Looking on the Stumbling Side

Cled E. Wallace

Away back yonder when the New Testament was written, James left a remark on record to the effect that “in many things we all stumble.” One reason the Bible remains up to date is that it is so true to the facts of life. A notable thing about stumbling is that it attracts so much attention. I was walking along one day and was not aware of attracting any attention at all, but I suddenly stumbled and everybody looked. Anybody can attract more attention by stumbling in a public place than he can by walking uprightly.

Now, preachers as I know them, are a pretty decent lot, but it is as true of them as it is of others that “in many things we all stumble.” And inasmuch as one stumble will attract more attention than a day’s walking it is not surprising that we hear a lot about the faults of preachers. Sometimes the first thing we hear about a preacher is something he has. Well, we all have them, but faults that are not too serious should be viewed with a good deal of tolerance. Finding fault is a pretty easy job for the reason that stumbling is so noticeable. And besides we do not all stumble at the same place and time, that is we do not usually do so.

It looks silly and useless to me when somebody else stumbles and my first impulse is to laugh or be shocked, depending on the seriousness of the situation and I may feel the urge to chide the delinquent and exhort him to be more careful. When I stumble, it is embarrassing and if there is a reason for it outside my own carelessness I am quick to see it, and use it in my own defense. That is human nature. Jesus drew a good lesson from this trait of human nature. “And why beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother’s eye, but considerest not the beam that is in thine own eye? Or how wilt thou say to thy brother, Let me cast out the mote out of thine eye; and lo, the beam is in thine own eye? Thou hypocrite, cast out first the beam out of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye.” About all of us are somewhat tainted with this form of hypocrisy. The Pharisees were deeply religious. When religion makes a man hyper-critical of the conduct of others, he can become more of a nuisance than an edifier. We preachers need to give a thought to this angle. The pulpit can easily become a platform for fault-finding. Some preachers scold people more than they teach them.

Conscience is a good thing but it can be over-developed. A thyroid gland is a good thing but it can give a lot of trouble if it is overdeveloped. The common foibles of the brethren are a constant temptation to the preacher with an over-developed conscience to degenerate into a com-

I have heard of some very good preachers arriving at the conclusion that the drinking of tea and coffee and certain “cola” drinks was injurious to health, an unnecessary waste of money, and that it is downright “sinful” to take such “slop” into the stomach. They wasted some of the Lord’s time, trying to get that over to the brethren. Most of the brethren in such cases just charged it up to a little queerness on the part of the preacher and went on drinking their tea and coffee, while a few others became a little nettled, and a very few more neurotically inclined actually tried to quit. You know it would be too bad for a coca-cola or a cup of coffee to keep you out of heaven.

Some of us who smoke really get the works. Now, I’m not going to try to think up any reasons why a man should smoke. The ones who smoke do not need them, and I have no desire to encourage anybody to start. Most everybody does some unnecessary things just because he wants to. It might well be that R. L. Whiteside, Winston Churchill and I could do clearer thinking and set a better example if we didn’t smoke, but when some preacher informs us that we are not welcome in his home or in his church because we do, we are likely to decide that we would prefer to be somewhere else anyhow. Preachers can get pretty funny sometimes and veer in the direction of the tyrannical. I could name at least one who thinks the kingdom would be greatly advanced if preachers would quit smoking and children would quit hating up their stockings for Santa Claus to fill up at Christmas time. How ever, he has consulted every doctor from Baltimore to Saint Louis, has taken enough pills and drunk enough alcohol in patent medicines to produce delirium tremens under other circumstances, and can entertain you conversationally with all the gruesome details of his various ailments. He is a good preacher in spite of all that and will probably live to be at least a hundred and go to heaven when he dies. As for me I was nearly grown before I found out that there wasn’t a Santa Claus. I’m not so sure about it yet, my own children have grown up and found it out for themselves, and I’m minded to let the little heathen that belong to the rest of the brethren find it out the same way. I’m heathen enough myself to wish them all a Merry Christmas while the delusion lasts.

After all, maybe the fellow had something who said there’s so much good in the worst of and so much bad in the best of us, it behoves not any of us to be too tough on the rest of us.
"ARE PROPHETIC SPECULATIONS MERELY NON-ESSENTIAL?"

Peter, Paul, and James, with all the force and emphasis that inspired language can give, declare that prophecies concerning David's throne have been fulfilled in Christ. On this point the teaching of the apostles is very definite.

