observe whether the “rare skill” Brother Boll possesses would be equal to the task of pleasing the Baptists on these things, as well as he appears to have done on “The World Outlook.” He and his friends have insisted that he is solid as a rock on fundamentals, such as the conditions of pardon and the like. I think both Brother Armstrong and Brother Brewer would stand sponsor for him here. Dr. Peak, who thinks “Dr. Boll is one of the most scholarly, humble, saintly and Spirit-filled men we have ever known” would possibly change his mind, and decide that the Spirit of the Lord had departed from him, like Saul of old, should he open up and preach “the doctrines of Grace, as taught in the Scriptures.” Or is it possible that Dr. Peak is right about Brother Boll, and that Brother Brewer and Brother Armstrong have been deceived? According to Dr. Peak Brother Boll is a very fair specimen of “Prewmillenialist Baptists” in everything except name and “sect” membership. However, that does not seem to disturb the fellowship to any great extent. Maybe Brother Witty will tell us what he thinks of this new sort of Unity Movement where Brother Boll takes the spotlight.