The NATURE AND USE OF PRAYER

CLED E. WALLACE

The Christian has become a partaker of the divine nature and the sources of his power must be divinity. Self-reliance and independence are strictly limited in the religious life of the individual. "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." "The way of man is not in himself." In the broad view, the most outstanding thing about man is his helplessness, his need of grace and the divine guidance it implies. Human infirmity required such a representative as we have in Jesus Christ our great High Priest. "Let us therefore draw near with boldness unto the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy, and may find grace to help us in time of need." We are partakers of grace and must have access into grace. The very doctrine of grace under scores the extremity and need of man.

In these distressing times much is being said about prayer, even by many who would not in normal times give it much thought. It is extremity that turns the thoughts to prayer. It is generally acknowledged that soldiers in foxholes and men drifting in rubber rafts will pray and their thoughts turn to God as naturally as they turn to mothers and homes. In too many instances prayer ceases when the extremity ends. Some good things are being said about prayer, others display a thorough lack of understanding of the subject and impress me as running contrary to both reason and revelation. "The prayer of a righteous man availeth much in its working" but it is not a substitute for everything. Some appear to regard it merely as an escape from a storm and keep the cellar door closed when the skies are clear. The attitude of men toward God may be such that he merely mocks when their fear comes and laughs at their calamities. He will not hear those who regard iniquity in their hearts. "And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you; yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood." Thus spoke Jehovah to many who carried on the forms of revealed worship and displayed every iniquity and injustice in their lives. They sought to use Jehovah as a convenience, a contributor to their own schemes. God will not be used that way. "Ye ask, and receive not, because ye ask amiss, that ye may spend it in your pleasures." It may be well, then, to note the proper place and uses of prayer in the life of the individual.

One glance at the subject reveals that the sources of spiritual power are a knowledge of the word of God and prayer. He is quite a dwarf in spiritual matters who is ignorant of the word of God and a stranger at the throne of grace. The man who neither studies nor prays does not have enough light to shine even out from under the bushel. Some of that kind are members of the church, at least nominally so. Growth in grace must accompany growth in knowledge and there is no growth in grace without prayer.

A knowledge of the word of God produces definite convictions about God. Vague and undefined impressions are not enough. The conviction must be strong enough to warrant a fervent appeal to "Our Father who art in heaven." Prayer requires faith in God. "Without faith it is impossible to be well-pleasing unto him; for he that cometh to God must believe that he is, and that he is a rewarder of them that seek after him." Prayer is an intimate part of daily life. There is a constant awareness of God and his interest in human affairs. Power, love, knowledge, mercy and justice are all his without measure. All that a man does not have and needs, God has. And the happiness and welfare of man is the aim of God in dealing with him. "And this is the boldness which we have toward him, that, if we ask anything according to his will, he heareth us: and if we know that we have the petitions which we ask, we know that we have the petitions which we have asked of him."

A knowledge of God involves a knowledge of Christ, an acceptance of Jesus as the Christ, through whom God speaks to man, and through whom alone man can approach God. He is our High Priest, Intercessor and Advocate. "And this is life eternal, that they should know thee the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." Jesus Christ gave his life for us. We are his by right of purchase. God is in Christ reconciling the world to himself. All acceptable prayer must be offered in his name. "And whatsoever ye do, in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God for the work of grace by which you have come to know Christ." (Col. 3:17.)

Religious thought is quite careless these days. It is often remarked that Jew or Christian can call on his God with or without Christ and be heard and answered. God cannot be honored apart from his Son. "For he that called you is holy; be ye holy in all manner of conversation; for the Lord knoweth how to save the godly, even from fire; and to reserve unto himself the persons that shall be saved." (1 Pet. 4:14.)
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THE WALLACE - MATTHEWS DEBATE

GLENN L. WALLACE

In September of 1943, I heard Dr. John Matthews of Los Angeles in a debate and heard him boast of his desire to debate his theories. I immediately contacted him on behalf of the Central Church here in the city. After many delays and efforts on the part of Matthews to have the debate cancelled, we finally arrived at an understanding and on January 18, 19, 20 and 23 the discussions were held. All expenses were paid by Central Church and although we were promised half the support for the hall rent, we have never received the money. The Embassy Auditorium and the Philharmonic Auditorium were used for the debate and large audiences attended all sessions. The largest audiences ever assembled in a service of our people in this city, were the result, and more outsiders heard the gospel than would have been possible in any other service.

John Allen Hudson, of the Southwest Church in Los Angeles, was a constant source of help and encouragement, both before and during the debate. C. R. Nichol, of the Vermont Avenue Church, was our moderator, and his counsel and assistance was deeply appreciated by all. All the preachers and churches of the Los Angeles area gave their whole-hearted cooperation. Many spent money in advertising in their sections and nearly all dismissed their week night services to attend.

Dr. Matthews is a Presbyterian, and although he is not a debater, he is by far the best speaker of the Anglo-Israel movement in this section. He has traveled over the world, and was formerly a lecturer on Shakespeare. He has a large following in Southern California and is one of about a dozen preachers of this theory. Dr. Matthews has no church, but depends upon his radio preaching plus Sunday engagements in a large auditorium to keep him going. He proved to be one of the weakest debaters it has ever been our task to hear. The first two sessions Brother Wallace was in the affirmative and Dr. Matthews read a prepared negative speech throughout. He took no notes and refused to answer a single argument made. His defeat was so evident to the audience that many of his followers have attended our services since the debate.

Foy E. Wallace, Jr., editor of the Bible Banner, was the representative of the church. Central Church here in Los Angeles and all Southern California are grateful for the great work that he did in defense of the truth. The Central church was a former place of labor for him and he preached to an overflowing house on Sunday morning while in the city.

The Anglo-Israel movement is not new, although it is new to America. It is centered chiefly in the British Isles and has followers in Australia, New Zealand and Canada. It is a religion of race and seeks to prove that the Anglo-Saxon peoples are the "modern covenant people of God." It has all the old doctrines of the premillennialist made to fit Britain and America rather than the Jews. It affirms that the ten tribes are the roots of the Anglo-Saxon races and that all the fleshly, earthly promises God made in the Old Testament will find their fulfillment in "us." The present king of England is seated on the "throne of David," and the throne will be taken by Christ at his return and will be again transferred to Jerusalem. It can be seen that that would add greatly to any feeling of superiority an Englishman or American might have of himself. It amounts to little more than the "master race" theory of the dictator nations. The doctrine is definitely un-American as well as un-Christian.

Bro. Wallace affirmed that baptism is for the remission of sins. It was evident that Matthews had never debated with a gospel preacher previous to this discussion, as he was completely lost on this subject. Our second affirmative was that Christ is now king on David's throne. Dr. Matthews affirmed that Christ will return to the earth for one thousand years. His last affirmative was, "The Anglo-Saxon, Celtic races are descended in large part from the ten tribes of Israel and are the modern covenant people of God." Since Matthews did not do much affirming, it was necessary for Bro. Wallace to show what the doctrine was and then to take it apart.

The proposition, "descended in large part," was used with force on Dr. Matthews. He was asked to tell just what part was not descended from the ten tribes. Since he admits that not all are a part of Israel, he was unable to tell what part was. If the present king of England is on David's throne, then when the thirteen colonies rebelled against England, they rebelled against a divine throne, and are today as much in rebellion as the ten tribes originally were and the United States would be perpetuating that rebellion even now. This was used with telling effect upon Matthews. It should be remembered that the English government does not give any endorsement to such foolishness as this. England and America stand as two great allies today and are not responsible for such absurd theories as advanced by these Anglo-Israelites.

Central Church feels that this was one of the greatest opportunities that has ever been offered the Cause in Los Angeles and it was well cared for during the debate. A fine spirit prevailed throughout and even brethren who were skeptical about the good of debates, admitted that this one was an outstanding success.

The material used in the speeches delivered by Brother Wallace on the throne of David and on the Israel question will be placed in tract form soon. Information about securing these can be secured by writing the Central Church of Christ, 12th and Hoover, Los Angeles 6, California.
I have read the article of Brother Earnest Beam which appeared in Firm Foundation of February 22nd. This article is headed “Was Jesus A Premillennialist?”

I seldom break into print with an article, and I am not doing so now merely to rush to the defense of those men who have been attacked or criticised by Brother Beam. Hoy Jr., and Cled can, and no doubt will, take care of themselves, and also Brother Otey. There are some inconsistencies in the brother’s article I want to point out.

First: His article has the wrong name. It should have been called: A defense for those in error and a criticism of those who earnestly contend for the faith.

The brother is so broad-minded that he could fellowship R. H. Boll though the teaching to which he clings so tenaciously strikes at the very vitals of Christianity. Of course, this would not keep him from fellowshipping Cled Wallace. He is with Cled on the question of premillennialism, but in faith, hope and love he wants to sit with R. H. Boll.

The brother raises the question “was Christ a Premillennialist?” All because brother Otey and others have said The Unity Movement is composed of those in the main who find a ground of common fellowship on the doctrine of premillennialism. The brother misses the mark here. The modern unity movement was conceived in iniquity and born in sin. The Christian Church will, as brother Showalter has said, unite with the church of Christ if we will accept and fellowship all their errors. As a church they will not lay aside their innovations. You had just as well look for other denominations to unite with the church of Christ, laying aside their creeds and false teaching.

Christ prayed for unity “through their word”-the teaching of the apostles. That is the only kind of unity heaven will recognize.

If Brother Beam is opposed to premillennialism why does he not write some articles condemning it? Condemning this false theory? Why not write a few articles on the scriptural basis of unity? Can a man love God and refuse to expose the errors of premillennialism? Can a man be a lover of God and the truth and fail to expose the errors of the Christian Church?