Peter declared on Pentecost that the prophecy of David that God would set One on his (David's) throne (Ps. 132:11) was fulfilled when Christ was raised from the dead and exalted at God's right hand (Acts 2:29-33).

Paul declared in his address in Antioch of Pisidia that God's promise through Isaac to "give you the sure blessings of David" (Isa. 55:3) was fulfilled in Christ. Hear him: "And we bring you good tidings of the promise made unto our fathers, that God hath fulfilled the same unto our children, that he raised up Jesus: as also it is written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. And as concerning that he raised him from the dead, now no more to return to corruption, he hath spoken on this wise, I will give you the holy and sure blessings of David. Because he saith also in another psalm, Thou art the root and the offspring of David; the sceptre shall not depart from David's house. He saith again another psalm, The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall add unto thee the days of thy life. And James understood that this prophecy had been fulfilled and that the tabernacle of David had been set up. Paul says in his address in Antioch of Pisidia that the prophecies concerning the setting up of the tabernacle of David have been fulfilled and that the tabernacle of David was fulfilled when Christ was exalted and seated on David's throne (Acts 13:33).

The fulfillment of these prophecies, according to both Paul and Peter, was complete in the resurrection and exaltation of Christ. Peter's "therefore" in Acts 2:33 makes the exaltation of Christ and his sitting on David's throne identical. And Paul's "therefore" in Acts 13:37 likewise marks the fulfillment of the prophecies he had cited regarding "the sure blessings of David."

James with equal clarity and finality declared in his speech before the conference at Jerusalem that the prophecies concerning the "tabernacle of David" had been fulfilled. Hear him: "Brethren, hearken unto me: Simeon hath rehearsed how first God visited the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name. And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After these things I will return, and I will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen: and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will set it up: that the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and the Gentiles, upon whom his name is called, saith the Lord, who maketh these things known from of old." (Acts 15: 14-18).

Peter connected the fulfillment of David's prophecy that God would set One of his (David's) throne with the resurrection and exaltation of Christ. Paul connected the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy on the "sure blessings of David" with the resurrection of Christ and remission of sins, and declared that "God hath fulfilled the same." James connects the prophecies concerning the setting up of the tabernacle of David with the establishment of the church and the admission of the Gentiles into it, and based his decision regarding the Gentiles at Antioch upon this fact.

What is the difference between the throne of David, the sure blessings of David, and the tabernacle of David? Will anybody venture to say that these three things are different things and not one and the same thing? According to Paul, Peter, and James, all of these Davidic promises have been fulfilled in the resurrection of Christ, the establishment of his church, or kingdom, and in the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles as well as the Jews.

(1) According to the argument of James in Acts 15: 14-17, God would "build again the tabernacle of David" and "set it up," that the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and the Gentiles, upon whom his name was called. If the tabernacle of David has not been built, or set up, the residue of men cannot seek after the Lord and the Gentiles cannot have the name of Christ called upon them nor receive salvation through his name. This is one consequence.

(2) If the tabernacle of David is not to be set up until the second coming of the Lord, since the residue of men cannot seek after the Lord, nor the Gentiles receive the gospel, until it is set up, it follows that the residue of men may seek after the Lord, and that salvation will be offered to the Gentiles, after the second coming of Christ. In what essential respect does this differ from the plain old Russellite doctrine of a second chance to be saved? Why should Gentiles be concerned about salvation at all now? And why should the gospel be preached to them?

James understood that the Gentiles had a right to the blessings of salvation and used this prophecy to prove it. Therefore, James understood that this prophecy had been fulfilled and that the tabernacle of David had been set up. To deny it is to deny the Gentiles, including our fathers and mothers who died in the faith, the blessings of the gospel. These speculative theories are not, therefore, merely nonessential. They strike at the fundamentals of the gospel. They are vital. Followed to their logical and legitimate end, they rob the Gentile world today of Christ. Will our speculative brethren accept this consequence? They will not. But it is there just the same, and they will have to do one of three things: Accept the logical end of their theory and quit preaching the gospel to the Gentiles; or abandon their speculative and foolish teaching concerning the future reign of Christ on David's throne in Palestine; or, doing neither of these, just remain inconsistent. Let us hope they will eventually abandon their false teachings, lay aside their homespun theories, and content themselves, like Paul and the rest of us, "not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified."
DAVID LIPSCOMB ON EPH. 4:9
HULEN L. JACKSON

The Gospel Advocate Co. has brought to the brotherhood a set of commentaries on the New Testament. These have been written by some capable men. Several of them are by Lipscomb and Shepherd. Since several thousands of these have been printed and distributed, it is quite necessary that no false doctrine be therein taught. I would not set myself as a judge of Bro. Lipscomb's writings, nor of the work of any other man, but because the comments on Eph. 4:9 plainly teach error, even to the casual reader. I submit the following.

