There is a popular impression to the effect that the way of righteousness is the hard way and that drifting along the path of least resistance in surrendering to every whim of the flesh is the easy way of life. It 'is a short-sighted and narrow view of the chief problem of life. He who knew all about life has said: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.

"Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest for your souls; but they said, We will not walk therein." The stubborn man who spurns divine guidance and scorns the restraints of law and insists on his right to independently walk along the path of his own choosing, he is the man who is in for a hard time.

Man is a part of a universe which is ruled by law. If he does not fit into an orderly scheme of things, he is in for a hard time. He can break himself against forces designed to bless him and make his life easy. God is the center and meaning of the universe and without him there is no explanation for it. His will is supreme and no righteous law can operate without reference to him. "For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things. To him be the glory forever." Rebellion begins with a hostile and stubborn state of mind directed against God and against nature. "Can a man take fire in his bosom, and his clothes not be burned? Or can one walk upon hot coals, and his feet not be scorched? So he that goeth in to his neighbor's wife; Whosoever toucheth her shall not be unpunished." A man may think he is having a good time, an easy time, take my yoke upon you, and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest, for your souls; but they said, We will not walk therein."

The principles that determine whether blessings or woes shall visit mankind are clearly defined and illustrated in God's revelation to man. "Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the wicked, nor sitteth in the seat of scoffers: But his delight is in the law of Jehovah: And on his law doth he meditate day and night. "Woe unto them! for they went in the way of Cain, and ran riotously in the error of Balaam for hire, and perished in the gainsaying of Korah the transgressor. When his offering was abruptly rejected and the wailing of "will-worship," a substitute for the offering that God commanded, "Lord, I know you want that, but I think you will like this" is implied in the presumptuous conduct of this vainglorious worshipper. It was easy for a man of Cain's disposition to do a thing like that. He was a transgressor. When his offering was abruptly rejected and the blessings of God descended on the obedient Abel, then Cain in a fit of rage and jealousy slew his brother. That is sin in its full-grown state. When Cain stood over the dead body of his brother, he must have been overwhelmed by the sense of the hardness of transgression. When an outraged God pronounced judgment upon him, he cried: "My punishment is greater than I can bear." "The way of the transgressor is hard." Balaam, the covetous prophet, who loved the hire of wrong-doing, was not willing to cut loose from God. He made quite a show of loyalty and piety. When the princely tempters of Balak dangled before the hungry eyes of Balak the "rewards of divination," and the dazzling bribes of treachery to God, the wavering prophet was vehement in his pretense of loyalty. If Balak would give me his house full of silver and gold, I cannot go beyond the word of Jehovah my God, to do less or more," It was a very bitter as the fruits of sin, and nothing harder than violated law exacts as a penalty for transgression. "Good understanding giveth favor; but the way of the transgressor is hard." "Good understanding" recognizes the place the will of God occupies as overall guidance in a human life. It is not a mere coincidence that Paul said: "Wherefore be ye not foolish, but understand what the will of the Lord is." The transgressor lacks understanding, he is foolish, he lacks a sense of values, and is really in for a hard time. Ignorance and sin cannot bring a man to any other end than a tragic one. Revelation and nature join in such a proclamation.

"Lift ye up a banner up, a high mountain, exalt the voice unto them."-(Isa. 13:2.)
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"TITLES OF HONOR"

The following article by L. R. Wilson was written sometime ago and was read over station WOAI at San Antonio in one of Brother Wilson's broadcasts. It represents the views of the editor so completely that it is being passed on in this editorial space with the author's consent—not his request, our request and his consent. We are not alone in the conviction that it is wrong for our colleges to confer the honorary Doctor's Degree on our preacher's. It is claimed, of course, that these degrees are not religious degrees. Strictly speaking, perhaps not—but for all essential purposes and effects they are. The purpose is to give prestige in that very way. It is so understood by the public. Sectarian preachers strive for them. When our preachers become Doctor it is on the exact level with such men as "Doctor Norris" and "Doctor Bogard" and "Doctor Webber" and all the Doctors of religious Doctordom. We sincerely believe that it is bad for the preachers, and bad for the church; that it is a bad example and exerts a bad influence among young preachers. When a man has served the cause of Christ and the church of the Lord for many years, his work becomes his distinction and the empty honor of a conferred Doctor's title is a meaningless thing. I wish to commend Brother Wilson's article to the brethren as worthy of serious consideration, trusting that men at the head of the faculty and students usually addressed me by the high-sounding term because they feel it removes all barriers and brings us closer together than if they used even the term "Brother." I have one brother and one sister in the flesh but, I do not affix the terms "Brother" and "Sister" each time I speak to them. I call them by their first name, and they address me in the same way. The sweetest word in all the world to any person is his or her name. About the greatest blunder one could make is to forget, or misspell, or mispronounce another's name. I have some degrees from higher institutions of learning, and when I taught at the University of Tennessee, the faculty and students usually addressed me by the highest title of honor they knew; nevertheless I never sought to be so addressed, nor do I covet such worldly honors and flattering titles. My one purpose in life is to teach people. How to be saved in Heaven at last, and to assist them along the way. To remove myself far from them by insurmountable barriers would defeat the work I am striving to perform.

In all the writings of the New Testament we have no letters begun in the following manner: "The Reverend Paul," or "Doctor Peter," or "Rabbi James," or "Father John." Instead Paul usually began his letters after this fashion: "Paul, a servant of Jesus Christ." If you will look in the margin of your American Standard Version you will note that Paul used the term "bond-servant" in speaking of himself. The translators gave us the word "servant" but Paul actually used the term which signifies "bond-servant" or "slave." What a contrast to the term "Reverend," which was affixed to the name of Jehovah, God. Uninspired men of today have arrogated to themselves the highest terms conceivable, while Paul, the inspired apostle, applied to himself the most menial and lowly term he could conceive. When all the preachers assumed the title of "Reverend" some felt that a plan had to be devised where-
by they could reserve for themselves exclusive honors, which the run-of-the-mill preachers could not get. Hence they secured the title of "Doctor." This is an honorary title ordinarily conferred by some recognized institution of learning. Note: I said it is ordinarily conferred by some recognized institution of learning. However this is not always true. The title is sometimes bought. Sometimes it is forged; and in many instances—like the term "Reverend"—it is simply assumed.

Just why do men covet such honors? There is but one answer. It is a desire to be exalted. They do not want to be placed on the same plane with the common people. They want others to look up to them. Because of the great number of preachers and the difficulty in keeping the average ones from grabbing the same titles of honor which the more ambitious arrogate to themselves some of the religious bodies worked out a system whereby all the preachers were compelled to accept the special titles of honor conferred upon them by the "head" of the organization. Hence we have such terms as, "The Reverend John Doe," "The Very Reverend John Blank," or "The Most Reverend John Jones." Those who are acquainted with these titles of honor are able to determine from them the particular "rank" of the individual in the religious body with which he is affiliated. Thus men are exalted all the way from the "laity" to the exalted head of the church. If you can conceive of more presumption and arrogance I should like to know what it is. On one occasion Jesus said to His disciples, "Ye know that the rulers of the Gentiles lord it over them, and their great ones exercise authority over them. Not so shall it be among you: but whosoever would become great among you shall be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Matt. 20:25-28). Men have reversed Jesus on this matter.

Just here let me quote an entire paragraph taken from the lips of our Lord. It is related in Matt. 23:1-12. "Then spake Jesus to the multitudes and to his disciples, saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses' seat: all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe: but do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not. Yea, they bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with their finger. But all their works they do to be seen of men: for they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments, and love the chief place at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and the salutations in the market places, and to be called of men, Rabbi. But be ye not called Rabbi: for one is your teacher, and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father on the earth: for one is your Father, even he who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, even the Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted." Here our Lord gives a positive injunction against the use of titles of honor when applied to men. He positively forbids us to call any man "Rabbi," "Father," "Master," or any other such like titles of dignity. I can understand why people who do not claim to believe the Bible might run counter to what it says, but to save my life I do not understand intelligent men who claim to believe the Bible and yet fly into the face of such positive injunctions as Jesus here gives. If sinful to call men "Rabbi," "Father," "Master" it is equally sinful to address them as "Doctor" or "Reverend," Jesus severely reprimanded the scribes and Pharisees because of their love of high places and titles of honor, and concluded with these words, "He that is greatest among you shall be your servant and whosoever shall exalt himself shall be humbled; and whosoever shall humble himself shall be exalted." Jesus severely condemned the Pharisees because they sought to appear pious before men and to make a show of their religion. Their teachers wore special robes of distinction with wide and flashy borders; they wore large pouches on their arms and about their necks in which a portion of the law of Moses was carried. These pouches were called phylacteries, and served more as ornaments than anything else. If I have to put on some special religious dress and wear some peculiar ornament about my neck or on my watch chain in order to convince people of my piety and goodness then I doubt if it is worth anything in the sight of either God or man. High-sounding titles and external appearances caused Jesus to say, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye cleanse the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full from extortion and excess .... Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For ye are like unto whited sepulchers, which outwardly appear beautiful, but inwardly are full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but inwardly ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity" (Matt. 23:25-28).

R. L. Whiteside's Writings
It will be a matter of general gratification the part of our friends to know that R. L. Whiteside will be a staff member of the Bible Banner, and that his writings will appear in its pages regularly along with the writings of Cled Wallace and a number of other men whose pens are followed with eagerness and assiduity by thousands of brethren.