According to Rom. 16: 17 a pertinent question just here to help the brother would be, Who has caused division in the church? Those who advocate the theory of premillennialism or those who condemn the theory? I’m tired of hearing brethren say I’m against the theory, but brother Boll is so full of faith, hope and love! Faith in what, who? Hope of what? A materialistic, Judaistic reign of Christ on earth in literal Jerusalem? Love for what and who? Tell me not that a man loves the Lord who disregards his teaching, and rends the church that cost the Lord’s blood.

If Brother Beam really loves the Lord and the truth let him expose false doctrine awhile instead of trying to pluck an imaginary mote out of the brother’s eye that has the stamina to root up error and plant the seed of kingdom.

I want to point out a place or two where the brother can start. If premillennialism be true the kingdom of Christ has not been established. If the kingdom has not been established then no one has been born again. (Jno. 3:3-5.) If no one has been born again are there no children of God on earth today.

Again: If the kingdom has not been established no one is converted now. If no one is converted now, all are unconverted.

Only converted people have their sins blotted out. (Acts. 3:19.) If none are converted now then none have remission of sins now. If no remission of sins now then all are lost, and the gospel is of none effect.

Redemption is in the kingdom of Christ (Col. 1: 13-14). If the kingdom has not been established then none are redeemed now.

The Lord’s Supper was to be observed in the kingdom (Lk. 22:29.) If the kingdom has not been established then no observance of Lord’s supper now.

Yet Brother Beam wants to sit with R. H. Boll because his faith, hope and love!

I prefer to sit with those who love the Lord and his church and truth and who will expose error in the church or out of the church.

It might be well for our brother that he read Titus 3:10, a very timely admonition to a gospel preacher. “A man that is an heretick after the first and second admonition reject.” Does this mean to sit with him in faith, hope and love?

Is premillennialism heresy? What is heresy? I have before me at this time a Bible Dictionary and here is the definition for Brother Beam. “An error in some essential point of Christian Faith, publicly avowed, and obstinately maintained.”

The only question for the brother to determine is this. Has R. H. Boll and the premillennial group publicly avowed this doctrine and is it error? The same application applies to the Christian Church with all its human societies and innovations.

The battle waged by those who oppose Premillennialism in word and in deed has saved the church from this heresy.

Had the fight been left to the sweet spirited among us many churches would have been wrecked and ruined in the West that have been made safe and secure against this ism. Thank God for men that lead the fight while others of us encouraged them to press the battle.

God bless Brother Otey who has defended the truth against the attacks made by the most able exponent of the Christian Church, J. B. Briney. Brother Otey has been on the walls of Zion many years and has sent treasures for a mansion in heaven by his firm stand for the truth and his able exposure of error.

I prefer to sit with their kind in faith, hope and love.
QUESTIONS ON THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT

W. CURTIS PORTER

Sometime ago an article of mine, entitled “Will The Jews Return to Canaan?” appeared in the Bible Banner. This called forth a letter, from Arkansas, asking a number of questions concerning the Abrahamic Covenant. While the letter addresses me as “Dear Sir and Brother” I am unable to tell whether the writer of it is a member of the church, for he refers to “your faction of the Church of Christ.” I may remind him, however, that I am not a member of a faction of the Church of Christ; the faction, as far as this issue is concerned, is that group of Premillennialists, led by R. H. Boll. But the following are the questions that he wishes, considered.

1. Is the Abrahamic Covenant a law or a promise?
2. Is the Abrahamic Covenant a unilateral or bilateral agreement?
3. Is the Abrahamic Covenant conditional or unconditional?

4. Who were the “fathers” Joshua refers to in Joshua 21:43, 44?
5. Were the Israelites under the leadership of Joshua given the land of Canaan for an “everlasting possession” under the terms of the Mosaic Law Covenant?
6. When will Moses receive his “heritage” (Gen. 13:14-17; 15:18 and 17:8)?
7. Does the word “land” in Acts 7:4 and Hebrews 11:9 have reference to the “land” mentioned in Genesis 15:15 and 17:8?
8. What does the word “promise” in Hebrews 11:13, 39 refer to?
9. Please present explicit citational evidence in proof that Abraham and the other ancient worthies mentioned in Hebrews’ eleventh chapter were promised admittance into the spiritual realm of heaven.

In considering these questions it is a little difficult to ascertain just what the questioner has in mind at all times. He merely refers to the “Abrahamic Covenant.” But God made more than one covenant with Abraham. There is first what may be called the Seed Covenant recorded in Gen. 12:1-3 and in other portions of the divine record. It gave to Abraham the promise that “in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed,” a promise which is fulfilled in Christ as the Seed to whom the promise was repeated with no mention of conditions. Yet I do not believe that the querist will claim that this proves it an unconditional covenant, for when we turn to the New Testament and find the promise being fulfilled we learn that conditions were implied. Paul declared in Gal. 13:1-3 that no conditions are mentioned as necessary on the part of the multitudes to be blessed through him. It definitely states: “In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.” In Gen. 18:18, 22:18 and 26:4 we have this promise repeated with no mention of conditions. Yet I do not believe that the querist will claim that this proves it an unconditional covenant, for when we turn to the New Testament and find the promise being fulfilled we learn that conditions were implied. Paul declared in Gal. 3:26-29 that it involved the conditions of faith and baptism and said: “If ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” Being heirs “according to the promise” made to “Abraham’s seed” depended on an if—“if ye be Christ’s.” And being Christ’s depended on being baptized into him by faith. So this covenant was a conditional covenant although no conditions were mentioned when it was made known.

Just so it is with respect to the land covenant. The conditions are shown in connection with the fulfillment of the promise. The children of Israel who continued to rebel against God were not allowed to enter. When the ten spies brought back the evil report concerning the land to be inherited and caused a large portion of Israel to determine to make them captains and return to Egypt, thus provoking God in the wilderness, God said: “Because all those men which have seen my glory, and my miracles, which I did in Egypt and in the wilderness, and have tempted me now these ten times, and have not hearkened to my voice; surely they shall not see the land which I swore unto their fathers, neither shall any of them that provoked me see it: but my servant Caleb, because he had another spirit with him, and hath followed me fully, him will I bring into the land whereinto he went; and his seed shall possess it.” Num. 14:22-24. So these men were shut out of their inheritance because of disobedience, and such would not have been so if no conditions had been implied. But perhaps God had not promised the land to this particular group. Oh yes, he had, for he said in Num. 14:30 to them: “Doubtless ye shall not come into the land, concerning which I sware to make you dwell therein,” save Caleb and of his oath unto Isaac; and hath confirmed the same to Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant, saying, Unto thee will I give the land of Canaan.” This is definite. It pertains to the covenant concerning the land of Canaan. This covenant was first made with Abraham; it was given to Isaac by an oath; and was “confirmed unto Jacob for a law.” Hence, the elements of both law and promise are included in this covenant.

2. Is the Abrahamic Covenant an Unilateral Or Bilateral Agreement?

The land covenant made with Abraham may be said to be both unilateral and bilateral, depending on the angle from which you view it. It was unilateral in the sense that is was made or arranged by one—God himself: but it is bilateral in the sense that it concerns or obligates more than one—God as the giver and Abraham and his seed as the recipients. This can be easily and definitely seen by reading the passages in Genesis already mentioned.

3. Is the Abrahamic Covenant Conditional Or Unconditional?

This covenant made with Abraham involved conditions—hence, it was a conditional covenant. The mere fact that no conditions are mentioned when first the covenant is revealed does not prove that no conditions were implied. When God made with Abraham the Seed Covenant in Gen. 12:1-3 no conditions are mentioned as necessary on the part of the multitudes to be blessed through him. It definitely states: “In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed.” In Gen. 18:18, 22:18 and 26:4 we have this promise repeated with no mention of conditions. Yet I do not believe that the querist will claim that this proves it an unconditional covenant, for when we turn to the New Testament and find the promise being fulfilled we learn that conditions were implied. Paul declared in Gal. 3:26-29 that it involved the conditions of faith and baptism and said: “If ye be Christ’s, then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” Being heirs “according to the promise” made to “Abraham’s seed” depended on an if—“if ye be Christ’s.” And being Christ’s depended on being baptized into him by faith. So this covenant was a conditional covenant although no conditions were mentioned when it was made known.
the son of Jephunneh, and Joshua the son of Nun. Then he added: "But your little ones, which ye said should be a prey, them will I bring in, and they shall know the land which he have despised." So the oath was made to them that they would dwell in the land but by rebellion they despised the land and forfeited their right to it. And so God said to them: "Ye shall know my breach of promise."

Num. 14:34. His purpose was altered concerning them because of their rebellion against him. All this shows that entrance into that land was conditional; otherwise their would have been no "breach of promise." Furthermore, the land was to be given to the seed of Abraham "forever." Gen. 13:15. Or, in other words, it was to be given to them for "an everlasting possession." Gen. 17:8. But this part of the covenant was also conditional. Whether they remained in the land depended upon their obedience to God, for Moses said to them: "When thou shalt beget children, and children's children, and ye shall have remained long in the land, and shall corrupt yourselves, and make a graven image, or the likeness of any thing, and shall 'do evil in the sight of the Lord thy God, to provoke him to anger: I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land whither ye go over Jordan to possess it; ye shall not prolong your days upon it, but shall utterly be destroyed." Deut. 4:25, 26. Likewise, if they would not obey the voice of the Lord, he said: "And it shall come to pass, that as the Lord rejoiced over you to do you good, and to multiply you; so the Lord will rejoice over you to destroy you, and to bring you to nought; and ye shall be plucked from off the land whither thou goest to possess it." Deut. 28:63.

