THAT FRANTIC SEARCH FOR CHANGE

CLEL E. WALLACE

The erstwhile mild-mannered editor of the Gospel Advocate shows signs of increasing irritability. His references to us consist largely of snarls and growls reflecting on the honesty of our motives. If he thinks he can afford that sort of thing, we can put up with it with as good grace as anybody. We are really getting used to it. We are beginning to understand the ground of Brother Brigance's protest against some who "descend to personalities, sophistry, and argumentum ad hominem." However, we are not at all "disheartened," and "discouraged" over such developments. Such opposition has not weakened the contention we have been making.

Brother Goodpasture explains that the whooping up of the "Service Committee for Conscientious Objectors", on the editorial page of the Gospel Advocate was not written by him at all, but was written by Jimmie Lovell, and the editor of the Advocate only intended it as a "news item." I accept the correction, but a slow thinker like me naturally assumes that when a thing like that involving "consequences of such gravity" appears on the editorial page of the Advocate unsigned, it at least has the endorsement of the editor. And after reading the editor's latest growl at us, I'm not yet convinced that it doesn't. It does not at all change the relevancy of the stricture that appeared in a late issue of the Bible Banner. Whenever the Gospel Advocate gets ready to cut itself loose from the tail of Jimmie's kite, I shall graciously applaud the act.

The irritated editor snaps at us in these words:

"The editor of the Advocate is neither the author nor the sponsor of the committee. His statement in a later issue of the Advocate does not represent an "abrupt change," or any change, in his views on the matter. It is rather significant, as well as amusing, to see how anxious the 'ace writer' and the 'canny editor' are to find a change in someone. Their 'abrupt change,' in teaching rather than in practice, on the 'war question,' announced after, not before, Pearl Harbor, has involved them in consequences of such gravity that they betray their utter desperation in a frantic search for change in somebody else."

The editor's amusement appears to be somewhat sardonic, and I shall try to amuse him further. Some of the readers are likely to be genuinely amused at the editor when they recall the frantic efforts he made sometime back to exploit "a change" that he charged against the editor of the Bible Banner. He started it and it back-fired and the result is "amusing." The readers of the Advocate have doubtless observed how he is enjoying it! The "utter desperation in a frantic search" on the part of some editors and others to prove cowardly and dishonest has not escaped our notice. It is more pitiful than amusing, and even if that gun is making a lot of noise it is kicking harder than it shoots. I had rather be on the front end than the hind end of it.

The editor of the Bible Banner has effectively handled the charge of "abrupt change" in so far as it applied to him. His statements and explanations have not been universally accepted in good faith. The Gospel Advocate, for instance, has virtually called him a liar, and attributed other motives to him that he specifically disavows. The editor charges that I too have changed. I do not charge him with intentionally mis-stating the facts in the case. I really do not think he did so with malice aforethought. I think "it was just downright ignorance" as Brother Brigance would say. It may be there was a spice of "frantic desperation" involved. But I do think he should "be careful." I have voted and taken some part in government affairs since I was of age., I took the same position in the first World War as to the right of Christians to engage in military service, I have taken in this one. I even argued the case with my father. However, had I changed over to Brother Goodpasture's position, I take it he would not have questioned my motives, as he has Foy's. Brother Goodpasture is a little clumsy in the art of abuse. He should turn that part over to Brother Dorris. He might publish that letter I received from Brother Dorris, for instance, in which he declared that we "are 'too crooked for material for corkscrews,'" An "announcement" of the proposed publication of those letters appeared some time back on the editorial page of the Gospel Advocate, as a "news item," I suppose, and Brother Goodpasture wrote it. I'm sure he could not say what Brother Dorris has said, but he can say: "Them's my sentiments." In spite of all this, I do not think Brother Goodpasture is a bad man. I just think he is wrong and somewhat frantic and desperate about it. I hope that even the readers of the Advocate who agree with him will not take him too seriously. He is really a very nice gentleman when he is in a good humor, and he is except when he thinks of us. Then he sees red and goes blind.

When he has a spell like that the result is the same, whether he grabs pen or scissors. He clipped a "news item" from a contemporary, who is also having spells, and inserts it on the editorial page of the Gospel Advocate. It has to do with my father and my youngest brother. The only 'war question', involved in this is war on us. So mote it be. We are ready to meet this new attack without hedging or dodging. We shall not juggle with facts. My father, God bless him, does not fully agree with...
For the proof of such a theory, the twentieth chapter of Revelation is certainly an inadequate proof-text. Yet it is the only text that makes mention of a thousand years reign. No apostle in any epistle to any church or to any Christian ever taught such a thing in writing to them on Christian life and hope and duty. And Rev. 20 is wholly lacking in the material with which to construct an earthly millennium. Upon examination, any observant reader can see that the passage does not mention (1) the second coming of Christ, or (2) a reign on the earth, or (3) a literal throne, of David’s or any other, or (4) Jerusalem of Palestine or any other earthly capital, or (5) a bodily resurrection, or (6) a conquest of all nations on earth for a reign over the whole world, or (7) there is no mention of us, but specifically the souls of them that were beheaded, or (8) no reference to Christ on earth, and (9) no mention of anything the theory obligates the theorists to prove.

It is a common saying that the Bible means “exactly” what it says, and theorists boast of “taking Revelation 20 as it stands.” But they do not take Revelation 20 “as it stands,” and it would not support their theory if they did. The saying that “the Bible means exactly what it says” is never true when things are spoken of in figurative language. Take for instance the figurative language in the 19th and 20th chapters alone. (1) The white horse (2) war and armies (3) rod of iron (4) birds flying to the supper of God (5) eating the flesh of kings (6) beasts, dragons, with tail that reached to the sky (7) the angel coming down (8) key and chain (9) dragon bound, body filled earth, tail reached the sky, bound with a literal chain (10) bottomless pit-literally without a bottom? (11) shut, sealed, air tight? (12) thrones-like the Pope’s and king of England? (13) beheaded-if literal, it cuts us out, if figurative, it cuts the millennium out (14) image and mark (15) prison and millennium (16) image and mark (17) prison and millennium (18) fire and brimstone (19) binding and loosing (20) dragon bound, body filled earth, tail reached the sky, bound with a literal chain and then (21) bottomless pit-literally without a bottom? (22) shut, sealed, air tight? (23) (24) thrones-like the Pope’s and king of England? (25) beheaded-if literal, it cuts us out, if figurative, it cuts the millennium out (26) image and mark (27) prison and millennium (28) image and mark (29) prison and millennium (30) fire and brimstone (31) binding and loosing (32) dragon bound, body filled earth, tail reached the sky, bound with a literal chain.

Shall we literalize all of these? Oh no, neither do they-with them it is all figurative, except the thousand years, and that is absolutely literal!

The obvious and fundamental principles of exegesis forbid that the thousand years be given a literal meaning. It is not so understood in other places where the expression is used. David said that God remembered his covenant, or word, to “a thousand generations.” Does that mean that at the end of a literal thousand generations God will not remember his word? Or, rather does it not indicate that God’s memory of his word is infinite, complete, and perfect.

If the thousand years of Rev. 20 is literal, then the reign of Christ will be for one thousand years only.

If that be true, then since they “lived” and “reigned” a thousand years-since lived and reigned, are both limited by the thousand years, it follows that both the living and the reigning will cease-and they therefore cease to live at the end of the thousand years. That is not a very comforting millennium after all, is it?

The only ones who participated in this living and reigning were the “souls of them that were beheaded”-a limited number-and “the rest of the dead lived not.” Then there could be no preaching to or judgment of sinners during the millennium-yet “judgment was given” to those who reigned. Whom did they judge, and how? The wicked nations are supposed to have been destroyed, and the wicked dead were not living, yet the reigning saints are said to judge somebody-who and how?

If the expression “lived and reigned” means that the souls were given literal bodies for the millennium, then when it says that the “rest of the dead lived not” until the thousand years was finished, it would have to mean that the “rest of the dead” would be given literal bodies at end of the thousand years, which will force the resurrection of the wicked too soon, before the time of the general resurrection, which comes after the little season, according to their theory.

The truth is the passage does not describe a period of blessings to be enjoyed at the close of this dispensation. This can be seen from the following considerations:

(1) The word resurrection is used in a figurative sense. Let us make some comparisons. In the twenty-sixth chapter of Isaiah, verses 13 to 19, we have a similar use of both the word and the idea in resurrection. In reference to the wicked lords who had dominion over Israel, the prophet said: “0. Lord our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us; but by thee only will we make mention of thy name. They are dead, they shall not live; they are deceased, they shall not rise.” Does that mean that the wicked shall not rise from the dead at all? No. It refers to the dominion of the wicked lords-they would not exercise their dominion again-it is a figurative use of the word. But again, the prophet continues: “Thy dead men shall live”-that is, God’s people, who were dead while in the dominion of the wicked lords, should live when the dominion of those wicked lords over them was destroyed. Hence, “Therefore hast thou visited and destroyed them, and made their memory to perish.” But the prophet called it a resurrection, when it was not a literal resurrection at all.

The foregoing figurative use of the words “dead” and “live” and “rise” is a perfect parallel with the use of the same words in Revelation 20. They are figurative resurrections. The fact that John had to specify the thing that he was talking about as a resurrection is the proof that it was being used in an unusual sense. This is the first resurrection—why did he have to tell them that it was a resurrection?. Because it was not a literal use of the term, it was metaphorical, not physical, and therefore, had to be explained.
In Rev. 3: 11 John told the ones addressed that to overcome their persecutions would exempt them from the second death. But in Rev. 20 to have part in the first resurrection would exempt them from the second death. “Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other.”

