A religion that meets all the needs of the human family must have the backing of final and complete authority over the human mind. In the very nature of the case it must be a revealed religion, a religion of the book and the book must be an infallible revelation of the will of God. We believe the Bible to be just such a book. Church authority is open to all the objections and suspicions suggested by the weakness and stumbling propensities of man. The church is made up of people. In a hierarchy, even the rulers are uninspired men and serious mistakes are more than likely, they are certain. The history of such setups is punctuated with illustrations of the fact. The records of the popes and councils of Rome make up anything else before it suggests even an argument for Church authority. Jesus Christ is the head of the church, its one and only law-giver and his place cannot be usurped by men, however pretentious their place or their claims.

The law of Christ cannot be determined by committees of men who busy themselves is writing creeds and passing laws to govern the people of God. These men are fallible and their failibility extends into the premises and conclusions of their religious reasoning. One such group has no more authority than some other similar group. They vary so much in their conclusions that a basis is formed for a variety of conflicting parties. There can be no real unity in such developments.

If we do not have an infallible Bible, we need one. If we do not have it there is not the dimmest prospect of getting it. There is every reason to believe we have it. So, it is divinely inspired to that degree that guarantees that it contains the infallible will of God.

As to the integrity of the Bible, historical criticism has established the fact that the New Testament we have is close to one hundred percent perfect. The error factor in the text has been established at the astounding minimum of one on an average for about every thousand words. These textual errors are of such a trivial character that they do not affect faith or doctrine. When a man opens his Bible, he can be certain, therefore, that he has the Bible. Jesus and the apostles had the Old Testament and indorsed it.

Since we have it, can we believe it? This brings up the question of credibility. We accept other ancient documents as historically credible even when they do not claim inspiration or infallibility. Certain historical tests, accepted by all critics, are applied to these documents to determine whether or not they are historically reliable. These tests have to do with the honesty, opportunities for knowing the facts, and the numbers of those who testify as to the facts in the case. No historian or witness has ever passed these tests with a greater degree of perfection than the writers of the New Testament. They were men of intelligence and the finest character. They had every reason to tell the truth and no motives for deception can be discovered by the closest scrutiny of critics. They are in every way reliable. They could not possibly have been mistaken as to the facts they dealt with. If they cannot be believed then we cannot be certain that anybody in the past ever told or wrote the truth about anything.

In spite of this, unbelief still persists. Men who are well informed in certain fields of knowledge bitterly criticize the Bible. In a surprising number of instances they know almost as little about it as an illiterate knows about the classics. They have built up a negative attitude without examining the positive side of the evidence. They have adopted a course which is unscientific to the highest degree. In colleges and universities, some professors of this class attack the Bible and revealed religion to impress youth who know nothing of the evidence in its favor, and leave them to infer that there is no such evidence worthy of any consideration whatsoever. They employ the prestige of their position and scholarship to put over the fraud that they are the wise ones and wisdom will die with them. They would show up most unfavorably on a polemic platform with a believer in the Bible capable of effectively presenting its claims to authority over the minds and lives of humanity.

Some friends of the Bible, that is they do not consider themselves hostile, feel that there must be a compromise of some sort between the Bible and the so-called verified results of science and criticism. Its moral teaching is good and a qualified respect for it is wholesome, but they are not prepared in heart to go all-out for it as the infallible revelation of the will of God. A physician of my acquaintance told a friend he wanted his daughter to believe the Bible "to a degree" but not at all of it. He thinks the book is somewhat extreme in spots. He doubts some of its miracles and its claims of inspiration. He appears not to be conscious of the fact that his attitude is a clear repudiation of the real mission the holy book proposes to accomplish. The Bible claims to be the word of God and promises blessings to him alone who trembles at this word. He must not add to nor take from it. It is the law of God and is not subject to human revision. Whoever proposes an amendment to the divine constitution is a presumptuous rebel in the light of the claims of the book itself. It claims to be a final revelation of the divine will, furnishing the man of God completely for every good work. In short it is "the

(Continued On Page 16)
For many years individual brethren and elders of the churches have been told that Don Carlos Janes and E. L. Jorgenson are out-and-out premillennialists and could not be trusted to represent loyal churches of Christ in any capacity whatsoever. That point is settled once and for all. Don Carlos Janes is on record for eternity, and his partner in heresy is on record with him, for all time, unless and until he becomes converted, turns from his heretical course, and repudiates these wrongs to Christ and his church, before it is too late, as it is in the case of the testator of this will.