For a number of years Brother Whiteside has been a writer for the Gospel Advocate, and has prepared their Annual Lesson Commentary, though his name has not appeared on the publication. It nevertheless has been his work. Brother Whiteside will not prepare the Commentary for the Advocate in the future—but his friends desire that he continue to write these lesson commentaries. Brother C. R. Nichol has suggested that arrangements be made through the Bible Banner for this valuable Lesson Commentary to be published and offered to the teachers and adult classes in the churches. We believe that this can be done and other announcements may be forthcoming.

Nearest to Brother Whiteside's heart, perhaps, is his desire to have his Commentary On Romans completed and published. The last word we had from him on this point was that he is now engaged in writing the thirteenth chapter of Romans. When this work is finished, it will be one of the finest commentaries on the Roman letter ever to be published. I personally do not hesitate to say that R. L. Whiteside ranks with J. W. McGarvey in Bible scholarship and he is the peer of all living commentators. He is preeminently a commentator. Not to make his work available on the important epistle of Romans would be a tragedy. The Bible Banner hopes, with the aid of some of Brother Whiteside's closest friends, to bring out this work as soon as he has completed it. The Bible Banner feels it a high honor to assist in putting it before the brethren. We believe that enough advance orders, when definite announcements are made, from preachers, teachers, and all students of the Bible among us, can be secured to pay the initial cost of publication.

Meanwhile readers of the Bible Banner will be delighted to see Brother Whiteside's articles in this publication. We consider it an honor extraordinary to have him with us.—F. E. W. Jr.
The Los Angeles Debate

It has been known in a general way for several months that a debate with the Doctor John Matthews, the leader of Anglo-Israel Millennialism on the West Coast, was pending. The Doctor arbitrarily changed the dates on the debate several times, with but a few days notice, but through the kindness of the brethren where I have been engaged for meetings I was able to shift gears with the Doctor, and the debate was finally staged.

It was held in the Embassy and Philharmonic auditorium in downtown Los Angeles. The questions debated were: Baptism, Throne of David, The Thousand Years Reign, and the peculiar claims of this cult that Britain and America, with all Anglo-Saxon and Celtic peoples, are fleshly Israel, descendants of the Ten Tribes, and therefore we are “God’s Modern Covenant People.”

The debate was arranged for and paid for by the Central Church of Christ in Los Angeles, but they received the fine cooperation of the churches of the Los Angeles area. Glenn L. Wallace and John Allen Hudson contributed more in effort, as individuals, to the bringing about the discussion, and their work in so doing has been generally applauded on the West Coast.

All the sessions of the debate were moderated by Brother C. R. Nichol, of the Vermont Avenue Church, and teacher of Bible in George Pepperdine College. His services were invaluable and were appreciated by all — and especially by me.

The debate was largely attended every session — several thousand outside people heard the truth, who perhaps had never heard it before.

On Saturday, before the debate closed the following Sunday afternoon, I received a telegram signed by all of the churches of Christ in the city where I live — Oklahoma City — and I am inserting this telegram in this opening of the paper. I had no thought of receiving such a warm expression of confidence and interest. Needless to say that my heart was melted by this expression of personal regard. It greatly increases my obligations in the endeavor to merit such confidence. It is my whole desire to do so. God being my helper, I shall never knowingly let them down.

A fuller report of this discussion will be given by Glenn L. Wallace, representing the Central Church of Christ in Los Angeles.

It is the desire of the Central church to have the Anglo-Israel phase of this discussion put in pamphlet form for distribution on the West Coast in view of the fact that this doctrine has some fifty thousands adherents, it is claimed, in the west and northwest areas from Vancouver to Los Angeles. It is a deep-seated doctrine in England, Australia, New Zealand, and the New England States and on the West Coast. The brethren believe the exposure of the doctrine, along with the opportunity of placing the truth before the People on the subjects of baptism and the kingdom, which the debate afforded, will result in great good.

The Bible Banner will carry a summary of the argument on some of the phases of this discussion, which will be put in pamphlet form for distribution. Have your friends send for the Banner, or send it to them — and we may suggest: Renew your own subscription.

Spiritual Preachments In The Secular Press

A few issues of the paper past, attention was called to a good work being done by Brother Frank Winters, elder of the Culbertson Heights church in Oklahoma City. Brother Winters is an able man in the church, has an excellent knowledge of the Bible and is an accomplished writer. A few months ago he fell upon the plan of inserting some doctrinal discourses in the daily paper each week, and these pieces are attracting wide interest. One of the churches in a neighboring city is running the same articles, with Brother Winters’ consent, in their daily paper. It is an excellent plan. Brother Winters’ experiment has turned out to be worth making permanent, and he has the ability to continue it indefinitely in the same good way. If other brethren and churches desire to use the articles, write Frank Winters, 1103 Perrine Bldg., Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Below is a good specimen of the articles appearing in the local press, and we will give others along to encourage the brethren to use them.

**“RIGHTLY DIVIDING THE WORD”**

“Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth.”—11 Timothy 2:15.

If the Bible is the very word of God as all Christians believe, it is of the utmost importance that every child of God should have at least a general and correct knowledge of this, the greatest library in the world. Today we are passing through a world of revolution in many ways and are soon to come face to face with other religions that know not our God and our Christ as we know them. Then too, there is an increasing number of religious sects that differ so widely from the Church which Christ established that if Christianity is to survive we must get back to the blessed old Book and walk in its ways, that our faith shall not rest on any word of man, but upon “Him in whom there is no variableness neither shadow of turning.”

“Rightly dividing (or handling right) the word of truth” is our text. All competent teachers of the Bible recognize that the first great essential is a correct knowledge of its different parts or divisions. It is all the word of God, but the fact that the 66 books of which it is composed were written over a period of several hundred years, and addressed to different peoples in widely different conditions, has everything to do with understanding its meaning and its applicability in this day. Hoping we might be of help to some beginners in this study, we are setting down an elementary sketch of the natural divisions of God’s book.

First is the two general divisions of the Old and New Testaments. The Old Testament naturally divides itself into four parts: (1) Law—first five books of the Bible; (2) History—the next twelve books; (3) Devotional—the next five books; and (4) the 17 books of prophecy. The four natural divisions of the New Testament are: (1) Biography—the first four books; (2) History of the early church-Acts of the Apostles; (3) Epistles—next 21 books, and (4) Revelation—the last book of the Bible.

Gentle reader, of this you may rest assured: there is no equal for this unadorned volume which graces the libraries and fire sides of more homes today than ever before. As we contemplate the tremendous importance of eternal salvation to a lost world, we humbly submit this simple lesson, hoping for a greater interest in this “Book of books” in this dark and troubled hour.

**Culbertson Heights Church of Christ**

1400 N. E. 13th Street
fine speech, but the trouble was that Balaam wanted to go although it was very clear to him that God wanted it otherwise. He came to God with an idol in his heart and God answered him according to that idol. Every step that Balaam took after that was in the way of transgression. It was a hard way and he came to a hard end.

"The gainsaying of Korah" is particularly interesting in this connection. The rule of Moses and Aaron through the divine order was extremely galling to him and the princely men associated with him. They were proud and ambitious. It was easy for such men to rebel and the justification they offered for their course must have sounded plausible to them and their followers. Transgressors always have a line of self-justification. They found fault with Moses and Aaron and played up to the vanity of their followers by flattery. At the beginning of their rebellion they could not see the yawning earth at the end of this road of transgression waiting to swallow them up. It was so with King Saul. It is so with all transgressors. Jesus told Saul of Tarsus that "It is hard for thee to kick against the goad." Transgressors are goad-kickers. Even an ox soon learns more discretion.

The divine voice of invitation and warning to the hosts of the earth reaches a crescendo of volume and power in the New Testament. "See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not when they refused him that spoke in the dry land, much less shall not we escape who turn away from him that warneth from heaven: whose voice then shook the earth: but now he hath promised, that the easiest way out for me was a public barbecu‐
e and the whole church invited. So that buck got barbe‐ced and was served up to the accompaniment of bread, pickles, onions, beans and so forth, yes, and coffee black and hot enough to give a preacher blind staggers, if he happened to be the queer sort who preaches against coffee and is allergic to Santa Claus. I took personal pride in see‐ing that the coffee was just right. We had a good time, including some innocent fun, even if some people do seem to think that nothing can be innocent, that is the least bit funny. My friend, Brother Whiteside was not there, but he heard about it and dropped me this remark: "And so you 'passed the buck' to the church. Preachers sometimes do that."

Concerning Brother W. Curtis Porter

Approximately two years ago I made a statement to my friends through the pages of the Bible Banner, informing you that I was a victim of one of the rarest blood maladies known to medical science. I was given only a few years, at most, to live. Upon the advice of doctors I gave up my work with the Tenth and Rockford church in Tulsa, Oklah‐oma, and returned to my home at Monette, Arkansas: I have endeavored to be out in the sunshine as much as possible, taking physical exercise and getting away from men‐tal strain. During these two years I have been giving away my blood as I knew nothing else to do. I have av‐erged giving away a pint of blood every three weeks for nearly two years, always hoping against hope that some remedy might be discovered before I had to pass on. Re‐cently information came to me that a doctor in Berkeley, California, was developing a remedy for this rare and fatal affliction. I got in touch with him, he agreed to take my case, and now I am in Berkeley taking the treatment. It is yet in the experimental stage, but it gives enough promise to cause me once more to have hope of living. Some of those who had taken the treatment have had to repeat with‐in a year or less time, but some others have gone four years without having to repeat. So we cannot tell how it will act in my case. I might have to repeat the treatment in a short time, but if I do I believe the Lord will somehow make it possible for me to do so. It is great even to have hope of living after having gone for two years without any real hope. And I know you will rejoice with me in the possibility of recovery. The treatment will require about two months, and I am now in my third week of the treatment. I ask the continued prayers of the brotherhood that the treatment may be effective in my case. Mail sent to my home address will reach me.