1. Overcoming their persecutions equals exemption from the second death. 2. Part in the first resurrection equals exemption from the second death. They are equal to the same thing, they are therefore equal to each other, and the first resurrection of Rev. 20 was the same thing as victory over the persecutions of Rev. 3: 11.

Just as the resurrection of Isaiah 26 meant victory over the wicked lords who once had dominion over the ones referred to by the prophet, so the resurrection of Rev. 20 refers to overcoming the persecutors and the triumph over defeat. Taking the souls out from under the altar (Rev. 6: 9) and elevating them to thrones (Rev. 20), in John’s vision, was represented as a resurrection.

The deliverance of God’s people from oppression in Isa. 26 was described as a resurrection—“they shall rise.” The destruction of the oppressors was referred to in like symbol—“they shall not rise (or be restored).” So it is with Rev. 20. There is the alternate revival of wickedness and the triumph of the cause of the persecuted saints, martyrs—but the victory belonged to the “souls of them that were beheaded” and “they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years”—denoting that their victory was complete, and their reward infinite.

The passage will not bear the literal construction and any theory that is built on such a construction becomes a mere glorified air castle, which is bound to collapse.

Finally, of the dead in verses 11-15, it is said that some were found in the book of life, and some were not found in the book of life. If this refers to the judgment of the wicked after the millennium, as claimed, there would be no use to “open books,” when the millennium is over, to see if those resurrected at the end of the millennium were found in the book of life, for all the righteous had been raised before the millennium in order to enter it and the wicked dead were the only ones that remained at the end of the millennium, hence, their names would not be expected to be found in the book of life! So that upsets that angle of their theory! There is no evidence that Christ is on earth between verses 4 and 11 of the chapter, as the millennialists contend.

The evidence points to the fact that the whole contents of the book of Revelation were fulfilled in the experiences of the churches to whom the message was addressed, and the historical events of the period in which these churches lived furnished the counterpart to all the symbols of the book.

Whatever application may be made to us today must be only in the spiritual sense. We enter that reign in the same sense that we share his throne and his kingdom, in a spiritual sense. Such is the portion of every true believer in any age. We share the life of our risen Lord, through obedience to his commands (Rom. 6: 3-5); we reign with him through righteousness (Rom. 5: 17); and through enduring the sufferings of the Christian life while we live here. (2 Tim. 2: 12) All such passages refer to character in this present life. There are many ways of reigning with Christ. We are kings and priests now. (Rev. 1: 6) We reign in life through righteousness (Rom. 5: 17). We reign with the apostles in spiritual life apart from worldly pride. (1 Cor. 4: 8) We reign by righteousness, as we execute Christ’s laws and decisions in our own lives. (1 Cor. 3: 10). We reign with him by enduring sufferings as we live with him. (1 Tim. 2: 12) We reign with him by overcoming. (Rev. 3: 21) That this reign is in process now is seen by a comparison of these various statements of scripture. Jesus said, “he that eateth shall live.” (Jno. 5: 27) Does that mean that the spiritual life referred to as “shall live” is future? Do we not have spiritual life now? Certainly. It means, then, that as we eat we live in this present state. Can we not have spiritual life now? Of course we can. It is evident from the text that those who overcame were “in the book of life” and those who were not found in the book of life! So it is with Rev. 20. We reign with him by enduring sufferings as we live with him. (2 Tim. 2: 12) We reign with him by overcoming. (Rev. 3: 21) That this reign is in process now is seen by a comparison of these various statements of scripture. Jesus said, “he that eateth shall live.” (Jno. 5: 27) Does that mean that the spiritual life referred to as “shall live” is future? Do we not have spiritual life now? Certainly. It means, then, that as we eat we live in this present state. Can we not have spiritual life now? Of course we can. It is evident from the text that those who overcame were “in the book of life” and those who were not found in the book of life!

On Renouncing War

P. W. STONESTREET

In his bond-selling speech over the radio Sept. 8, 1943, President Roosevelt made a statement that is in point here when he very aptly and significantly remarked: “The money you lend and the money you give in taxes buys that death-dealing, life-saving power we need for victory.”

Regardless of any reservations that may be had relative to certain phases of the New Deal or any political bias that may exist, the man does not live who can successfully gainsay that statement of the commander in chief of “that death-dealing, life-saving power.” It expresses an exact truth that should challenge the attention of all whose head (reason) has been overcome by their heart (sentiment) on this subject.

That is exactly the purpose that such power serves in God’s realm of force. To approach such manias as the leaders of the Axis powers with the gospel plea for righteousness would, at this time, violate the inspired injunction: “neither cast your pearls before the swine, lest haply they trample them under their feet, and turn and rend you.” The thing to cast at them, under present circumstances, is more death-dealing power that its life-saving power may accrue to civilization; and all who buy war bonds have their part in it. Nevertheless, Harry Emerson Fosdick, in settling his account with the unknown soldier several years ago, as quoted by the Gospel Advocate of August 26, 1943, says among other things: “I renounce war, and never again, directly or indirectly, will I sanction or support another.” This shows to what extremes even able men will go when sentiment has, at least temporarily, dethroned reason.

All normally-minded people renounce the causes of war. But to unqualifiedly renounce war, as Mr. Fosdick did, is to renounce both sides, including its life-saving aspect, or else that renunciation assumes there is no life-saving aspect to war. If he and those who endorse his rash statement would move over into Poland or a few other countries for a few months they might realize that war with all its horrors, when resistance is sufficiently strong, has a very definite “life-saving” aspect.
MORE ON POST-WAR PLANS

CLED E. WALLACE

The following excellent article from Brother Johnson expresses well the reaction of many preachers and church- es to some of the plans and schemes that are being born in these restless times. Brother Johnson lives in the west. He is a native of New Mexico and is “the competent preacher” of the church in Roswell, New Mexico. I do not know just how well qualified the elders of that church are, but I take it that they compare favorably with those of church- es that are volunteering to “sponsor” plans for other churches to adopt. Allen Johnson is a well-read, thought- ful man of wide experience. He knows enough about the history of his native state to write a text-book on it. He is a graduate of Abilene Christian- College and a veteran of World War I. He speaks the Mexican language fluently and has done a lot of work among Mexicans in his state. You may note also that he thought Brother Goodpasture wrote that “news item” which appeared on the editorial page of the Gospel Advocate. I think nearly everybody else did, until the editor rather irritably told us otherwise. The editor should be more “careful.” An editor with a thin skin is doomed beforehand to unnecessary suffering. You will enjoy Brother Johnson’s article. We hope to have him in our columns often.

MISSION WORK AND SERVICE COMMITTEES

ALLEN E. JOHNSON

Quite a bit has been said recently by Brother G. C. Brewer and others about “missionary” work in the post- war world. The idea that I gather is that some brethren at Lubbock, Abilene, and the West Coast are contemplating the evangelization of Europe after the war. Europe being a part of “all nations,” it is perfectly proper to preach the gospel there under the Great Commission. This “plan” that Brother Brewer talks about may create an interest in a world-wide spreading of the gospel in its purity: if so, then it will be fine, but the general tenor of the language used and some of the “dust” stirred up over it, rather gets in my eyes. Quite a few brethren have always been over eager to fall for fanciful and visionary schemes. On the face of it, it seems to me that it will lull churches into thinking that nothing very important can be done now, so just “mark time” till the time comes to put the “plan” into motion. Just before his ascension, the Lord told his apostles that they should be his “witnesses in Jerusalem, all Judea, Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth.” The gospel was to spread in ever-widening circles till it reached the farthest corners of the earth. Applying this principle here given by the Lord, we should cover the United States with the gospel, and the world with their millions who have never heard the truth. Why hasn’t someone enthusiasts himself over these people who are our neighbors; our “Judea and Samaria”? For several years our own government has been emphasizing the “good neighbor” policy toward these peoples. What could evoke a more neighborly policy than to send them the gospel in its purity? Here is something to do here and now! My friend John Wolfe and his co- laborers have labored for years on a “shoe string” to get the gospel into Mexico, yet how many have worked up plans to help them adequately? Maybe it is because “the landscape holds no charm and distance lends no en- chantment” down Mexico way.

But why all this talk about “missionaries”? Who is a “missionary” anyway? We read in the New Testament about “apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers,” but no mention is made of “missionaries.” But some will say with a snort, that “a missionary is a per- son on a mission for Christ.” Maybe that’s why so many “missionaries” have “gone haywire” on foreign fields; they were “missionaries” instead of evangelists.

But the really surprising thing to me is that “the de- mand for more to be written on this subject has been great, and the writer has received calls to come to various places and speak upon the subject and fully set forth the plan.” What kind of preaching have these brethren who wrote Brother Brewer been listening to all these Years? Haven’t the preachers they heard ever preached on the Great Commission? It seems to me that it reveals a very serious defect in somebody’s preaching. Brother, the “plan” is fully set forth in the Great Commission given by our Lord and recorded in Matt. 28: 18-20; Mark 16:15, 16; Luke 24:46-49; Acts 1:8.

