The sneak attack on Pearl Harbor profoundly affected all of us and startled a reluctant nation into instant realization that it must fight or perish. Our government very properly declared war on Japan and her criminal co-conspirators against this nation. There was one dissenting voice in Congress, a woman, whose pacifism would not admit "a change" to save the nation from destruction. Christians generally, who love peace and hate war, recognized and accepted the desperate situation and supported the government. It required painful inner struggles on the part of many of them and some adjustments in matters of conscience were not easy. We tried to help along by a discussion of issues relating to the Christian's relation to his government. We did not expect that our views would be universally accepted by the brethren, but we did expect something better from some sources than to have these views attacked in the vicious way they have been. The issue has been ignored, our position perverted and our motives impugned. This is not a complaint. We might have expected it. The result is gratifying in a way from our point of view, for the brethren in the main are a discerning lot and it has led many to conclude that since we have not been met, we cannot be. About the best one leading editor has been able to do about it, was to criticize our grammar, disparage our financial rating and play up the fiction that Pearl Harbor blasted us into "a change" that enveloped us in the darkness of an inconsistency we will never escape from. This was lamentably lame for the editor of a leading paper and the repercussions were more painful to him than to us. He has gone to desperate lengths to find witnesses to embarrass us, making an abortive attempt to use our father to discredit us. This one really back-fired. My father, a veteran preacher, now does not care what they may say. I don't care in the first place; and in the second I am not going to waste time with them.

My father is not indifferent to the issues, nor is he wholly in accord with us in some positions we have advanced, but he knows a fair fight when he sees one, and he makes no effort to conceal his disgust over the sort of opposition we have met. They called up the wrong, witness in this case. This same editor stumped his toe with disconcerting results on two other witnesses against us whom he paraded on his editorial page. Their expressed disgust was not directed against us. The disappointed editor faced one of them in person and accused him of changing and playing up to Foy Wallace, Jr., so he could get to preach for a big church Foy had influence with. The editor seems to have a sort of mania for evil surmising. Such things are to be regretted.

We have frankly met the charge that we "changed since Pearl Harbor" together with the ugly insinuations the editor intended to convey in that connection. Some things in that connection have moved Brother R. L. Whiteside to write me a few observations with permission to publish them should I so desire. Brother Whiteside is widely known for his able and conservative views, calmly arrived at. Here is what he has to say. It deserves a careful and thoughtful reading.

'Have you a copy of the 'Life of Elder. Benjamin Franklin' by his son Joseph and Headington? If so, read, beginning on page 246. Of course, the man who criticises another for changing, thereby really assumes that it is wrong ever to change, and that he himself never changes. Strange philosophy once wrong, always wrong; and a sinner, always a sinner! It is what a man is now, not what he used to be, that counts. To array a man against himself is poor business. I never did array Briney against Briney. If I cannot meet what a man now says, I will not play the weakling by saying, 'But here is what you used to say'... If Briney had formerly been in favor of instrument music, and later turned against it, would any of us have said, 'But here is what you used to say'? If not, why not? Would even an editor say to a Christian, 'You are inconsistent and unreliable; you used to be an alien sinner, but you changed'... There is an old saying about the fellow that changes, and the one that never changes. Saul of Tarsus made a radical change, and gloried in it. The only consistency worth anything is this: set your heart on learning the truth and eliminating every error of thought and practice; and then, no matter how often you have to change, you are consistent. To be consistent with a high purpose is better than to be consistent with an ignominious past. That's my philosophy.'

And that's the right philosophy. Brother Whiteside maintains his reputation of writing a whole volume in a paragraph and saying about all that needs to be said on a point without carreering all over creation to do it. I cherish this gem of "philosophy" as something that has done me good. I recommend it to the editor of the Gospel Advocate. It ought to do him good, too, and furnish some salve he may need to take some sting out of some badly needed adjustments he needs to make and ought to make in his attitude toward some things and some men.
WHAT THE POSTMAN HANDS ME
CLEO E. WALLACE

It is only human that I should be interested as a preacher and writer in the reactions I stir up in people who hear me speak, and read what I write. Of course if I did not think what I say should be said I would not say it. It is not at all surprising that some good people, better than I think I am perhaps, think I should not say some things I say, and the opinions of some of them bring the mail to my door. Compliments and criticisms often come in the same mail. What makes one smile, makes another frown. The very same thing arouses pleasure in one and bitterness in another. People are that different. I am fairly well acquainted with human nature, especially as it appears in men and women who read papers published by the brethren. This may be a fault, but the consideration of how people will take it enters rather mildly, if at all, in what I write. The visits of the postman lead me to conclude that some think I am better than I am, while others think I am worse than I am. I am what I am. Some even think I use “I” too much. I’m not inclined to argue the point but when I mean “I,” I say I, and when I say “I,” I mean I. I’d hate to try to get along without “the periphrastic pronoun.” I would have a hard time talking about myself without it. “This scribe” and that “editorial writer” could not quite do justice to the subject.

Brother C. E. W. Dorris is the champion letter writer. The number I have from him now runs to nine or ten. It is hard to keep count of them. My impression is that they now total around one hundred typewritten pages. They are all about the same style. My reply to the first one was my reply to all of them and took up about three lines. Brother Goodpasture has announced editorially that they are to be published in book form or something like. I have suggested that it might be good advanced publicity to let the first one appear in the Gospel Advocate, as a sort of foretaste of what the readers may expect, but up to date I have had no returns from that suggestion. He has my permission, and I give him my word of honor that I won’t sue him for libel if he does so. Since he has given it editorial endorsement, I see no reason now why it should not appear in the Advocate.

A lady Christian who informs me that she is “a widow,” and is of the opinion that she wasted a dollar when she subscribed for the Bible Banner, bounces this one off of me.

“I have said for a long time that we have preachers that need to stop preaching for a year and let their practice catch up. I can’t admire a preacher that will refer to his aged father as ‘the old man’.” Read Luke 2:48 and see how it would ha-e sounded for Mary to have said that to her twelve year old son? “the old man,” but why should she? He wasn’t her “old man,” he was her son. Looks to me like you’re clear off the subject. But you “know it was spoken in irony.” You don’t know any such a thing. It was pure unadulterated affection and came out of my heart with more meaning than classic endearments mouthed by plaster saints. Some people appear to get mighty little out of life, either from experience or observation. I have tousled my boys around from the time they were able to walk and gleefully asked: “How do you like your old man?” The youngest of the lot is about six feet tall. He is the only one at home. All my old lady has left of her ample flock is this one chicken and the old rooster. She sees the others only occasionally. When one of these big fine sons of mine lays his hand tenderly on my shoulder and says: “Well, how’s my old man feeling this morning?” do you think for a minute that I detect any signs of disrespect? Applesauce! I feel as proud as “the old man” can feel. My father has at least as much sense as I have, even if some others do not. I’m still mighty proud of “my old man.” He’s tops. And it doesn’t worry me much if some of the sob-sisters don’t like it.

Another dear lady, a spinster this time, over Tennessee way, is inclined to compare conscientious objectors with Daniel in the lions’ den and other heroes of faith who have insisted on obeying God rather than men. This is of course, a begging of the question, but pointing that out to her would no doubt have little effect in changing her opinion about my way of saying things. According to her the case generally is next to hopeless. Says she:

“I have searched the brotherhood in vain for, a religious paper to send the boys gone from our congregation into service to help them keep the Faith, and I have found none that would help or comfort them.”

Well, now, that’s a revelation to me. I was under the impression that it would not take a very wide search in the brotherhood to find most anything in the way of a religious paper from mushy softness to Puritan severity. Since our worried sister cannot find it in the brotherhood she might contact a peddler for the Salvation Army periodical. It has a ﬂy- trial title, though, which might be offensive to soldiers. She may have to “sit here helpless” by the side of Jimmie Lovell. Personally, I know soldiers, preach to them, comfort them, help them, know how they feel, and have a couple in the family. I suggest that the sister send them the Bible Banner. Most of them will like it and it will do the rest of them good.