It would appear that the “one-man missionary society” is a rather profitable business. It is strange, indeed, that money thus collected from individuals and churches, over a period of many years should be put into, and kept into, a “trust fund” until the day of a man’s death and then made a part of his will. Reports have come through all along that proceeds from these funds have been loaned out to the Bollite churches in the vicinity of Louisville for building, or improving meeting-houses and other purposes. And it will be noted that Don Carlos Janes had sole control of funds, specifying in his will the misdoings his bequest.

Here the question arises: If the testator of the will, Don Carlos Janes, was such an ardent premillennialist as evidenced his bequest, doesn’t this prove that he would voluntarily will a portion of the funds to missionaries who do not believe this doctrine, or who were not in sympathy with this group in Louisville? His will becomes a brand to every missionary who accepts his bequest.

Another question pushes in: Would a man who makes such a will designate an executor and executrix to administer it without bond, who do not indorse the thing that he has done, as well as the views which he has held? Is it conceivable that E. L. Jorgenson did not know all about it all the time, and that he has not been a party to it all? The Janes will brands E. L. Jorgenson, not only as an all-out premillennialist (a thing some of us, of course, have known all the time) but it brands him as being the same in kind and in degree as Don Carlos Janes: Yet there are brethren over the country who have told us that the way to treat the premillennial brethren is: to publish their reports, have them preach and sing in our meetings, and thus break down the "disfellowship"! We are wondering what the particular preacher who gave that advice in an Abilene Christian College lecture thinks about it now?

There is yet another question pushing in: What about the other one-man missionary agencies among us? For instance, B. D. Morehead and James L. Lovell. They are doing the same thing in principle, if not in actuality. The brethren should, and surely they will, turn thumbs down on them now. This is not a matter of mere expediency—it involves scriptural principles of “missionary work.” If these one-man missionary agencies and offices are to be continued among us, we had as well surrender the opposition to the missionary societies now, as between the two missionary societies of the Christian Church are not more unscriptural, and they are certainly operated on a better business basis. This is not intended as even a hint of disfellowship of the latter in any degree, but just another way of voicing an unqualified repudiation of the “one-man missionary society” instead.

It will be noted that the Gospel Advocate, Apostolic Times, Firm Foundation and Bible Banner were mentioned in this will as having done the church irreparable harm by their “propaganda” against what the will calls the “scriptural orthodox teaching” of premillennialism! I cannot help wonder how these other publications feel about being put in the same sack with the Bible Banner! The Firm Foundation has been more liberal in its attitude toward the premillennial Louisville brethren than any of the papers mentioned and more lenient than most of the brethren think it should have been. This has been especially true of its attitude toward Don Carlos Janes. It has been more than liberal with him here, and has been generous, in the publication of his reports, and his articles all through the years. In appreciation of that generosity, the Firm Foundation receives a slap in the face in the Janes will, is branded as a propagandist, a hindrance to the church, and as “having done a great injury to the cause of the Lord.” What a bequest in return for favors bestowed and services rendered! Some of us think the greatest injury some of the other papers have done to the cause of the Lord has been in publishing the reports of any of this group, of premillennialists, however good the intentions on the Part of the papers and the editors may have been. And many have protested all the while their doing so.

“The Last Will And Testament Of Don Carlos Janes”-what a document to face in the judgment! And what a mill-stone its testator has hung around the necks of his premillennial fellows who he has left behind! Is it possible that brethren can ever apologize for them again?

And think of the legacy! Thousands of dollars bequeathed to teachers of error and to the propagation of heretical doctrines. And then obligating his fellow in error and heresy, E. L. Jorgenson, to perform that evil task! It should haunt them in their dreams, and taunt them in their waking hours.

As for the statement in the will that “the premillennial view of the Lord’s coming advent is the scriptural orthodox teaching of the church from the days of the apostles”—that is a pure assumption. A rank and arbitrary assertion.

Don Carlos Janes has gone—but his will remains. And we are told that his missionary offices have been left to another—to a successor who is instructed to continue receiving funds in the same way. The name of this person should be advertised, and all the churches warned. Is it possible that the brethren will be so gullible as to continue this sort of thing? Surely not. F. E. W. Jr.
THE LAST WILL AND TESTAMENT OF DON CARLOS JANES

The probate of the will of Don Carols Janes has brought forth many ejaculations from brethren in various quarters who have had reports of the contents of the will. But it is not a matter of surprise at all to some of us who have known what was being done with “missionary money” by this “one-man missionary society.” When-brethren were told of these things the usual reaction was a sort of blank of surprise and suspicion tinged at someone whom, perhaps, we did not like — and they went on giving their money to a one-man missionary agency. The last will and testament of Don Carion Janes lists the title, and the lid, and the brethren can now see for themselves.