4. Who were the "fathers" Joshua refers to in Josh. 21:43, 44?

Joshua said: "And the Lord gave unto Israel all the land which he sware to give unto their fathers." So "their fathers" were the ones to whom he swore to give the land. Who were they? Referring to the same oath and promise Moses said: "Behold, I have set the land before you: go in and possess the land which the Lord sware unto your fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, to give unto them and to their seed after them." Deut. 1:8. This ought to settle it. Moses said their fathers to whom he swore to give the land were Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. I take it that he knew what he was talking about.

5. Were the Israelites under the leadership of Joshua given the land of Canaan for an "everlasting possession" under the terms of the Mosaic Law Covenant?

The Israelites under the leadership of Joshua were under the restrictions of the Mosaic law when they inherit the land, for they received the land in the law dispensation; but the land covenant was made with Abraham before the Mosaic law was given, and they inherited the land under the terms of that covenant. But terms implicit in that covenant were revealed through Moses, as has already been shown, just as terms of the Seed covenant have been revealed through the apostles of Christ. The promise of the land covenant was not fulfilled independent of the law just as the promise of the seed covenant is not fulfilled independent of the gospel.

6. When will Moses receive his "heritage" (Gen. 6:8)?

Gen. 6:8 says nothing about the heritage of Moses. I am sure the querist intended to give Ex. 6:8. This statement says: "I will give it you for an heritage." Whatever "heritage" Moses had in the land of Canaan was forfeited by his disobedience at the waters of Meribah when he failed to sanctify God in the eyes of Israel. Num. 20:7-13.

Because of this transgression Moses was not allowed to enter Canaan. Deut. 32:51, 52. And there is no more reason why he should have a future heritage in the land than there is for the Israelites who rebelled and were overthrown in the wilderness. But if you will look closely at Ex. 6:8 you will see that it says nothing about the heritage of Moses anyway. In the statement, "I will give it to you for an heritage," the pronoun "you" does not refer to Moses but to Israel as a people. This can be easily seen by reading the context. Read verses 6 to 8. It is not what God said to Moses but what he said to Israel through Moses. Let us read it and emphasize the pronoun "you" as we go along. "Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am the Lord, and I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched out arm, and with great judgments: and I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God: and ye shall know that I am the Lord your God, which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians. And I will bring you in unto the land, concerning the which I did swear to give it to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; and I will give it you for an heritage." The heritage was to the "fathers" Joshua refers to?

In Heb. 11:9 have reference to the "land" mentioned in Gen. 15:15 and 17:8?

Yes. Stephen in Acts 7:4, speaking to the Jews of his time, referred to it as "this land, wherein ye now dwell." That was the land of Canaan. It is called the "land of promise" in Heb. 11:9. This is the same land mentioned in the Genesis record as being promised to Abraham and his seed.

8. What does the word "promise" in Heb. 11:13, 39 refer to?

In Heb. 11:13 the word is "promises," not "promise." "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." The promises of this verse evidently have a spiritual significance and cannot be made to apply to the land promise. The following verses show a desire for a heavenly country which they entertained. They were looking for that and "confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth." And the promise of Heb. 11:39 was the promise of the Messiah and the work which he would accomplish as the following verse indicates: "God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." They died in faith, not having received this promise.

9. Please present explicit citational evidence in proof that Abraham and the other ancient worthies mentioned in Hebrews eleventh chapter were ever promised admission into the spiritual realm of heaven?

In Heb. 11:10 Paul said that Abraham 'looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.' This cannot refer to any city on earth that has been built by man. So it must have to do with a city in "the spiritual realm of heaven." And unless he had been promised something of this nature how did he know that there was a city of this kind for which to look? Also Heb. 11:16 says: "But now they desire a better country, that is (Continued On Page 7)
HONORING GOD’S WORD
W. CURTIS PORTER

Religious people generally do not show the proper respect for the word of the Lord. If men were just willing to take what the word of God says about a thing, and let that be final, it would be a long step away from present conditions and toward the unity that ought to exist in their religious world. But too many opinions and ideas of men have been injected into religious thought, and this has hindered many from accepting the truth in its purity. Minds are warped and twisted over spiritual matters because of the doctrines and commandments of men. It is hard-almost impossible-to get men to give up human opinions and just accept the truth as it is revealed in the word of the Lord. Ideas inherited from religious ancestors have too much weight, and what God says is too lightly ignored, for men to be what they ought to be in religion.

Cornelius certainly had the right attitude as revealed in his language to Peter. He said: “Now therefore are we all here present before God, to hear all things that are commanded thee of God.” Acts 10:33. Whenever you find men who are willing “to hear all things” that God has commanded or taught it is an easy matter to convince them of the truth. Too many are unwilling to hear. They would rather take what grandfather said about it than to take what God said. Consequently, it is very difficult to show them the truth in its purity. Paul commended the Thessalonian brethren in the following manner: “For this cause also thank we God without ceasing, because, when ye received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men, but as it is in truth, the word of God, which effectually worketh also in you that believe.” 1 Thes. 2:13. It is possible, as we see from this statement, for men to receive the word of God as though it were the word of men. The brethren at Thessalonica had not done that—they had received it as the word of God. Men receive the word of God as the word of men when they put it on the level with human testimony and regard it as of no more value than what man would say about it. On the other hand many men will receive the word of men as if it were the eternal word of God. They will accept what man says in preference to what God says. Such is not properly honoring the word of God. When professor friends of the Bible refuse to believe its statements they are receiving the word of God as the word of men. We should let God be true but every man a liar who disagrees with the word of God. No other course, shows proper respect for the word of the Lord. To accept something in religious faith and practice which God has is no way sanctioned, and to reject the things he has authorized, is a lack of respect for the word of God.

With this thought in mind I ask you to take a look at the following quotation from a Baptist preacher:

“We are not to look to the Baptist denomination, nor to denominational leadership, nor to Boards and Committees for programs, but we have to look to the Holy Spirit, the One and only One authorized to initiate and supervise them. That’s the order of the Scriptures, and the Scriptures should be honored by us Baptists.”-W. Lee Rector in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

“I am willing to agree, of course, that the Scriptures should be honored by us Baptists.” In fact, they ought to be honored by all men. But the trouble is that “us Baptists,” along with many other religious people unknown to the Bible, have not “honored” the Scriptures. If they had, there would not be any of “us Baptists” in the world, nor many other religionists that we have among us, for the Scriptures do not say a single word about “us Baptists.” You may search it from cover to cover and find nothing of the kind. So if “us Baptists” were to honor the word of the Lord, we would cease to exist as such and become simple Christians. The Scriptures do speak of Christians. In Acts 11:26 we are told that “the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch.” And Agrippa said to Paul: “Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian.” Acts 26:28. And Peter declared: “If any many suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf.” 1 Pet. 4:16. But you cannot read in the Scriptures that “the disciples were called Baptists” anywhere nor at any time. Nor can you read where any one was ever “persuaded to be a Baptist.” Neither does any inspired writer ever say: “If any man suffer as a Baptist, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God on this behalf.” In view of all of this, if the Baptists were to honor the Scriptures, they would cease to be Baptists and become simply Christians. But they may tell us that they are Christians already-Baptist Christians. But whoever read in the Scriptures anything about “Baptist Christians?” Were the disciples ever called that? Or was any man ever “persuaded to be a Baptist Christian?” Or did any New Testament writer ever say: “If any man suffer as a Baptist Christian, let him not be ashamed?” No you can’t find any such denominational handle attached to the word Christian anywhere in the word of the Lord. So a man cannot be a “Baptist Christian” and at the same time honor the word of the Lord. If he honors the Scriptures, as he should, he will be forced to give up his denominational name. He must become a Christian, not a Baptist nor a Baptist Christian.

Furthermore, if “us Baptists” will “look to the Holy Spirit” to “initiate and supervise” our programs, there won’t be any Baptist denomination, nor “denominational leadership,” nor “Boards and Committees” to initiate programs for the Baptist Church. After all, where did the Holy Spirit, the one authorized to initiate and supervise our programs ever say anything about the “Baptist denomination” or “Baptist Church?” There is no need to twist around about this. We would just as well face the question and get it over with. Can you read in the Scriptures anything about the Baptist Church? If so, where? I know many Baptist preachers who would pay a big price for just such a Scripture. They have been hunting for it for a long time and have never found it. So if you can find it, I think you can sell it at a fancy price to a lot of Baptist debaters. A few years ago while in debate with H. A. Thompson, Missionary Baptist, at Weatherford, Texas, I pressed upon him, in response to a question he had asked me, to read Rom. 16:16 to the audience. He hesitated to do so, but under pressure he finally read it, but he read it this way: “The Baptist churches salute you.” This was the worst blunder he could have made. Everyone who knows anything about it knows that it reads: “The churches of Christ salute you.” But he was so terribly pressed to find something in the Bible about the Baptist Church, and so anxious to get it over to the audience that the Baptist church is mentioned in the Bible, that he actually misread it, deliberately reading into the text what it does not say. And I exerted so much pressure upon him that he read it correctly, thus revealing to the audience his deliberate dishonor for the word of God. No man, not even among “us Baptists,” has the proper respect for the Scriptures when he thus deals with inspired statements. So when Baptists reach the point where they will honor the Scriptures the Baptist Church will cease to exist. There just isn’t any such thing mentioned in the Bible.
And since "the Scriptures should be honored by us Baptists," we may wonder why they will not honor what the Scriptures say about the plan of salvation. They have long taught sinners to pray through to salvation. According to such it is through "agonizing prayer" that they reach the point of "trusting faith" at which the Lord bestows salvation "without works." But when Ananias, a man sent by the Lord to tell Saul what to do, came into the presence of Saul he found him down engaged in prayer. What did he tell him to do? Did he tell him to go right on and 'pray through to salvation?' Not Ananias. He wasn’t a Baptist preacher; so he did not give that sort of instruction. Instead he said to Saul: "And now why tarryest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts 22:16. The word "arise" means to "get up." So instead of telling a sinner to "get down" or to "stay down" and pray through to salvation, he told him to stop his prayer, to "get up" and "be baptized and wash away thy sins." But Baptist preachers and "us Baptists" generally will not honor that statement of Scripture. Another Baptist debater, C. A. Smith, whom I met on different occasions some years ago, told, during our discussion at Maysville, Ark., of an incident that occurred in a Baptist meeting. A number of mourners were down at the altar trying to pray through to salvation. They invited Christians to come to the altar and talk to the mourners. A certain man, a "Campbellite," he called him, came to the altar and knelted down beside one of the mourners and quoted to him the language of Ananias: "And now why tarryest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." The Baptist brethren, according to C. A. Smith, took that, man by the nape of the neck, the seat of the pants and kicked him out of the house. How is that for "honoring the word of God?" Had those same Baptists been present when Ananias came to Saul and told him what to do, they would have treated Ananias the same way. But there were no Baptists in the days of Ananias, and so he did not get kicked out of the house. All these, and many other things now practiced among the Baptists, will have to be given up if they ever reach the place where they will "honor the Scriptures" as they should do.