Recognizing this, Brother Brewer in his article in the Gospel Advocate of July 8, 1943, “More About the After- the-War Missionary Program And Other Postwar Prob- lems,” says, “The plan is for each church to act independ- ently in the matter. Each one will save money according to its ability and according to the interest that may be elicited among the members by the elders, deacons, teachers, or any other person who may have influence with the members.” Then why try to make this “plan” appear to be some new “get up”? Any member who reads his New Testament already knows the plan as given therein. The principle of the autonomy of each New Testament congre- gation is too well understood by all who are interested in this question to require a repitition of it here.

But Brother Brewer seems surprised that brethren keep writing to him about it since, “it was never the purpose of the Lubbock church to act as agent for any- body, and we do not want money sent to us. No such thing was intimated in our former article, but inquiries have been received.” It seems to me that if Brother Brewer will reread his “former article” that he can see where some of the brethren got the idea. He says in his “former article” (Firm Foundation of Feb. 16, 1943, page 2) under heading, “Lubbock Church Sponsors This Plan:” “The elders of the Broadway church at Lubbock have considered this work for some weeks and have decided to accept the suggestion of the brethren and stand respon- sible for the work that is here outlined.” (Emphasis mine, A. E. J.) Is the Broadway church at Lubbock the only one responsible for the Great Commission being carried out? For after all, that is the only “plan” advanced by Brother Brewer.
Now the churches all over the country have for the past several years been the victims of all kinds of "co-operative" efforts to spread the gospel in various places. Some church or preacher finds a place where there is no church and immediately sits down, plans a "campaign to visit the churches" in a certain section or sections to raise funds for the project. It strikes at the very heart of congregational independence in that it brings pressure from the outside to bear on the churches to do a given work, instead of letting the pressure come from the inside and move outward, as the Lord indicated it should. The program of churches is constantly being upset by some well-meaning brother who has a "plan" for doing "mission work." If it be thought that the elders ought not to let so many "beggars" "fleece the flock," then consider this: that it is often some friend or preacher well known to them and they "feel" they can't turn him down. It is time that all of us began giving more time, thought, and teaching to "God's plan" of preaching the gospel in the light of the teaching of the New Testament on congregational autonomy.

It reveals a serious weakness in somebody's preaching and teaching when all of the "plans" and "sponsoring" are circulated freely in the press of the brotherhood.

Passing from post-war "plans" to the "Service Committee For Conscientious Objectors," it reveals the same general tendency to get away from the teaching of the New Testament on the autonomy of each church, a dissatisfaction with God's way, and to set up unscriptural organizations for doing benevolent work. Why preach against the "United Christian Missionary Society" of the Christian Church and say that the church is the only "missionary society needed" to carry the gospel to the lost, and then turn right around and organize an unscriptural "committee" for doing benevolent work, even granting that it is the "duty" of the churches to do such work? The tribe is increasing alarmingly fast among us that is dissatisfied with God's way of doing things. It is the same old sectarian idea of improving on God's plan that we have fought for over a hundred years. If allowed to pursue its course, it will lead to the organization of a committee one of these days that will not choose to disband, since it exists by its own authority. It is human wisdom and condemned by the New Testament.

J. M. McCaleb, T. H. Bumstead, R. N. Squire, Wade Ruby, Boyd Field, and James L. Lovell "have dedicated themselves as servants to assist in this work and see that it is handled in a business like manner." (Emphasis mine, A. E. J.) It is time that they and all others should "see" that it is not their business to meddle in the affairs of the churches in a "businesslike manner" or in any other manner. In this case a "businesslike manner" is not the New Testament manner. "We purpose to keep the church informed concerning how many of our brethren are in camps." "We" the "Committee For Conscientious Objectors" propose to "keep the churches informed." It is high time that the churches of the New Testament order "inform" this "Committee" to disband and that each church will formulate its own program of work and spend its own money in its own way to carry it out. "Wherever people have learned of our plans (Emphasis mine, A. E. J.) responses have been enthusiastic and generous." Whose plans? Not the plans of the churches, but "our plans;" the plans made by an unscriptural committee existing by no higher authority than the men who organized it and compose it; founded on purely human wisdom and reasoning, and in defiance of every New Testament principle governing the churches of Christ in such matters. But we are told that "when this particular work is completed, this committee will be disbanded." What assurance have we of that? Why, the assurance of one of those interested in forming the committee! That indicates to me that Brother Goodpasture was a little uneasy as to how those who know their New Testaments would take the matter.

When men get the consent of their own minds to set up machinery for doing church work not authorized by the New Testament, what assurance has any one that they will not go on to more extreme lengths and form all sorts of "committees" for doing the Lord's work?

It reminds me of a salesman selling razor blades who said in his sales talk that the president of the company himself recommended them! Another fear in the mind of Brother Goodpasture is expressed thus: "It has not been formed to advance any teaching (Emphasis mine, A.E.J.) for or against war, but simply to care for our brethren regardless of where they might be and to protect the good name of the church in which we place our hope." We read of a man back in Old Testament times by the name of Uzzah who had about the same sort of notion of the fitness of things divine. To organize a "committee" to "protect the good name of the church" reveals that he thinks the church needs "propping up" a little here and there. Another surprising thing in this statement is, "It has not been formed to advance any teaching for or against war." Now a thing that is neither "for nor against" smacks a whole lot like the digressive argument "for" instrumental music in worship. But just here another thing arises in the minds of many. Did these young men who were willing to accept food and shelter from the "Historic Peace Churches" have very much concern about the "good name of the church" to start with? Are we to understand that every time a group of brethren get off on the wrong foot and do unscriptural things that a "Service Committee" is to be formed to "protect the good name of the church" and "wipe out the stigma" attaching to such a course? I trow not.

But Brother Goodpasture further says, "We know there are thousands who feel (Emphasis mine, A. E. J.) about this as we do, including boys in the service, parents of boys in the service, those on both extremes of the war question." Through the whole thing there has been too much of what somebody "feels" or the assurance of one of those interested in forming the committee! That indicates to me that these who know their New Testaments would take the matter.

Brethren, if churches of the New Testament pattern allow a gap to be let down and this proposition of raising and distributing funds for conscientious objectors, or for any other purpose, to be turned over to a "committee" to go unchallenged, and large numbers of brethren and church-es enter into such a procedure, then the way is paved for any number of "committees" to be formed for doing any work of the church.

"Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip." Heb. 2:1.
PERSONAL

There are two things that I hope always to be man enough to do-first, to modify or change my stand on any question when by investigation I find that the truth requires it; and, second, to be willing to apologize to any one whom I may have wronged.

Sometime ago, in connection with the discussion of certain questions, the Bible Banner printed some articles that contained reflections on the personal integrity of Brother C. R. Nichol, in attributing to him exterior motives in some of his statements in his book, “God’s Woman.” I have not accepted some of the views set forth in this book, but I do believe in the complete sincerity and honesty of its author. I do not believe that he wrote anything to please any class in the church. If I believed that he did such a thing I could not have any confidence in him, whereas I do hold him in confidence and respect and I have never doubted his complete loyalty in heart to the word of God.

It is one thing to discuss a question; it is quite another thing to question a man’s honesty in discussion. Regardless of intent, statements containing such implications appeared in the Bible Banner, and they should not have been published.

I am indebted to my father and G. H. P. Showalter, to R. L. Whiteside and C. R. Nichol, for whatever I may know. They have been my teachers-all of them. It is not required of me, even by them, to accept every point and detail of their teaching-though I did, and do, accept by far the most that they ever taught me, the value of which has been inestimable to me. When I was a lad of sixteen attending Thorp Spring Christian College, I missed a week of school (without permission) to stay through the Nichol-Lockhart debate in a neighboring county. I was disciplined by the school, my father concurring with the president, in prescribing the punishment, until Brother Nichol interceded in my behalf, suggesting that they “lay off” on the ground that I had learned more in “one week” at that debate than I would have learned “all year” in the school! His appeal got results-with my father, if not with the school. I am still using information that I obtained in that debate.

The personal emotions involved in this statement have their origin in family and fraternal ties. Among the earliest recollections of my childhood are things connected with the friendship between Brother Nichol and my father. That friendship has not waned with the years and will endure until “death do them part,” which cannot be many years as we count time, for my father is seventy-two; Brother Nichol a number of years younger.

Out of that friendship grew other ties-a similar relation between Brother Nichol and my father’s sons, particularly Cled. For years Brother Nichol and Cled have been inseparable friends.

When our mother went to heaven, in 1913, Brother Nichol and Brother Showalter were called by my father to speak the words that would help to heal our hearts. Brother Nichol was overcome with emotion and Brother M. O. Daley completed the talk. But we have not forgotten the words that Brother Nichol in such emotion did say. I remember his words as if they were spoken yesterday.

In their early years my father and Brother Nichol labored much together in the gospel. And it was “labor.” I know of an instance years ago when they went from Texas to Oklahoma together to hold a debate with a Mormon. There were no members of the church there. They were entertained in a sectarian home. They did not get expenses for their trip, to say nothing of the ten days work—and they knew before they went. But they went, gladly, and none of us ever heard either of them complain about it. That is only one example out of many that could be related, of the things they did because they loved the Lord and His Cause—the Lord and the Cause they still love.

If anyone should say that my father wrote a book, or an article, or preached a sermon to please a certain class of people, I would resent it—and would deal with it. Brother Nichol is not thin-skinned, and he does not take exceptions when his views on any matter are put to the test of discussion. But when it is intimated that he wrote things in a book, or anywhere else, to please a certain element—that such was his object, rather than to teach what he believed was the truth, such could only mean that he would be seeking to please men rather than God, and a conscientious man could not lightly pass by such a charge. All of us who know Brother Nichol know that his entire life has been the very opposite of that and is, in fact, a sufficient denial of it.