W. Curtis Porter

P. O. Box 195 Monette, Arkansas

(P. S. And we suggest that the friends of Brother Porter enclose a liberal check to him when you write him. His expenses are heavy — and we know, by experience, what the aid of friends means in such a time as this. — F. E. W., Jr.)
Devout believers of the Bible and defenders and advocates of the New Testament order of things are often appalled at the extent to which religious errors become entrenched in the minds of the people. Ideas that have no scriptural support whatever become impregnably fortified in the minds of multitudes and make gospel evangelism a very difficult task indeed. This phenomenon challenges the attention of every gospel worker and can be met only by employing a high degree of thought and intelligence.

Just as I sat down to begin this article, I was interrupted by a telephone call and the conversation that followed may affect the entire course of this discussion. A sweet-voiced lady informed me that she had only recently arrived in this city and wanted to make arrangements to have her baby "christened." I supposed she was looking for a Methodist, Episcopal or Presbyterian minister, or possibly a Catholic priest, but she informed me that she was a member of the church of Christ and her baby was "fifteen months old" and had never been "christened." She seemed distressed about the matter. Further inquiry revealed that she came from a city in Texas and the church and the preacher she mentioned are quite well known. Now, it probably would not improve the situation for me to publicize that church and excoriate that preacher for their lack of attention to doctrinal matters. I do not have enough facts in hand for all the deductions I can at the moment think of. It would be embarrassing to me if some lady who had heard me preach very many times should go off to another city and call some preacher and ask him to "christen" her baby. I know something about the preacher in this case but I would have to know more about the lady to blame him too much. It is a humbling thought to consider how little we preach really sticks in the minds of those who listen to us. People generally, even members of the church, do not read the Bible enough to get the best results from even the best preaching, and it is surprising with what facility even plain speech is misunderstood and misapplied by some who from all outward signs should know better. There is not a hint in the whole Bible about "christening" babies, no example of it, no command for it and no inference looking that way. Nevertheless doting mothers numbering into the thousands feel that their darlings are not properly named and miss other blessings if it is not attended to. Why is this?

A casual look into the situation reveals some interesting and disconcerting facts. This and other ideas and practices belong to that large body of tradition which has grown up and found lodgment in the human mind since the New Testament was written. It is backed up by vast organizations, widespread and subtle propaganda, and is supported by concentration and group appeal. It is not only respectable, it has become by force of custom in many circles, the thing to do. Many do not feel any need to go beyond this for authority. The fact that it belongs to the doctrines and commandments of men and condemned by the Lord is unknown and unthought of. To get that fact over to them is a most difficult task.

To break away from the bondage of entrenched error is difficult for the individual. It often means defiance of strong organization and a break with custom. It requires both intelligence and independence to do this, and that to a degree a large number of people do not possess. The step is obviously painful. It was so with Paul and others who became Christians in his day. A brilliant physician was asked by one of his patients: "Doctor, what church do you belong to?" The answer was: "I am a Presbyterian." He was asked if he knew why he was a Presbyterian, if reading the Bible made him such and a few like questions. The physician replied that he had never given that angle any particular thought. His parents were Presbyterians, his associations and rearing determined his course and he had never had time or inclination to go into the theological merits of the situation. He was a Presbyterian as a matter of course. The patient requested him to read the book of Acts, to note the establishment of the church, how people became Christians and see if he could find anything there that looked like the Presbyterian denomination. The doctor promised to do so, and if he did, it must have initiated a conflict within him, the age-old conflict between truth and error. The huge religious errors that have found root in one way or another in the popular mind are not in the New Testament. The only way to uproot them is to establish in the minds of the people the authority of the New Testament in religious matters and make them acquainted with its contents.

Everybody knows how hard it is to reach a Catholic with the simple teaching of the New Testament. He is in the bondage of a system. It is as hard for him to break loose from it as it is for a Jew to become a Christian. The obstacles to be overcome to even have him exposed to gospel teaching are near the inuperable. There is nothing extant in the way of religion that is much farther from the New Testament order than the Catholic hierarchy with its network of traditions. Take a New Testament and make an attempt to evangelize the domain of Romanism, and you will catch what I mean by the entrenched positions of religious error. It is as difficult to uproot them is to establish in the minds of the people the New Testament order than the Catholic hierarchy with its nomination. The doctor promised to do so, and if he did, he had never had time or inclination to go into the theological merits of the situation. He was a Presbyterian as a matter of course. The patient requested him to read the book of Acts, to note the establishment of the church, how people became Christians and see if he could find anything there that looked like the Presbyterian denomination. The doctor promised to do so, and if he did, it must have initiated a conflict within him, the age-old conflict between truth and error. The huge religious errors that have found root in one way or another in the popular mind are not in the New Testament. The only way to uproot them is to establish in the minds of the people the authority of the New Testament in religious matters and make them acquainted with its contents.

Everybody knows how hard it is to reach a Catholic with the simple teaching of the New Testament. He is in the bondage of a system. It is as hard for him to break loose from it as it is for a Jew to become a Christian. The obstacles to be overcome to even have him exposed to gospel teaching are near the inuperable. There is nothing extant in the way of religion that is much farther from the New Testament order than the Catholic hierarchy with its network of traditions. Take a New Testament and make an attempt to evangelize the domain of Romanism, and you will catch what I mean by the entrenched positions of religious error. It is as difficult to uproot them is to establish in the minds of the people the New Testament order than the Catholic hierarchy with its nomination. The doctor promised to do so, and if he did, he had never had time or inclination to go into the theological merits of the situation. He was a Presbyterian as a matter of course. The patient requested him to read the book of Acts, to note the establishment of the church, how people became Christians and see if he could find anything there that looked like the Presbyterian denomination. The doctor promised to do so, and if he did, it must have initiated a conflict within him, the age-old conflict between truth and error. The huge religious errors that have found root in one way or another in the popular mind are not in the New Testament. The only way to uproot them is to establish in the minds of the people the authority of the New Testament in religious matters and make them acquainted with its contents.

Protestantism as it is commonly known, in its up-to-date development, is sustained more by the authority of its organizations and customs than by an appeal to "It is written." The arguments commonly used in its defense are of a blanket character capable of offering covering to Romanist, Jew and even deist. Toleration is the watchword of modern religion. Any effort to approach any citadel of error with an open New Testament is challenged by the sentries of toleration. In modern religion any man who says a man is not right in his religion when he is wrong, is intolerant. Intolerance is getting to be close akin to treachery. Thus another link is forged in the chain of error that binds the minds of mankind. True tolerance is a good thing and intolerance can become demoniacal, but the proper bounds of these words need to be clearly noted. When tolerance holds out the olive branch to false doctrine, it is clearly abusing its proper functions. Incidentally, some of the apostles of modern tolerance can become flamin-ingly intolerant, when opposition begins to pinch them. Broadmindedness can sometimes express a rather sneering contempt for what it calls "narrowness." And "narrowness" has often turned out to be the truth in the realm of religion. The seeker after truth in religion should keep a New Testament handy. It more often condemns what the world approves and approves what the world condemns than otherwise. It is a good book to know and in addition to its other virtues, it is excellent for mental hygiene.

A striking example of the entrenched position of certain errors has recently come to my attention. Some years ago...
a moving picture of Biblical scenes was shown on the screens of theatres throughout the country. The baptism of Jesus showed John and Jesus standing in the water about ankle deep and John was pouring a little water on the head of Jesus. A few years ago, I glanced over a series of pictures in a daily paper illustrating the current Sunday School lesson. The text of the lesson was: “I indeed baptized you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.” Then the picture shows John and one of the multitude standing in the stream about ankle deep and John pouring water on the head of the other. It is pure sectarian propaganda. The uncritical and the uninformed, not to mention the confirmed pedo-baptist, assume that baptism was so performed by John and others in the New Testament.

That one picture widely circulated makes a wider impression in favor of sprinkling and pouring for baptism than any number of books and sermons on the subject. A lot more people see the picture than would read the books or hear the sermons. Besides, it is easier to draw a plausible picture on that particular subject than it is to make a convincing argument, in view of the scarcity of material on that side of the question in the New Testament.

The picture is interesting for a number of reasons. It raises some questions. Why should John lead anybody into the water, even ankle deep to sprinkle or pour water on his head? Affusionists do not do that way today. Did John think a man had to be immersed on one end and sprinkled on the other to be truly baptized? John led them into the water all right, but more than ankle deep. He immersed them and made a complete job of it. The whole New Testament is quite clear on this particular point. Error here has made use of many devices to maintain its position.