And how does the following sound as coming from a Baptist preacher?

"Christian people, those who really want to follow Christ, do not put their trust in man-made denominational systems. Follow Christ. Away with this religious paganism and idolatry. Back to God and his word. Away with authoritative creeds, rituals, forms, ceremonies, organizations, etc. Accept the Bible as your only guide, and follow Christ, and him alone."-Ben M. Bogard in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

This is about the finest sermon I ever heard from a Baptist preacher. It sounds just like a gospel preacher calling denominationists back to the Bible. Think of it! A Baptist preacher calls on people not to put their trust in "man-made denominational systems!" Even Baptist preachers will admit that the name Baptist is a denominational name and the Baptist Church is a denomination. So their system must be a "denominational system." And since God never said a single word about it in all of his divine revelation, it certainly is not "God-made" and must be "man-made." Thus it must be a "man-made denominational system." And Bogard calls on people to turn away from such. If his people take him seriously, the membership of the Baptist Church will be greatly diminished. And Bogard actually calls upon people to throw away their human creeds. But his people adopt Hiscox’s Manual, Pendleton’s Manual, and even Bogard’s ‘Baptist Way-Book’ to govern them in the activities of their churches. To follow Bogard’s instruction the Baptists will have to throw these things away. But I think such would be a fine thing to do. Just assign them to the rubbish heap, the bon fire, or any place to get rid of them, and do as Bogard says: "Accept the Bible as your only guide." That would certainly be honoring the Scriptures, and I do wish Board and his people would let their practice catch up with Bogard’s preaching along this line. And whenever they do this and “follow Christ, and him alone” they will never be led thereafter into the Baptist Church, the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church or into any other "man-made denominational system" but into the church of the Lord Jesus Christ (Mat. 16:18; Acts 20:28; Rom. 16:16), for which he died (Eph. 5:23-27), and in which are found all the saved and redeemed of earth (Acts 2:47; Eph. 5:23). May the Lord speed the day when Bogard’s advice along this line will be followed.

ABRAHAMIC COVENANT
(Continued From Page 5)

an heavenly: wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God: for he hath prepared for them a city." So there is a city in a heavenly country which God has prepared for them. It is not an earthly city nor an earthly country. It therefore must pertain to the spiritual realm of heaven. If this is not "explicit citational evidence" that they had a promise of entering heaven, I am at a loss to know just what it would take to constitute such evidence.

In my former article I called attention to the fact that every promise in the Old Testament to the Jews that they would return to Canaan was made before the Babylonian captivity, or during the Babylonian captivity, or before the restoration from Babylon had been completed. Hence, a return to the land has been accomplished since those promises were made. I further said: "There is not a promise in all the New Testament that the Jews will ever inherit the land of Canaan." Commenting on this the writer of the letter says: "No-but the apostle Paul takes in more territory and declares that Abraham and his seed were given the 'promise... that he should be heir of the world.' Rom. 4:13." Thus he would indicate that Abraham and his seed are promised "the land of the world" for their inheritance. That is "more territory" than I knew a Premillennialist would be willing to include. If that is the meaning of the passage, then why argue anything about the regathering of the Jews to Canaan in fulfillment of the promise to Abraham? The land of Canaan is only a very small part of the world. Hence, it would not be necessary for the Jews to return to Canaan in order for the promise to be fulfilled. They might be anywhere in the world-in Egypt or in Spain, in Germany or in France, in China or in Japan, in the United States or in Mexico, or anywhere else in all the world-and the promise be fulfilled. In fact, it looks like, according to this position, the fulfillment of the promise to Abraham as it concerned the Jews would demand a dispersion, a scattering, instead of a gathering. They would have to be in every land beneath the sun or the promise would fail. So maybe, after all, the promise has already been fulfilled in the dispersion of the Jews and Premillennialists are just now beginning to find it out. What straits men are driven to when they try to defend a false doctrine.

The promise made to Abraham, as mentioned by Paul in Rom. 4:13, is not a land promise, but is the promise that all nations of the world would be blessed through him, as the connecting verses clearly show. The land promise has been fulfilled. Joshua said it had all been fulfilled and not one thing had failed. Josh. 21:43-45. I believe he told the truth about it.
Children often need to be whipped. Sometimes, perhaps, they get it when they don't need it; but more often they need it and don't get it. When I was a child I absorbed a number of whippings. I am not going to argue that I did not need them; at least, my parents thought I did. And so they administered them to me. But this lesson is not to tell parents how to rear their children, but when to whip them. It is instead a study of the chastisement of the children of God. That God chastens his children is plainly stated by Paul in Heb. 12:5-11. Hence I know that children of God need chastisement sometimes and that God administers it. But I am not going to discuss the methods by which God whips his children. I know, however, that preachers sometimes draw false conclusions from the fact that he does and as a result preach false doctrines. For example, Baptist preachers claim that a child of God can commit every act in the catalog of sin—adultery, rape, theft, murder, idolatry, and every form of uncleanness—and die in the very act and still go to heaven. For such sins, they claim, God will whip his child, but he will not send him to hell. As Ben M. Bogard so often and inelegantly puts it: "God will not send his children to hell, but he will whip hell out of them." The trouble seems to be, however, that there is so much hell is so many of them that he never gets it all whipped out.

In 1 Cor. 6:9, 10 Paul said: "Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God." But Baptist preachers deny this. They say that fornicators, idolaters, thieves, drunkards, etc., will not inherit the kingdom of God if they are alien sinners, but if they are children of God, they will go right on into heaven. They make their inheritance of the kingdom depend on whether they are alien thieves or Christian thieves, alien drunkards or Christian drunkards, and so on. In Gal. 5:19-21 Paul defined the works of the flesh, including these things already mentioned and a number of others, and said: "They which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." He should have said, according to Baptist doctrine, "They which do such things, except children of God, shall not inherit the kingdom of God." And in Eph. 5:5 it is put this way: "For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of God." What? No whoremonger? No unclean person? No covetous man? That is what he said. But, according to Baptist preachers, he should have said: "No whoremonger except he be a child of God will have any inheritance in the kingdom of God." If he is a child of God and becomes a whoremonger, an idolater, a thief, an unclean person, or a drunkard, God will whip him for it while he is here, but he will still give him his inheritance in the glorified kingdom. Such is Baptist doctrine, but Paul did not make any such exception. In Rev. 21:8 the apostle John added this: "But the fearful, and the unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." Does this mean "all liars" will be lost? Maybe he should have said: "All liars except the children of God." Maybe so, but I have an idea that he said it like God wanted it said.

Do you think I misrepresent Baptist preachers when I tell you that they teach that a child of God can commit any or all of there sins and die in the very act and still go to heaven? Well, I am going to let them speak for themselves about it. First we note the following quotation:

"Well, some one asks, What happens to saved ones who sin? Will he become lost again? No, his Father, God, whips him for it.

"That servant, which knew his Lord's will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes' (Luke 12:47)."—A. C. Thompson in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

He had been discussing the matter of sin and had called attention to the fact that if a man knew to do good and did not, it is sin. But it can't cause the saved one to be lost again, he insists. "His Father" will "whip him for it," but he will not let him be lost. And he even tried to prove it by Luke 12:47. Let us take a look at that passage and see what it does for Mr. Thompson. The servant that "knew his lord's will" but did not prepare himself the gentleman claims, is the saved person who neglects his duty. What about him? He will be "beaten with many stripes." That means according to Thompson, that God will not send him to hell but will just give him a good thrashing. But the next verse tells about another fellow: "But he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes." So this fellow must be the unsaved man, the fellow that did not know the Lord's will. What will happen to him? He will get a whipping too—he "shall be beaten with few stripes." His whipping is less severe than that of the saved person; one is beaten with few stripes, the other with many stripes. If saying that the saved person will be beaten with many stripes proves God will not send him to hell but just give him a sound threshing, then saying the other fellow will be beaten with few stripes also proves he will not go to hell but just get a little paddling. In other words, Mr. Thompson's position on this passage would cause the child of God to get a worse punishment than the child of the devil. But I wonder how the gentleman happened to overlook verses 45 and 46 of this same chapter. They are the verses that just precede the one he quoted. Could it be that he couldn't read them? Anyway, they upset his whole system of theology. Let us read them: "But and if that servant say..." And following immediately is the statement about his being beaten with many stripes. The passage shows clearly that it has no reference to any whipping God will give his child during his lifetime, but it refers to the second coming of the Lord, and to the punishment to be given him then. Then is when he will be beaten with many stripes. But what happens to him then? The passage definitely says that the Lord "will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers." And following immediately is the statement about his being beaten with many stripes. The passage shows clearly that it has no reference to any whipping God will give his child during his lifetime, but it refers to the second coming of the Lord, and to the punishment to be given him then. Then is when he will be beaten with many stripes. But what happens to him then? The passage definitely says that the Lord "will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers." This fellow is not an unbeliever—for he is contrasted with the unbelievers—but he is one of the Lord's servants. But at the second coming of the Lord he is given his "portion with the unbelievers." I wonder what the portion of unbelievers is. John says in Rev. 21:8: The unbelieving... "shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone." So this unfaithful servant of the Lord gets the same portion. The many stripes with which he is beaten, then, are the stripes that he receives in hell. The gentlemen will have to hunt some other
er passage; this one is very unfortunate for his theory.