P. S. Since the family has got into the discussion, I have a daughter, too. She’s a sweet young thing, off in school. She doesn’t call me “the old man.” She says “Aw, Daddie-e-e-e-e-e” and looks as pleased as spring sunshine. I have a three-year old grandson, too, and he sometimes says things his mother spanks him for, and his Grand Dad wishes she hadn’t.
KEEPING TO THE ISSUES

My friend and fellowpreacher, D. H. Hadwin, formerly of Wheeling, West Virginia, but now of Winter Haven, Florida, communicates this heartening word to all of us: “I do appreciate receiving the Bible Banner. You have succeeded in clarifying the war issue for me, and no doubt for many others.” Unlike some who think the same thing but do not want certain others to find it out, he is not ashamed to admit it, for he says in another line, “use this statement if you wish.” I like that. And it has truly been so for many others.” We have received hundreds of such expressions, including many, many preachers.

The above word from Brother Hadwin is more significant than a mere expression of his thoughts on the particular issue mentioned. It incidentally states the very purpose of the Bible Banner—the sole reason for its existence: the clarifying of issues. To this end it was born, for this aim it has lived, and to this service it remains dedicated.

A reprint of the first editorial written for the Bible Banner, its first issue in July 1938, will serve to “clarify” to some the need for the Bible Banner and the purposes that brought it forth. There are several thousand who now subscribe to the Banner, and other readers of it now, who never read its “key-note” statement. For that reason, and because it has a bearing on the continuous course the Banner has pursued, we are disposed to submit it again. Read it, and you will know the what and why of the Bible Banner.

JEHOVAH-NISSI—THE LORD MY BANNER

There is something in a name. Bible names always meant something. When Abraham was moved by divine fiat to offer his son Isaac upon the altar, God provided the sacrifice, and Abraham called the place, Jehovah-jireh—“The Lord Will Provide.” God does provide for all who like Abraham implicitly heed His voice.

When Gideon answered the call of God to go in His might to deliver Israel from the hand of Midian, he was an altar at the scene of his call and named the place, Jehovah-nPayment—“The Lord Sends Peace.” God did send peace. But it was peace through conflict, not compromise. We do not see Gideon calling a “unity meeting” with the Midianites; he did not ascend a knoll, lift up beneficent hands, stretch out spreading arms to Israel’s foes and say: “Let us have peace together.” He drove the Midianites out by “the sword of the Lord and Gideon.” There are some who seem to think that the Lord has dispensed with the sword, dismantled the armour, and restored to diplomatic conferences with the powers that be.

When Amalek fought against Israel, Moses stood on the mount of battle with his hands uplifted, supported on either side by Aaron and Hur until the going down of the sun, and when Israel prevailed, he called the place, Jehovah-nissi—“The Lord My Banner.” God was Israel’s ensign, Israel’s standard, that day. God is our Banner now. The inspired Psalmist said: “Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of truth.” (Psa. 60:4) The prince of prophets said: “Lift ye up a banner upon the high mountain, exalt the voice unto them.” (Isa. 13:2) In the spirit of these sacred sentiments the present paper is promoted as a banner of truth in a day of need—hence, The Bible Banner.

A Potential Text

A general softness is pervading the church. Firm faith and plain preaching, once universal and unanimous among those devoted to the ancient gospel, are now yielding to the persuasions of the plush-mouthed and velvet-tongued moderns who would stealthily admonish us to “speak the truth in love,” but who only seek refuge behind this divine behest for their own compromises while they themselves ignore the very manner in which the inspired author of this counsel, the fearless and peerless Paul, did speak the truth in love. He himself applied that principle. Observe him in action; witness his courage; behold him on defense (not the fence); accompany him on his itinerancy; hear him preach and watch him “turn the world upside down” leaving behind him a religious upheaval that is comparable only to a typhoon of cyclonic destruction of every false thing; listen to his release of righteous fury against Elims, the perverter, and his Stephen-like arraignment of the “enemies of the cross of Christ;” follow him through persecution to prison; think on his resolute charge to Timo- thely—then compare the plaint preaching so prevalent to-day, condoned by the capricious censing of such a potential text! Did not Paul give us an example of “speaking the truth in love?” May we in fact rather than mere fancy imbibe the spirit of that apostle who enjoins us all to love the truth and speak it.

The Spirit of Christ

Other stock expressions of apologists for the soft-pedal cadences of sweet preaching are that we should manifest the spirit of Christ, and do things in the Christian way. The word “manifest” means to make clear and plain, ap parent. Then to manifest the spirit of Christ means to make clear and plain what Christ thinks of the errors and shams of religion. This can be done by showing what He said and did regarding the teachers and institutions of error in His day. He said they were human plants and would be rooted up, and He called them all by name. A follower of Christ should always manifest the spirit of Christ; and a Christian should always exemplify the spirit of Christ in the Christian way. There is no man whose soul senses a deeper desire for these Christlike traits than my own, unless he has a deeper soul. But how may we know the spirit of Christ save as He exemplifies it? Follow Him from Nazareth to Calvary and hear him release His spirit in reiterated ex coriation of religious blind guides and their blind alleys. To the divinity doctors and phylacterized Pharisees He had a bad spirit—the spirit of Beelzebub! If the very spirit of Christ in His own preaching was stigmatized as the spirit of the devil by pharisaical praters and pretenders who had their piety on parade, those who preach today as Christ
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and the apostles did, need not think to escape the same stigmatic criticisms. The Lord’s way of preaching is on record. He said those religious leaders did things “for a pretense” and should receive “the greater damnation;” He said their proselytes (converts) were “twofold more the child of hell” than themselves. He said, “Ye fools and blind. Ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel” (the Lord even had a sense of humor and resorted to the ludicrous in exposing their shams); He said, “Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell,” and “upon you may come all the the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.” Such was the preaching of Jesus. Do those who talk so much about “the spirit of Christ” preach that way on anything, ever? Rather do they seem to think that “the spirit of Christ” and “speaking the truth in love” means to be so gentle and love everybody so dearly as to let them die and go to hell before we would nettle their feelings by telling them the truth?

There are religious Pharisees with us yet whose sins and shams demand castigation “in the spirit of Christ.” Preachers today can choose between two courses: the course of the least resistance in preaching only that portion of the truth in a mild and affirmative manner which meets no opposition, or like Jesus and Paul, preach the will of God in all of its condemning as well as saving power, without thought of man’s fear or favor. But the praise and popularity that accrue from compromise and neutrality are empty, indeed. “He makes no friends who never made a foe.”

**Institutional Influence**

Back of much of this doctrinal softness is the influence of some of the colleges among us. They have harbored teachers of error; they have promoted a spirit of worldliness; they have manifested an air of superiority; they have conducted campaigns among the churches to affiliate church and school which will eventually, if continued, result in college domination and control in the church. The college domination danger is not imaginary. When it is said that “the church that does not put the college in its budget does not have the right preacher”—that is college domination. It means college control of preachers, with a threat. When the ban of boycott is placed on gospel preachers who do not “cooperate” with the college, or who criticize anything the college does, and who oppose the church-budget scheme of linking the church and college together—that is college domination with vengeance. When the president of the college can sit in his office and dictate letters to young people in various churches who belong to “The Ex-Student’s Association” and through them influence the policies of a congregation on certain issues, even to the point of who shall or shall not preach in certain places—that is college domination. When these young people in the church, whether preachers or not, feel that they are obligated to the institution that graduated them, and they become virtually an auxiliary of that college in the church where they are—that is college domination. There are those who measure a man’s loyalty to Jesus Christ by his loyalty to the college. This attitude is tested by the fact that he may criticize the church and bring no censure from college devotees, but if he criticize the college he is anathema! These are some of the dangers in this form of institutionalism, growing up among us, the gravity of which cannot be denied.