The Bible Banner is publishing this document in full because of its world-wide interest and its definite bearing on vital issues in the church. (Editor).

I, Don Carlos Janes, being a resident of Louisville, Jefferson County, Kentucky, do hereby make and declare this my last Will and Testament, hereby revoking any and all Wills by me heretofore made.

ITEM I.
I direct all my just debts and funeral expenses be paid.

ITEM II.
I direct that my body be buried at Resthaven Cemetery, Jefferson County, Kentucky, beside that of my dear wife.

ITEM III.
I direct that the items mentioned in Item I and Item II herein, and the following devise be paid out of my personal estate.

I devise to my brother, Clarence L. Janes, Columbus, Ohio, the sum of Twenty-Five ($25.00) Dollars.

I devise to my nephew, Robert Janes, son of my brother, Clarence L. Janes, Sunbury, Ohio, the sum of Twenty-Five ($25.00) Dollars.

I devise to my niece, Mrs. M. A. Baur, daughter of my brother, Clarence L. Janes, 1722 Catalina Street, Bond Hill, Cincinnati, Ohio, the sum of Twenty-Five ($25.00) Dollars.

I devise to my sister-in-law, Mrs. Eliza Kinsey, 1286 Mt. Vernon Street, Akron, Ohio, the sum of Twenty-Five ($25.00) Dollars.

The Janes Printing Company Stock, which I own at the time of my death, I devise to Tony Covey upon payment by the latter of Two ($2.00) Dollars per-share for same.

The Janes Company Printing Stock and printing plates, which will be in the bank on deposit in my own individual name.

ITEM IV.
Gut of my personal estate, I direct my Executor to use the following amounts for the following purposes:

2. Cold Drafts Fund.
3. Current Missionary Funds for general benefit of Missionaries, which before my death I may blend or combine into one Trust Fund, as they are held for the same uses and purposes.

These Funds were mainly raised by me from miscellaneous givers, who absolutely entrusted their gifts to me to be used in the cause of the Apostolic Church, in its various needs.

ITEM V.
The Missionary Trust Funds, which have been in my hands, and which I have been administering for many years, are the following:

2. Cold Drafts Fund.
3. Current Missionary Funds for general benefit of Missionaries, which before my death I may blend or combine into one Trust Fund, as they are held for the same uses and purposes.

These Funds were mainly raised by me from miscellaneous givers, who absolutely entrusted their gifts to me to be used in the cause of the Apostolic Church, in its various needs.

ITEM VI.
The Missionary Trust Funds, which have been in my hands, and which I have been administering for many years, are the following:

2. Cold Drafts Fund.
3. Current Missionary Funds for general benefit of Missionaries, which before my death I may blend or combine into one Trust Fund, as they are held for the same uses and purposes.

These Funds were mainly raised by me from miscellaneous givers, who absolutely entrusted their gifts to me to be used in the cause of the Apostolic Church, in its various needs.

ITEM VI.
The Missionary Trust Funds, which have been in my hands, and which I have been administering for many years, are the following:

2. Cold Drafts Fund.
3. Current Missionary Funds for general benefit of Missionaries, which before my death I may blend or combine into one Trust Fund, as they are held for the same uses and purposes.