This reminds me that back in 1941 Elder Ben M. Bogard visited J. Frank Norris’ tabernacle and school and church in Fort Worth, Texas. He tells of the small number he found in the Bible school, contrary to reports he had received about the school. And he says he counted the chairs in the auditorium to see how many it would seat and found that, by filling the aisles with chairs, it would seat only slightly more than half as many as Norris had been reporting. He reports all of this in the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, issue of April 25, 1941. And following are some of his comments:

“Wish Dr. Norris and those who are working with him would quit exaggerating so much. It is big enough to tell it like it is without so much exaggeration.”

Bogard refers to the report of 166 students in the school and said that “One hundred and five were counted to pad the report.”

Then he expresses himself this way:

“Such exaggeration shakes confidence when the facts are known. The same way about the ‘house packed to the doors’ that we read about and the ‘five thousand present etc.’ Just exaggeration that is needless. But all of us have our faults and one of Frank Norris’ outstanding faults is telling it too big.”

After this Bogard tells that a court found Norris guilty of “malicious libel,” assessed a fine of “twenty five thousand dollars” against him, and then after all of this Norris denied “that anything of the kind had been done.” Yet Bogard says: “When I get to heaven I expect to find Frank Norris there in spite of that wicked streak that runs through him.”

In fact, he plans, according to his report to get Bob White and Frank Norris together and the three of them have a talk about this whole affair. And relative to the talk Bogard says:

“I expect to ask Norris why he sought to ruin Bob White all because white would not submit to his dictation and then when he practically destroyed White and White got a judgment of twenty-five thousand dollars damages and he called it malicious libel, why then did Norris publicly deny that anything like that ever happened? Selah! My! how the grace of God is magnified when we think of how it takes all three of us to heaven in spite of our wickedness!”

“Peter, the apostle, cursed and swore and even denied the Lord and Paul withstood him to the face because he was to blame and if Peter got by with all that and went home to glory, I think it likely that Norris will also.”

And somewhat as a conclusion to all of this Bogard says concerning Norris: “I feel sure he is in for a terrible chastisement that God gives his children. I see no way for him to escape.” This ‘terrible chastisement” that Bogard “feels sure” he will get, will that keep him out of heaven? Oh no, not according to Baptist doctrine. He will go right on to heaven anyway, whipping or no whipping.

To compare his case with Peter’s is out of the question; they are not parallel at all. It is true that Peter “cursed and swore” and “even denied the Lord,” but who ever read where Peter later “denied that any such thing ever happened”? Well, according to Bogard, that is what Norris did relative to his devilment. If Peter had remained impenitent and denied the whole affair, there is no reason to think he would have ‘got by’ and gone “home to glory.” And to claim that a man can “get by” with any sort of wickedness and devilment just because he is a child of God is out of harmony with divine teaching. Peter himself said: “For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, they are again entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse than with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them.” 2 Pet. 2:20, 21. This does not sound like Peter thought men could get by with anything just because they had once been made free from sin. Why, then, use Peter’s case to justify a doctrine of that kind?

With the fact in mind that Baptist preachers teach that a child of God cannot so sin as to be lost in hell but will go to heaven in spite of all the wickedness he might commit, though God may give him a whipping while he is here, we are made to wonder about the following statement:

“Eld. J. T. Moore had a shadow resting over his life that was pitiful. His oldest son started out to be a Baptist preacher and in fond hope Dr. Moore helped him go to Baylor University, a Texas college and one of the greatest in the Southern Baptist Convention. The result was that the young man lost confidence in the inspiration of the Bible and came out a full-fledged Modernist and quit the Baptists and became an Episcopal Rector.”-W. A. Heard in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

I can see no reason for all of this, if Baptist doctrine be true. This young fellow who started out to be a Baptist preacher certainly had the necessary “experience of grace” that caused the Baptist Church to accept him for baptism and membership in the Baptist Church. And that was proof to them that he was already a child of God. And certainly he had evidence of a “divine call to preach.” Why then should his father have such a “shadow resting over his life” and be so “broken-hearted” just because his son “came out” of college “a full-fledged Modernist and quit the Baptists and became an Episcopal Rector?” After all, if a child of God cannot go to hell anyway and God will take those to heaven who turn to adultery, idolatry, murder, theft, and malicious lying, then why be disturbed about a fellow who turns to modernism, quits the Baptist church and becomes an Episcopal Rector? The only thing God could do, according to Baptist doctrine, would be to give him a good whipping and take him on to glory. So I can’t see why the shadow that rested over the life or Elder Moore was so “pitiful.” It is admitted that a person does not have to be a member of the Baptist Church to be saved. In fact, it would be claimed that this fellow who “started out to be a Baptist preacher” was saved before he entered the Baptist Church, and since “once saved, always saved,” of course, he was not lost after he left the Baptist Church. Hence, there was no need, in view of such teaching, for Mr. Moore to let his heart break over the result to his son.

And in addition to all of this you might be surprised at the following report of a Baptist meeting:

“At the close of the meeting there was a total of 33 conversions, 6 additions by letter, 1 addition by statement, and a host of backsliders restored. The church was happy indeed.” Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

I can understand how the church might be happy over a number of “conversions,” but I see no reason to have so much joy because a host of backsliders” were restored. After all, we might wonder what they were restored to. It could not be to the fellowship, communion and favor of God, for it was impossible for them to “backslide” from that, since it is claimed that “once in grace, always in grace” is true. And if they were merely restored to the fellowship of Baptist brethren, I see no reason for so much... (Continued On Page 15)
One objection which I have often urged against Russell-ism, and all forms of premillenialism is that they do not rely upon the plain teachings of the New Testament for their theory, but base it exclusively upon their own interpretation of the dark sayings of the Old Testament contained in the promises to Abraham, and the prophecies regarding the kingdom. They go back to the types and shadows for their base, and we must accept their interpretation of them or be classed as unbelievers.

Illustrating this point I quote from an argument I received from one of them a few days ago in reply to this very charge, he said, "Your suggested mode of procedure, and the one which you follow, is precisely the cause of your conflicting, unsupported, assertions. You start at the top and work down, basing your conclusions upon a few certain New Testament citations, instead of starting at the bottom upon a basic promise, i.e., the promise made to Abraham, and working up."

"I insist on starting at the roots and trunk of the tree and working upward to the branches from the bottom, and you insist on beginning with the branches, and working downward. In other words you endeavor to harmonize your conceptions pertaining to the roots and trunk of the tree-with your conception gleaned from the branches of the tree, i.e., your interpretations of New Testament citations, instead of harmonizing your branch conceptions with the root conceptions."

I think he has stated the issue correctly, and I think he has admitted the sole reason, why we reach opposite conclusions. I hardly expected to find him frank enough to admit what I had charged as the chief cause of the weakness of premillenialism, but you only have to read their literature to know that my charge was correct, and all of them proceed in the same way. The entire theory is based upon their misconception of the promise made to Abraham, and the prophecies pertaining to the kingdom, and the New Testament passages must be made to harmonize with the theory, or be thrown out as interpolations, or called a mistranslation.

Proceeding in this way we cannot wonder that they reach the same conclusions on the promises and the kingdom that the Jews did who crucified the Lord because he would not accept their conclusions. They have the same promises, and the same prophecies, that the Jews read, and since they ignore the light the New Testament has thrown upon them just as the Jews did, they reach the same conclusions, both regarding the promises to Abraham and the kingdom.

Either Jesus did not understand the promises and the prophecies, or the Jews did not understand them. Certain it is that they never could agree on them, and it was over these very things that they split with him, rejected him, and set about to destroy him. Now what was it the Jews expected from the promises and the prophecies? They expected the literal kingdom of Israel would be restored to them, and the land given back to them as in the days of David and Solomon, and their enemies would all be driven out, as they thought the Messiah would do when he came.

God sent his Son to the Jews first, and he came to bring light to the world, and to make them understand what God's promises meant to them. But they thought they already had all the light there was, and soon made up their minds that Jesus was denying them the very things God had promised them. They refused to believe what he taught them regarding the promises to Abraham, and the kingdom promised by the prophets, and delivered him to Pilate to be crucified. I challenge all schools or premillenialists to show wherein their conceptions on these two points differs from the ones held by the Jews who crucified the Lord and killed the apostles.

Jesus chose twelve apostles and spent three years teaching them the mysteries of the kingdom of God, and the promises to the fathers. He sent the Holy Spirit to guide them for after all of this teaching he would not trust them to expound these truths without power from on high. But the Jews could not agree with what they preached, and set about to destroy them, and the Jews who persecuted the apostles held the same views on these two points as the premillenialists hold today.

Whatever these apostles preached was the Holy Spirit's interpretation of the promises and prophecies of the Old Testament. What they did preach gave us the church as God's kingdom on the earth, and the gospel as the power of God unto salvation to Jew first, and also to the Greek. What they preached and did was not what the Jews expected and wanted for it did not coincide with their conception of what the promises and prophecies had guaranteed to them.