**Lines of Cleavage**

Other signs of doctrinal weakness settling down upon the churches are seen in such issues as that type of congregational anarchy existing in majority rule government in the church. This was back of all the dividing wedges of division driven by the digressives fifty years ago. By majority rule they confiscated property that belonged to loyal brethren through the elders, who without restrictions named in the deeds to property, were helpless in courts that considered the property rights were vested in the majority or held that a civil court had no jurisdiction. The majority rule issue has taken definite form and looms as an issue in the near offing. The lines of cleavage exist in localities. Elders who are concerned for the church will do well to check and double check the preacher’s record on this question before he is called to their service. Once a majority rule preacher has done his work, the elders have been disarmed and a rebellion is in full charge, led by an ambitious preacher. The sequel to all such cases is simply another church gone wrong.

**Preachers’ Meetings and Lectureships**

A brand of convocation, conference, convention, or “what have you,” that is becoming quite promiscuous, and which seldom, if ever, resulted in any good to the church, is ‘The Preacher’s Meeting,” more lately styled “Lectureships.” They tend toward a sort of preacher union, or mass influence. All sorts of ideas are carried back into the congregations from these meetings, and frequently cause considerable trouble. If elders do not take to new ideas of the preacher, they are met with: It was done “disapproved and sanctioned at the preacher’s meeting.” In one of these meetings recently membership in the Ministerial Alliance by the located preacher was defended on the ground that “Paul became all things to all men” and used “guile” and once took a vow! According to that Paul could have joined the Masonic Lodge or Methodist Church, had they existed. In other of these meetings the conference of apostles and elders at Jerusalem (Acts 15) was used as an example of the church settling questions of dispute by majority decision—hence congregational government by majority vote! Just an old stock argument of the digressives which has been exploded as many times as authoritative for instrumental music in the worship has been refuted. Such meetings cannot advance the Cause generally, nor benefit the church locally. I have something more to do than attend them.

There are many important issues before us. They are not imaginary; they are real. We have been taking too much for granted. The present generation has not enjoyed the thorough indoctrination accorded former generations under the giants of early restoration days. There must now be a general return to militant preaching, the old type of preaching—and the old type of journalism—plain first principle preaching and teaching and writing that defends the truth against all errors, teachers of error and institutions of error by name, make, model and number. It is the only thing that will salvage the church from the calamity of another wholesale digression. It may be too late to redeem a large element in nearly every church who have been saturated with weak teaching and are virtually out of sympathy with the original primitive plea. There will be a certain sloughing off as a result of this weak element—but many can be retrieved, and the church can be saved for sound doctrine if elders and preachers will awake from their lethargy and arm themselves for battle in all ages. It has been the history of God’s people and the church in all ages.

An Independent Mind!

... In this connection let it also be stated and understood that The Bible Banner is not in competition with the Firm Foundation, Gospel Advocate, Christian Leader, Christian Worker, Apostolic Times, or any other gospel paper. With especial reference is this true of the Firm Foundation, which is a landmark for the Cause of Christ in Texas. Its editor, Brother G. H. P. Showalter, has my
full endorsement and cooperation in his unwavering stand on all issues. I am persuaded that this feeling is mutual. Brother Showalter has been generous in his encouragement and commendation of me beyond my worth or merit. For this I feel both appreciative and reciprocative. We stand for the same things, and men who do stand for the same things should stand together. Any impression to the contrary entertained by anybody we should like to relieve. Any differences over any supposed issue, or attitude arising therefrom, or from any accident of the past, were composed. Personally, I am always willing and ready to correct any mistakes of my own in dealing with my brethren. If we differ on anything at all doctrinally or personally, I do not know what it is. I indorse wholeheartedly the positions to which Brother Showalter has committed the Firm Foundation on those issues involving the irregularities in certain institutions which he has sought to correct, and of the dangers of institutionalism. The policy and attitude of The Bible Banner toward the Firm Foundation will therefore be cooperative rather than competitive. Brother Showalter has himself had in mind the publication of a monthly periodical as an adjunct of the Firm Foundation devoted to special lines. He has in the past discussed such a project with me, and in the event he should yet consummate his plans to do so, my personal attitude will be unchanged, and we shall still cooperate as far as possible. (Note: This had reference to the Gospel Proclaimer which began publication soon afterward).

With a bid for the generous welcome and the liberal support of all who are jealous of the doctrinal purity of the church, and zealous for its promotion, and who believe in the defense of the truth against all encroachments of errors and isms and institutions, we pray for the guidance of God always in all things.-Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

Thus and for that the Bible Banner was launched, and for thus and that it yet lives. It was never intended to serve the purpose that the weekly papers among us serve or to occupy their field. It is not a religious newspaper. The Bible Banner is a polemic in the field of religious journalism to clarify issues, indeed. We have never sought such a fight, and have pursued it with determination and we shall still cooperate as far as possible. (Note: This had reference to the Gospel Proclaimer which began publication soon afterward).

With a bid for the generous welcome and the liberal support of all who are jealous of the doctrinal purity of the church, and zealous for its promotion, and who believe in the defense of the truth against all encroachments of errors and isms and institutions, we pray for the guidance of God always in all things.-Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

The years I have spent with the brethren here to read the back files of the Gospel Advocate-I mean away back -back in the days of its early editors, the beloved men of Tennessee. And with the Firm Foundation it is not necessary to go that far back, for all the examples needed to illustrate my present point can be found within the useful career of its present editor. In the early days of the Advocate the fight was bitter and hard. The editors received caustic criticisms from the weak and wavering among the brethren of that time, many of them harsh and unkind. But they ignored them and "kept to the issue" even when personalities were the order of the day.

Later, in Texas and all over the great West, the Firm Foundation led the fight for the primitive church. Its present beloved editor stood stoutly through storms of protest when unavoidable personalities entered into the discussions. If the Firm Foundation had waivered in those days in the contention over live and burning issues, the tide would have turned the wrong way and the Cause would have sustained a set-back for a century. But the Firm Foundation stood its ground and some of the brethren who criticised it then, and some who criticise it now, are indebted to the fixed policy of that paper, and the firm faith of its editor, for the fruits of strength and truth that they enjoy today.

Nor do we here imply, therefore let none infer, that the editor of the Firm Foundation does not yet stand for the same principles espoused and defended then. He does. Reference is made to it simply to justify by example the work the Bible Banner has steadily striven to do in its field-its very special field of "clarifying" those somewhat extra-special issues existing in the religious society of our day and the generation before. It yet waves. It was never intended that we should like to relieve. Any differences over any supposed issue, or attitude arising therefrom, or from any accident of the past, were composed. Personally, I am always willing and ready to correct any mistakes of my own in dealing with my brethren. If we differ on anything at all doctrinally or personally, I do not know what it is. I indorse wholeheartedly the positions to which Brother Showalter has committed the Firm Foundation on those issues involving the irregularities in certain institutions which he has sought to correct, and of the dangers of institutionalism. The policy and attitude of The Bible Banner toward the Firm Foundation will therefore be cooperative rather than competitive. Brother Showalter has himself had in mind the publication of a monthly periodical as an adjunct of the Firm Foundation devoted to special lines. He has in the past discussed such a project with me, and in the event he should yet consummate his plans to do so, my personal attitude will be unchanged, and we shall still cooperate as far as possible. (Note: This had reference to the Gospel Proclaimer which began publication soon afterward).

With a bid for the generous welcome and the liberal support of all who are jealous of the doctrinal purity of the church, and zealous for its promotion, and who believe in the defense of the truth against all encroachments of errors and isms and institutions, we pray for the guidance of God always in all things.-Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

Thus and for that the Bible Banner was launched, and for thus and that it yet waves. It was never intended to serve the purpose that the weekly papers among us serve or to occupy their field. It is not a religious newspaper. The Bible Banner is a polemic in the field of religious journalism to clarify issues, indeed. We have never sought such a fight, and have pursued it with determination. We reserve the right to choose the ground upon which we fight, and though we are "set for the defense of the gospel," when the instance requires it and the need arises and the cost in personal humiliations, in physical hardships, in mental pain, in spiritual suffering, and-in the loss of friends. But believing that we are right, we have gone ahead, firm in the conviction that the triumph of the truth we have upheld has fully vindicated the course we have pursued.