These Funds were mainly raised by me from miscellaneous givers, who absolutely entrusted their gifts to me to be used in the cause of the Apostolic Church, in its various needs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO THE FOLLOWING PERSONS IN THE AFRICAN FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emma Sherriff the sum of Four Hundred and Ninety-Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodora Sherriff the sum of One Hundred Forty-Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. N. Short the sum of One Thousand One Hundred Seventy-Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foy Short the sum of One Hundred Twelve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Dow Merritt the sum of One Thousand Forty-Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George M. Scott the sum of One Thousand Twenty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Pearl Scott the sum of Two Hundred Forty-Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. L. Brown the sum of One Thousand One Hundred Seventy-Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Brown the sum of One Hundred Seventy-Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardash Diogene Brown the sum of Ninety-Six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alva B. Reese the sum of Six Hundred Forty-One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyd Reese the sum of One Hundred Forty-Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. D. Garrett the sum of Eight Hundred Sixty-Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. C. Shewmaker the sum of One Hundred Forty-Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orville D. Brittell the sum of One Hundred Twenty-Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Myrtle Rowe the sum of One Hundred Eighty-Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvin Hobby the sum of One Hundred Ninety-Six</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO THE FOLLOWING PERSONS IN THE JAPAN FIELD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J. M. McCaleb the sum of Eight Hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman J. Fox the sum of Twelve Hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Lillie D. Cypert the sum of Four Hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Sarah Andrews the sum of One Hundred Sixteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. D. Bixler the sum of Nine Hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. A. Rhodes the sum of One Thousand Fifty-Six</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO THE FOLLOWING PERSONS IN THE CHINA WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles Gruver the sum of One Hundred Twenty-Eight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. W. Wright, the sum of One Hundred Twenty-Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowell B. Davis the sum of Four Hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Alice Broadus the sum of One Thousand Six Hundred Eighty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lewis S. Jamie the sum of One Hundred Twenty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Whithfield the sum of Two Hundred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss Ethel Matthey the sum of Four Hundred</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO THE FOLLOWING PERSONS IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. G. Cassell the sum of Six Hundred Seventy-Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. T. Rodman the sum of Six Hundred Nineteen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George R. Johnson (of Brazil) the sum of Three Hundred Eighty-Four</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukehiro Ishiguro of Los Angeles, Japanese Work, the sum of Four Hundred Twenty-Two</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Current Missionary Funds made up of funds, which have been paid, and are currently being paid for missionary purposes, to be paid to certain designated Missionaries. As moneys are thus collected and paid in, they are credited on a list which I have been carrying, and which will be found in my possessions, and on this Ledger will be found the names of said Missionaries and the credits entered thereon to be paid to said persons for missionary purposes.

On this Ledger will also be found some general funds, which have been paid in for general missionary purposes undesignated as to whom they are to be paid. My Executors are to designate the Missionaries to whom these general funds are to be paid.

All other funds on said Ledger, credited to certain Missionaries, are to be paid to them as credited.

Additional Trust Funds, which I have been administering, are the following:

**"CHURCH TENT FUND"** consists of funds made up of donations and gifts, made wholly by myself for the purpose of providing a tent, or tents, and facilities for the doing of Christian Evangelistic work. I consider that the purposes of this Trust would be carried out if my Executors should, with the revenues from this Fund, buy a medium-sized tent for Christian Evangelistic use in and around Louisville, to be used especially for the establishment of new congregations of the New Testament type. In the event it should be the wish of the Highland Church of Christ in Louisville, Kentucky, that the said tent be under the management and trusteeship of the Highland Church of Christ of Louisville, Ky.

Any balance in said Fund, over and above that necessary to actually buy the tent and facilities connected therewith, will be used, and I direct to be used, in carrying on of Christian Evangelistic services, and the doing of Christian Evangelistic work.

I direct that if possible said fund be used for the holding of one protracted meeting under said tent in and around Louisville, Kentucky, if the Church accepts the management and trusteeship of such tent.

**"CHURCH OR ESTATE FUND"** consists of Funds, which came to me out of my parents' estates, and this Fund I denominated Church or Estate Fund, and have been using same for general Church religious work.

I direct that my Executors use such of said fund as may be in existence at the time of my death for publication of religious literature.

**"RELIGIOUS LITERATURE FUND"** consists of funds, which have been given by friends and givers for publication of Christian religious literature.

I direct my Executors to use such of this fund as remains at the time of my death for such purposes.

**"MISSIONARY TRACT FUND"** consists of funds, which came from the proceeds of sale of pamphlets, and I direct my Executors at my death to use such moneys as are in said fund for the purpose of continuing my free Christian tracts, and to the extent left open for supplementary gifts from those willing-hearted.

**"STENOGRAPHERS FUND"** consists of funds which were given by various persons to maintain a stenographer in my office, and I direct my Executors to use such moneys as remain in said fund at the time of my death for the purpose of providing themselves with stenographic work to be used in promoting Christian foreign missions.

**ITEM VII**

In the event any person or persons should contest this my Will, or assist or lend aid and comfort to any one who might contest same, then and in that event, I direct that such person, or persons, shall forfeit all interest which they may have in my estate by reason of any devise to them herein, or by reason of their being my heirs.

**ITEM VIII**

If any portion of this Will, or any devise herein, should be considered as in any way invalid, then I devise that portion, which would have otherwise vassal under said devise, for Christian religious purposes to be used and expended by the Highland Church of Christ of Louisville, Kentucky, in any way it may seem fit.