Due to the relations that have existed through the years between Brother Nichol and my father, and Cled and me, it doubtless inflicted a deeper wound for such things to be printed in a paper published by one of us, and as I am the one who furnished the medium, I am making a forthright apology, unreserved and unqualified, for permitting anything to appear in the Bible Banner in any article, whether my own or another’s, that reflected directly or indirectly on the sincerity, honesty, and integrity of C. R. Nichol.

This has nothing to do with any discussion of issues. It is simply an apology-when we fight, we fight; and when we apologize, we apologize.—Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

We Extend Sympathy

This titanic war for human freedom is bound to bring tragedy into many of our homes. Lt. Henry B. Roberson, Marine corps pilot was recently killed in a plane crash off our east coast. This heroic young man was twenty-two years old, the son of Brother and Sister Charles H. Roberson of Abilene, Texas. Brother Roberson is head of the Bible department of Abilene Christian College. Lt. Roberson got his wings in the Marine corps just a few weeks before my young son, John, got his in the Army Air force. This quite naturally heightened my feeling in connection with the tragedy that descended upon the Roberson family. I visited the family soon after the tragedy and was profoundly touched by their heroism in the face of such sorrow. Heroic sons call for heroic parents. People such as they are make this country great. Brother Roberson assured me that he could not even think of such a thing as enjoying the fruits of citizenship in our great country without bearing the responsibilities that go along with it, including its necessary tragedies. Many of us feel exactly like that. About a week after his son was buried, the Robersons gave up a grandchild, the two year-old daughter of another son sickened and died. We devoutly believe that this stricken family are receiving the sustaining grace of God in these trials. They have from us the deepest sympathy we are capable of feeling and expressing.

I think it proper in this connection to mention that the Abilene Reporter-News of August 15th lists “Ninety-four ex-students of Abilene Christian college” who “are now serving as officers in the United States.” There are doubtless many others serving as enlisted men in the ranks. We pray for the time to come when these men may return to civil life again, proud of the service they have rendered their country in time of war, and ready for what we hope will be greater service in a world at peace.
**"A Tribute To A Good Woman"**

I am adding my word to the many tributes being paid to a good woman. Sister Showalter was a woman of faith. She believed the Bible and followed its teaching. She was a true wife to her illustrious husband and the mother of a large family of children who occupy a useful place in society and the church. She loved her husband, her children, was sober-minded, chaste, kind and a worker at home. Her life reminds me of many things in the New Testament regarding the character of a good woman. She was intelligent and reverent and her adorning was "in the incorruptible apparel of a meek and a quiet spirit, which is in the sight of God of great price." She will surely have a place among the redeemed.

The Showalter and Wallace families have been close to each other. Brother Showalter and my father have been friends from the time of boyhood. They lived close together and worked together in the long ago. Sister Showalter and my mother were friends and neighbors when their children were small. They loved each other as two of a kind would. When my mother died many years ago, Brother Showalter and Brother Nichol paid touching tributes at that last sad service. I recall that it was with the greatest difficulty that they were able to control their emotions to complete the service. The reading included: "A worthy woman who can find? for her price is far above rubies." Sister Showalter was such a woman. She lived to see her children grown and knew the thrill of the embraces of grandchildren. She leaves them all a rich heritage of hope and the sweetest of memories.

As for Brother Showalter, his faith in the promises of God and his loyalty to the truth of the New Testament, will enable him to be far more grateful than regretful in the loneliness of bereavement. He has, we devoutly hope, some years of useful service ahead of him. The grave which lies somewhere ahead of him can be viewed with calm and confidence and taken in stride. In this connection I am reminded of some immortal lines from Robert Browning which he wrote after the death of his wife. I quote from memory as I do not have the volume at hand:

"Fear death? To feel the fog in my throat, the mist in my face, when the snows begin, and the blasts denote I am nearing the place; Where he stands, the Arch-fear in a visible form; yet the strong man must go. For the journey is done, and the summit's attained, and the barriers fall; Though a battle's to fight ere the guerdon be gained, the reward of it all. I was ever a fighter: so-one fight more, the best and the last; I would hate that death bandaged my eyes and forbore, and bade me creep past; No, let me taste the whole of it, fare like my peers, the heroes of old. Bear the brunt, in a minute pay glad life's arrears of pain, darkness and cold. For sudden, the worst turns the best to the brave, the black minute's at end. The element's rage, the fiend voices that rave shall dwindle, shall blend, shall change, Shall become first a peace out of pain then a light, then thy breast; O, thou soul of my soul, I shall clasp thee again, And with God be the rest!"

—Cled E. Wallace

**McGarvey And Johnson (F. E. W. Jr.)**

The Gospel Advocate recently asserted that so far as they knew only two representative men connected with the history of the church in this country held the views on civil and military government that have been set forth in the Bible Banner. We challenged their statement and produced the proof that the Advocate had erred, and we have more proof, just as strong, if and when it is needed.

In an effort to break the force of our evidence in this case, the Advocate tells its readers that B. W. Johnson was only "about twenty-eight years old" when he replied to the "Manifesto" against war which was signed by some notable brethren, including J. W. McGarvey. But the Advocate failed to mention that McGarvey was about the same age when he signed the manifesto to which Johnson replied. Was this another oversight, or was it "downright ignorance" again?

It was in the year 1861, the year of the manifesto against the war between the states, and the year of Johnson's reply to it, that McGarvey was writing his renowned Commentary on Acts. The author's preface reveals that he and Johnson were very near the same age. If the Advocate seeks to discredit Johnson's reply to the manifesto on war, because of his age, will they not be compelled to discredit McGarvey also as a signatory of the document to which Johnson replied? "If not, why not?"

We are next told that the sentence from Johnson's comments on Rom. 13 that "we should not obey wicked magistrates when they command us to disobey God"—indicates that Johnson changed his views when he had "older grown." But there is no contradiction in that statement and his earlier contention that a Christian may, under certain circumstances, bear the sword without disobeying God. Nobody believes that we should ever obey "wicked magistrates," or anybody else, when they "command us to disobey God." The efforts on this point are a pitiful begging of the question.

If the Advocate thinks it finds in Johnson's comments a faint intimation that he later changed his views—what would the later statement of J. W. McGarvey on the right of resistance indicate to them? Lest this should also be "overlooked" we again refer the Advocate to McGarvey's comments on the Sermon On The Mount in his Fourfold Gospel.

"This command which enjoins non-resistance, like most of the other precepts of this sermon, does not demand of us absolute, unqualified pacifity at all times and under all circumstances. ... Absolute non-resistance may so far encourage crime as to become a sin ... "Self-preservation is a law of God giving rights, which under most circumstances, a Christian can claim. He may resist the robber, the assassin and all men of that ilk, and may protect his person and his possessions against the assaults of the violent and the lawless (Acts 10:35-38)."

That is what McGarvey said on the subject of non-resistance when he had "older grown." And he gave the case of Paul as an example. There is not one sentence in the comments of B. W. Johnson on Rom. 13 that contradicts his reply to the manifesto on war in 1861, or that contradicts the position of the Bible Banner now. But the later statement of J. W. McGarvey certainly is against the non-resistance position of brethren Brigance and Goodpasture.

As for his credentials as a historian, which Brother Brigance says he did not know that he had, the catalog of Freed-Hardeman College lists him as professor of religious history. He has for ten years been the editor of a department on church history in the Gospel Advocate. (Continued on page 16)
PROGRESS OF THE UNITY MOVEMENT

W. CURTIS PORTER

Before me lies the second issue of "The Christian Unity Quarterly" of which Claude F. Witty, of the Church of Christ, and James DeForest Murch, of the Christian Church, are joint-editors. This quarterly tells of the plans and progress of the Unity Movement, perhaps more accurately and more unfavorably known as the Murch-Witty Movement. This movement began in Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1936. The leaders of the movement are the present editors of this quarterly. It had as its purpose the unifying of the conservative element in the Christian Churches with the Churches of Christ. Since it has been launched four National Unity Meetings have been held and much has been said about it in religious papers, in bulletins and in various ways. But what progress has been made toward the accomplishment of the purpose for which it was begun. Perhaps we can find out something about it if we read some of the statements made in this quarterly. But from all outward appearances that I have seen, it seems that the Christian Church has been the victor in all of these efforts and that unity is no nearer than when the movement first began, except where members of Churches of Christ have moved closer to the position held by the Christian Church. Vital differences exist between the two bodies of people. These differences destroyed the fellowship in the first place. And the only Scriptural way for unity is for these differences to be removed. But so far there has been no removal of unauthorized practices from the work and worship of the Christian Church.

Time For Action

Let Brother Witty tell us something of the progress made. On page 36 of the quarterly he says:

"Enough time has been spent in preliminary work. What we need is action."

I believe he is on the right road here. It does seem to me that enough time has been spent in preliminary work. This admits that all the work done thus far has been preliminary, and I should think that seven years of preliminary work, with four National Meetings included in the preliminaries, ought to be enough for any such movement. So the time has come for action, thinks Brother Witty. And I verily believe the time is ripe for action on the part of the leaders of the movement. James DeForest Murch and Claude F. Witty have been working for seven years in preliminary work, and they themselves are no closer together than when they started. Have these two mighty leaders of the movement reached an agreement on unity yet? Are they united? I would just like to have them tell us. What did Murch give up that brought them closer together? And what did Witty surrender? In fact, has either of them given up anything? Are they not still divided? Well, if the two leaders can't get together in seven years of work, how do they expect to merge the two bodies of people. Yes, it is time for action; and Murch and Witty are the men to begin. Let them get together and then tell us about it.