The Bible Banner has nothing to retract in the fight it has made- but it has something to reiterate, namely, that same lofty aim and end breathed in the fervent words of the Bible Banner's first editorial. We have no desire to indulge in purely personal discussions. We want to keep to the issue. We renew our determination to do so. But let no one think that it lets down the gap for certain others to do and say everything under heaven they desire, without due and proper attention from us. There are, indeed, some things we do not care to notice, have not noticed, and will not notice. We reserve the right to choose the ground upon which we wish to cast battle, and though we are "set for the defense of the gospel," when the instance requires it and the circumstance justifies it, we shall take time out to defend ourselves in all righteousness. "They shall not pass."-F. E. W. Jr.

no other cause would justify the fight that has been necessary and the cost in personal humiliations, in physical hardships, in mental pain, in spiritual suffering, and-in the loss of friends. But believing that we are right, we have gone ahead, firm in the conviction that the triumph of the truth we have upheld has fully vindicated the course we have pursued.

The Bible Banner has nothing to retract in the fight it has made- but it has something to reiterate, namely, that same lofty aim and end breathed in the fervent words of the Bible Banner's first editorial. We have no desire to indulge in purely personal discussions. We want to keep to the issue. We renew our determination to do so. But let no one think that it lets down the gap for certain others to do and say everything under heaven they desire, without due and proper attention from us. There are, indeed, some things we do not care to notice, have not noticed, and will not notice. We reserve the right to choose the ground upon which we wish to cast battle, and though we are "set for the defense of the gospel," when the instance requires it and the circumstance justifies it, we shall take time out to defend ourselves in all righteousness. "They shall not pass."-F. E. W. Jr.

Doughtitt Leaves Louisville

1810 Frankfort Ave., Louisville, 6, Ky.
Oct. 26, 1943.

After more than seven years with the Haldeman Avenue church in Louisville, Ky., I am preparing to move to Obion, Tennessee on January 1, and shall be engaged in meeting work a part of the time during 1844. The years I have spent with the brethren here have been very happy ones. I am always willing to serve the Lord in any way I can, and shall make every effort to help the church to which I am going. I hope to be able to help it to grow, and to make its work more effective. I am sure it will be glad to welcome me as a new member of the church.

Cecil A. Doughtitt
During the past few years much has been said pro and con, publicly and privately, in pulpit and press of Brother E. W. McMillan's preaching. The criticisms have for the most part been made because of his particular connections with certain men and movements which have been under fire and which do not stand in the favor of the loyal brethren all over the world. The Bible Banner has had its part in these discussions and has contributed its share of the criticisms.

During the past few weeks occasion was afforded for Brother McMillan and me to exchange visits and to discuss in personal conversation many things pertaining to the kingdom of Christ and sound doctrine. He does not know what I am about to write or that I am about to write anything at all, but with all that has already been said over several years of time, I figure that he can take what I am about to say now, and I doubt if he has any objection to my saying it.

In one of our conversations, Brother McMillan asked me plainly what I thought he could do to regain the confidence of many brethren who are honest in their belief that he has not been loyal to the gospel in his preaching. Without assuming to be wise enough to dispense advice or presuming to prescribe a course of action for another, I did suggest to Brother McMillan, just as freely as he requested it, that if he would renounce his doubtful affiliations and “crack down” on plain gospel preaching, like he did when he first started out, it would in my humble opinion accomplish the thing that he desired.

The Davidson Movement was a definite threat to the church from every standpoint in everything it proposed. Had it succeeded the Cause of Christ in the United States, especially in Tennessee and Texas, would have suffered a major disaster, and all that has been accomplished during the past century for the New Testament order of things versus modernism and digression would have been lost. Many churches of Christ and many preachers of the gospel would have been ruined, as a few have been in spite of all that could be done. This movement was stopped. It is extinct as a movement, but its influence is still being felt in the breasts that had to be inflicted and the scars that have been left as a result of the bitter fight. It was Brother McMillan's connection with this particular movement that marked him more than any other one thing in the eyes of thousands of loyal brethren who knew the character of that movement. I have believed, and yet believe, that brethren like Brother Sewell and Brother McMillan who were connected with the Davidson scheme, but who now see the mistake of it, should openly say so—simply renounce it in the press, where all the brethren could see it and know that it was done, for that is where they helped to promote it. I am told of men who were present in a special meeting at San Antonio that Brother Sewell admitted that he had been deceived in reference to the Davidson movement. If that is true, Brother Sewell should say it to the whole brotherhood, just as he promoted Clinton Davidson and his schemes before the whole brotherhood. Nothing short of doing so could even begin to undo the harm that was done by the promotion of that movement in Texas and in Tennessee.

Another thing that had cast a doubt over Brother McMillan's loyalty to the gospel was his connection with the Central Church of Christ in Nashville, Tennessee. This church had a record of softness and was generally so regarded by loyal churches and loyal preachers. Brother McMillan was condemned by many brethren because he preached for this church. But that issue has now been re-moved because Brother N. B. Hardeman has recently preached for it, too. Since the Central Church refused to cooperate in or even announce the gospel meeting supported by thirty of the Nashville churches, and other evidences of antipathy to the plain gospel and the New Testament order of things, many gospel preachers thought that they should refuse to preach for the Central Church until proper amendments were made for the things that had been done. In this they thought they were supporting both the truth and Brother Hardeman in his stand for the truth in Nashville. But later, without the Central church having done anything in amendment or reparation of the wrongs that had been done, Brother Hardeman preached there in a number of services. Whether that was the right thing to do or not the right thing to do, his doing so eliminated the Central Church as an issue in the controversy. Brother McMillan was condemned for preaching there. But if it was right for Brother Hardeman to preach there, it was also right for Brother McMillan to preach there. The question of what was preached is not the point now—we all know that Hardeman preached the truth. The point here is the where, not the what. Other men have been criticized for going there and preaching there—the fact, that Brother Hardeman did so constitutes an indorsement of so doing and justifies Brother McMillan's connection with that church as its preacher. For that reason I say that the issue of the Central Church, so far as Brother McMillan is concerned, has been removed, and I am not willing to criticize him for doing a thing that another does without criticism, for it is obviously not fair to condemn one and condone another, regardless of persons.

I have said all of this in order to say something else. I recently heard Brother McMillan preach in two services in Austin, Texas. The subject of one of these sermons was “The Church Of The Lord.” On this subject he preached “the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.” His text was “Upon this Rock I will build my church.” He pointed out that the Lord's church is first of all a church. He explained that material is not a building, but that material must be built into the building. He said in a very forceful way that the Lord builds us into it when he adds us to it, and he showed plainly how we are added. He did not stop there. He stated in unmistakable terms that denominations are not churches of Christ, and that when people go into them they are not built into the Lord's church. Furthermore, he called names, from the Roman Catholic Church down through all the orthodox protestant denominations. He told the audience that all these religious bodies held certain truths in common, such as the being of God, the deity of Jesus, the inspiration of the scriptures, and principles of morality—yet it is not what is held in common that makes a denomination, but rather the errors peculiar to them, which distinguish them from each other and from the church of the New Testament. The Jews on Pentecost believed in God, and had that much in common with the apostles—but were nevertheless outside the pale of salvation. So it is with the denominations, notwithstanding the truths which they hold in common they are nevertheless outside the pale of the Lord's church, and without salvation, because they fall short of obedience to the gospel, the specific thing that saves men and adds them to the church. And he did not stutter when he said these things. I take it that he believes what he preached. I have heard men who have a reputation for sound doctrine who did not “put it out” that plainly.