I hereby charge that the comments by David Lipscomb on this passage teach premillennialism. Turn to page 76 and study carefully paragraph 3. Verse 9 says, “Now this, He ascended, what is it but that he also descended into the lower parts of the earth?” The comments are as follows:

“The reference here is to the Messiah who came to earth from heaven, his original dwelling place, to destroy the Power of the devil; to annihilate his kingdoms, cast out the evil spirit inseparable from them; reassert the authority of God, reestablish his rule and kingdom; make his Spirit again the life-giving and pervading influence of this world. When this work is accomplished, death will no longer reign on perishing mortals: Those in the bondage of death will rise from their imprisoning graves.”

Bitterness, wrath, strife will cease among men, then shall the prophecy of Isaiah 11:6-9 be fulfilled. This is the result of the reign of the kingdom of God on earth. The fullness of that reign and the rule of that Spirit will usher in the glorious millennial morn.”

He thus plainly teaches in so many words that when death is destroyed, or when the resurrection arrives, Isaiah 11:6-9 will be fulfilled and the millennium will begin. That is premillennialism. If not, why not? That comment should never have appeared in print in the commentaries. Why not do as I have done to mine, write not so across this section?

A study of Isaiah 11 will show that it was a prophecy of the coming of Jesus Christ as a root of Jesse to set up His kingdom on earth wherein peace would abound and wherein the Gentiles might seek after the Lord. That peace is described figuratively by verses 6-9: “The wolf also shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. And the cow and the bear shall feed; their young ones shall lie down together; and the lion shall eat straw like the ox. And the suckling child shall play on the hole of the asp, and the weaned child shall put his hand on the cockatrice den. They shall not hurt nor destroy in all the Lord’s holy mountain: for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea.” Now then, verse 10 says in that day the Gentiles would seek after the Lord. Do they seek after the Lord today? In Acts 15:13-17 James plainly teaches that now the Gentiles do seek after the Lord in fulfillment of the prophecy of Amos and he could have also said Isaiah’s too. If that is so, right now in the Christian era the prophecy of Isaiah 11:6-9 is fulfilled and we need not look for the “dawn of the millennial morn” in the premillennial way suggested by Bro. Lipscomb in this comment.
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Uncle Sam’s mail-toters hand us a good many things which are inspired by what appears in the Bible Banner. We feel at liberty to make use of any of it that might prove entertaining, or edifying, to the readers of the paper. Of course it would be impossible to use all of it and quite improper to use some of it. We omit names unless there is a good reason for using them and try to avoid affording anybody any ground for charges of unfairness.

Sometime ago a lawyer of Houston, Texas took a shot at “shootin’ preachers” in the Firm Foundation and pretty definitely yoked them up with the devil. In reply I had something to say about “Suein’ Lawyers.” R. O. Kenley, of Houston, writes:

“My only criticism is your failure to let your readers know to whom you referred. As you well know, I always fight in the open. I am not ashamed of my views upon any Bible question, and any time I express my views, I welcome criticism.”

Very well, Judge, that ought to be easily fixed, and you quite satisfied. The “well-known lawyer of Houston, Texas” was R. O. Kenley, a good fellow, who is quite right when he is right, and pretty wrong, when he is wrong. He is quite capable of proving that a lawyer can be as stubborn as a preacher. You are quite welcome to the criticism, Judge. Incidentally, the Judge did not tell his readers to whom he referred when he lifted the lid of hell and asked “shootin’ preachers” to take a smell.