With Or Without

To give you some idea about what the Christian Church preachers think about it, read this from the pen of J. F. Bellville of Elmira, N. Y. He says:

"In my beginning ministry in Alabama I served on a circuit of two churches that had organs and three that did not, and I had no trouble; I could do the same again. If your heart is as my heart, give me your hand."

Well, my heart is not as his heart, and I cannot extend my hand to him. On this ground the Christian Church is willing to unite. If you are willing to work with the organ or without it, they are ready to accept you. But many of them have always claimed that you can worship God acceptably without the instrument as well as with it. So if I give them my hand on this proposition, they are surrendering nothing. To me the instrument is an addition to the worship of the Lord, as revealed in Eph. 5:19, and we are not left to do as we please about it. But I wonder what Brother Witty will say to this fellow.

Brother Witty, is your heart as his heart, and did you extend to him your hand? Brother Witty claims to represent a brotherhood movement, and many in the brotherhood have been demanding for a long time that he tell us what he will do with the instrument question, but as far as I have seen his statements, I do not recall any answer that he has made to the demand. So I am insisting that Brother Witty tell us if he can do as this New York Christian Church preacher-preach for churches both with and without the organs. The brethren have a right to know about it, if he expects them to follow him in this movement. So let him break his silence about it and give us the information.

Leave It To The Majority

This is the solution given by 0. P. Spiegel of Montgomery, Alabama. He says:

"Personally I believe that every subject not specifically laid down in the New Testament should be left to the majority in each local congregation and then all should stand together — location of churches, style of architecture, cost, round or shaped notes, aids in any and every way to worship, individual communion cups — and I pledge to work with the majority in any congregation of which I am a member whether it is according to my ideas or not.

It isn't hard to tell where this fellow stands. He classes instruments of music — which he calls aids to worship — in a class with communion cups, round or shaped notes, and the architecture of a building. He throws all of these together and declares the matter should be determined by the wishes of the majority of the congregation. It is an easy matter to show that musical instruments cannot be classed with the things with which he puts them, but I am not arguing that point now. I am just looking to see how the Unity Movement is progressing. And if what this digressive preacher says about it is any evidence, the movement can be consummated quickly if those identified with Churches of Christ will cease their opposition to such "aids to worship" and let the majority in the congregation settle the matter. Is that what it is coming to? Has Brother Witty been working with them for seven years in "preliminary work" and yet has not made them understand that in order to have unity such unauthorized "aids to worship," which caused the division in the first place, will have to be given up? Or can it be possible that Brother Witty intends to meet them on their grounds? Is he willing for the majority in each congregation to settle the question? He ought to tell us something about this that we may know which way the Unity Movement moves.
The Digressives Have Something

In a foot-note, or at least in a small paragraph at the bottom of the page, the following report occurs in the Unity Quarterly:

“George Roberts, preaching for the ‘organ’ church at Willisburg, Ky., has revived a non-organ church out that way; had a wonderful meeting with somewhere around 60 renewals, and baptisms, and has a special meeting of some kind set for June. Says he likes the organ, but doesn’t want one in that church, — showing once more something among the ‘digressives’ that the radicals don’t know anything about.”

I don’t know who put this report in the paper, but it had to pass the inspection of the editors, one of which is Claude F. Witty. So it passed into the quarterly with his indorsement — and the very wording of it shows it to be an editorial report. Thus Brother Witty gives his indorsement to the idea that “the digressives have something that the radicals don’t know anything about.” The “digressives” are those who have digressed from the truth and have added mechanical instruments to their worship. And I suppose the “radicals” are those who are opposed to such. And this digressive, organ-grinding preacher, likes the organ but doesn’t want one in the church he has revived near Willisburg, Ky. That is, he doesn’t want one now, for the majority would probably be opposed to it. But if later the majority became in favor of it, of course, the preacher who likes the organ would want one there. Until then, however, he can worship with it or without it. So he has something the radicals don’t know anything about. And it seemed to be something that suited Brother Witty, for he raised no editorial objection to it in this connection nor elsewhere in his quarterly. I am glad that I am not that broad-minded, that I know nothing about a thing of that kind, for I want to please my Lord. I am not concerned about the majority in this case and would not surrender my convictions in the matter, nor the truth of God, if the majority on the other side were ever so great. But what will Brother Witty do about it? Does he know anything about this sort of broadmindedness that “the radicals know nothing about?”

Three Realms Of Religious Activity

And now we will hear again from Brother Witty. He delivers himself after the following fashion:

“If I understand the matter, God has placed before his church three realms. The realm of faith, the realm of expediency, and the realm of vain worship. In the realm of faith every issue must be settled by a direct command, by an approved example or by a necessary inference of the New Testament Scriptures. Man has no choice in the matter. It is God’s part to say and man’s part to obey. In the realm of expediency it is different. Man, governed by the law of love and guided by sound judgment, must make the decision. In the realm of vain worship a true Christian dare not go. No man or church has a right to force any one to accept a commandment of man as a doctrine of God.”

He thinks our troubles have been brought about because men have confused these realms. And I think so too. But to which of these realms does the musical instrument belong? There is no command, no example, nor necessary inference from the New Testament in its favor. It cannot belong to the realm of faith. I believe-and thousands of my brethren also—that it belongs to the realm of vain worship, and that not even the majority in any congregation has the right to bind it on us. The digressives think it belongs to the realm of expediency—as song books, communion cups, church buildings, and such like. Now, Brother Witty, in what realm do you place it? Do you regard it as belonging to the realm of expediency and that it can be used or left off as we please and as the majority decides? Or do you regard it as a part of the doctrine and commandments of men that belongs to the realm of vain worship? Can you and James DeForest Murch, as leaders of the Unity Movement, get together and decide which realm it must be assigned to. As soon as you have reached your decision, let us know, we will begin to think the movement has made some progress. Until then I can see no evidence of progress except a movement toward compromising the truth of God with the doctrine of men.
WHEN DO WE GET ETERNAL LIFE?

O. C. LAMBERT

The Baptists in their desperate attempts to prove their most loved doctrine, of the Impossibility of Apostasy, wrest many scriptures. One of their favorite lines of argument concerns eternal life. Their text is frequently the King James Version of John 3:36, which reads: “He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life; for the wrath of God abideth on him.” They place great emphasis on “hath.” They would have us believe that because “hath” is used here, that the believer becomes the possessor of eternal life at the moment of belief, before he obeys. But it is noticeable that they never use the Revised Version when talking about this passage, for it puts life after obedience. Here it is: “He that believeth not the Son shall not see life.” This demolishes their contention for eternal life before obedience.

But does the statement “hath eternal life” mean that a man gets possession of eternal life at the moment of belief, or even in this life? Their whole contention rests on the assumption that there is no other interpretation possible. Seven days before the Children of Israel got possession of Jericho, the Lord said: “I have given into thine hand Jericho, and the king thereof, and the mighty men of valour.” But according to Baptist interpretation the Bible is wrong here! The Midianite interpreter of his fellow soldier’s dream is made to say: “into his hand hath God delivered Midian, and all the host.” (Josh. 7: 14). That was before Gideon ever went out with his three hundred armed with lamps, pitchers and trumpets! Who can believe that Gideon already had possession? Nobody but a Baptist. In Mark 9:31 Jesus makes this statement: “The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill him;” The Baptist would say, (if he stays with his argument of John 3:36), that Jesus was already in possession by his enemies! So “hath” does not necessarily mean that the believer is in actual possession of eternal life.

We Only Hope For It

Romans 8:24, 25 shows us that the word hope cannot be properly used with reference to things actually in our possession. “For we are saved by hope; but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it.” While we cannot hope for what we already have, yet we are said to hope for eternal life. “That being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life.” (Titus 3:7) Paul speaks of himself being in the hope of eternal life as follows: “In hope of eternal life, which God that cannot lie, promised before the world began.” (Titus 1:2) Arranged in the form of a syllogism the truth appears:

1. We cannot hope for what we possess; 2. We hope for eternal life; 3. Therefore we do not possess eternal life.

We Must Lay Hold On It

“And this is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life.” (1 John 2:25) “For bodily exercise profiteth little; but godliness is profitable unto all things, having the promise of the life that now is, and of that which is to come.” (1 Tim. 4:8) Paul speaks of Timothy’s “unfeigned faith” (2 Tim. 1:15), which according to Baptist doctrine, would be equivalent to possessing eternal life, but he also commands Timothy as follows: “Fight the good fight of faith and lay hold on eternal life.” (1 Tim. 6:12) Timothy had faith, but he did not possess eternal life.

In the same chapter where Timothy is admonished to lay hold on eternal life we are informed that we will have to wait until the “time to come” to lay hold upon it. “Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy; that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate; laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternal life.” 1 (Tim. 6: 17-19) Jesus in the following statement says that we get eternal life after we lose our lives: “He that loveth his life shall lose it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal.” (John. 12:25) Not only does the preceding passage tell us that we do not get eternal life in this world, but the following states that we get it in the world to come: “And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or parents, or brethren, wife, or children, for the kingdom of God’s sake, who shall not receive many fold more in this present time, and in the world to come life everlasting.” (Luke 18: 29, 30) Matthew 25 from the thirty-first verse to the close of the chapter gives us a view of the final judgment, and tells us that after the judgment the righteous shall go away “into life eternal.” (verse 46) We can only go into a thing when we first experience it. If the righteous had been in eternal life before this time, they could not get into it. From these scriptures it is unmistakably plain that we do not get eternal life, actually, until the time to come, in the world to come.