**ITEM IX**

I hereby name, constitute and appoint Elmer Leon Jorgenson, and his wife, Irene Doty Jorgenson, and the survivor of them, as the Executor and/or Executors of this my Will, and direct that they be permitted to qualify as such without the giving of any surety on their bond, and
THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY

It was recently my privilege to assist in meetings with the Taylor Boulevard and West End churches in Louisville, Kentucky. The two meetings covered a three-Sunday arrangement, one beginning on Sunday and ending the following Sunday afternoon, the other beginning that Sunday night and ending the next Sunday night, dividing the three Sundays equally between the two meetings. These meetings were fruitful in many ways and resulted in good to the Cause throughout the Louisville area.

During the meeting the differences between the Bardstown Road church and the West End church were amicably and scripturally adjusted and fellowship was restored between these congregations. This settlement of differences indirectly affected other congregations in the city and vicinity also and was accepted by all the faithful churches as removing all hindrances to fellowship between them. The true churches of Christ in Louisville have made a notable record in their firm opposition to the premillennial movement which has centered in that city. In doing so they have made a fine contribution to the cause of truth the world over. It would, indeed, be too bad for any root of bitterness to spring up among this group of loyal churches there, to divide them and render impotent the stand they have made for the pure gospel in the years past. What a club this would have been in the hands of the digressive and premillennial parties in Louisville! The brethren were determined that no such thing should be perpetuated over differences that could and should be settled. In the spirit of Christ their trouble was settled and as in olden times “there was great joy in that city.”

that they be recompensed from my estate for their services as such Executor and Executrix.

My said named Executor and Executrix have been for many years my true friends, whose love and friendship I highly value, and I have every confidence in their spirit and ability to carry out my wishes as expressed in this Will, and to administer the trust funds herein in harmony with my wishes and others, who have contributed to said trust funds.

ITEM X

I wish it to be known that I hold that the first thing in life is to honor God with conduct conformable to His holy and righteous will: that I believe the Bible to be the Book of God, containing His revealed will to man; that it is worthy of the highest esteem of unfaltering belief, and unwavering obedience; that I believe in the general activity, growth and development of all Christians (not merely of the few who may be most willing or seem to have the greatest talent) ; and that I wish the Highland Church of Christ in particular and all of Christ’s congregations in general to walk in scriptural unity and flourish under the blessings of our God.

I further express the desire that all who have respect for my wishes, both those at home and those farther away, be truly diligent in the service of the Lord God Almighty, for nothing else in the world is so profitable as that.

It is desirable to express appreciation of the love and friendship of all who have these qualities toward me, and to say that it has long been a practice to thank God daily for my friends and all their love, sympathy and helpfulness in every way. If a final word here could have weight with others this 4th day of April 1942.

(signed) DON CARLOS JANES

WITNESSES:
Katherine Morris
Lucian L. Johnson
Henry M. Johnson

The oldest church of Christ in Louisville is the Haldeman Avenue church, where M. C. Kurfees preached for forty-five consecutive years. His very worthy brother, J. F. Kurfees, is active in the affairs of this congregation now and has been a strong factor in holding the congregation to the principles preached by his scholarly brother so long. Since the death of M. C. Kurfees, the Douthitt’s have been the preachers for the Haldeman Avenue church and it is being served in that capacity now by Cecil B. Douthitt who has been with them for some seven or eight years.

The Bardstown Road church was formed about twenty-five years ago when Brother Campbell Taylor and a number of faithful people separated from the Janes-Jorgenson premillennial Highland church over issues surrounding the teaching of that heresy in that church by E. L. Jorgenson. This congregation now owns one of the most modern buildings in the city and has grown steadily since its beginning. Brother Norman H. Beam is now their preacher and is a very capable young man.

The Taylor Boulevard church, with whom I was associated in the meetings to which reference has been made, is an excellent congregation. They have just completed a new brick building which would be a credit to any community and a bright future is before this thriving congregation in its determination to advance the Cause of Christ in their section of the city. Brother R. G. Embry is the preacher for this church and I have not been associated with any gospel preacher whose love for the gospel impressed me more. He is a capable evangelist and an unselfish and untiring worker in the promotion of New Testament teaching. His work with this congregation has marked an epoch in its growth. Whether Brother Embry stays with this work or goes into other fields, success will attend his labors, for he is that kind of a preacher.