I have this from a preacher “whose name need not be mentioned in this connection,” as editor Drypasture would say:

“Cled you are really doing good in your paper. When you and Foy first started your paper I thought it out of place but I subscribed for it and sometimes when I received it I would wait until I would get on the train going to my meeting before I would read it. By the time I would reach my appointment I would be plenty mad but sometimes you can preach better when you are mad, at least I do. Now, I see and realize the need of just such a magazine. Your efforts will go down in the history of the church of Christ. You have saved the church from what I think may be benefitted by some general observations I am mentioning in this connection,” as editor Drypasture would say:

“It is somewhat heartening to see “186 pounds” flop over on our side so explosively and so decisively. However, we sense the need of a warning against extremes. You know, “186 pounds” of enthusiasm can get hot enough in the way of praise, that it needs cooling off a bit in the interest of the facts in the case. It might not affect me too much, but if somebody should make the editor believe he had “saved the church from something” it might go to his head and there’s not much telling where he would wind up, trying to save it from something else. It just wouldn’t do for an editor to get the idea that he is the savior of the church. I have to watch him close enough as it is. If I had an editorial savior on my hands, I don’t know whether I could handle him or not.

Now, I’m not so sure about a fellow preaching better when he is “plenty mad.” It depends largely on what he is mad about. It would have to be righteous indignation, which is a far cry from some sorts of madness. I have had the urge to both preach and write when I felt that I was angry after a godly sort of fashion. I always do better under such circumstances when I can lighten the pressure somewhat with a little humor. It is like dropping a little sugar in a cup of coffee. It does something to it. Some people have iron enough in their insides to gulp it down hot, and black, but most people take it better with a little sugar in it. Then there are a few others, some of whom are preachers, who do not drink it at all, but prefer milk, slightly warmed with a little pepsin in it.

We get many such letters as the one I am about to quote. This one was written by a father with sons in the armed forces of the country.

“Because of some teaching that I had when a boy, I thought a Christian could not do anything in the armed service, and be pleasing to God. I had the idea if one was in the armed service, and got killed, that he had no chance for the kingdom of God. I was wrong at last, and I was glad I was wrong.

So when this war came on, and my two boys were in line for duty I was worried, very, very much over it, because of my former teaching, but thank God, before they were called for service, the Bible Banner came to me, and my eyes saw a new light on the matter. Why just think, if I had never been enlightened on the war question, and my two boys in the service of their country, how I would have been feeling all this time. We are humble and genuinely glad that we have been able to bring such comfort to such parents throughout a wide area, based on both reason and revelation. We know of many who feel as this father feels and some of them have “changed since Pearl Harbor.” If a man can think at all a thing like Pearl Harbor ought to stimulate him to do a little of it.

A sister over Georgia way is quite irritated. She points a finger at us and says: “I have written you three letters on this point and got no answer.” I did not see the “three letters,” so I take it that they found the editor’s desk. It possibly never occurred to the lady that the editor is a busy man, travels extensively and preaches two or three times each day and finds it a big task to do the necessary work of getting the paper out on time. He could not possibly give his personal attention to all this sort of personal correspondence, even if he were so inclined, and querists were thoughtful enough to include postage for reply. Since her letter is quite typical of the attitude and thinking of some very persistent people, it may be worth a look see. She reminds us that we must “seek first the kingdom of God and all these things shall be added unto you.” Then she tosses this at us.

“How can a soldier on foreign soil or at home either, seek the kingdom of God? Does he in it too, as others always have that it is sinful to 'forsake' the assembly on the Lord’s day for any reason whatsoever except sickness of your own body? Do you know of Christians who have left corpses of loved ones at home and have sought the Lord’s appointment at his table on Lord’s day? I have. Does ‘first’ indeed mean second? How can Christians get off from Lord’s day worship long enough to go to war? Now if you can’t answer this or don’t want to because I’m a woman, then don’t answer. But if you do not care to answer this, cancel my subscription to your paper.”