Heirs In The Time To Come

In Matthew 19:16, the rich young ruler asked what he must do to “have” eternal life, but in the record according to Luke 18:18, he asked what he must do to “inherit” it. It is clear that the term “have” is here used as the equivalent of “inherit.” This is a good question, and all men should be concerned about it. Peter understood that the word of Christ was the source of information. Hear him: “To whom shall we go, thou hast the words of eternal life?” (John 6:68) Paul says that grace reigns “through righteousness unto eternal life.” (Rom. 5:21) Since righteousness is God’s commandments (Psa. 119:172), grace reigns through God’s commandments unto eternal life. This harmonizes with Heb. 5:9, which says: “he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him.” “To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory and honor and immortality, eternal life.” (Rom. 2:7) This states that the reward for well doing is eternal life.
Russellites, Jew Baiters and Bollites  
T. B. Wilkinson

My little article on the Jews and the kingdom has brought me a storm of criticism from a faction of a minor nature who claims to be members of the church of Christ, but who talk and write as no inspired member of the church ever talked or wrote in New Testament times.

In that article I challenged all Russellites, Millerites, Bollites, Webberites, or Jew baiters, to find one promise to the Jews after the flesh in the gospel of Christ. Since this was published I have received some lengthy communications pretending to furnish such promises, but so far I have seen nothing that resembles proof. This challenge cuts all preachers off at the pockets who go about the country preaching to the Jews that God bound himself by an oath to do something for them that he has not done.

It is my contention that the gospel is the Lord’s last word to man, and the salvation offered is the only salvation that ever will be offered, and all parties admit that it puts into effect, at least, the spiritual phase of the promise made in the covenant with Abraham. It is my contention that the promises of the gospel are based exclusively upon faith and obedience, and therefore there can be no promise in it to the Jews after the flesh.

It is also my contention that the land promise made to Abraham was fulfilled under the law at the time Joshua led them into Canaan and put them in possession of it. “And he gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers, and they possessed it, and dwelt therein. And the Lord gave them rest round about according to all that he sware unto their fathers, and there stood not a man of all their enemies before them; the Lord delivered all of their enemies into their hand. There failed not of any good thing that the Lord had spoken unto house of Israel all came to pass.” (Josh. 21:42-45)

I thought when I presented this passage it would be the end of controversy on that point, but I had not properly appraised the cunning of debaters who have a theory to establish. I am promptly informed that this Scripture has no reference whatever to the promise God made to Abraham regarding the land of Canaan, and the fathers mentioned in it were not Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. I am told these fathers are the ones God took by the land to lead out of the land of Egypt, and the promises the ones he made to them at that time.

As I remember the incident recorded by Moses the Lord was not too well pleased with the fathers he led out of Egypt. It seems that they continued not in his ways, and he regarded them not, and swore in his wrath that they should not enter his rest, and their carcasses fell in the wilderness.

But suppose we should admit that Joshua 21:42-45 did have direct reference to the promises the Lord made with them at that time, and the ones afterwards incorporated in the law, what effect will that have on the fact that the promise was made first to Abraham, and the land grant made to him? We find that this same land was promised to Abraham and his seed at various times before it was fulfilled. It was promised to father Isaac, and then to father Jacob, but it was the same land, and the same promise, made to the same identical people, the seed of Abraham.

It is stated in Exodus 6:8 that the Lord appeared to Moses and told him the time of the promise made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, was now to be fulfilled. He sent Moses to Egypt with a commission to lead his people out of bondage, and put them in possession of the promised land, and the books that Moses wrote, and the book of Joshua, tells us how that promise was literally fulfilled.

But I am told that what Joshua did for them only fulfilled the promises made in the law, and the Original promise made to Abraham remains yet to be fulfilled regarding the land of Canaan. But the promise contained in the law was the same promise made to Abraham, pertained to the same land, and the same people, and Paul says the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after the promise was made to Abraham, cannot disannul it, or make the promise of none effect.

Then what effect did this law of Moses have on the promise God made to Abraham? We know positively that it did not disannul it, or make it of none effect. (Gal. 3:17) Paul said it was added to the promise because of transgression. If it was added to it then it became a part of the original promise, and when the promises of the law were fulfilled the promise made to Abraham was fulfilled in so far as it pertained to the land of Canaan.

Now, let some Jew-baiter who is going around preaching that there are a lot of unfulfilled promises that God made to Abraham, and swore to, and cannot break, and therefore must fulfill to old Abraham and all of his seed after the flesh at some time in the near future. They are all dead, those back there, but they see no difficulty in that. God swore it, they say, and must do it. Therefore, he will resurrect all of the Jews, good and bad, and with all the living Jews put them in possession of the land of Canaan, and by hook, or crook, fix it so they can live in it forever. Now answer the argument in the proceeding paragraph.

Jesus said to some of the fleshly seed of Abraham when they bragged about it to him (like all Jews will do after they hear these Jew baiters): “Ye are of your father the devil, and the lust of your father you will do.” But according to the Jew baiters that will not change the results in the least. God is bound by an oath, and he must resurrect them, and put them in Canaan, and keep them forever, and ever, regardless of what they think, or do.

Jesus Christ is the promised seed of Abraham through which all of the nations of earth would be blessed, and the gospel is the fulness of all God’s promises to humanity, that filleth all in all. (Eph. 1:23) I know of no salvation to any man, Jew or Gentile, except that one in the gospel of Jesus Christ, and no other way for any man ever to be saved except through faith and obedience to that gospel. If these Jew baiters know of any other way to be saved or any other salvation yet to be offered to Jew, or Greek, let them come forward and show us where it can be found.

They talk very learnedly about a “future reconciliation,” which they say is to be for all men in some post-gospel-age period. When you tell them that is just old Uncle Charley Russell’s theory, they deny it, and claim it is something they have figured out from their deep knowledge of the covenants, and of prophecy, and which the ordinary man never would have discovered.

Yes, it took a deep man to figure that theory out, deep like old Charley Russell-muddy water always looks deep. You can’t even see the wiggle tails in it if is muddy enough, and this theory has plenty of things in it, things foreign to the gospel which Paul preached, and by which all men must be saved. They can’t even tell you how men can be saved in that post-gospel age. The Bible gives them no light on it, not even a hint. They will not be saved by the gospel for it belongs only to this “church age” that they talk so learnedly about. The gospel age will end with the church age and they both end when Jesus comes the second time for the judgment, and the Lord’s people will receive their reward.
The following essays on the authority and comfort of the Scriptures were written by Brother Frank Winters, an elder of the Culbertson Heights church in Oklahoma City, and printed on the weekly church page of the Daily Oklahoma and Oklahoma City Times. Articles of this type, and on gospel subjects, are being run in the space allotted to the Culbertson Heights church in the two daily papers mentioned each week as a regular feature, and have attracted considerable attention. The pieces are well written, breathe a reverent spirit, and carry some concise suggestions that should arouse some interest in the readers of a secular paper, which may direct their attention to the importance of what the Bible teaches and what it will do for those who believe and obey it. The editor of the Bible Banner wishes for Brother Winters, his personal friend, all the results for which he may hope through this unique medium of trying to contact the minds of his fellow citizens with the vital truths of God’s living word. All such efforts are truly worthwhile.

The Authority Of The Bible

We think it must be evident to any student of spiritual conditions today that there is a widespread tendency to ignore and set aside the authority of the Bible.

One of the unique characteristics of this Book is that it claims the right to control the actions of men. It speaks “as one having authority.”

It speaks to men, not from the standpoint of human wisdom or morality, but from a plane far above the most exalted human standards and with an attitude demanding unqualified submission. This assumption of authority over men rather contradicts the “democratic spirit of our times” which has agitated most for peace, has produced the most wars. The words of our text, written by Isaiah in troublous times, give the divine solution. It is an individual matter.

The great mass of men, including most of the leaders of our age, are completely absorbed in the activities of the world and are utterly indifferent to the claims of the Bible. But this Bible nevertheless still has a hold on the consciences of the few, and by its influence wields a mighty power. In some quarters the Bible is assailed and its divine origin disputed in the name of “scholarship” and of “science;” though there is no known principle of science which the Bible contradicts. Sometimes the attack may come from those who concede the inspiration of the Bible, but claim that other writers were also equally inspired. There is no practical difference in these two positions; the result is the same. The unique authority of the Bible is set aside.

We believe that it is of the very highest importance to insist unceasingly upon the sufficiency, finality and completeness of this revealed word of God, and with this attitude the Bible is a chart and compass, “a lamp unto our feet,” and an anchor of the soul. With any other attitude the Book is bereft of its power to bless and save mankind, leaving humanity lost and groping in darkness and despair.

The Comfort Of The Scriptures

“All shall keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on thee.” Isa. 26:3.

“That we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope.” Romans 15:4.