The other sermon I heard Brother McMillan preach was on the subject of faith. His definitions were plain
and scriptural and he exalted the word of God as the only source and ground of faith-simply what God says. It was a sermon on the plan of salvation. There is but one criticism I would make of this sermon, and perhaps, others could make more than one of sermons I try to preach. It refers to what I have heard other preachers say—that faith, repentance, the confession and baptism, are not to be regarded as “steps” for it is all faith, faith from the beginning on through. Well, I think I know what Brother McMillan meant, but since we are said to walk by faith (and that was one of his texts) I just wonder how one could walk without taking steps. Besides, the New Testament says the very word—“walk in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham.” Faith walks and faith has “steps.” Faith is itself a “step” toward God, because “he that cometh to God must believe.” I do not see any good reason for weakening an otherwise good sermon by a futile effort to eliminate “steps” from the “plan” of salvation—but this saying is not peculiar to Brother McMillan. Others who have been acceptable to the brethren have done the same thing. One good brother has written a tract entitled “Are We Preaching The Gospel?” and he thinks “we” are not because we call faith, repentance and baptism “steps” and refer to the gospel as “a plan” of salvation! But I still think I am preaching the gospel when I do it that way, and I’ll just keep on doing it—that way and baptizing hundreds of people as a result of preaching it that way, as I have been doing for about thirty years.

With that one exception I could indorse all that I heard Brother McMillan preach in his Austin meeting, and I think he would agree with me in what I have said about the “steps” of faith. I really do not think he meant that faith, repentance and baptism are not “conditions” of salvation, for he proved in the same sermon that they are.

It was announced that his next sermon would be “The Conversion of Saul of Tarsus”—so it is evident that he was preaching the plain plan of salvation through this meeting, and I rejoiced in the fact that he was doing so. Brother G. H. P. Showalter was in attendance in the meeting and had charge of the services. He exchanged remarks with me along this line and was pleased that Brother McMillan was preaching these simple truths of the gospel.

I have in the past wondered if Brother McMillan could preach the gospel. Now, I know he can, for he did. I heard him do it. What he has done in some places, or may do in other places, I cannot say, but he preached the simple gospel of Christ in the Austin meeting. Seeing that he can do it and has done it, if he does not continue to do so, constantly and unceasingly, the greater will be his condemnation. My prayer is that he may do so—and I feel the urge to say that I believe he will.

Put Porter On The Air

It is generally known that it has become necessary for Brother W. Curtis Porter to curtail his preaching work on account of physical impairment. He has not had to leave off preaching, or debating—the amount that he is able to do, he can do as well as ever—he has had to limit it in order to extend his usefulness in the cause. Brother Porter can preach at proper intervals, in meetings and on appointments, and do it well. He can continue to hold debates at reasonable intervals, and in that work he excels.

With a complete and sympathetic understanding of his situation, brethren in Arkansas have had Brother Porter on the air in regular preaching work. This is a type of work that he can do with regularity without jeopardizing his general condition. It has now been proposed that arrangements be made with the radio station in Blytheville, for a daily sermon by Brother Porter from Monette, where he lives, through the facilities of remote control. Many have become interested in seeing this done. On this point I have the following expression from Brother Porter in a letter to me.

I am preaching on the radio every Wednesday from 1:30 to 2:00 in the afternoon. We have the remote control to Monette. The station is KLCN, Blytheville, Arkansas. It is a good station and covers some seven or eight states. Many want me on for a daily broadcast, for five days in the week, Monday through Friday, and an effort is being made to put it over. I would be glad to conduct a fifteen minute daily broadcast as it would help me to reach many people. I believe it could become self-supporting, and without a begging campaign.

It appears to me that it would be a most fitting thing. Not only should the brethren in Arkansas act at once upon this suggestion, but the brethren in adjacent states should do so. West Tennessee, Missouri, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Texas, are all within reach of the preaching that Brother Porter could do in this way. This arrangement would not be a “Tom, Dick and Harry” program—it would be putting W. Curtis Porter in the pulpit at Monette to preach the gospel through the air. And in making provisions for the work, the arrangements should be ample to provide for Brother Porter’s financial support, for he could not be expected to expend his diminishing energies preaching on the air and living on nothing. Here is a job for the brethren to do in the right way and for the right purpose, and I hope they will do it. Write W. Curtis Porter, Monette, Arkansas, and tell him what you can and will do, and do it now—that is what I am doing.

The Porter-Dugger Debate

The best discussion of Seventh Day Adventism that I have ever read is the Porter-Dugger Debate. It is a complete answer, put in the Curtis Porter way, to the best arguments that, can be made in favor of Adventist doctrine. Mr. Dugger was as able a representative of the Adventist positions as can be found. Brother Porter’s answers to his arguments are direct and brief, but complete. It brings to the reader the ready material needed to meet the turns and twists made by Adventists in their efforts to bind Sabbath-keeping on Christians.

In addition to the Sabbath question, Brother Porter affirms what the New Testament teaches with reference to the first day of the week, and the Christian’s duty with reference to its observance. There is a wealth of information in Brother Porter’s treatment of this proposition, and his arguments were untouchable, and therefore, unanswered by his opponent.

There are two worthy things that can be accomplished by ordering this discussion. First: Every student of the Bible needs it for the information it contains. Second: Brother Porter’s work has been limited because of necessary caution with reference to his physical condition, hence, his income has been materially reduced. In ordering this debate you will be aiding him while obtaining far more in return for yourself. My suggestion is that you order not one, but a dozen of these books and hand them out to your Adventist neighbors. It is the answer to all the questions they can ask.

The price of the book is $1.00 and it is worth one hundred times that to anybody who has Adventism to meet. Order it from W. Curtis Porter, Monette, Arkansas.
Human Creeds

The following is taken from the pen of Ben M. Bogard, editor of the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, as printed in a recent edition of that paper.

"Then that silly twaddle about 'human creeds!' What other kind of creed can there be except a 'human creed'? Do dogs and cats have creeds? Do fish and birds have creeds? It takes a human being to have a belief (creed) and if a man has any belief at all he has a creed. All men have creeds except idiots. A man who has no creed is necessarily a fool. But the objection may be to written creeds. If that be so it follows that Campbellites are either ashamed of their belief (creed) or afraid to publish it to the world because to reduce it to writing would be to subject it to public inspection and when they say 'the Bible is our creed,' the object is to catch suckers."

It is rather strange that a man of Bogard's boasted calibre is unable to understand what is meant by "human creeds." Certainly the word creed has to do with one's belief, and I feel certain that cats and dogs and fish and birds do not have creeds, but there are some "human beings" that do not have a "human creed." A "human creed" is not merely the belief which a human being has, but it is a creed (belief) based on human authority, written and constructed by human wisdom, containing the doctrines and commandments of men. Creeds like this are found among the Baptists. J. M. Pendleton's Baptist Manual is an example of a human creed. And Bogard's "Baptist Waybook" is another. These are "human creeds," not because they contain the belief of human beings, but because they rest on human authority. I wonder if Bogard had never thought of a "divine creed"? Of course, according to his statement, there can be no such thing as a divine creed, for he says there is no other kind but human creeds. At least this is an admission that he has no divine creed and that the creed of all Baptists is human. I knew that all the time, and I thank Bogard for his admission of it. A "divine creed" is a creed given by divine authority, based on divine wisdom and written by divinely inspired writers. I am willing to agree with Bogard that "a man who has no creed is necessarily a fool," but I also maintain that man is foolish who accepts a "human creed" in religion. The people whom he styles as "Campbellites" have never denied having a creed, but we do deny that we have a human creed and challenge any man to prove otherwise.