It would be surprising, if not alarming, to some who take their practice for granted, should they carefully examine the New Testament for proof and affusion was practiced for baptism. The chief reliance is upon the text: “I baptize you with water.” Of course if the word baptize meant to sprinkle, which it does not, it could be done with water, but affusionists assume that immersion could not be done with water. The weakness of the sprinkling argument, if it can be called an argument, is the assumption that “with water means it had to be sprinkling or it could not be “with.” It is quite impressive when presented to the uninformed and thoughtless. Scholars among them are bound to know better. The American Standard version puts “in water” instead of “with water.” The word that is translated “with” in the King James version is used nine times in this same chapter. Six times it is translated “in.” “In the wilderness,” “baptized in Jordan” whose fan is in his hand” etc. The argument based on “with” cannot mean too much to those who know this.

“With water” does not imply sprinkling or pouring as baptism, nor is it proof of immersion taken alone. There are facts and circumstances connected with baptism in the New Testament which are decisive. Baptism is a command of God, it came from heaven, and all who recognize the authority of heaven should be sure to know what it is and do it right. It is both with and in water, John baptized “in the river Jordan.” “And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway from the water.” “And straightway coming up out of the water.” “And John also was baptizing in Aenon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came and were baptized.” (See Matt. 3:6, 16; Mark 1:10; John 1:23).

John performed the same act that the apostles’ and other Christians did as recorded in Acts. The evangelist Philip baptized the eunuch with water, and in water. What happened is rather clear. “And as they went on the way, they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch saith, Behold, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they came out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip; and the eunuch saw him no more for he went on his way rejoicing.” (Acts 8:36-39). Do these circumstances favor sprinkling or immersion?

Circumstances connected with the baptism of the jailor are interesting and informative. “And they spake the word of the Lord unto him, with all that were in his house. And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, immediately. And he brought them up into his house, and set food before them, and rejoiced greatly, with all his house, having believed in God.” (Acts 16:30-34). This baptism took place somewhere outside the jailor’s house sometime after midnight. Since they came “up into his house” after the baptizing, they must have gone down somewhere to do it. We know there was a river in the city and jails were usually built close to them and above the flood stage. Where are we to suppose Paul baptized the jailor, since he did it outside the house after midnight? Do the circumstances favor sprinkling or immersion? If they went to water, went down into it and came up out of it, they must have gone where there was enough water to do all this. Affusion would not require it. Immersion would

The allusions to baptism in Paul’s letter are unmistakable. They cannot be made to fit affusion at all. “Or are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life.” (Rom. 6:3, 4). “In whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with him in baptism, where ye were raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead.” (Col.2:11-12). These Christians had all been baptized. Paul alludes to the fact. They were baptized with water. Does sprinkling fit in with Paul’s references? Affusionists have been much troubled to handle these references. Some of them have gone to the length of taking all the water out and leaving not a drop, even for sprinkling. The reason therefore is too obvious. They can do more for their practice by drawing pictures than citing texts of scripture. Consulting any Greek dictionary reveals that the word “baptize,” or rather that from which it came, means to immerse. The circumstances attending the baptism of persons in the New Testament all favor immersion. They do not favor sprinkling at all. People who are anxious to obey the Lord, should look further for information than a misleading picture in a newspaper. If a man is not intelligent and independent enough to use his New Testament, there is not much telling where pictures and other things may lead him off to in religion in these modern days.
The Pastors Association

Brother F. D. Srygley once remarked that he had always imagined he would like to be a Methodist bishop but for some scriptural obstacles that stood in the way. My imaginary ambitions do not run in that direction but I do have some of a less pretentious sort. I have often thought it would be real nice to be a member of the Pastors' Association in the town where I live and maybe work up to be president of it. Some factual and scriptural considerations always clip the wings and pull the tail feathers out of that ambition before it can take to the air and get going. It just doesn't fit into some ideas of religion I get from the New Testament. It is fundamentally a denominational setup. These pastors represent their denominations and have more authority to speak than I can claim. I am not a pastor and could only speak for myself. I am not even a member of a denomination. It might afford me some opportunity to work them over, so to speak, and teach them the way of the Lord more perfectly, but I cannot see my way clear to join an unsubscriptural organization to get to do that. I believe it was Paul who rejected the idea that it was proper to do evil that good may come. If I lived in a city where there were a dozen or more gospel preachers and they should form themselves into an organization to pass resolutions and otherwise busy themselves in behalf of the city and the churches of Christ, I do not believe I could ever join that. Such organizations do not fit into the New Testament pattern, as I understand it. There is a principle involved which should not be submerged on the grounds of a doubtful expediency.

There is nothing personal about this. I much prefer to get along with people than be out of step with them, even denominational preachers. The majority of them, as I know them, are likeable fellows in the ordinary relations of life, but they are officially connected with religious setups I cannot endorse with my present views of the New Testament order of things. To be other than frank at this point would amount to insincerity.

Another thing occurs to me just here. A representative organization like the Pastors' Association naturally likes to assert its authority and craves an increase of power which is often exercised to the disadvantage of religious groups which are busy represented in it. In some cities I'm told that nobody can conduct a religious program over a radio unless he is endorsed by the Pastor's Association of the city. In another city, the Pastors' association selects the ones who conduct chapel exercises at the High School. If you do not belong to the Association, you are just not selected. Personally I decline to look to it for authority to do anything, even if I do imagine sometimes I would like to be president of one.

Still Taking Care Of Himself

It will be recalled that some time ago Brother Dorris, the "venerable," was able to take care of himself and that those letters would be published in book form. Well, I have another one for the book. It is the twelfth, I believe, and contains twelve typewritten pages. My apology for giving the readers a late sample of how Brother Dorris proposes to take care of himself is the fact that he is the author of one of the Advocate's commentaries, and has the editorial backing of the editor of the Advocate in his letter writing escapade. I find this on the first page of the long letter:

"I would be ashamed to leave such a dirty, nasty, stinking job for the grace of God to perform. I shall do it myself. You need not worry my dear Brother about my cleaning up. I always 'clean up,' and down all over immediately after completing as dirty, nasty, stinking a job as threshing a bunch of war preachers who once knew and preached the truth but departed from it. Heretofore I have managed to get myself fairly clean by using only Ivory Soap, but this time the job is so nasty and dirty and stinks so bad that I shall have to use lye soap and old Dutch Cleanser mixed with concentrated lye and then fumigate to get the dirt and stink all off. It out stinks anything that I ever had to deal with. Its enough to make your great grandfather turn over in his grave and chew on his night shirt."

It isn't so much what Brother Dorris thinks of us that I am concerned about as I am about what Brother Goodpasture thinks of him. They both charge us with being out of harmony with the spirit of Christ in the position we advocate on the government question. They are strict and uncompromising pacifists and sure, I suppose trying to demonstrate to us how Christ would act and talk and write. I notice that Brother Goodpasture is on the program to make a speech at Freed-Hardeman College. His subject is: "The Art Of Getting Along With Brethren." He might tell the story of what artists he and Brother Dorris are in taking care of themselves. I have an idea that these gentlemen are easy to get along with when you agree with them. I have had a taste of what happens when you disagree with them. Possibly, Brother Hardeman made a mistake. Maybe he ought to have let me handle that subject instead of Brother Goodpasture. I have at least one advantage over these brethren. I have stayed in a good humor and I'm afraid they haven't. Of course that does not mean that I am tickled over some things they have said about us. Who would be?

Brother Whiteside puts it this way:

"Here is a puzzle? Those who were so loud in declaiming against war and claiming that all civil governments belong to the devil are now very quiet, with a few exceptions. Did this 'devil's government' tell them to quit? If they were obeying God in their writing and preaching, why are they now ' obeying the devil ' instead of God?

I have thought, too, that it is a strange thing for a preacher and editor to think it is a mortal sin to kill in self-defense, and yet do his very best to kill two preachers with carnal words. What are carnal weapons? Was not the church at Corinth carrying on a carnal warfare among themselves with words as their weapons? Their strife was carnal."

Aside from the revelation it makes of the men who employs them, there is this danger in the use of carnal words as a weapon. They have a way of coming home to roost. Like hate, they do the hater more harm than the hated. Prudence, if not principle, should discourage their use.
The editor of The Bible Banner has not asked for and needs no help in his defense of his “changed views” on the war question. However, the charge made by those who cannot defend their views is to discredit those who have changed. The following excerpt from the “Preface to the First Edition of the Christian Baptist” published August 3, 1823 by Alexander Campbell is interesting in this connection. Alexander Campbell was castigated for changing and in reply said:

“We have learned that to make truth the sole object of our inquiries, and to be disposed to obey it when known, serves more to guide us into it than all commentators. We have been taught that we are liable to err; we have found ourselves in many errors; we candidly acknowledge that we have changed our views on many subjects, and that our views have changed our practice.

“We candidly acknowledge that we have changed,” said Campbell, yet the Baptist and other sects of that day made much of that fact. “Campbell has changed, Campbell has changed,” they chortled. To those who did not know the issue and were governed by a party spirit, the cry of “change” carried weight. There are those today who follow slavishly the “traditions” of the elders. To them, the “voice of the pioneers” is the voice of God.”

### The Crime of Changing

Again Campbell said, “If it be a crime to change our views and our practice in religious concerns, we must certainly plead guilty.” Campbell was guilty! Guilty of what? Guilty of the high crime of changing. To this he pleads guilty.

Who among us likes to say to the whole brotherhood;

“Brethren, I am sorry, but I just did not speak the gospel truth on this question.” Those who think they are big preachers would not admit a change for fear they would lose some degree of their self-assumed infallibility. But hear Campbell again, “If it be a humiliating thing to say we have been wrong in our belief and practice, we must abase ourselves thus far.”