I feel under no obligation to answer questions under threat, and since the sister displays more temper than a desire for information, I’m not certain that anything I might say would be satisfactory to her. However, some may be benefited by some general observations I am moved to make in the way of setting forth some general
principles. Difficulties often arise in the course of human life which are not easy to dispose of with finality. There are times when I do not feel the urge to be dogmatic. Most any woman, for instance, can put posers to me in the way of questions that I cannot answer fully right off the bat. It is always deplorable when situations arise that make it impossible for Christians to be in “the assembly on the Lord’s day.” Such situations do arise. In such cases they have not “forsaken” the assembly. They simply are unable to attend. This is true in the case of “sickness of your own body,” as the lady expresses it. It would be well for some to look up the meaning of the word “forsake.” Yes, I have known people who have left corpses of loved ones and attended worship on the Lord’s day. I have admired their courage and faith. Yet, should a grief-stricken mother remain beside the body of her child, I would not Pharisee enough to criticize her for it. Some critics can be quite hard-hearted in the name of loyalty. Even the strict legality of Moses allowed exceptions in the case of sabbath observance for certain emergencies and cases of mercy. A Christian, if need be, can “get off from the Lord’s day’s worship long enough” to save a life, put out a fire that threatens life and property, or even pull an ox out of a ditch. The Lord’s supper is not a sacrament. It should not be neglected, forsaken, nor is it something to be fanatical about. A Christian in the army should make every reasonable effort to break bread with other disciples on the Lord’s day, just like Christians outside the army should. Many of them do so. When conditions are such that they cannot they are just like some Christians on the outside who cannot. Some Christian boys will undoubtedly have to be absent from some Lord’s day meetings to keep the Japs and the Huns from taking charge of this country. If some feel capable of criticizing them for so doing, just leave me out of it. I’m not built that way. I think I know what a time we would have meeting at all if those pagan barbarians were in charge of this country. If some emergency arises where it is necessary for the Georgia lady to turn in a fire alarm, call a doctor or the police instead of “going to church.” I do not think she will be charged with “forsaking” the assembly for any such reason.

I see where my friend Dewey Plum of Parkersburg, W. Va. has gone into “a haze about days and other things” and expects to “get plenty of kicks” for it and solicits “a line of encouragement.” He reports “many encouraging letters and cards” and “each mail is bringing more” who are applauding his valiant efforts to kill Santa Claus and take Grandpa’s pipe away from him. He says “Christmas means no more to me than any other day.” “Smoking is a waste of money.” I still think preachers ought to do like I did—quit smoking. This effort to kill Santa Claus springs up about Christmas time each year. A few preachers take a few pot shots at the good-natured old cheer spreader, but somehow he seems to get around on time and there isn’t any present prospect of his early funeral. I think the preachers, in the interest of childhood ought to tackle an easier job first. They should try to get rid of Mother Goose and Jack And The Bean Stalk. When they save the children from these huge falsehoods, then they can pop at Santa Claus. Personally, I rather like the genial old fellow. And I usually have a pretty merry time around Christmas, especially when the children are at home. Brother Plum is a mighty nice fellow and he has a very, very tender conscience, but he shoots poor little rabbits. I’ve seen him come in with his feet muddy and his pants bloody. You know it costs money to buy shot-gun shells, especially when a fellow does as much missing as Brother Plum. I have hunted with him. Why, the price of one box of shells, not to mention the gasoline “wasted” would keep my pipe afire for a whole month. Brother Plum assures us that he was not “born in the objective case and in the kick-a-tive mood.” I do not think he was either. But he sometimes teeters a little in that general direction, along around Christmas time. Too bad that he can’t go along and have a good time with the rest of us. I take it he would be afraid to eat a slice of turkey or a piece of fruit cake the last week in December for fear somebody would think he is celebrating Christmas. It is a sort of Lenten season with him. I have spent may pleasant days in his home and he is a gracious host, but I do not think I would enjoy Christmas with him, unless we could go rabbit hunting. But then “Preachers would have more money to give to the Lord, and hence more ‘treasure in heaven,’ if they did not send it up in smoke” shooting at and missing fleeing rabbits. However, I am inclined to believe that some preachers are too nosey about how other preachers and brethren spend their money. It is easy for a preacher to get that way and it nearly always does more harm than good.

Speaking of letters, I almost forgot that I have another one, the eleventh I believe, from our “venerable” Brother Dorris. I would not feel justified in imposing this on our readers but for the fact that Brother Greenpasture has served the public with an editorial announcement that these classics are to be put in tract form. A tract will not contain them. It will take a book. Brother Dorris starts off with:

“My last pill was for your stomach. Since I have not heard from you, it may be your disease is making its way to your liver, and if so, swallow this pill and perhaps it will have a tendency to check its spreading further.”

This is the sort of stuff the Editor of the Advocate is acting as press agent for. Brother Dorris is anxious to make some explanations of some of his former utterances which I allowed the readers of the Bible Banner to see as an example of the sort of literature the Gospel Advocate endorses and advertised. Here are the samples. He referred to our position as “the war baby” and added:

“Since the baby’s eating apparatus is located at the front end, Brightwell will be expected to feed the child. Foy, of course, will look after the other end.”