Neither has the objection been made to "written creeds" as Board guesses. We have no objection to a written creed. In fact, the creed which we accept was "reduced to writing" nearly two thousand years ago; and we are neither ashamed of it nor afraid for it to be "subjected to public inspection." It has been publicly inspected many times by Baptist preachers, including Bogard, and it has stood all the attacks they have been able to make upon it. Furthermore, we are ready at any time to have it publicly inspected by them whenever they see fit to make the inspection. The creed which we accept "is given by inspiration of God" (2 Tim. 3:16, 17) and will "thoroughly furnish the man of God unto every good work." What more should we want? Is that not sufficient? Why turn that down and accept "human creeds" with all their imperfections? But to say that "the Bible is our creed," is, according to Bogard, merely an effort to "catch suckers." Maybe that is the reason he does not claim the Bible as his creed. But it seems to me that those who are taken in by human creeds are the suckers. At least, no one can with any degree of reason claim the Bible to be the Creed of the Baptist Church, for surely the "creed of the Baptist Church" would say something about the Baptist Church, and it is not even mentioned in the Bible. I don't blame my friend Bogard for not claiming it as his creed, for if he "caught" anybody by that claim, he would likely be a "sucker."

Evidence Of Salvation

A short time ago a Missionary Baptist student in Harding College wrote Ben M. Bogard of Little Rock, Arkansas, a letter. That letter was published in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, of which Bogard is editor. The girl was wanting to know how she could know when she was saved. She said:

"Several years ago I thought I was saved, then I became dissatisfied and worried about my condition. I thought maybe being baptized would help. I was baptized into the Missionary Baptist Church, still that didn't satisfy me, so I thought if I was not saved I didn't have any business in the church."

I do not know where the girl got the idea that "being baptized" into "the Missionary Baptist Church" would give any help in determining whether she was saved. I am sure she got no such idea from the Bible, for the Bible does not tell any one to be baptized into the Missionary Baptist Church as a proof of salvation or for any other reason. In fact, the Bible does not even mention "the Missionary Baptist Church" or any other kind of Baptist Church. But, according to Baptists, there was no reason for the girl to worry about it, for surely the Baptist Church into which she was baptized did not accept her for baptism until she had given satisfactory evidence that she was already saved. Her "experience of grace" certainly agreed with theirs or they would have voted against receiving her for baptism and for church membership. If they were mistaken in her case, likely they have been mistaken in all other cases, even in their own, and all of them should become disturbed about this question. In fact, it is my honest conviction that they should do just that. In answering the girl's question, Bogard, among other things, said this:

"The Bible proof that enables us to know that you are saved is found in the First Epistle of John. In that epistle we are told that 'We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren' (1 John 3:14). Does it not say we know we are saved because of some feeling. It does not say we know we are saved because we have been baptized as Harding College teaches. But it says we know because we love the brethren."

If Bogard could just get his brethren convinced of the fact that they do not know they are saved "because of some feeling," it would make it much easier for us to teach them the truth about the plan of salvation. Baptists, almost universally, have contended that feeling is an evidence of pardon? They often say that the good feeling they have in their left side is proof that the Lord has pardoned them and that they would not give such feeling for all the Bibles in the world. Well, I am glad that Bogard, at least, is convinced of the fact that men cannot rely on their feelings as evidence of their salvation. Perhaps he may get that idea over to some of his brethren sometime and maybe some of them will decide to rely on the word of the Lord.

The passage Bogard gives from 1 John 3:14 regarding the evidence of salvation is the truth of God, but it is not all of the truth. That is only one of the things which the Bible mentions as proof that we are his children. Bogard writes as if he thought all truth about the matter is con-
tained in this one verse of Scripture. But since it says "we know we have passed from death unto life because love when the brethren" the question logically and naturally follows: Who are the brethren? And, furthermore, how do we know when we love them? Unless there is some limit placed on the passage, it can be made to prove universal salvation. The Baptists can say "the brethren" are the members of the Baptist Church; the Methodists can say they are Methodists; the Pentecostians can say they are members of the Pentecost Church; Masons can say "the brethren" are the members of the Masonic Order; the Odd Fellows can say the same for their lodge; and on throughout every organization, religious or non-religious, in all the world. Each group loves its own brethren and that may be taken as evidence of the salvation of that group. So this would result in universal salvation. But the Lord had a definite group in mind when he had John to say "the brethren." So back to our question: Who are the brethren? Jesus asks and answers the question for us in Mat. 12:48-50. Matthew tells us that Jesus said: "Who is my mother? and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren! For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother."

This ought to settle the question. "The brethren" are those who "do the will" of the Father in heaven. But the will of the Father says to be baptized for the remission of sins. Acts 2:38. When a man refuses to do that he refuses the will of the Father and cannot be classed as one of "the brethren." Baptists are not baptized for the remission of sins; hence, they are not "the brethren." And no one else who has not done this commandment can be put in that class. So it begins to look like baptism may have something to do with it after all, regardless of Bogard's theology.

Since "the brethren" are those who have done the will of the Father, we ask: How do we know that we love them? "We know we have passed from death unto life because we love them," but what is our proof that we love them? The apostle John answers this question in 1 John 5:2. I wonder if Bogard knew it was in the divine record. John says: "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God, and keep his commandments." Now, the "children of God" are "the brethren." So we know the love the brethren when we keep the commandments of God. And one of his commandments is "baptism for the remission of sins." Thus we are shown that the evidence of our salvation includes the fact that we have been baptized, although Bogard says it is not because we have been baptized. And in connection with this we may also read 1 John 2:3. This tells us how "we know that we know him." Bogard overlooked this statement entirely. What does it say: "And hereby we do know that we know him, if we keep his commandments." And the next verse says: "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." Thus it is seen that the man who does not obey the commandments of the Lord, does not know him and does not know that he knows him. The disobedient man has no evidence of salvation and he has no salvation. But remember that one of the commandments of the Lord that stands between the sinner and salvation is baptism. Acts 2:38; 22:16; Mark 16:16. We know that we are saved when we obey the commandments upon which the Lord has promised salvation. We do not have to depend upon feelings: we have the word of the Lord for it. The man who has not been baptized is not one of "the brethren," has not done the will of the Father, is not saved and has no evidence of salvation.

Saved From Water

In 1 Pet. 3:20, 21 we have this language from the apostle Peter: "Which sometime were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water. The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Thus the salvation of Noah and the salvation of men today are presented in type and antitype. The ark, borne on the bosom of the water, transported Noah from the old world to the new; and baptism translates us from a state of condemnation to a state of justification. Thus Noah and family were saved in the ark by water, and we are saved today by baptism. So our salvation by baptism is "the like figure" (or as the Revised Version puts it: "a true likeness") of the salvation of Noah by water.

All of this is as simple as it can possibly be. There is no reason for men to misunderstand it. But it is amusing to watch the antics of Baptist preachers as they try to "figure" baptism out of the plan of salvation as given in this verse. Ernest L. McCain, in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, recently tried a new angle in this figuring business. He went at it in the following fashion:

"They were saved by the water like you and I are saved in the storm cellar from the storm. So Noah and his household were saved in the ark, from the water, and not in the water. We are saved in the cellar, from the storm, and not in the storm. Baptists preach that we are saved in Christ Jesus's blood and not in the water."

This is certainly a master stroke in the figuring enterprise. Mr. McCain "figured" that he had baptism completely figured away from the plan of salvation, but his figure is so accomplishing its purpose, "the figure of Peter out of the New Testament. When we reach the sum of this system of figuring we have this: Peter did not say what he should have said. His language should read like this: "Which sometime were disobedient, when once the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved from water. The like figure whereunto we are now even saved from baptism." Wouldn't it be a great consolation to Baptist preachers if Peter's statement read like this? But I figure that Elder McCain's figures are all wrong. His comparison just won't work. Yes, we are saved in the cellar from the storm, not by the storm. But so we are saved in Christ Jesus's blood, from the storm and by the storm. If a man were encircled by a raging fire, doomed to perish within its flames, but just before the moment of doom arrives a howling storm sweeps across the land, picks up the man from his place of peril, hurrs him through the air, and sets him down safely beyond the reach of danger, he is then saved by the storm. And it is a figure of this kind that Baptist preachers must find in order to parallel the statement of Peter about the salvation of Noah, for Peter did not say that Noah was saved from water but by water. To illustrate by a salvation from the storm will never get the job done in a way that will satisfy men who will use their brain cells just a little bit. As each man is saved by the storm when that storm sweeps him from danger and sets him down in a place of safety, so Noah was saved by water when that water carried him and his family in the ark from the old world to the new. Remember, it was by water, not from water.