Alexander Campbell then lays down this rule:

“Never to hold any sentiment or proposition as more certain than the evidence on which it rests; or, in other words, that our assent to any proposition should be precisely proportioned to the evidence on which it rests. All beyond this we esteem as enthusiasm—all short of the evidence does not sustain our views, let us abandon them. Truth should be our guide and not man. If the evidence does not sustain our views, let us abandon them. We should not think we are infalliable; we cannot make a mistake in our teaching, and we should be willing to “abase” ourselves in changing our views and practices when they are wrong.

### Campbell Further Accused

Those who could not meet Campbell’s arguments were not satisfied with the accusations of “changing.” They were graduated from the University of Scandal. “They,” said Campbell, “find it more easy to defame than to refute. And of all calumniators, they do it with the most effect, and are consequently most obnoxious to reproach, who commend that they may defame; who say such a sentiment is true, and in this he is undoubtedly right; but’ (O! the tremendous “but”) ‘he is a Socinian or an Arian.”

“But by their more private innuendos and reproaches, and by whole phalanxes of omnipotent buts, like moles, work underground, and bury themselves and their followers in the heaps they rise.”

The editor of the Bible Banner has been accused of many things. Yet he has never been accused of some things of which they accused Alexander Campbell. Here are some of the things said about Campbell:

1. Horse thief.
2. Drunkard.
3. A deist.
4. Extremely immoral.
5. His ruin is certain.

Now if you think that I have overdrawn the picture about Campbell, then read his very words:

“And when this will not serve their purpose, even my moral character is assailed. In Kentucky, some time after my debate with Mr. M’Calla, it was reported I had stolen a horse; and not long since, in Illinois, it was said that I was excommunicated for drunkenness. Not far from Lake Erie, I was said to have turned deist, and by those two, who bought their sermons in Boston, and read them in Ohio; and in many places, that I was said to be an extremely immoral man in my own vicinity.”

The criticism of Campbell started after his debate with M’Calla. Strange, is it not? The criticism of the editor of the Banner started just after his debate with Neal. Is this a coincidence?

“In fact, as a Doctor of Divinity told his people near Lexington, ‘I am a very bad man in the estimation of many, and it would afford them a satisfaction, which I trust they will never enjoy (and yet it is cruel on my part to deprive them of it) to be able to publish my fall and ruin to the utmost bounds of this union.’”

-Christian Baptist, Page 217.

Yes, they, toward Campbell, are like some today toward the editor of the Banner, were sure that Campbell would crash like Humpty-Dumpty. Too, what joy some would get in announcing that the editor of the Banner was ruined. Their deeds and lisings avow it.

The Way You Do It

It is often said, “We do not object to what you are doing. We object to the spirit you manifest. It is the way you do it. You are ‘utterly unschooled in the matter of diplomacy’ and do not show the spirit of Christ.”

This charge is very old. Listen as the sects of the early day rant against Campbell:

“I have taken the Christian Baptist now from its beginning; I, e., I have read them from their first publication, and my opinion has been uniformly the same. That, although sensible and edited with ability, it has been deficient in a very important point, a New Testament spirit.”

-Christian Baptist, Page 227.

Now, there you have it. It was, “the way they did it.” The fact is, brethren, one just cannot uproot error in a manner to please those who hold it. When the denominations approve the “spirit” of what I am doing—then I am not doing anything. That is the only spirit they approve. The spirit to let them alone, to them, is the spirit of Christ.
Sometime ago the following paragraph from the pen of Ben M. Bogard appeared in the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight:

**NOW IS THE TIME**

In the Firm Foundation recently a Campbellite preacher relates his experience which he had in Cambridge, Mass. He was preaching in a rented room and of course there was no baptistry in that rented room. A soldier was present and accepted his invitation and came forward saying he believed Jesus Christ is the Son of God. But there was no place to baptize the man. The preacher telephoned the Baptist preacher near and asked him to allow the baptizing in the Baptist baptistry and was refused. He even offered to pay the Baptist preacher for the use of the baptistry and still was refused. Poor soldier might die and go to hell because a Baptist preacher refused to allow the use of the baptistry to wash away the sins of this soldier. Then they betook themselves to the river, some distance away, and baptistry to wash away the sins of this soldier. Then they paid the Baptist preacher near and asked him to allow the baptizing in the baptistry to wash away the sins of this soldier. Then they could be found. No place where Saul was baptized had been under the control of a Baptist preacher, he would likely have refused its use to a man who wanted to be baptized to “wash away his sins.”

It was very consistent of the Baptist preacher to refuse his baptism to be used to “wash away the sins” of a soldier, for such an action might leave stain on the inside of his baptistry. Hence that “contaminating” his baptistry and thus contaminating his sheep who subsequently were baptized “because their sins were already washed away.” It would be too bad, of course, for such sheep who had already had their sins washed away to be baptized in a baptistry where some one was baptized to wash away his sins. Ananias evidently didn’t have that trouble in Damascus when he baptized Saul of Tarsus. He told him: “Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins,” calling on the name of the Lord.” Acts 22:16. The record tells us that Saul “received his sight forthwith, and arose, and was baptized.” Act. 9:18. Thus we are informed that the baptism of Saul was not long delayed. But Ananias did not have to deal with a Baptist preacher. If the place where Saul was baptized had been under the control of a Baptist preacher, he would most likely have refused its use to a man who wanted to be baptized to “wash away his sins.” In that case, his baptism might have been longer delayed. But that problem did not have to be faced at that time, for there were no Baptist preachers in the days of Ananias. And it was therefore unnecessary to obtain the consent of any such in order to baptize Saul.

But I want to look at a number of things in this paragraph by Mr. Bogard and see something about what the consequences may be when his interpretation of 2 Cor. 6:2 is accepted.

**Meaning Of “Now” Is Misrepresented**

In 2 Cor. 6:2 Paul said: “Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.” And Bogard claims that that “Campbellite preacher” who says “baptism is necessary” could not preach that “now is the time” for he had to “wait until a place for baptizing could be found.” In other words, he thinks that “now” means a thing must occur within a split second of time that immediately follows the utterance of the word, or that it must occur even before the word is finished. If you must wait for two hours, or an hour, or thirty minutes, or even five minutes to accomplish the thing, it cannot be now. So the man that must take time to baptize somebody cannot preach that “now is the time” if he believes that baptism is necessary to salvation. But that Bogard’s idea of the word is entirely wrong can be seen from several points of view.

In the first place, the very language of Paul himself reveals Bogard’s blunder, for Paul said: “Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation.” He had just quoted from the prophecy of Isaiah: “I have heard thee in a time accepted, and in the day of salvation have I succored thee.” And he showed the application of that prophecy to the time in which he was living; hence, “Now is the day of salvation.” He did not say, as Bogard’s position would force him to say: “Now is the split-second of salvation,” but “now is the day of salvation.” The time this refers to the “day” and the “day” refers to a period of time that is much longer than a split-second. The word day, in its fullest scope, could thus be made to mean an age — the gospel age, the age or day of salvation. And as it pertained to any individual it could easily refer to his lifetime. Jesus said one time: “I must work the works of him that sent me, while it is day: the night cometh when no man can work.” John 9:4. Thus he applied “day” to his lifetime, followed by the night of death. So the thought of the apostle Paul is that one’s opportunity is confined or limited to his lifetime — that such is the day of salvation — and there will be no chance for him to accept salvation after death. And since, of course, he has no guarantee of years to come, he should accept the way of salvation when he has the opportunity. But to make it mean a split-second of time was certainly never in the purpose of the apostle.

This idea may be further substantiated by other uses of the word “now.” In Acts 10 we are told of the visit of the angel to Cornelius, telling him that his alms and prayers had come up as a memorial before God. And to Cornelius the angel said in verse 5: “And now end men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose name is Peter.” This is the same “now” used by the Apostle Paul in 2 Cor. 6:2. But what did Cornelius do? “When the angel which spake unto Cornelius was departed, he called two of his household servants, and a devout soldier of them waited on him continually; and when he had declared all these things unto them, he sent them to Joppa.” Acts 10:7, 8. Remember that he was told to send men to Joppa “now.” But after the angel left he took time to call men to him, and then he took time to “declare all these things to them” and then sent them to Joppa. If Bogard had been present he would have said: “Cornelius, you are all wrong. You are not doing what the angel told you to do at all. He told you to send men to Joppa now, but you have waited till you could call these men into your presence, and you waited till you could declare all these things to them before you sent them. You just can’t claim that you obeyed the voice of the angel at all.”

Likewise you may look at the statement Jesus made to Saul in Acts 26:17, 18: “Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom I now send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.” This would mean, according to Bogard’s idea of “now,” that he must start preaching to the Gentiles at that very instant. But did he? Oh no, he had to be led by his companions to Damascus and there wait for three days for Ananias to come and tell him what to do. After learning what the Lord wanted him to do he was baptized, and then he preached Christ in the synagogues of Damascus. Acts 9:20. So he tells us that he “showed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should repent and turn to God.” Acts 28:20. Had Bogard been there he would have said to Saul:
"The Lord said he was sending you now to the Gentiles, but you waited three days in Damascus until you were baptized, and you waited till you preached in Damascus, and you waited till you preached in Jerusalem, and you waited till you preached throughout all the coasts of Judea, before you went to the Gentiles. You were therefore disobedient to the heavenly vision. But what does Paul say about it? He says: "I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision." Acts 26:19. So Bogard is wrong in his interpretation of the word "now."