The newest congregation in point of establishment in the city is the West End church — yet it is not a new church for it is composed of some of the best people in Louisville who have been faithful members of the church there and elsewhere for many years. This congregation was formed about a year ago. Brother J. Early Arceneaux was called from Texas to spend one month with them and during that time he was induced to return to begin permanent work with them about three months later. During this interval of three months Brother R. L. Whiteside was their preacher and teacher. The fact that these two men were selected by these brethren for their first preachers is a sufficient recommendation of their strict adherence to the principles of New Testament doctrine and practice. Brother Early Arceneaux is recognized as far as the church is known as one of the strongest gospel preachers in the world. His residence in Louisville is an asset to the Cause of Christ in that city. He is well prepared to expose the errors of premillennialism in the lair of its chief promoters and it would be a fine thing if it could be arranged for him to engage R. H. Boll in debate in Louisville. I would go to hear that one. As he continues his work with the West End church it will grow, as it is now growing, to take its place among the leading churches of Louisville in its influence for primitive New Testament teaching. Incidentally, Brother Arceneaux has agreed to join the Bible Banner staff.

For a number of years I have had some strong personal friends in Louisville. These ties of friendship have been strengthened. I am happy in the association with these brethren through these meetings and rejoice with them all in the good that was done.—F. E. W. Jr.
CONCERNING PERSONS, MOVEMENTS AND INNOVATIONS

On the opposite page is an article from Brother E. R. Harper. IT has my indorsement — if that will be of any help to Brother Harper in his efforts to rid Harding College and the State of Arkansas of the blighting effects of premillennial teaching and teachers, and their sympathizers. One does not have to admit that he is a premillennialist to be one for all essential purposes and intent. Hardly anyone admits it now. Some even deny it — but all the time lend their whole influence to that party, for the vindication of its personnel. It has been very properly said that a premillennialist actually is one who believes the doctrine — but a Bollite is one who sympathizes with those who teach it, runs with them, apologizes for them, and compliments them, while he criticizes every man who has with any effect opposed them.

In reference to Clinton Davidson, he has not only attempted to vindicate the premillennial group all the way from R. H. Boll and his Louisville party down to J. N. Armstrong and his Harding College group at Searcy — but his whole movement was as definitely a menace to the Cause of Christ as the premillennial party in the church has ever been. Was he an innovationist? My answer is that his whole movement was an innovation. The Questionnaires and Surveys that started it were innovations. It was born in the cradle of innovation and its inglorious end was the demise of an innovation. Let no man attempt to resurrect its remains — we simply remind the one who does that he shall not pass!

Should we accept a man's own statement of what he is and what he is not? Yes-unless his conduct belies his assertions and denials. All the time that Clinton Davidson was attending and working with a modern Christian Church in New York, did he not deny being a digressive? That has been his status also with reference to premillennialism. He denied that he was a digressive-but he called the church "the alleged church of Christ" and associated with the digressives! He denies that he is a premillennialist, but he associates with the premillenialsists and has been vehement in his condemnation of all who have opposed and exposed them. In such cases, actions speak louder than words and are far more convincing.

If Ernest Beam's apology for the National Unity Movement and its promoters was "missing the mark," as the Firm Foundation very aptly said, any apology for Clinton Copyright Davidson could not be less than that. If the one is missing the mark, the other is shooting a blank. This is no time to be minimizing the issues involved. It is no time to be fondling and coddling the men who have been exposed in connection with their schemes and movements. The battles have been too hard and long for us to acquiesce to any such apologies now. We are simply not going to do it. If the fight is to be renewed, our battle lines will be found right where they were before- and just as impregnable formed.

As for complimenting the "many excellent qualities" possessed by Clinton Davidson, all that is beside the point— the same can be said of the men who promote the National Unity Meeting, and that was precisely what Ernest Beam was doing when the Firm Foundation said that he missed the mark! Doubtless R. H. Boll, or most any Methodist Bishop, has some excellent qualities. It constitutes no reason to spare men of the exposure that is due false doctrine and fake movements.

At the close of an address delivered by E. R. Harper in San Antonio, Jesse P. Sewell came to the front and publicly indorsed Brother Harper's address and stated "before them all" that Clinton Davidson had deceived him, and others who had been connected with his movement. That is what the brethren should be told, instead of all the apologizing and love-making to Davidson. I have not heard of any apologies Davidson has offered to the brotherhood for what Brother Sewell called his deceptions. I agree with Brother Sewell that the Davidson Movement was that very thing — and thousands of brethren were duped like Brother Sewell was. In fact, what would have been the result if the Davidson Movement had not been exposed and stopped? There are plenty of brethren outside of New York City who can answer that question.

As for Brother E. R. Harper — he has submitted abundant evidence from time to time to substantiate what he has said, and evidently has plenty more. I have heard him criticized but I have not seen his evidence refuted.