Incidently, this figurative Baptist, while trying to figure baptism out of the plan of salvation, figures himself out of church membership. It is a well known fact that a man cannot be a member of the Baptist Church without submitting to Baptist baptism. But Mr. McCain rea-
sons like this: We are saved in the storm cellar from the storm, in the same way Peter’s statement indicates that Noah was saved in the ark from the flood; and it shows we are saved in the blood from the water, from baptism. But suppose we leave the storm cellar and get into the storm. Are we then saved from the storm? No, we will have to stay out of the storm to be saved from it. But what do Baptists do? Do they stay out of the water? Do they stay out of baptism? Oh, no. They have to get into the water in order to get into the Baptist Church. As long as they stay out of the water they stay out of the Baptist Church. If they are saved from the water, they are also saved from the Baptist Church. If this Baptist preacher’s illustration were carried to its legitimate conclusion, in practice, it would soon end the existence of the Baptist Church. It would be a fine conclusion for a Baptist argument. I advise Mr. McCain, however, to be more concerned about letting the statement of Peter remain as it is and to be less concerned about what “Baptists preach.”

What Makes A Baptist?

Baptist preachers and debaters have contended that God sent John as a Missionary Baptist preacher, that John baptized Christ and that made him a Baptist Christ, that he baptized the apostles and that made them Baptist apostles, and that Christ took men whom John baptized and formed them into a church and that made the church a Baptist Church. This is the line of argument that Baptist preachers have had to depend on in an effort to find any Scriptural authority for a Baptist Church. But now comes Ben M. Bogard, editor of Orthodox Baptist Searchlight and who, in his own estimation, is the greatest debater of them all, and spoils this whole argument. In a recent issue of his paper he makes the following statement:

“Since God called the first baptizer a Baptist it will logically follow that the church which baptizes now should be called Baptist. If John was the Baptist because he was the only one at that time who was authorized to baptize why is it wrong to follow the example God himself set and call the only church which baptizes by the name of the Baptists?

With Baptists the church does the baptizing by means of authorized administrators. No individual baptizes. This editor has never baptized anyone in his life, but the churches have used him as an agent and the churches using him as an agent have baptized a great many. With Campbellites the individual baptizes and hence the church authority-just anybody can baptize according to them. Hence it would not be proper to call their church by the name of Baptist. But each and every Baptist church actually baptizes and hence can be properly called Baptist church or the Lord God himself made a mistake by setting the example of calling a baptizer by the name of Baptist.”

Bogard slipped a little by saying that John was called “a Baptist.” He knew that such was not the case. So he soon corrected that, without intending for his Baptist readers to discern the correction, by saying he was “the Baptist.” This title was applied to John. He tells us, because John was a “baptizer.” In this he is exactly correct. “John the Baptist” simply means “John the baptizer.” He was therefore not called “Baptist” because he had anything to do with a church by that name but because he baptized. We thank Bogard for this admission. We have been telling: Baptist preachers for years that this is true, but Bogard is the first one that I have ever known to admit it. But his reasoning from the individual to the church is rather lame. He thinks that the church baptizes now. Hence, we can call it Baptist, for God called the first baptizer “the Baptist.” Yes, but it was an individual that was called “the Baptist.” God never called any church “the Baptist Church.” So he “set no example” for us to follow along that line. If Bogard can find the “example that God himself set” in referring to a church as Baptist, then I’ll be perfectly willing to “follow the example.” But when he presents an individual as a “set example” for a church, I am not willing to take that, for Bogard himself makes a clear distinction between the individual and the church.

Since he says that it is the Baptist Church—not the individual—that does the baptizing, then what right has he to take a title that was given to an individual and attach it to the church and claim he is following the example that God set? The matter resolves itself into this: Nothing can be a Baptist that does not baptize. Bogard says that John was called “the Baptist” because he baptized. And he thinks the church should be called “the Baptist Church” because it baptizes. Christ, therefore, did not become a Baptist when he was baptized by John, as Baptist preachers have always contended. In order for him to be a Baptist he would have to have baptized some one else. And the disciples baptized by John were not Baptists as a result of that. They had to baptize some one else first. And, merely taking John’s disciples and organizing them into a church, they would not make a Baptist church. That church would have to baptize first before it, could be a Baptist Church. Incidentally, I may state that Bogard took this position in his debate with me at Hulbert, Oklahoma. The church is a Baptist Church because it baptizes. So it has to baptize before it becomes a Baptist Church. Yet Bogard said the commission in Mat. 28:19 was given to the church. To what church? I inquired. It could not be to the Baptist Church, for it had to operate under that commission to become one. What kind of church was it before it operated?

Another thing that Bogard accomplishes by this argument in his paper is to cut out all “individual Baptists.” Did you notice that he says: “With Baptist ... no individual baptizes”? Link that with his admission that a Baptist is one who baptizes. Since “no individual baptizes” then no individual can be a Baptist. Of course, every member of the Baptist Church who has never baptized any body cannot be called a Baptist, and that includes by far the larger part of the membership of the Baptist Church. But it takes in more than that. It includes all the preachers of the Baptist Church too, for, according to Bogard, the individual preachers do not baptize. Even Bogard says he has never baptized any one. So none of the members and none of the preachers of the Baptist Church have any right to wear the name Baptist. You can have a “Baptist Church” but you can’t have “individual Baptists.” Call the church “Baptist Church” but don’t call any individual member of it a Baptist, for if you do, you will not be following the example that Bogard thinks he found that God set.

But in the New Testament I read of individuals who did some baptizing. In Acts 8:38, when Philip baptized the eunuch, we are told that “he baptized him.” And he did it without going back to Jerusalem to get the vote and the authority of the church. And Paul in 1 Cor. 1:14-16 said: “I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanas; besides, I know not whether I baptized any other.” Thus Paul talks as if he had baptized these people at Corinth; and the people there evidently had the same idea of it. Otherwise there would have been no danger of their thinking he baptized in his own name. If they knew it was the church—not Paul—that did the baptizing, they might have thought he baptized in the name of the church but certainly not in his own name. And they might have been tempted to call themselves Baptists—provided that was the name of the church.
By premillennialism I mean everything in that line from Russellism to Bollism, including the modern Jehovah Witnesses, and other intermediate grades. They are all of a kind when you run them down, and in all essential points believe about the same thing. Russell perfected the theory, and most of the others just dabble at it trying to escape some of the absurdities of Russellism, but under pressure show that they hold all of the essentials. Russell was the first man to invent a workable theory, and his theory is the center around which all of the others revolve. They float around in an ocean of speculation until they meet up with difficulties from fair criticism, and Scriptural argument which cannot be met, and then they flee to the refuge prepared for them by Charles T. Russell and hide under its fog banks.

Concerning Heaven

It is easily deducible from their numerous writings that they do not think very highly of that place we call heaven. It is well enough as an abode for angels which they esteem as creatures of a much lower order than man. They will be armed with rods of iron, and or does the king-there is ever to come such a thing? Then the Lord and the trained saints will come to heaven and take possession of the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of the Lord and his Christ (Rev. 11-15). Then the saints will do any of the hard work. They will be rulers over cities, some over five, and the best of them over ten thousand. The church state will be used for a short time as a proving ground for its fog banks. Heaven will be used for a short time as a proving ground for the saints who are to be the real rulers when they come back to take possession of their inheritance on the earth. The church, which they say is only a little flock, are being selected now for this training period, but the church state is not the training period—it is a selection period, and the training will take place in heaven during a period of seven years which they call the times of tribulation for the people on the earth. The saints will be caught up to heaven for their training at the beginning of the seven years tribulation. Then the Lord and the trained saints will come back to the earth with rods of iron in their hands, and take possession of the kingdoms of the word, and beat the people of the nations into submission. What a wonderful theory has been thought up. Even the Lord never thought of it, or if he did he never mentioned it.