**"Now" Used In Connection With Baptism**

That Mr. Bogard is wrong about this whole matter is shown by the use of the word "now" in connection with baptism. When Jesus came to John to be baptized of him, John hesitated. He felt that he needed to be baptized by Jesus. But the Lord said: "Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Matt. 3:15. Does this mean that John had to baptize Jesus within a split second of the utterance of that word? It does, according to Mr. Bogard. But after Jesus uttered that word, they had to wait till he could go down into the water before the baptizing could take place. It will not change the meaning of the word now to say that Jesus was not baptized "for the remission of sins," for neither was he baptized "because of the remission of sins." It certainly was not inconsistent with the word "now" for enough time to be taken to perform baptism.

And we might take another look at the statement of Ananias to Saul. He came to him to tell him what he must do. Saul was engaged in prayer when Ananias arrived. So Ananias said to him: "And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Acts 22:16. I don't suppose there was a baptismity in the house of Judas where Paul was praying, and it must have been necessary to make some arrangement for a place to baptize, or at least it required time to get to a place where the baptizing could occur. And this man was to be baptized in order that his sins be washed away. If Ananias preached that night that "now is the time," I wonder if he contradicted himself because he had to wait till he could get to a place to baptize Saul. He used the word "now" right in connection with baptism as a condition upon which sins were to be washed away. Too bad Bogard was not there to set him right on this.

Likewise, the statement of Peter adds force to the fact that Bogard does not know what he is talking about. Peter said: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." 1 Pet. 3:21. Bogard says that baptism cannot save us now, and if a man claims baptism has anything to do with our salvation, he cannot even preach that salvation is now; but Peter said that baptism now saves us. But did not Peter know that it takes time to arrange for a place to baptize? Did he not know that it takes time to get to a place for baptism? Yes, I have an idea that he knew all of this. Yet he said: "Baptism doth also now save us." So salvation can be now and still depend on the condition of baptism. Somebody blundered—either Peter or Bogard—and I don't believe it was Peter.

**Paul Preached Salvation "Now"**

It was the apostle Paul who said: "Behold, now is the accepted time; behold, now is the day of salvation." What attitude did he take about baptism? Did he preach that baptism is necessary to salvation? If he did, there is no conflict between that idea and now is the time, unless he contradicted himself. And I hardly think that even Bogard would be ready to affirm that. Let us note some of the statements made by this apostle. In Rom. 6:3, 4 he said: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Since the same writer affirmed in 2 Cor. 5:17 that a man must be "in Christ" in order to be a "new creature," then he made baptism necessary to becoming a new creature, for he says we were baptized into Jesus Christ." This same thought is repeated in Gal. 3:27. A man therefore cannot get into Christ without baptism, for he is baptized into Christ. But he must be in Christ. To be a "new creature." Becoming a "new creature" is thus made to depend on being "baptized into Christ. This certainly makes baptism necessary to salvation unless a man can be saved without being in Christ and without becoming a new creature. Also this passage in Romans tells us that we are raised from baptism to walk in newness of life. So Paul affirms that the new life does not occur before the burial, but that men are raised into it. If the new life is the Christian life, the life of justification and forgiveness, such cannot be claimed before baptism. Bogard would insist that the new life must be walked before a man is a proper subject for the burial, but in that he is in direct conflict with the apostle Paul. And in Rom. 6:17, 18, referring to baptism as the "form of doctrine," Paul also declared: "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." We cannot obey the doctrine—death, burial and resurrection of Christ—but we can obey the form of it in baptism; and when we do, Paul says, we are "then made free from sin." Certainly this means we are not made free from sin before then, as Bogard and his brethren teach. Then in Col. 2:11-13 we have a very interesting statement from Paul. "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: burial with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." The word "circumcision" means cutting around, or cutting loose. In the Old Testament there was fleshly circumcision among the family of Abraham. But Paul speaks of a different circumcision, a circumcision made without hands, the circumcision of Christ. But it also means a "cutting loose." We cannot claim the cutting loose or a putting off "the body of the sins of the flesh." This is done by the operation of God. God performs this operation when he cuts loose "the body of sins of the flesh." But when is this circumcision of Christ performed? Paul answers: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." Hence, the circumcision of Christ, the cutting loose of our sins, is accomplished when we are buried and raised in baptism. And then what? When this is accomplished we are "quickened together with him" and have all our trespasses forgiven—"having forgiven you all trespasses." According to Paul, then, our trespasses are not forgiven, we are not quickened with Christ, and the body of sins is not put off until we are buried and raised with Christ in baptism. This definitely shows that Paul preached that baptism is necessary to salvation. Yet he said: "Now is the day of salvation." If friend Bogard had been there, he would have said something like this: "Now, Paul, you are certainly mixed up on this matter. You say that now is the time.' Yet you claim that one must wait till he can be baptized before he
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can enter Christ, become a new creature, be made free from sins, walk in newness of life, have the body of sins cut loose and be forgiven all his trespasses. You just cannot preach these things and yet tell people that now is the time without contradicting yourself.” But Paul did preach those things even while saying that now is the day of salvation; and as Paul did it, I am sure that a preacher today can do the same thing.

Bogard’s Argument Applied To His Position

In public debate Bogard has often objected to baptism as a condition of salvation because it would make it possible to “place a rock between a man and his salvation.” He illustrates by putting a man in a cave, letting a rock fall between him and the exit, thus shutting off all means of his getting out. A “Campbellite preacher,” he claims cannot preach to this man that “now is the time,” for he is behind that rock and cannot get out to be baptized. The preacher cannot get to him with water to baptize him. So the man is doomed to die with a rock between him and his salvation. But he says a Baptist preacher, who believes you are saved just as soon as you believe in Christ, can preach Christ to the man, tell him that “now is the time” and the man behind the rock can believe in Christ and be saved without ever getting out of the cave. But the objection of Bogard to baptism can easily be made against his idea that faith is a condition of salvation. In order to do this, we are going to make the man behind the rock an unbelieving Jew. And we are going to make the rock big enough that the man behind it cannot hear the voice of Bogard on the outside. The Jew believes in God but he does not believe in Jesus as his Son. Bogard preaches that a man must believe in Christ in order to be saved. He also claims, as does Paul, that faith comes by hearing the word of God. Rom. 10:17. So it is necessary to preach to men that they may become believers in Christ. The Jew understands that there is an eternal destiny for him. He knows that Daniel says that some will awake to everlasting life and others to shame and everlasting contempt. He knows he must die if he is not freed from the cave. He knows that Daniel says that some will awake to everlasting life and others to shame and everlasting contempt. He knows he must die if he is not freed from the cave. He wants to die as one prepared for everlasting life. He has never heard the gospel and does not believe in Christ and must therefore be lost unless some man can preach to him. But Bogard and his brethren cannot reach him with the gospel so that he can believe. He therefore dies “with a rock between him and his salvation,” and Bogard, according to his own position, cannot say with respect to this man that “now is the time.” If we cannot preach that “now is the day of salvation” because the man would have to wait till we removed the rock or dug another opening to him so we could baptize him, then Bogard cannot preach it either, for according to his position, the man must wait till the rock is removed or another opening is made so that Bogard can get to him to preach Christ that he might believe. So this argument, as is true with so many arguments made by Baptists, proves to be a boomerang to my blundering friend, Mr. Bogard.

Order a copy of “The Polymathist,” a 450 page book of more than 200 sermon sketches by pioneer preachers, published in 1871, long out of print. Of the 200 copies recently secured more than half were sold on first announcement. Price $2.00. Order this rare volume now.

Tinius-Sanderson — 228 E. Third — Tulsa, Okla.
The record says: "Then Peter made talks, and were of the Pentecostal Church. So the two of us were proclaimed by the church of Christ. His widow's people called upon to take part in the service. And, to make time ago I was called to assist in a funeral service, with preach as recorded in the New Testament. The fact is, the Holy Spirit is not leading them, but they are following what the Holy Spirit led Peter to preach on the day of Pentecost. Certainly the Spirit, if their claim is true, has misled somebody, for it makes them preach a doctrine in conflict with what it made the apostles preach as recorded in the New Testament. The fact is, of course, that the Spirit misleads no one. The apostles spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance. But these modern day fellows have not received the Holy Spirit at all. The Holy Spirit is not leading them, but they are following the doctrine and commandments of men. They are not inspired. They are deceived and deceivers of men. They are "blind leaders of the blind." Do not follow after them.

You have claimed that baptism is not for the remission of sins, but the apostle Peter says to 'be baptized for the remission of sins.' Do you believe in doing what Peter said to do?

He replied: "I believe you have to repent first."

"So do I. But that is not the question I asked. Regardless of what has to be done first, do you believe in baptizing men for the remission of sins as Peter said to do?"

"I won't baptize men for the remission of sins," he said.

"Then you don't believe in doing what Peter said to do? Is that right?"

"That's right," he responded.

I demanded that he say it loudly enough that the audience could hear him. He said, with enough force that the audience could hear, that he did not believe in doing what Peter said in Acts 2:38 to do. So this is the straits to which men are driven who claim the baptism of the Holy Spirit. They say they are inspired and led by the Holy Spirit in all their preaching. But they deny emphatically what the Holy Spirit led Peter to preach on the day of Pentecost. Certainly the Spirit, if their claim is true, has misled somebody, for it makes them preach a doctrine in conflict with what it made the apostles preach as recorded in the New Testament. The fact is, of course, that the Spirit misleads no one. The apostles spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance. But these modern day fellows have not received the Holy Spirit at all. The Holy Spirit is not leading them, but they are following the doctrine and commandments of men. They are not inspired. They are deceived and deceivers of men. They are "blind leaders of the blind." Do not follow after them.