They wanted the kingdom restored as it was in the days of David and Solomon, and they tried to take Jesus by force and make him king. He told them his kingdom was not of this world, but the kingdom they wanted was of this world. That was the very point in which their ideas differed. Jesus did not refuse them the kingdom, he did not reject Nicodemus when he came to him inquiring about the kingdom, but told him he would have to be born again. Why must he be born again? Because this kingdom Jesus came to set up was not of this world.

In the Sermon on the Mount he showed them why he never could be the head and founder of a kingdom based on power. Such kingdoms are of this world and belong to this world, and the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. The author of the Sermon on the Mount placed an impassible barrier between himself and a kingship upon an earthly throne, and the Jews knew it. That meant that the old literal kingdom of Israel never could be restored by him, it was a kingdom upheld by the sword, and the author of the Sermon on the Mount never could be that kind of king.

Place any interpretation possible on the Sermon on the Mount and you will still be forced to admit that it would be impossible for its author to be the founder of a kingdom upheld by policy and material power. Material power, think of it, and think of the Lord Jesus, with all power,
both in heaven and on earth, using such power, either as our king, or our Savior, for he is both. God ordained civil government for men, and that has never been taken from him and God's kingdom, over which Jesus reigns, is over all such kingdoms, and they are subject to him. Now premillenialists, like this brother, must admit that their conception of the kingdom does not come from the New Testament teaching, and the preaching of Jesus and the apostles. Like him they begin with the roots, and trunk of the tree, and work upward, and argue that the branches, and the fruit, must agree with the roots. That might be possible if there was any way we could positively identify the roots, and be sure of the identifications. The Jews were sure they knew what was in the roots, but when the branches and the fruit appeared they were disappointed, it was not what they had been expecting. How can premillenialists know that they have done a better job in understanding what was in the roots than the Jews? The Jews misunderstood them, and even the apostles, after three years of teaching from the Lord. Even after he arose from the dead they asked him to restore again the kingdom to Israel, and he told them it was not for them to know. They had the roots, and the trunk, but they did not have what this Brother calls the branches, which is the gospel. They got the gospel when the Spirit came upon them, and they never more worried about the material kingdom being restored to Israel, they never mentioned it again. They had received a better kingdom, one that cannot be moved. They could not understand the roots, from which premillenialist admit they get their conception of the kingdom promises, and needed the Holy Spirit to help them, and they got that help in the gospel which the Holy Spirit revealed to them. But premillenialists do not need that help, the roots and trunk are all they need, and they claim they can understand what the apostles could not understand without the aid of the Holy Spirit.

The same materialism which blinded the Jew's premillenialists holds to this day. They cannot deny it and few of them will even try. They wont even admit that the Jews were wrong in their expectations of an earthly kingdom, and while they admit they did not get it, they contend that they will get it yet. The earthly kingdom has only been postponed, the Jews were not blinded at all, they were correct in what they expected of the Messiah, and he will give it to them yet, Russell And The Little Flock

"Fear not little flock for it is the Father's good pleasure to give unto you the kingdom". In the writings of Russell and his disciples no other expression is found more often than that of the “little flock.” You will find it in all of their writings, and it has become a hobby with them, and they misapply the expression as they do so much other Scripture. And there is a good reason for it, they have a theory to sell to the world, and the success of their plea requires them to belittle the church, and do all possible to make the influence of the gospel look insignificant to the world. They are preparing a foundation for a theory of post mortem reconciliation which they claim will save a vast majority of humanity who have lived since time began.

So the church is a “little flock,” and such it must remain to the end, and all the gospel was ever designed to accomplish was gather out this little flock, the church, who will become the judges and administrators of the post mortem, post resurrection, reconciliation. The little flock will be gathered out during the time Jesus remains in heaven, and when the little flock is completed Jesus will return to the earth, the dead will all be raised, and the little flock will proceed to administer to them a post mortem reconciliation, and then they will be settled in their proper inheritances in various parts of the world. The expression, “little flock”, was never applied to the church in the Bible. The only time the expression was used, Jesus applied to the twelve apostles, and the few disciples who followed him during his personal ministry. It was a little flock at that time but he promised to give them the kingdom, and on the day of Pentecost he made that promise good. The kingdom came with power, and never after this was it called a little flock. It was the church of God, the kingdom of God, the family of God, the body of Christ, and kindred expressions, but never a little flock.

On the day of Pentecost the kingdom came with power as Jesus had promised it would (Mark 9:11), and it came to the little flock, numbering at the time one hundred and twenty souls. Three thousand were added to their number that day, the next day five thousand, and then “multitudes of both men and women”, and then the disciples were scattered abroad and went every where preaching the word, and the borders of the kingdom extended rapidly.

It is never called a little flock after that. Peter and Paul refer to local congregations as flocks which the local elders were to feed, and some of them small in numbers. But the church, or kingdom of God, was no longer a little flock, but a mighty aggregation of men and principles which turned the world upside down, tore down the temples of idols, and in a few short centuries changed the course of civilization for the world, and paganism received a deadly wound.

But Russell had a theory to sell to the world, and to sell it he needed the impression that the church was a small affair, and the influence of the gospel over the nations of the world was insignificant, and the Lord never expected it to be otherwise. They will continue in the same meager course to the end of the gospel age then Jesus will come back again, bring his little flock with him, take away the gospel, and supply a different power to the reconciliation of mankind, and it will be one which will succeed where the other has failed.

They make no attack on the gospel, or the church, in a direct way, they just say they were not expected to do more than they have done, and the Lord was not ready yet to proceed to the reconciling of the world to himself. The work which the church was to administer this world reconciliation must be settled first, and the gospel was designed only to accomplish that purpose. It was never expected to convert the world, and the church had no commission to attempt such an impossible task. It was merely a preliminary which must be worked out, and when this work is done the dead will all be raised and the work of world reconciliation can begin.

This post-resurrection reconciliation has been in the purpose of God from the beginning, and it is only after the resurrection that reconciliation will be offered to the whole world. This explains, they argue, why Satan's plans have been such a howling success through the ages, and the Lord's plan such a dismal failure, the Lord was merely letting Satan have his day in court. The truth of the matter is that the Lord had no plan to save those people during their lifetime, his plan was to let Satan have them, and destroy them, and when he gets them all killed off the Lord will raise them from the dead and proceed to reconcile them unto himself.

There was no salvation for the people back of the cross, the blood of Christ could not reach them. The sacrificial laws of God were mere mockeries in their way of viewing
them, a hoax, and a fraud, which the Lord practiced on them, for they say there was no way possible for them to save the people.

There was something God was doing with those people, Noah, Abraham, Job, Enoch, Moses, Elijah, and men like that, but he wag not trying to save them. He was fiddling with them, teasing them perhaps with the idea that they could be saved, and he did give them some temporal blessings, but no salvation. Jesus spoke of many that would come from the east, and from the west, and sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of God, but they explain it that way like they do other contrary passages, for all must be made to harmonize with the theory.

When I first began reading Russell's literature I was struck by the frequency that expression, the little flock, appeared in it, and I supposed it must be a common one in the New Testament, if not every chapter at least in every book. But when I began looking for it I failed to find it, and this was one thing that first shook my faith in the man's sincerity and honesty. When I found that no inspired man ever applied it to the church, even in its infancy, I could not fail to see that he was not dealing honestly with the word of God. The church was few in numbers at the beginning, but the kingdom of God does not consist in numbers.

There was a reason why they wanted to make the church look small, and the influence of the gospel over the nations seem insignificant, and they wanted to do it without making a direct attack upon either. What better plan could be devised than to belittle them, and then apologize by pretending the Lord only expected meager results from them, and designed them with that end in view. Yes the gospel is doing all the Lord expected of it, it is gathering up the little flock out of this present evil world. There will be another world in which all who have lived in this one will live again, and with no devil to hinder the Lord will reconcile them all.

One ardent disciple of Russell's theory wrote me a few days ago as follows: "Brother, your trouble lies in your effort to crowd everything into the gospel age, and into Joshua 21-40-45, hence, making the devil's plan a howling success, and the Lord's plan a dismal failure."

Now we know what this one at least thinks of the law age, and of the gospel age, on God's part they are dismal failures, while from Satan's side they are a howling success. Both ages however have produced some worthy names which have survived as models of faith, meekness, patience, and righteousness, not to mention courage, zeal, and fidelity to the Lord. He ignores twenty-five hundred years during which such men as Abel, Noah, Abraham, Job, lived, as not even worthy of mention. He wants to make it look little and would have us believe that all the nations seem insignificant, and they wanted to do it with-
THE BRAND – DOES MAKE ANY DIFFERENCE?  

ALLEN E. JOHNSON

Some time ago I was introduced to a lady by a mutual friend. Our friend added that I was the minister of the church of Christ. The lady said quickly, "Well, I don't think it makes any difference what we are religiously. The Lord is not going to turn us all over and look at the brands." I replied that I didn't think he would have to as he already knew all the brands.

This lady, along with most religious folks who cling to that doctrine, know only too well the doctrine for which the church of Christ stands. They understand that the church will not accept doctrines that are not in harmony with the word of God.

But will the Lord "look at the brands?" When I was a boy on my father's ranch we always branded and marked our calves with our brand, which gave due notice of ownership to all others who might have cattle, that these calves were ours. But what about "branding" in religious matters? People are perfectly willing to be "branded" Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterians, Nazarenes, Catholics, etc., with all of the various "branding irons" that men have figured out. Some religious "brands" are mighty fantastic when compared to the "brand" the Lord made in the long ago. The inspired writer Luke gave the "brand" with which all true children of God should be "branded." "And the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." (Acts 11:26).