We believe if the unconverted could know the comfort and peace the holy Scriptures can bring to the Christian churches could not house the multitudes seeking admission. Yet no beatitude of Christianity is more surely taught than that the living word of God received and kept in the hearts of men shall bless the heart and mind with the “peace of God which passeth all understanding” (Phil. 4:7). Not only do the Scriptures say that it shall be, but the experience of every true Christian confirms this truth that the word of God is a source of comfort and happiness far above any earthly pleasure and comparable only to the promised bliss of heaven of which it is undoubtedly a foretaste.

In our meditation we think what comforts the Bible has brought: under the arms of the Pilgrim fathers when they came to this country—in the hands of our minister when death came to our loved ones—in the best libraries of earth—in the humble Christian homes of the poor and lowly-in the tent of the dear boy far away in our country’s service—in the hands of his mother as she waits and prays.

One of the scars of this age is the continued failure to find peace. In dismay we must realize that this generation, which has agonized most for peace, has produced the most wars. The words of our text, written by Isaiah in troublous times, give the divine solution. It is an individual matter.

These lines are written hoping to help someone toward Christ and His peace, and may not we who have named the name of Christ and who by reason of haste and the cares of life have not always found the comfort the Bible may bring, may we not fail to seek and claim this precious treasure which, through the death of Christ, our elder brother, has been provided for all of us as children of God.

Announcement

“We deeply regret to announce that at the close of this year, our minister, Brother Cecil B. Douthitt, is leaving us. For seven years as a fellow worker with us, he has given diligence to present himself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright the Word of Truth. He has a thorough knowledge of the Scriptures, presenting them in an intelligent and able manner. We esteem him highly in love for his work’s sake, and shall always hold him in grateful remembrance for his loyalty to God’s Word, and in not failing to declare the whole counsel of God. We are grateful that he came our way, and pray that God’s richest blessings may attend him in his future labors, and that he may continue to be as helpful to others as he has been to us. Haldeman Avenue Church, Henry Craft, Secretary, 111 Waverly Court, Louisville 6, Ky.
The Preacher's Coffee

W. CURTIS PORTER

Occasionally various Baptist papers have published a little poem about some coffee. Sometimes this poem is published under the title of "The Preacher's Coffee," and sometimes under the title of "Methodist Coffee." Recently Ben M. Bogard published this in his paper, Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, under the latter title. He recommended that his readers clip the poem and paste it in their scrap books. The poem, as published in his paper, follows:

METHODOIST COFFEE

I have a pleasant story which I will tell in rhyme,
About a circuit preacher who lived in recent times;
He was a circuit rider of good John Wesley's brand
And rode the finest circuit in all this blessed land.

At one of his good charges, some members, not a few,
Became quite sorely troubled about the word "into."
The Good Book says right plainly in Acts, in chapter eight,
"They went down into water," as Baptist people state;
The preacher preached a sermon of extra zeal and might,
And to his satisfaction, he set the passage right.

"Into does not mean into, but only at, near by;
They went down to the water and got a small supply." But near that place of worship there lived a Sister Brown,
And for her splendid cooking she'd gained a great renown;
Her yellow legged chickens, her luscious cakes and pies,
Had often made that preacher roll up his weeping eyes.

And her delicious coffee, the circuit all around,
The preacher oft admitted its like could not be found.

So when he preached his sermon of extra power and length,
He loved at the Brown's table to rectify his strength.
But Sister Brown was a Baptist, the stoutest in the land,
She oft reproved the Methodists for changing God's command.
She heard the preacher's sermon, and thought the subject o'er,
And asked him home to dinner as oft she'd done before.

She ground the good brown coffee, her kettle steaming hot,
She put it "at" or "near by" the famous coffee pot;
She poured Bro. Jones a cupful, I think it was no sin—
"Why you forgot, dear sister, to put the coffee in."

"No, no, Bro. Jones, that's coffee, I ground a good supply,
And put it at the kettle — into is at, nearby.
By logic of your sermon, I thought it rather thin,
If 'at,' 'near by,' means 'into,' I put the coffee in.
So if you'll strictly promise no more such stuff to teach,

A SEQUEL TO THE PREACHER'S COFFEE

Just then in stepped a preacher who wears a Bible name,
The simple name of Christian, of apostolic fame;
God put "into" the Bible no human name to wear,
And hence he was contented the inspired mark to bear.

Then Mrs. Brown he questioned if really she'd admit
That "into" had the meaning that she had given it.
She said she would most surely, and who would dare say not;
No coffee's "in" the vessel till put "into" the pot.
Then gently spoke the preacher: "Don't censure parson Jones;
You've spoken condemnation to self in strongest tones.

"Into has the meaning you've given it at last,
"They went down into water," I trust its every word;
But Sister Brown he questioned if really she'd admit
That "into" had the meaning that she had given it.
She said she would most surely, and who would dare say not;
No coffee's "in" the vessel till put "into" the pot.
Then gently spoke the preacher: "Don't censure parson Jones;
You've spoken condemnation to self in strongest tones.

"Into does not mean into, but only at, near by;
They went down to the water and got a small supply." But near that place of worship there lived a Sister Brown,
And for her splendid cooking she'd gained a great renown;
Her yellow legged chickens, her luscious cakes and pies,
Had often made that preacher roll up his weeping eyes.

And her delicious coffee, the circuit all around,
The preacher oft admitted its like could not be found.

So when he preached his sermon of extra power and length,
He loved at the Brown's table to rectify his strength.
But Sister Brown was a Baptist, the stoutest in the land,
She oft reproved the Methodists for changing God's command.
She heard the preacher's sermon, and thought the subject o'er,
And asked him home to dinner as oft she'd done before.

She ground the good brown coffee, her kettle steaming hot,
She put it "at" or "near by" the famous coffee pot;
She poured Bro. Jones a cupful, I think it was no sin—
"Why you forgot, dear sister, to put the coffee in."

"No, no, Bro. Jones, that's coffee, I ground a good supply,
And put it at the kettle — into is at, nearby.
By logic of your sermon, I thought it rather thin,
If 'at,' 'near by,' means 'into,' I put the coffee in.
So if you'll strictly promise no more such stuff to teach,
A PUBLIC LETTER TO CLAUD F. WITTY

T. B. WILKINSON

Dear Sir and Brother: I have received a copy of your Quarterly, "Christian Unity," and have read it carefully in an effort to find if possible what you want me to do about unity. I include in this also the church of Christ of which I have been a member now for some sixty years. If there is something which we should do, which we have not done, to promote unity among the people of God, I for one would be glad to have it pointed out to me.

There is one way, of course, by which we could have unity of a sort: end all opposition to instrumental music in the worship, and the societies and human organization they have invented to supplant the church of the Lord and we would be united, but I cannot see my way clear to do this. I hardly think you want us to go that far. On the other hand, if they will abandon their instrumental music, and other human inventions, and join with us in New Testament worship as simple member of the body of Christ, we could be united. But I do not understand that you are asking them to go that far. Then just what do you propose?

I agree with you that God intended for all of his "true children" to have fellowship with each other. But I do not agree that he meant for them to fellowship all who "profess to be children of God," that would be taking in too much territory. I mean this to be Witty. Even the Holiness people claim to be true children, and the Methodist and Baptist profess to be, and even the Mohamedans, and the Mormons, and I never could agree to such broad principles.

I can also agree with your three realms which you say the Lord has set before the church, which you call the realm of faith, the realm of expediency, and the realm of vain worship. I also agree with you that in the realm of faith man has no choice, God commands and man must obey. I also agree that in the realm of expediency he has liberty, but should use judgment, and be considerate of others, and in the realm of vain worship he should touch not, taste not, and handle not the unclean thing, which may be putting it a little stronger than you expressed it.

But what you do not make plain to my mind is under which one of these heads you classify the church of Christ, instrumental music, and the societies. If the manner of worship common to the churches of Christ belongs in the realm of faith, we have no choice in the matter according to your own argument. We have to be just as we are, and do just as we are doing, because it belongs to faith. If I understand you, and I think I do, you do not question the ground occupied by the church of Christ on these points, we are standing upon solid ground.

Then under which head shall we classify the Christian church, instrumental music, and the societies? If you classify them under the head of expediency you will surrender the only grounds upon which the church of Christ can justify itself in the stand it has taken on these points, and forthwith become of the other party. That is the ground upon which those people have always tried to justify the use of these innovations in the worship. They are expediencies, they say; they work well, therefore, they are justified under the law of expediency.

I don't think you will go that far, unless you have drifted farther from the truth than I think you have. If they are mere expediencies, and actually do the very thing the Lord wants us to do, then we do wrong when we oppose them. We should even join in to help them out with their expediencies which work well. Then we would be united, but united in what? We would all be digressives together, and the Christian church would swallow the church of Christ, and that might be called fellowship of a kind.

But I do not believe that is what you want, there is some intangible something you are working after, and that is what I am trying to find, since you have not made it plain. The use of instrumental music in the worship, and the societies of various kinds are the sole cause of disunion between the two bodies of people, and a proper settlement of these points will bring about the fellowship you are working for. Either we must surrender our stand on these points and join them, or they must surrender and come over to our ground, otherwise the difference will always exist. But from all I can get from what you say, you are not asking either side to do this, and that is why it is so hard for me to understand what you propose.

Expediency, as I understand the word as applied to the worship, is doing what the Lord requires in his worship in the most expedient manner. As applied to the song service it would mean the singing of spiritual songs with spirit and understanding, rendered in the most capable manner possible. But playing upon musical instruments is not singing, it is doing something else, something the Lord has not placed in his worship, therefore, it cannot come under the head of expediency. Then it must come under the head of things commanded by men, therefore, under the head of vain worship, which you say no church has a right to ask men to accept.