I Helped With A Funeral

W. CURTIS PORTER

Often gospel preachers are called upon to take part in mixed funeral services. Perhaps relatives of the deceased represent various religious faiths, and you are asked to help in the services where Baptist, Methodist or other denominational preachers also take part. Some time ago I was called to assist in a funeral service, with a Pentecostal preacher as the other participant. A young man had died. His relatives were believers in the doctrine proclaimed by the church of Christ. His widow's people were of the Pentecostal Church. So the two of us were called upon to take part in the service. And, to make it a little different from the usual, both of us were to make talks.

It has never been my desire to take any unfair advantage of any one in a funeral service. Yet people need to know the truth at such times as well as on other occasions. The Pentecostal preacher delivered his talk first. While he was talking I kept thinking: "Here is a man on the pulpit with me, who claims miraculous power, and who should walk to the casket and say: 'Young man, I say unto thee, arise.' And the dead man should come to life." So when it came my time to speak I spoke somewhat after the following fashion:

"Great men mentioned in the Bible have been interested in the subjects of death and concerned about those who are left sorrowing when loved ones pass away. In this respect the conduct of Jesus is outstanding. He went one time to the house of Jairus whose daughter had died. He said that she was only sleeping and was laughed to scorn by those present. But he took the father and mother and three of his disciples and entered the room where the body of the damsel lay. There he took her by the hand and said: 'Damsel, I say unto thee, arise.' Immediately she arose and walked and joy was brought to the sorrowing family. On another occasion Jesus, with his disciples, followed by a multitude of people, approached the city of Nain. The only son of a widowed mother had died and was being carried to his burial. The funeral procession was passing out the gate of the city as Jesus approached. He saw the sorrowing mother and had compassion on her and said to her: 'Weep not! He came and touched the coffin and said: 'Young man, I say unto thee, Arise.' Immediately the dead came to life, began to talk and joy was brought to the mother. Then, too, we recall that Lazarus, a close friend of Jesus, died. He was not present when the event occurred. After four days Jesus arrived at Bethany, the home of Lazarus and Martha and Mary. Being directed to the place of his burial, Jesus stood beside the tomb and wept. After addressing his Father in heaven Jesus said with a loud voice: 'Lazarus, come forth.' And the dead man arose."

"Not only was Jesus interested in the bereaved of his day but likewise were his apostles interested. We read in the book of Acts of a certain disciple at Joppa named Tabitha or Dorcas. She had been known for her good works and almsdeeds. But she died. Peter was at Lydda, a town not far away, and he was sent for to come without delay. When he arrived he was shown into the upper room and the widows stood by and showed him the garments Dorcas had made while she was with them. He put them all forth, kneeled down and prayed, and turned to the dead body and said: 'Tabitha, arise.' She opened her eyes and sat up."

"We are gathered on a similar occasion today. A young man has died and his body lies before us now. If I had the power that Jesus had, or if I had the power that the apostle Peter had, I would approach this casket to day and say: 'Young man, I say unto thee, arise.' And the young man would immediately come to life 'and I could present him to his sorrowing relatives. But I do not have that power. No man on earth today has that power. Such things have not been done since the complete revelation of God's will has been made and spiritual gifts have been removed."

I did not say that the preacher who was on the stand with me claimed to have that power and should proceed in the manner. But I hoped the audience would be able to get the point. Somehow, I believe many of them did.
Autonomy Of The Local Church
TED W. McELROY
It is generally known to the readers of the New Testament, that the word church means the “called out” or saved and is used in two senses, general and local. In the general sense, the church is the organization or officers except, “He is the head of the body, the church” (Col. 1:18). A local church, that is the Christians of a given locality, has its elders, deacons, and saints. No organization larger than the local church is authorized in the New Testament. Each congregation of disciples is separate and independent, and has no human organizational connection with other congregations. Efforts, to bring congregations into a “defacto” diocese, are unwarranted by the New Testament, and are founded on pride, ignorance and ambition.

Note a few scriptures which point out the work and show the autonomy of the church. “To the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord” (Eph. 3:10-11). This scripture makes its plain that the “wisdom of God,” the gospel, is to “be made known through the church.” A committee or financial agency is not hinted at. To take the position that the church as such is inadequate for the task God imposed upon it, is a rather bold presumption. Upon this bold presumption of the inadequacy of the church, the societies are built. I believe the church as authorized in the New Testament is all-sufficient for the task of making the “wisdom of God” known, and that apart from its elders and deacons, the church needs no financial committee or agency, in it, or over it, to assist in doing its work.

Another scripture, “Unto him be glory in the church and in Christ Jesus unto all generations for ever” (Eph. 3:21). This is emphatic that the church is the instrumentality formed for God’s praise and glory. The committees and human organizations which pretend to glorify God, are in reality insults to Him; because they are formed on the presumption that human wisdom is superior to divine wisdom, and that the human institution will be better suited to function for His glory than the church. The organizations and schemes of men dishonor God, rather than glorify Him.

The New Testament furnishes us with examples that are binding upon us. Note the example of the gospel work of Paul and Silas, Acts 15:40-41, they were “commended by the brethren” of Antioch, and went forth to preach the gospel. Their work in Philippi, Macedonia is described in Acts 16:11-40. In the course of their work they went to Corinth and taught there for a year and a half, Acts 18:1-11. While thus engaged in preaching in Corinth, the Philippian church supplied their wants, 2 Cor. 11:9; Phil. 4:15. The significant point is that the church acted, it was not the work of a society or committee or self-appointed agent; but the church is said to have done the work. Another significant lesson; since Paul and Silas had been sent from the church in Antioch, was the Antioch church considered the “sponsoring church,” and was it necessary for the Philippian church to send its contribution through the Antioch church? No indication is given that the contribution was routed through Antioch. In New Testament times, if any church knew of Paul and his need and desired to have fellowship in his work; they were at liberty to do so without going through a sponsor.

Observation of Rom. 12:3 is a good society preventive. “For I say, through the grace given me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think.” Efforts, to combine churches and individuals into committees and under sponsors, evince that some one thinks more highly of himself than he ought to think. Usually the motive for such efforts is that somebody wants to be the “head” of something bigger than anything known to the New Testament. Such is an unholy ambition, and deserves to be resisted. An effort to bring a specific application of these scriptures. Something in quotation marks. “Post War Missionary Program” has been crawling out and demanding the attention of the brotherhood. At first it was just “agitation” and originated in California; second, it appeared in Lubbock as a “sponsored plan,” and now a brother Beeson from Arkansas wants it to be a “financial agency.” No, I don’t think it is a monster with seven heads and ten horns which will gobble up all the churches in one lusty feast; this “agitation,” “sponsored plan” or “financial agency,” which ever it turns out to be, is probably more like a harmless little grass snake than a monster. Anyway I am not scared to step on it or at it.

In the Firm Foundation Sept. 14, 1943 brother Beeson of Little Rock has an article on this “After the war missionary program.” If brother Brewer and the Lubbock church do not endorse this Arkansas encouragement and explanation of their “Post War Missionary Program” it is as dead as faith without works.” From that statement it is plain that we will have to cease “fighting any organization larger than the local church,” if this “after the war missionary program of congregational cooperation” is put into effect. His statement is a plea to stop the fight and open the gate. Now the crucial question is, have we been wrong in fighting any organization larger than the local church? We have not been wrong, the battle against such organizations is part of the good fight of faith, and may it ever be fought. Since the fight against organizations larger than the local church kills brother Beeson’s idea of congregational cooperation, something is wrong with the idea. The fight is good, and if it kills the idea, it is evidence that the idea is wrong. Let us continue the good fight and let his brand of cooperation stay dead.

Those who are advocating such post war plans of cooperation anticipate opposition, and shall not be disappointed. They try to hedge their scheme behind the skirt of its being “voluntary.” They seem to think, if it is “voluntary” it is all right and that should smother the opposition. But is a thing scriptural, just because participation in it is “voluntary,” if so every religious activity in our nation is scriptural. Being a Catholic and burning incense is “voluntary.” Does that make it acceptable to the Lord? Of course it does not. Neither does the mere statement that these defections are “voluntary” make them scriptural.

There are several other things in brother Beeson’s article that I would like to notice, but for the sake of brevity just one more point. Brother Beeson says, “How is this missionary work to be done on the basis of equality, so that one missionary will not be surfeited with finance while another is neglected entirely by the churches? Financial cooperation and agency are the only means by which we shall iron out the inequalities of support and maintenance and build a permanent missionary program abroad.” The apostles and early evangelists preached the gospel “in all creation under heaven” (Col. 1:23) without any such financial agency; which proves it can be done without the agency, and brother Beeson furnished no proof that the Lord wanted any such agency connected with the work. We ought, therefore, to strive to do the work of the Lord without setting up an agency unknown to His word.
Russellite universals claim that, orthodoxy, which they love to belittle will consign the majority of mankind to a red-hot hell, and thus prove the Lord a poor loser to Satan in the battle for souls. On the other hand they claim the system which they teach, which is not orthodox, will save the majority of mankind, and thus exalts the Lords wisdom, power, love, and mercy. Our conception of the gospel, and the judgment, they say is narrow, and contrary to unbiased reason, and reflects upon the omnipotent love and mercy of God.