It is the practice in the cow country for every owner to brand his own stuff. The Lord has evidently placed a "brand" on every child of his. "Nevertheless the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are his." (2 Tim. 2:19).

Changing from cattle to sheep, we have this: "I am the good shepherd, and know my sheep, and am known of mine." (Jno. 10:14).

Now to use the figure of the old cow country. When the range was open to everybody, cattle ranged far and near. Once or twice a year the cow men sent out a wagon and a bunch of cow hands to round up and brand all of the unbranded stuff. As a rule they branded the calf with the brand of the mother it followed. This kept things straight. But occasionally some escaped the boys and the result was, some "mavericks." Now, we either belong to the Lord or to the devil, with now and then a "maverick." Now up at the judgment, I have an idea that the Lord is "going to look the brands over." "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father who is in heaven. Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils, and in thy name have done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." (Matt. 7:21-23).

When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations: and he shall separate them one from another, as a Shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats: and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left." (Matt. 25:31-33).

This looks mighty like the Lord is going to "look them over." We are all "branded" unless there are some "mavericks," and the devil is likely to get the "mavericks" unless they "flee for refuge" to the Lord's camp and let him put the name Christian on them. (Acts 2:47).

But there is something else about this "branding" business in the New Testament while we are on the subject. "Brethren, be ye followers together of me, and mark them which walk so as ye have us for an example. (For many walk, of whom I have told you often, and now tell you even weeping, that they are the enemies of the cross of Christ: whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things)" (Phil. 3:17-19). Therefore the brethren are to do some "riding" and "marking" for the Lord. Paul had the right "brand" and we are to measure everyone by the "brand" he gave. Those who mind earthly things are to be "cut out" and "marked." What are some of these earthly things that brand a man as unfit for the company of God's people? Let the apostle Paul tell us. "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these; adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (Gal. 5:19-21).

Now we know that there are many brethren and not a few sisters who are guilty of "revelling, and suchlike," when they "trip the light fantastic," engage in petting parties, and other practices unbecoming God's children; and I know a few brethren who have been guilty of the sin of drunkenness; and any or all of these sins will keep a man from inheriting the kingdom of God in the sweet by and by. Every Christian is to "mark" such violators of the truth and try to get them to change their ways by every means placed at their disposal by the Lord. But judging from what I read in the papers, there are some editors, although they would cast up their eyes in "holy horror" at some brother who is guilty of some of the above mentioned sins, yet they insist on practicing heresy by organizing and promoting the "Committee For Conscientious Objectors" so they can "wipe out the stigma" attaching to the church because (in their opinion) some misguided young men got themselves in a C. O. camp run by secretaries. And, another thing; while we are on the subject of editors, Paul told the young preacher Titus to "shew sound speech that cannot be condemned." (Titus 2:8). And again to the Colossians Paul said: "Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that ye may know how ye ought to answer every man." (Col.4:6); and again, "And that ye study to be quiet, and do your own business, and to work with your own hands, as we commanded you." (I Thess. 4:11). I commend the reading of these passages especially to Jimmie Lovell and his West Coast Christian. Jimmie should be, and likely is, "marked" by all true Christians who "fear God and love the brotherhood." (I Pet. 2:17). About the wildest thing Jimmie has put out to come under my observation, appeared in his December issue. He says, under the caption, "Feed The Hungry," I just read of the 'heifer' project of the Church of the Brethren. Members contribute heifers-10,000 of them-to that church and as the Allies enter one of the over-run countries, the Brethren follow with their milch cows while we stay at home, drinking our own milk-Christ murderers!" So, because the church of Christ does not send 10,000 heifers to Europe, they are guilty of murdering the Christ! At first, I thought I had not read it correctly, but after several readings, it still read the same. Thinking that to be about the limit to be reached for wildness in an editor, I was again brought face to face with this: "Maybe it would be best to forget all such dangerous ideas of feeding the hungry and remain at
QUESTIONS PLAINLY ANSWERED

F. L. PAISLEY

One day last week I received by mail some questions from a lady who listens daily to this program, but wishes her name withheld. We shall comply with her wish and reply to her questions. I am glad to answer questions of such interest and importance as these. The sponsors of this broadcast have no objection to being criticised by name and their position critically examined, so long as we are correctly represented both by name and teaching. But some other people do not feel the same way about it.

The questions designate by name four groups of religious people of our day and of our city. Since I regard these people as excellent folk, I can answer the questions in a general way and use their names, yet not make personal attack upon any of them. In our halls of congress great debates are conducted and out lawmakers call by name and rebuke each other sharply. They even attack the office of president by name. This is as it should be. But a false standard of ethics in religion will not grant the same degree of frankness and investigation of the greatest issues that men ever face. We are very inconsistent here.

Before I consider the questions involving the four churches about which the lady asks, I shall notice her first question which is an implied criticism of this speaker and his brethren. But it is the kind of criticism we like. It brings a very important truth to view. We solicit questions which most sharply bring out objections to what we teach, or what people think we teach. Her first question is this:

Do you really think that you are the only people to be saved? In answering let me say first that it really matters little what I think about any such question. The chief point is, What does the Bible teach on such a delicate point? But her question comes from a failure to grasp the possibility of a church today being strictly the New Testament kind in faith, name, teaching and practice. The question is based on the assumption that any church of necessity is just one more denomination. This is a mistake. We know of no denomination better than any other.

If the lady will allow me to change her question slightly, we shall leave myself and my brethren out of the question of being saved at all, and state the question this way: Do you really think that the Lord's people, his church, whoever compose it, are the only ones to be saved? I want to state frankly that this is the only form the question can take to represent the position we maintain. I am sure we can agree in answering this question. The answer is, Yes, such people are the only ones to be saved. There are only two groups of people properly classified. They are the Lord's and Satan's. It is not our prerogative to state arbitrarily just who is in each group. But we do know what the Lord has said as to qualifications to be in each group. We agree that those who remain Satan's will not be saved. How many times have I said in the fifty-four weeks I have been speaking on this broadcast, that regardless of who is and who is not a part of the Lord's church, that church alone is right and it alone can go to heaven? Will someone name the person in the New Testament after Jesus died who was saved apart from the church of our Lord? Send me the name, or the place in the New Testament where I can read of him or her. Can you imagine the Lord suffering, dying and giving his blood to save the church (Acts 20:28), then saying, "Gentlemen, I have died to build and save a thing that may prove to be a pretty good arrangement, but you can go to heaven as well without it as in it."? Would you pay any costly price for anything as useless as men say the church is? What men? All men who say that salvation is found outside its realm. No, lady, we do not think that we are the only ones to be saved, as if we were the standard, but we know that only the church purchased by the blood of Christ has a single word of promise or assurance of salvation. If we are fortunate enough to be that church in fact, by reason of complying with the divine standard of faith and teaching, who objects? One chief purpose of this program is to plead with all who will hear that they accept the same opportunities and privileges we have and be Christians only. You know our slogan is, The New Testament only makes Christians only. If we be nothing except as and what the Lord requires of all alike, and if others do the same, then we shall be united in the Lord's church, and not some denomination. Others will not have to come to us or our way, nor we to them and their way. We each and all shall have gone to the Lord and his way. This makes friends and brethren of strangers and enemies. It makes all one in fact, religiously. This alone is the plea of churches of Christ. And this plea is being made by none others than churches of Christ. None others have any use for it. For this fact we are not responsible. The responsibility rests upon all who will not enter and abide by the only possible way of unity in the Lord.

Next, the lady wants to know the facts concerning the origin of the Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian and Christian churches. Usually when such a question is raised or such churches are discussed, men go to the better histories of church and religious movements. It is possible that we could find about these churches some interesting things in that source of information. But the chances are that the lady asking the question does not have access to the histories we might produce. If not, then she has no way of knowing that we state them correctly. It is not fair to her to use evidence she could not check, thus giving her no chance to see that we misrepresent the truth, if we did.

But I take it that she has a Bible. This great and grand old Book is the most ancient, accurate and scholarly history of church affairs we have ever seen or heard of. If I should refer to it she can check on me in her own Bible and know where and when I am right or wrong. So, if she and you will read the 29th chapter of Matthew, (not 28th) and the second chapter of Acts and the twentieth chapter of Romans, she and you will find all that the Bible says about the four churches she asks about—all about their name, origin, doctrine and practice. Now, if any one—just any one—knows any other chapter in all the Bible mentioning such churches, just send me the references and I shall read them over this radio and quit my broadcasting as unqualified to answer a simple question with any proof whatsoever.

But the querist wants to know how I would go about to prove that these four churches are not New Testament churches. Really, the task of such proof is not mine. It is not my duty, at least on the radio, to prove that such are not right—except as I am obligated to prove what is right by the Bible. It is their task to prove that they are churches of the New Testament pattern. This they will not undertake to do, when anyone is present to examine their supposed proof. We are perfectly willing to prove that the New Testament church is such and such in name, doctrine, faith and practice. When I do that, we have proof that we are that divinely established church, if and only if that be our faith and practice, too. This is certain. - We are willing to prove what we are and what the New Testament
saying all should be. We are not entering into the task, in-
formation and interesting as it might be, to prove what
other folks are not. (Of course, this "apology" was to pave
the way on the radio for some things to follow-FLP.) It is
not your task to prove that the moon is made of Lim-
burger cheese. If I say it is, it is my task to give the proof
I claim to have. If many folks are not enough interested in
being what the Bible requires to claim to have Bible
authority for existance.