“The reason the doctors failed to find anything wrong with you, is, they examined the wrong end. Your defects are all located in the upper end, not the lower end. We all know that the end the doctors examined is as sound as a dollar and in good working order.”

And these gentlemen appear to be surprised that we do not relish a debate with them on a proposition of their own choosing! Brother Dorris explains at length in his last letter that the opposite end from the “upper end” is the feet! Brightwell is expected to feed the child, while Foy must keep its feet clean! I went to Scott and White to have my feet examined! Now, I’m glad to have this explanation, for it will relieve a good many people of the temptation of thinking Brother Dorris meant something else. When Brother Greenpasture puts the first letter in the Advocate he should by all means include this explanation from Brother Dorris. Anything the Gospel Advocate endorses and advertises should be highclass in every respect.
Brother Jimmie Lovell has been “talking it over” with the brethren for a number of years. His articles have appeared in publications back east, down south, and out west. Our brother admits that he often blunders, and insists from time to time that he “must be crazy.” These are radical terms to be employed in a self-imposed indictment. Such suggestions are hardly in order; the discerning reader should be able to reach a conclusion by the internal evidences. It is commendable to admit error, but the best commentary is improvement.

Since ushering in the “talking” period our brother has not spared, with but few exceptions, the preachers, the elders, the congregations. The exceptions might have helped him had they comingled admonition with applause and sympathy. Genuine friends discourage the partisan spirit by pointing out defects along with good traits. The grateful strive to improve. Is it possible that our brother developed an obsession during the “silent” period when he might have been subjected to the excessive and elongated dissertations of preachers and elders? If he determined to “lay on” when opportune, the “tune of the harbor” is self-evident. In his articles, private correspondence, and personal observations, he has singled out unsightly blemishes which have been “screamed” with such “language” that the applause is confined to the bleacherite partisan. A multitude would rejoice to observe expressions and endeavors more in harmony with the spirit of Christianity.

Brother Rowe, with brotherly admonition, told Jimmie that he was “talking too much” (James 1:19); our brother thanked him and kept talking. Brother Nickal, with fatherly advice, pointed out to him that he was using “exactly” the word the Lord told him “not” to use. He was “thankful” but explained that the word “fool” was used with a different meaning. How were the readers able to determine the exact meaning? Brother Cled Wallace has used about every “approach” in an effort to help the brother see himself in the light of reason and revelation. Brother Fox’s strictures, in days gone by, were merely the sum total response to a broadside invitation. Are these men the enemies of our brother? If so, Christ and Paul were the enemies of Peter. They employed plain speech, while face to face, and Peter loved them dearly—not in word only, but in deed! (II Peter 3:15).

It is possible for good intentions to be misdirected and leave question marks in the minds of honest observers. Brother Akin asked Jimmie to leave his name out of a personal observations, he has singled out unsightly blemishes which have been “screamed” with such “language” that the applause is confined to the bleacherite partisan. A multitude would rejoice to observe expressions and endeavors more in harmony with the spirit of Christianity.

Brother Rowe, with brotherly admonition, told Jimmie that he was “talking too much” (James 1:19); our brother thanked him and kept talking. Brother Nickal, with fatherly advice, pointed out to him that he was using “exactly” the word the Lord told him “not” to use. He was “thankful” but explained that the word “fool” was used with a different meaning. How were the readers able to determine the exact meaning? Brother Cled Wallace has used about every “approach” in an effort to help the brother see himself in the light of reason and revelation. Brother Fox’s strictures, in days gone by, were merely the sum total response to a broadside invitation. Are these men the enemies of our brother? If so, Christ and Paul were the enemies of Peter. They employed plain speech, while face to face, and Peter loved them dearly—not in word only, but in deed! (II Peter 3:15).

Brother Akin asked Jimmie to leave his name out of a personal observations, he has singled out unsightly blemishes which have been “screamed” with such “language” that the applause is confined to the bleacherite partisan. A multitude would rejoice to observe expressions and endeavors more in harmony with the spirit of Christianity.
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THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION IN ARKANSAS

Early in 1919 a few brethren got together in Conway, Arkansas, and looked with regret upon the educational situation so far as the church and the children of the parents of the church were concerned. We saw our children going to other educational institutions and coming out with their faith shaken and with but little, if any, interest in the church. As we viewed this situation we also faced the truth that the church of the Lord Jesus Christ could not undertake to operate any organization or institution but itself. If we were to have such a school it would have to be an independent institution independent of the church. The church was to have no control of the school, nor could the school control the church.