As for the implied charges of misrepresentation — all of us know that it is "a grievous sin" to misrepresent anybody or anything but it has not been established that Brother Harper has done so. If anyone thinks that the Bible Banner has committed that "grievous sin," let them submit the evidence for our consideration. It might afford the occasion for us to produce more "evidence" that the public does not know is in existence concerning some of these men who would beguile you and lead the church away by their smooth words, fair speech, ambitious schemes and booster movements.

As for Clinton Davidson-he has not made any amendments for the evil effects of a movement that contained all the threats to the purity and the integrity of the church that any digressive movement ever did. If other editors want to go to the wailing wall for him, and weep with him over the mound of his dead movement, they may do so-but excuse me from that service. I shall not be there. But if and when an effort is made to resurrect it, then some of us will be there with plenty of dry ammunition.

As for me-my residence is still Oklahoma City, Post Office address, Box 1804, and I still have some good sox, if not the same pair, on my feet, if the gentleman wishes to renew the alleged threat to sue them off my feet.

Belated editorial apologies for Clinton Davidson are not calculated to impress discerning brethren as serving any good purpose. The Davidson Movement has not been dead long enough to be canonized into sainthood by having the defects of its character forgotten, and an effort to boost him or bolster it will only raise questions, and eyebrows, too-and will be regarded at best as wholly gratuitous.

We need a strong defense of the truth-not weak apologies for error.-F. E. W. Jr.

THANKS A LOT!

Tipton, Oklahoma
March 7, 1944

Dear Brother Foy:
The elders got to paying their taxes, and I guess it made them think about preachers having to pay taxes, too. So they informed to send you twenty-five dollars to help pay your withholding tax on the meeting you held for us last summer.

Your Brother In Christ, A. M. Smith,
(Treasurer, Tipton Church of Christ).

Note: This is the first time I have been the recipient of this particular thoughtfulness. With thanks to the Tipton brethren, I am passing it on for the benefit of other preachers, with the thought that other churches may follow the good example. Obviously, it is easier for a church to bear this item than for the preacher, who is in their service, to do so.-F. E. W. Jr.
IS IT THE TRUTH—OR THE PERSON?

E. R. HARPER

In this article I am discussing what seems to me to be a most tragic trend in the discussion of the “kingdom question.” I am asking this question, and then pressing for an answer. The question is, is it a personal difference between men, or is this a vital issue over principle? If it is a personal affair with a personal grudge between men and a desire to hurt some leader in the church because of popularity in fighting him, or because of envy concerning his stand in the church, then please count me out for I know that neither of the above causes enters my defense of the truth.

I “jump on” no brother because it is popular to do so, neither do I envy my brother his stand or place of prominence in the church. I would to my Lord that all men were “strong and influential” to the “fullest possible” degree that we might reach all who are lost. I attack no man unless I believe that there is a vital principle involved and that he is the man who is teaching it or openly defending those who are. By openly I simply mean doing it so that it is influencing others to “smile” at the error and “receive” without question the man who is teaching the error. I do not believe it is fair, neither do I believe it is right, and least of all Christian, to make “one man” the “goat” when there are others involved, who are just as set in their convictions as he is. This seems to me to be the order of the day by many preachers, papers, and institutions. They will fight “one man and his group” over a vital question, or is it vital in their sight, and at the same time refuse to expose others, but go so far as to fellowship them, have them to speak for them, defend them and oppose all who try to point out their errors, which errors are related to that of the man or men they have been exposing. If it is a matter of “principle” I press the question above. Why shield some and expose others? If we do that, and I know it is being done, how can it be an honest matter of principle? If it were, why not be willing to “find out all who are guilty” and expose them?

An example outstanding: R. H. Boll has been fought by every paper, pulpit, preacher and most schools, here of late, “generally speaking” and the men who are his close defenders, who live in Louisville, are put down with him as unsound and therefore have been “marked and avoided” by the church in general and the papers no longer allow him space to write his views and the pulpits are closed to him, and his men, who live in Louisville, and most schools will not allow him to enjoy their fellowship. Now why this when others who believe very much as he and his defenders do and men who defend him and condemn those of us who oppose him, are allowed free access to all our papers, except a very few, to our pulpits, and are kept in our schools and are influencing the youth of to day, in the church, in the wrong direction.