They have a scheme in which no hell will ever be needed, the majority of mankind will be saved, and the few who fail to make the grade will be destroyed literally, and all will be peace and harmony in the new heavens and new earth, especially in the new earth, for they don't seem to have much need for a heaven after the Lord comes the second time. They plan to move the whole works down to this earth, and heaven will be left an empty shell.

I want to examine their theory and see just what it does have to offer mankind, just as they have conceived it, and formulated their plan. Salvation as they preach it is based exclusively upon what they call the two-fold promise God made to Abraham. In that two-fold promise two kinds of seed are embraced, a fleshly seed, and a spiritual seed, and two kinds of salvation offered; one salvation to earthly reward and glory for the fleshly seed, and the other heavenly reward and glory for the spiritual seed. These two seeds of Abraham embrace all the people of Adam's race. Those of the flesh become Abraham's seed by a fleshly birth, and those of the spiritual seed become such by a spiritual birth, or conversion under the gospel.

The spiritual seed belong exclusively to the gospel dispensation, or age, and other names by which they identify this same period of time are," the times of the Gentiles," "this present evil world," "the church age," and the "little flock age," and these expressions are common in their writings.

This period of time is bounded by the ascension of the Lord back to heaven after his resurrection, and his return the second time. When he comes the second time the gospel age, or dispensation, will end, it has accomplished all that the Lord ever expected it in gathering up this "little flock" who are to become the judges in the second phase of the promise to Abraham, during a post mortem, post resurrection, age of reconciliation in which all of mankind will have a part, and the "little flock," or church, will be the administrators.

It is only during this post mortem period of reconciliation that salvation becomes available for the whole world. It has to be post mortem, for most of the people to whom this reconciliation is to be offered were dead people. But they do not find any difficulty in that fact, they will have the Lord raise them all from the dead and assemble them in Palestine, and around the site of ancient Jerusalem, and the "little flock" will be doing their work of reconciling them to God.

This, according to the theory, is the second phase of the two-fold promise made to Abraham, the part of the promise that embraces the land heritage, which the Lord gave to Abraham, and "to thy seed after thee." This of course is Abraham's seed after the flesh. God has bound himself with an oath to give them the Land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and they claim further that this promise had been expanded to include the whole world, see Romans 4-13, and this promise they affirm has never been fulfilled. This is the work assigned to the little flock in the post mortem age, settling the races of mankind in their possessions.

This reconciliation, and salvation, which they offer them is not the heavenly award, and kingdom, glory, that reward was reserved for the spiritual seed, and their number has already been made up, and the reward given. What they have to offer is the reward embraced in the second phase of the double promise, an everlasting inheritance on the earth, and the glory is an earthly one as well as the salvation, and all will share in it from Abraham down to the last Jew. It is salvation by promise, based on a fleshly relation, and is unconditional and unilateral.

The spiritual seed were all made up during the gospel age, and while they are only a "little flock," they are the judges of the world and of angels, and the appointed administrators over the fleshly seed and their inheritance of the earth. The spiritual seed receive no inheritance among the fleshly seed, like the Levites under the law. As the administrators, however, they will be over the estates of the fleshly seed, and I suppose will live from the tithes.

When they place the Jews in possession of the world, and settle them in their habitations, the two-fold promise to Abraham is fulfilled, both to the spiritual seed and to the fleshly seed of Abraham. This is all that the theory offers, or can offer, on a basis of the promise to Abraham. But at this point they attempt to work in a joker, they seek to expand this promise to include all of Adam's race who have ever lived in the world, as well as Abraham's fleshly seed, and the spiritual seed which comprises the little flock who are the judges.

But there are other millions, and billions, who come up in the resurrection, who are not of Abraham's fleshly seed, nor of his spiritual seed, and never can be if Russelliteism is true. They have nothing to offer these billions according to the theory they have worked out, and these billions are doomed to go unsaved forever. And for what reason are they doomed? First, because they were not born of Abraham's family, and secondly because they never had an opportunity to become one of the spiritual seed, not having lived at the time it was being made up. Russell's theory leaves those billions all unsaved, and with no possible way for them to be saved.

The only ones who could possibly be saved must be either of the spiritual seed of Abraham, or of his fleshly seed. The spiritual seed were made up during the church age, or gospel age, and the fleshly seed are raised, and settled in their earthly heritage when Christ comes the second time. Those people had no choice as to their parentage, and no chance to become spiritual seed during the gospel age, and the theory leaves them without God and without hope.

They have these billions on their hands and no place for them to go, not even a red-hot hell. They cannot be saved, and they cannot inherit on the earth, for that was reserved for Abraham's fleshly seed. Neither can they inherit in heaven, or the kingdom of God, that was reserved for the little flock. What will they do with those billions of unsaved people, and whom their theory cannot possibly save, as it made no provisions whatever for them? There will be Edom, Samaria, Egypt, Babylon, and the riff raff of all nations, kindreds, and tongues, and the only ones the theory is able to save is the little flock, and the Jews.
They started out, I grant them, to find a theory which would be able to save about all of Adam's race, and give them a home somewhere on the earth, but they have bungled the whole thing and saved very few. The promise to Abraham that he should be heir of the world, they say was literal, and means just what it says, it was the literal world that Abraham, "saw and walked upon," they say, and made up of sand, rocks, soil, hills, mountains, rivers, and all of this was given to Abraham by oath, confirmed unto Isaac as a promise, to Jacob as a law, and to Abraham's seed after him as an everlasting possession.

Then as the world belongs to Abraham, and his seed after him, and the kingdom, and heavenly award, belongs to the little flock of judges, where do these other billions of Adam's race come in? Like the Phillisitines, and the Canaanites, in the days of Joshua, they must be disposed of before the seed of Abraham can be secure in their inheritance. And there is no place for them to go, not even a hell, for the whole world belongs to Abraham and his seed after him.

There is only one thing left that I can see, and that is for the little flock, of whom Uncle Charley and his bunch are chief, to slay them with their rods of iron, with which we are told they will all be armed. I used to wonder about those saints with their rods of iron, and just why the immortal saints wanted them, but perhaps we have found a use for them after all. They would be useful first in prodding dissatisfied Jews who grumbled at their par
duction is the Jews will have to do the milking, and keep the flocks. And what an awful slaughter that will be? Think of all the wars since time began, and roll all of them into one single war, and it will be an infant compared with this slaughter, and the saints will do the slaughtering.

Now if they had some place to ship them off to that would be more merciful, they could be trusted to slaughter each other. But 'is there such a land, or place, according to Russell's theory, unoccupied, and unappor
ated, for any other person, being, or purpose? Yes, there is just one according to the theory, the place which we now call heaven, According to Russell's theory heaven will be vacated, and even God himself will bring his tabernacle down to the earth and dwell with his people upon it, the tabernacle of God will be with men.

I think it would be more merciful to ship those billions of unsaved souls off to heaven, and let them take possession of it. We don't know just what condition it was left in when God and Christ and all the angels left it and came down to earth to live with man, but that won't matter. It may not be as bad as we think of hell when they arrive there, but give that bunch of crooks thirty days and it will be worse than any hell we have ever pictured. With all the Hitlers, Mussolinis, Kaisers, Caesars, Napoleons, Pharoahs, Herods, Hanhibals, Alexaders, and despots of all ages herded there together fire will be flying before the last shipment arrives, and after that we won't need to worry about hell.

Then this is what they wind up with, and who have they saved? Just a "little flock," and a few Jews, fleshly descendants of Abraham, over whom the little flock will ride herd through all eternity. It will be time of plenty though, milk and honey and sweet wine dripping from the hills, and running down the mountains, and one consolation is the Jews have to do the milking, and keep the flocks.
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FOR ALL BIBLE CLASSES AND HOME STUDY

These four books, having proved helpful to both student and teacher, are gaining an ever-increasing circulation.

1. Bible Topic Studies.
   Contains twenty-eight lessons on as many Bible topics. Guides the student into a knowledge of what the Bible actually says, rather than what men have said about these most important Bible subjects.

   Contains twenty-six lessons. Makes it easier for one 'to acquire a knowledge of the great events of the Old Testament, and to remember the things "written for our admonition."

   Contains twenty-six lessons in the life of Christ and the history of the early church. Each lesson begins with a brief explanatory background, followed by a series of questions with the scripture reference for the answer after each question.

4. Revelation Studies.
   Contains twenty-six lessons covering the entire book of Revelation. These lessons contain no speculation; they are a definite warning against such. Designed to help one acquire a knowledge of what the Revelation actually says.

WHAT OTHERS SAY

J. A. McNut in The Evangelist: "The writer has used Brother Douthitt's 'Bible Topic Studies' in class work and found it practical and interesting. It is refreshing to examine a series of lessons on the Book of Revelation, not animated by some speculative theory."

Leslie G. Thomas in Firm Foundation: "No student can go through this course of study without becoming familiar with the teaching of the Bible. Churches and individuals would do well to use this series of studies freely."

B. C. Goodpasture in Gospel Advocate: "(Regarding Revelation Studies), "It is sound and instructive; well adapted to class use and home study."

Many other unsolicited letters of commendation have been received.

Price: Single copy, $0.35; Three copies, $1.00; Four copies, $1.25; Six or more, per copy, $0.25.
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