To have such an institution, as we saw the need, we realized it would have to be under the control of Christian men capable of operating an educational institution, just as Christian men would operate a business.

These men began Planning and soon presented to the brotherhood of the state a Plan endorsed by a great majority of them. An Architect was appointed and plans were adopted, and bids were asked for from towns interested in the location of such a school. The city of Morrilton, Arkansas, offered one hundred thousand dollars. ($100,000.00) and forty acres of land as a site for the school and this offer was accepted and the school located there. Then came the depression of 1920 and the school was not opened until the following year. In a few years this school and the one at Harper, Kansas, were consolidated and the college at Harper moved to Morrilton. This consolidation was not effected in full agreement with the original Promoters of the Morrilton school, and out of this consolidation came the discharge of the late faithful soldier of the cross, John T. Hinds, who was at that time teacher of Bible in the school. It was generally understood this action was the result of Brother Hind's opposition to the premillennialism taught by those who came down from Harroer. When this discharge was announced three members of the board announced their resignation as members of the board, and walked out also. Then began the teaching of the speculative known as premillennialism in the State of Arkansas with the influence of the school behind it.

From the beginning of the school it had experienced financial difficulties and the consolidation gave very little relief to this situation. The policy that "the end justifies the means" was adopted and many practices followed in keeping therewith, among them the soliciting of funds from the brethren of the church with the Promise that they would be used for definite purposes, or returned if not thus used, and the use of the funds thus ear marked for other purposes dealing in cotton futures for the purwosee of obtaining funds and the using of such monies in the operation of the school; the collecting of funds from the members of the church and turning them over to some one who was not a member of the church and had no interest in it, to be administered by him for the school; the selling of bonds never paid; the promising salaries to teachers and never paying them; the gathering of young men in the school and sending them out to preach for the churches, without regard for qualification or faithfulness, thus sacrificing the welfare of the church. The Scriptural qualification of being "faithful men and able to teach others also" was ignored.

Out of this institution and this kind of an effort, there has gone a number of very fine young men who are preaching the gospel. There have also gone from there some who are not sound in doctrine, with the indorsement of the school, Much boasting is being made of the number of young men thus sent out, and the stress thus given them would lead one to think the church of Christ never had any real preachers and never would have had had it had not been for this school. In the working of the school, loyalty to the school is one of the first lessons every student is forced to learn, and many of these youngs go out of the school in such a state of mind that if you are not for "this school" then they are against you. They measure the standing of all others, so far as they are concerned, by the attitude you take toward this school.

All this is given as a matter of history and fact to get the setting for what I want to suggest. Through this kind of working the school has fastened itself on the church. If a church is not for the school, then the school is openly the "doctrine taught" by the school and lets that fact be against that church, and if a preacher does not agree with known, then the school is against that preacher and tries to kill his influence, regardless of his "faithfulness" to the cause of Christ and his ability to preach the gospel.

The churches must be for the school and the preacher must subscribe to its manner of teaching and operation, or the school will "denounce" them.

A divided church is the outcome of this situation as we now have it. In most of the congregations in the state of Arkansas there are some pro-school and some anti-school members to be found and this causes disagreement in the working of the church and this is all because of the attitude the school is taking toward the church and false doctrine. If the church suffers in order for the school to prosper, then let the church suffer, seems to be the policy now.

Let me say that I think we need a school. I am for a school according to the original purpose and I have no desire to interfere with the operation of such a school. What I would like to see and am praying for, is for the school to be operated according to the original purpose, and to see the church of the Lord Jesus Christ free from entanglements with the school. Let the church attend to its own affairs. Likewise let the school attend to its own affairs, stand for the truth, auit defending those in error, and stop trying to kill the influence of those fighting for the truth. Then the school could be a great help to the cause and the brethren would supply more students for the school.

Brethren, what do you think about it? Who is to be head of the church, Christ or the school? Are you ready to sacrifice the church? Remember the school cannot be expected to lessen its hold on the church. The church will have to free itself from the school.

J. C. Dawson (The only living member of the original group that met in Conway, Ark., and planned the school at Morrilton).
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