Every thing is literal with them, and material. All the promises of the covenants made with Abraham, and all the prophecies that foretold this kingdom, are to be accepted in a literal-sense, and in no other. They shall plant vineyards and eat the fruit thereof, and every man shall sit down under his own vine and fig tree. This indicates we will have free enterprise in that new world, and private property, but we need not suppose that the real saints will do any of the hard work. They will be rulers over cities, some over five, and the best of them over ten cities, and we suppose they will have their slaves do the work, while the saint sits under his vine and fig tree and enjoys the shade. They will be armed with rods of iron, and of course they will beat their subjects, and whip them into line. It will be some consolation to know that we will not be bothered by communism, and socialism, over there, just free enterprise with private property, and every saint with plenty of servants at his disposal. They will have sheep, and if sheep then goats, and camels, and that means more work, milking goats and camels, and churning the butter, and shearing the sheep. We know they will have sheep for it is said the lion and the lamb will lie down together, and a little child shall play on the hole of the asp. Little children implies they will have mothers, and if so, then fathers are implied, and that means marriage. Or does it? All the hills will be made low, and all the valleys filled up, and the crooked ways shall be made straight. That will mean lots of hard work, but it will be a great help to travel, there will be no winding roads, or roads leading up hills, and down hills, like we have them now.

I have never been able to figure out why the immortal saints will need roads, or cars to run on them. They can flap their wings, if they need wings, and fly through the air, writing a gospel book on a gospel parchment, and clouds, and reach their destination in the wink of an eye. Neither can I see what they want with vineyards, and fig trees, or other meats that perish with the using, since they will eat fruit from the tree of life, and drink from the river of life. "For the former things are passed away. And he that sat upon the throne said, Behold I amek all things new." There is not one thing so far as we can know that goes to make the present world and the life it is suited to, that the immortal saints will need, or can 'use. If there is one thing let these materialists name it. I challenge them to try it.

Speaking of literal things, I once remarked that the Bible speaks of a millennium during which Satan will be bound with a gospel chain. I am asked to give chapter and verse for that gospel chain, and if I cannot find it to never be guilty of speaking of it again. To this I replied, I admit freely that John does not call it a gospel chain, neither does he call it a material chain, a brass chain, an iron chain, or a steel chain. But John was a gospel man, and he was writing a gospel book on a gospel parchment, and for gospel people, and it seems only fair to me to say that he was writing about gospel things. Whatever the chain, it was one that could bind Satan. Will my critics maintain that Satan can be bound with a material chain, and not in a material dungeon, or prison house? If Satan a material being, or a spirit? Can a spirit be bound with a literal chain made of iron or steel?

Satan can be only be bound by taking away from him the powers by which he deceives mankind, and this can only be done through the instrumentality of man himself without destroying free moral agency in man.

When Satan interfered in the affairs of this world, and intervened between man and his creator, he started something right there in the garden of Eden that has kept him busy for six thousands years. But the Lord set in motion a plan that would undo the damages Satan had wrought in his creation, and that plan embraced the active cooperation of man. These plans culminated in the gospel of Jesus Christ, the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth. Into the hands of God's Son was committed all power in heaven and on earth, and this power he bound up in the gospel, and gave it to his church as the one weapon that would destroy the power of the devil in the world.

Concerning The Kingdom

Brother Boll affirms, "When Satan shall be dethroned, bound, and imprisoned (Rev. 20:1-4)—When the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of the Lord and of his Christ (Rev. 11:15)—If there is ever to come such a time, and the word of God bears this out, then Christ must and will come before that time."
How does Brother Boll know that Christ must and will come before that time? No one has said so but him, and he quoted no Bible to prove it. It is a bold assertion of something the Bible does not say, and Brother Boll could never prove it if his life depended upon it. I might differ from Brother Boll about what these events mean, but that feature is not in controversy. He raised no question on that point, but introduced a third point, the second coming of Christ, which is not contained in either of the passages which he cites, and boldly affirms that it must happen before either of the other two can take place. The Bible nowhere says, or intimates, that Christ must and will come first, only Brother Boll said that.

He has three separate questions, or points, in his argument: the binding of Satan, the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdoms of the Lord and of His Christ, and the second coming of Christ. For the first two he offers passages of Scripture which he claims proves them to be true but offers no proof for the third point. He mixes them up, shuffles and pours them out, and invites the reader to accept his word that the third point is true because the others are. He assumes there is something in the passages which is not there-the second coming of Christ.

What the Bible means by the binding of Satan and by the kingdoms of the world becoming the kingdoms of the Lord and of His Christ, the Lord has no necessary connections with the second coming of Christ. If the Bible had said he was coming to bind Satan or to take over the kingdoms of this world, it would have an argument. But there is no such text, if there had been one he would have quoted it.

In fact what texts we do have that might bear on that point are all on the opposite side. The only passages that speak of a second coming of Christ, and its bearing on Satan, and the kingdoms of this world, show clearly that it will have a different effect on them. Satan will not be bound then, he will be destroyed by the brightness of his coming, and cast into a lake of fire where he will be tormented forever and ever.

If Jesus had wanted a material kingdom he would have set up one. He never wanted such power, he refused it, and did all he could to teach us how vain it is, how futile, how insignificant, when compared with the powers which he does wield. He could have taken over the Roman Empire, if he had wanted it, even easier than Moses could have taken over the throne of Egypt.

Not only did the Lord refuse that kind of dominion for himself, he taught his disciples also that he had none of it for them. In Matt. 20-2-26, we have the following: "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority over them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever shall be great among you, let him be your minister, and whosoever shall be chief among you let him be your servant." This is the very kind of dominion Brother Boll covets for the saints. He teaches that every saint is promised a throne during the millennium.

Suppose we grant them that there are some people left in this world, not saints, over whom the saints will reign what is the object of that reign? Here is an interlocutory reign of a thousand years that has no real meaning. It is an interlocutory judgment awarded them of a reign that comes in between the gospel age and the final reward of the saints for a thousand years, no more, and no less. A thousand years is a short time compared to eternity-Methuselah lived that long. It is a small thing compared to a greater reward which has no end, promised them at the judgment. If a saint misses it he has not missed much, and if he gains it he has not gained much, just a few years reign over somebody, or something, which Brother Boll has never taken time to define sufficiently. Russell furnishes them a job, and Brother Boll will have to come to it, or take out.

Like their Lord the only reign a true saint ever wants, or will ever get as a saint, is a spiritual reign. If one who is a saint should be any chance occupy some material, earthly, throne, or seat of worldly authority, he will reign as a citizen of some earthly government, not as a saint. Civil government is an ordinance of the Lord, but it is separate and distinct from his spiritual government, although a man may be a citizen of both. A man can be a good citizen of his country and not be a saint, and he can be both a saint and a good citizen of an earthly government. Being a saint makes a man a better citizen, and if he is a ruler he should be a better ruler.

But that is not the kind of dominion the Lord promised the saints, that kind of dominion belongs to this world. Such dominion is upheld by policy, and force, and is authorized in the Bible to use the sword when necessary. The powers that be, civil powers, are ordained of God.

The dominion which is promised to the saints is joint dominion. One saint does not reign over some other saint, or some poor sinner who is not a saint, the saints reign jointly, or with each other. They also reign with the Lord. His reign is a spiritual reign and their reign must be the same. In the second coming of Christ, He will exercise dominion over other saints, like the princes of the Gentiles, but joins in the reign with all other saints, and with the Lord who reigns with them, and through them.

Brother Boll is blinded by material power, just as the Jews were who rejected the Lord.
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