But I should not argue the rights or wrongs of instrumental music, and the societies with you, for I understand you oppose them the same as I do. You want to me united with the fellows who use them, and prevail upon us to fellowship each other in some intangible way without disturbing the faith of either on these essential points, and just be brethren in spite of the differences. Brother Witty, it can't be done. There never will be unity between us until these points are settled, and settled right. And they cannot be settled by compromise, nor by sugar-coating, and covering them up. Compromise never settled anything since the world began. Our stand on these points are right or wrong. If right it would be a sin to surrender them, or compromise them. If wrong, it is a sin to oppose instrumental music and the societies.

If I understand your object it is to bring harmony between these two bodies of people, but I do not understand how you propose to do it. If you are asking me, and the brethren with whom I am identified to give up our stand on the societies, and instrumental music, and join the other side, and work with them in their societies and other human inventions, I could understand that, and can give you reasons why I cannot do it.

On the other hand if you would join with me in an humble effort to persuade these brethren to give up their unscriptural practices, and unite with us on the Bible, I could understand that. But since you mean neither of these, then you are too deep for me, and I think you are talking just to hear your head rattle. Since you do not mean either of the things I mentioned there is nothing you can mean, since you do not require either party to change. If you can work up fellowship and harmony on such a basis as this you are a wonder, indeed, and such a man might even find grounds upon which the Lord can unite with Satan.

Would it not be wonderful if you could only make friends between the Lord and the devil? It might be worth trying, Brother Witty. You know Satan did make some overtures to the Lord, and offered to join forces with him in subduing the kingdoms of the world to him, Compromise with error is all I can see in the things you propose.
Some More Irresponsible Chatter

CLED E. WALLACE

Even when I think a man is wrong, I like for him to challenge my respect by talking like he had a modicum of sense in his head. Under the guise of “Talking Things Over With My Brethren” Jimmie Lovell continues to talk, just chatters along irresponsibly. It is discouraging, or worse. Here is another sample of his chatter.

“Brethren, one of the most disgraceful blots upon the church of today is the neglect of our boys whose faith prevents them from taking part in the war. I had as soon desert my wife and daughter to the Japanese as to desert our boys in camp.”

This is at least twice recently that garrulous Jimmie has made reference to his wife and daughter in a manner that shows an utter absence of that delicacy of feeling a refined gentleman would naturally entertain toward the women in his household. Once he would see his wife and daughter “raped” before he would use extreme force to prevent it; now he had as soon desert them to the Japanese ad-nauseum. Is the man insane? He certainly doesn’t talk sense. He has even non-combatant service. Brother Showalter says they have “poorly educated consciences.” I should say as much. They get three meal each day, a comfortable place to sleep, and the work they do is light compared with regular training for military service. Jimmie is spilling tears from California to the Lord knows where over the terrible persecutions they are suffering and sobs aloud: “If I were the one to make the awards to our heroes I would pin the medals of Distinguished Service upon you—men of faith.” I suppose he would turn his wife and daughter over to the Japanese to get to do it! Ugh! And there is more of this pitiful drivel.

“Young men—you mothers and fathers who have boys there—1 seem to sit here helpless. I hardly know what I can do to help you. Would that God would show me a way to obtain from the government permission to establish a camp where we could get all of you together. It could be done if some large church as Lubbock, Texas, would go about it. Anyhow, I love you for the cross you bear.”

I suggest that this would come under the jurisdiction of the “Service Committee For Conscientious Objectors.” With a large church as Lubbock, Texas” as a “competent preacher and a qualified eldership” as “sponsor,” a man like Jimmie as “publicity director;” and a medium like the Gospel Advocate to whoop it up in, “the government” ought to be duly impressed. It might work, except there is a political situation involved. The Lubbock church might have to change preachers. The present incumbent is writing articles about the government that sounds like he were opening the Republican campaign for the Presidency, and the present administration in Washington might look on it as a conspiracy. After all it might be just as well for Jimmie to “sit here helpless” till the war is over, and then the boys will be turned loose anyhow. I don’t see anything else to do, unless the Lord favors Jimmie with a special revelation about how to “go about it.” While Jimmie sits, his tongue wags, but that is a “cross” we will all have to “bear.” If we are to have an epidemic of committees and boards, I’m going to suggest a Sanity Board. I don’t want Jimmie on it. He is the first one I want to call before it.
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us on the military phase of the “war question.” He does his own thinking and we do ours. He is a patriotic American citizen and has contributed much to the war effort. His youngest son, our brother and a fine upstanding lad, even if this does tempt the editor of the Gospel Advocate to write some sneers about “modesty,” is a soldier, performing “non-combatant” duty in the Air Corps. This is as he and his father wished it. Of him our father writes: “He is loyal to his government and doing a faithful service in loyalty to his country.”

Since our critics seem to be hungry for every bit of fame, information they can get, and would probably make “a frantic search” for skeletons if they had the key to our closet, I am going to give them a little inside stuff they do not have in their files. Brother Dorris has more than once given me a preview in his letters of what I might expect to see later on the editorial pages of the Gospel Advocate. He and Brother Goodpasture are evidently cronies these days. Some time ago Brother Dorris in one of those characteristic letters of his, brought my father into this fracas much as the Advocate has broadcast it by remote control from Birmingham. I quite casually mentioned the matter to my father. Of it he writes:

“IT do not know where Dorris got his information and I do not care. A man of his ilk I'd as soon say one thing about me as anything else. I am not to blame for I have attended strictly to my own business.”

If our critics depend on friction in the family ending up in a big wreck, I'm afraid they will have to revise their “war” strategy. That worthy gentleman “Brother Foy E. Wallace, Sr., who has studied the bible and preached the gospel longer than Foy E. Wallace, Jr., has lived” and although he “does not agree with” all “the premises or the conclusions of” his brilliant editor son in these matters, has overtly expressed himself rather pointedly to me, and given me permission to publish it.

“If and when you need it you are at liberty to use anything that I have said to you at any time. I am not in sympathy at all with the anti-government men, have never been at any time in my life that I know of.”

If these critics, who seem more concerned about making war on us than they are about any issue, can get any comfort out of what my father says further, they are welcome to it.

“IT do not think hard of any man to think and say as he pleases about the right or wrong of this business. I claim the same for myself. From childhood it has been instilled in me that it is wrong for Christians to engage in combat-bear arms. That is my privilege if I cannot see into a big wreck, I'm afraid they will have to revise their “war” strategy. That worthy gentleman “Brother Foy E. Wallace, Sr., who has studied the bible and preached the gospel longer than Foy E. Wallace, Jr., has lived” and although he “does not agree with” all “the premises or the conclusions of” his brilliant editor son in these matters, has overtly expressed himself rather pointedly to me, and given me permission to publish it.

“If and when you need it you are at liberty to use anything that I have said to you at any time. I am not in sympathy at all with the anti-government men, have never been at any time in my life that I know of.”

If these critics, who seem more concerned about making war on us than they are about any issue, can get any comfort out of what my father says further, they are welcome to it.

The Nashville Christian Institute

(F. E. W., JR.)

We have the following letter from Marshall Keeble, our colored brother and evangelist:

Baltimore, Maryland, Aug. 12, 1943.

“Dear Sir & Brother in Christ: For three years we have been trying to conduct a school where the Bible can be taught daily to our boys and girls. I have decided to travel among the brethren to see if I can raise funds for the school, and I am kindly asking you for a written endorsement of my efforts, PLEASE. Your endorsement will be a blessing to our efforts. Brother J. E. Acuff, of Nashville, is our treasurer, so that no one will be uneasy about the handling of the funds. I have always appreciated your endorsement of my work. Meeting here is doing fine. Pray for us. Fraternally yours, M. Keeble, 1600 Scovel St., Nashville, Tennessee.

I have always endorsed the preaching and the work of Marshall Keeble and Luke Miller. They are able preachers of the gospel, and they are consecrated and humble and sincere. They know what their work is and they know how to do it, they do it. They have not allowed the white brethren, who in many places have used such poor judgment, to make them vain and haughty. Their attitude is right, their hearts are right, and their work among their people has borne the right kind of fruit. It gives me pleasure to commend all colored preachers of the gospel like them, and there are some others who could well afford to imitate their humility and their manner of life and preaching.

The present endeavor of Marshall Keeble in soliciting funds for his school in which to teach the Bible to colored boys and girls is a worthy one. Keeble is the right man for the place. The brethren should help him liberally in this work. Brother J. E. Acuff, an official of the Life & Casualty Insurance Company, and an elder of the Charlotte Avenue church in Nashville, is a business man of first rank, and his name as treasurer of the funds furnishes the proper guarantee of business management. The Bible Banner wishes M. Keeble and his associates success in this work, and will help him every way we reasonably can.

McGarvey And Johnson—From P. 7

thought that was “credentials.” Hence, it was suggested that his effort to minimize our position on the government issue had only discredited his credentials as a historian—and we still think that is exactly what happened.

This is not “a broadside.” We have the ammunition with which to fire one, but that is not the purpose of this piece. We merely want to keep the record straight. When a man claims to be writing history, he ought to know that what he is putting in the record is right. We love Brother Brigance as a man and as a friend, and we will still stick up for the school with which he is connected, but he should not expect us to let his pass at us “pass.”