But since the lady is perfectly honest and sincere in
that nice question, we shall not leave it just yet. Let us
suppose that which we have no proof of at present. We shall
suppose that they all four are New Testament churches. If
they are, then it follows as certainly as night follows day
that they are all alike in every basic and fundamental be-
ief, name, doctrine and practice. If they are all New
Testament churches, then either one of them is. This
means that the Methodist church is. Then it follows that
they are all in fact Methodist churches, for all being alike
they must all be what one is. Not only so, but if all are
churches of New Testament pattern, then the Baptist
church is just that. And since all being the same thing are
just alike, it follows that all the four churches she names
are Baptist churches. And the same would go, of course,
for the other two, also. Now, if you can refute my reason-
and prove that they are not all Methodist churches, you
save me the assignment that they are not all New
Testament churches. But I raise no issue at all with either
of these fine folk. They would be the first to deny that they
are in fact, in real church doctrine essentials, the other
group. All Baptists deny that they are Methodists, and all
Methodists deny that they are Presbyterians. All three deny
that they are Christian Churches in that denominational use
of the term, as the Christian Church uses it to describe it-
self. And these denials in no wise reflect upon the char-
acter of the others unfavorably. Each group is as fine
people as the others. It just happens to be true that they
are neither the other and neither one is mentioned in the
right place in the Bible to give the proof the lady seeks. I
should not be held accountable for the Bible's failure to
mention them elsewhere than the chapters I have given.
Unless you find and read those chapters you can't read of
those churches in the Bible. To make sure, I give them
again. Matt. 29; Acts 40; Romans 20 and Jude 2.

The querist correctly says that they all use the same
Bible I do. Yes, and they and we alike misuse that Bible
when we or they try to make it authorize churches not
once mentioned between its lids or in any book written by
angel, man or demon dring the first sixteen hundred
years after Jesus died. For the failure of all history, in-
spired or secular, previous to the sixteenth century, to
mention such churches is not my blunder. It is a fact of
failure that neither I nor you nor they can refute.

But the Bible does describe the church which wears
the title of the Lord, and all other groups of people know
that that church contains the only possible ground of unity,
not because we are members of it, or because others are
not, who are not. But because God made a standard of
truth long ago without asking us what it should be. I and
we and you and they, all alike must come to and abide in
that standard in all religious faith and practice. We are
just bold enough to say without fear that any group of
people, regardless of color or tongue, that wears no other
names than those given by the Lord to his church, and be-
lieves and teaches and practices only what they did, as
items of religious faith, such group is a New Testament
church whether I or you agree with them or not. All
others are of human origin, for such widely differing things
cannot be alike in enough essentials to be even loosely re-
garded as the same kind.

The lady's last question is, Is it true that the Catholic
Church is the mother church? I answer, Yes, the mother of
all churches like her. She is the grandmother of all who
pattern after her in doctrine or practice. They may be
Protestant in name or claim, but the "mother" is the.
author of all the modern practices and doctrines not of New
Testament origin. She is the mother or grandmother of
all churches starting this side the day of Pentecost. The
Lord's church existed first, however, and is in no way
related to the church in question. This is being trans-
cribed for permanent record of what we say, though I am
speaking to you in person on this January 14, 1944. Until
tomorrow, this is Light Beams saying, May the Lord's
blessings be yours.

WHIPPING HIS CHILDREN

(Continued From Page 9)

As matter of fact, the whipping which God gives his
children, according to Baptist teaching, is a matter of
injustice anyway. Paul said: "For whom the Lord loveth
he casteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.
If ye endure chastening, God dealeth with you as with sons:
for what son is he whom the father chasteneth not? But
if we be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers,
then are we bastards, and not sons." Heb. 12:6,8. In con-
version, Baptist preachers claim, the spirit, or inner man,
becomes a child of God, but the body, or outward man, re-
mains a child of the devil till the resurrection. And all
the sins committed after conversion, they insist, are com-
mittcd by the flesh, the child of the devil. The inner
man, the spirit, or child of God, after conversion is just
as holy as God himself and cannot possibly sin. So we
are led to ask: For what does God chasten his son? Does
he whip his child for sins which the old flesh, the child
of the devil, commits? If so, he whips the wrong man,
and it is therefore unjust. Unless he whips the inner man,
the one who does not commit the sin, the child of God
will have to go without chastisement. But Paul said: "If
ye be without chastisement, then are ye bastards, and not
sons." So the doctrine of Baptists would make every child
of God a bastard, or God would have to chasten the fel-
low who does not commit the sin. In fact, there would be
no reason, according to Bogard's position, for God to chas-
ten Norris for his devilment, for that streak of wickedness
which Bogard says now runs through him is all in the old
outward man, the child of the devil, anyway. His spirit
has never sinned since his conversion. His exaggeration,
his malicious libel and his denial were all done by the
fleshy man; the spirit had nothing to do with it. So in-
stead of whipping the spirit for what the flesh did, it looks
to me that the sensible thing to do would be to take the
spirit to heaven and send the flesh to hell.
USES OF PRAYER (Continued from page 1)

All objections to prayer that I have ever heard appear to me to be both presumptuous and shallow and the failure of many to make prayer an intimate part of their lives is a futile attempt to get along satisfactorily without God. Of course God knows what we need even before we ask him and that better than we can tell him and he can give us more than we can ask or think. So what? The conclusion that we need not pray certainly does not follow. Paul prayed and advised Christians of his day to pray without ceasing. They did not know how to pray as they ought any better than do we, but they prayed and received a full measure of blessings both objective and subjective from the practice. Prayer gets things done. A man need not hesitate about prayer for fear he will ask amiss. God does not expect perfection from anybody who really needs to pray. Prayer is the language of need. It implores help for the weak. Some knowledge of the word of God, a humble and a contrite heart and proper reverence for the Person of God will guard against serious defects in prayer. The truly devout may safely ask for what they want, even if the mercy of God does veto some of it.

I cannot become very interested in how God answers prayer, or fail to ask because I cannot see how he can grant my request. A child of mine once lay at the point of death. I prayed, not once but many times. I asked for the life of the child. The child lived. Had he died, it would not have shaken my faith in God. I was not trying to dictate to God and my knowledge of the will of God in such matters is very limited. “Not my will, but thine be done” should always be a preface to prayer. Many people who are better than I am and whose faith is at least as great as mine have prayed for loved ones to live and they did. It has ever been so, even in the days of miracles. Ephesians 2:4 “was sick nigh unto death.” God had mercy on him and on Paul and he recovered. Earnest prayers must have been offered in his case. All sick brethren in that day did not recover even when prayers were offered on their behalf. There is no argument against prayer, especially in view of how little we know about divine administration in such matters.

It is impossible for a man to understand how God can run a universe in an orderly manner and not overlook a sparrow’s fall or lose count of the hairs on a human head, but he can believe it. What he cannot understand he can charge up to his own ignorance or weakness. He should not try to limit God to his own size. I may not understand how God can know and understand the hearts of all human kind, when I cannot even understand myself, but then I can believe it for he is God.

It is easy to confuse the answer to prayer with the working of miracles. Prayer and providence are closely related. “And we know that to them that love God all things work together for good, even to them that are called according to his purpose.” We see the providence of God in the history of Joseph and Esther, a divine influence in human affairs where natural forces both sordid and noble played their part in fulfilling a divine purpose and furthering a divine plan. God still rules and he answers prayer. “O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past tracing out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? or who hath been his counsellor? or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and unto him, are all things. To him be the glory for ever. Amen.”

BRANDS (Continued from page 13)

home as we have been doing, holy, serving God by doing nothing-leave Christianity in the hands of the Catholic, Mennonites, and others. O Lord, what mob in all the earth ever nailed him tighter to the cross than we?”

Now there you have it-twice in the same article-the first under double emphasis—that because the church does not feed the world, it is guilty of murdering its Head.

But that is not all. In the same issue on page three, Jimmie says: “The Mormon Church in Utah has canned over 50,000,000 cans of foodstuffs for the hungry during the past summer which is more than ‘the’ church has canned since Columbus discovered America and we ask God to help others to see our good works. God have mercy upon us.” As a matter of keeping the record straight, I’d like for Jimmie to tell us just how many cans of foodstuffs the church has canned since Columbus discovered America. In order to make his point mean anything, it seems to me, he would have to know that. But in all of this he has thrown bouquets at the Catholics, church of the Brethren, Mennonites, and Mormons, and has blasphemed the “church which is his body.” I recommend that he “join” those apostate bodies where he can send thousands of heifers, shiploads of food, to the “over-run” countries, and set up a huge canning factory for hungry Mormons. It seems that our friend Jimmie thinks that the way to a man’s spiritual heart is through his stomach.

But the “marking” goes further than that. Paul told the Romans, “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which we have learned; and avoid them. For they are such as serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple. Romans 16:17, 18. We are plainly commanded to “mark them that cause divisions contrary to the doctrine” we learned from Paul. The lady I was introduced to felt the force of this “marking.” All who teach doctrines that cause divisions feel the force of the ‘marking’ being done by true gospel preachers, editors, and churches throughout the land.

Those who wear the “brands” of men upon them—that of Luther, Calvin, Wesley, the pope, or any other human name, and teaching things “contrary to the doctrine” found in the New Testament, are to be “avoided;” that is, “have no fellowship” with them, but “rather reprove them.” (Eph. 5:11)

Another group that should be “marked” by all true Christians is that to be found in the church who are continually crying about the “so-called elders” in the congregations. They claim that the “so-called elders” will not let them work, have no vision, etc. The elders are not bothering them in any way if they really want to labor in the vineyards and do it in a Scriptural way; but the trouble lies with those who are doing the howling-they want to run the church and the elders are opposing their ambitious schemes, as they should and have perfect right to do. This rebellion against the elders is “Korahism,” and should be carefully avoided by all who respect God and his authority in matters religious.

So the obvious thing to do is to get in the “corral” of the group divinely appointed to do the “marking”—the faithful church of our Lord Jesus Christ—follow faithfully the teaching delivered to it by its Head, and all will be well.