Why is it that if you wish to condemn “premillennialism” you must write and quote from R. H. Boll, or one of his “Louisville buddies,” and are not allowed to quote from, nor call the names of, others in the church who are premillennialist and whose writings we have and can produce and no man will deny its being premillennial? Now again I press the question, if this subject is a vital one, then why expose some and “cover-up” others. Any man who will expose “one man” and cause him to be “marked” because of his “premillennial” views and will “defend and cover up” another, must be charged by me in my way of thinking, as unfair to the man exposed, unfair to the truth, and in it, not from a matter of “principle” but because it is “popular in the church” at this time for a man to “jump on a certain group.” If not, why not “want to know who the premillennialists are among us to day and expose all of them?”

Any paper that will not let you discuss one man’s premillennial views and name the man but will allow you to quote and expose another’s views and call his name, is, from my view point, not sound in the faith and the love of the truth. He must think it is better from the publicity standpoint and therefore a better financial scheme. My way of thinking is this, if there is nothing to this “fight over the kingdom issue” then for heaven’s sake let us stop it, but if it is vital, and you know it is, then let us be fair and discuss all who are guilty. Now just point out to me wherein I am wrong at this point. The trouble in this entire affair is that we have become “loyal to men” instead of the truth. We have become “loyal to institutions” instead of the church, and we fight only those whom we do not love personally and those whom we think can be criticised without harming us in the discussion of the subject.

R. H. Boll and his men, who are openly with him in Louisville, are not the men to day who are harming the church, so much, for they have been “marked and set aside,” but it is that group of men in our institutions who have books, letters, articles, and students, who tell you that they are premillennial. It is that group that is not so openly defending Boll but who are trying to eat from both sides, that is causing our trouble to day. I could call them by name but if I did this article I am sure would never see the light of day.

Now brethren what is the matter? Really are we serious about this thing or are we just fooling ourselves? I assure you that I want the love of all men in and out of the church and I am not in this fight over the kingdom question just to be fighting over something. You make enemies, divide congregations, split states, and the work of our Lord is hindered in this fight over “premillennialism.” My point in this is, if there is nothing to it then for the sake of unity, peace, and love among us all, let us stop it, but if it is vital then let us be no respector of persons and institutions. Why jump on R. H. Boll and his men, and Clinton Davidson, and “mark them” while at the same time we let run loose in our midst the men who believe and teach premillennialism to our children and who run with and keep alive Brother Davidson’s views, and who fight, try to kill, and ruin the influence of those of us who are openly defending the truth against such innovationists as the above. To this question there is but “one” answer and that is, treat all of them alike.

I am ready to take the stand any time and defend publicly all I have said and every accusation that I have ever made against any man or institution and if I am wrong I am willing to admit it, but if I am right then what are you willing to do? How many of our religious papers will open their pages to me, or to any of us, and allow us to publish the articles, and name the men who wrote them, and then expose the article and show the danger of the man being where he is? If you will allow R. H. Boll’s name spread all over your ‘paper why not allow any man’s name spread over your pages if he is a “premillennialist”? If it is the “principle” you are after and not the man, then open your pages and we will “see what we shall see” and this thing can more quickly be brought to the light. I am willing to take the “rap” and run the risk of “living or dying” as a result of such an opportunity. Given this opportunity and you will see the pressure being brought to bear to keep me out, for I have things that will be like a revelation.
We can't always believe what preachers tell us. Many preachers are preaching false doctrine, and in their efforts to uphold false theories and to overthrow the truth, they tell us the strangest things. They become desperate in their desire to find some Scriptural sanction for their teaching, and there is hardly an absurdity that does not come within the reach of what they tell us. So don't always believe what preachers tell us. Too many have made that mistake. Let us examine what they say. Compare it with what the book of God says, and you may find they have not preached the truth. From time to time I want to take a look at some things preachers tell us and see just what they look like.

Recently a Baptist preacher, in an effort to tell us that baptism is not essential to salvation and to "pump all the water (baptism) out of John 3:5," went through the following motion:

"The terms again says plainly, man has been born once and must be born once more; he must have two births to be saved, and only two; one is past, the other is future; verse 5, 'Except a man be born of (both) water and spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God.' Are both the water birth and spirit birth future? Then he should have said in verse 3 man must be born twice more; and he said again, once more. Verse 6, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit,' and to complete the analogy, he could have said that which is born of water is water.

The plain English is the physical birth is a water birth and, no doubt, was so considered by the ancients, and that is exactly what the Savior meant by born of water in verse 5."-J. W. Chandler in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

It is true, as this preacher tells us, that Jesus referred to one future birth in his conversation with Nicodemus. He did not say a man must be born twice more, or again and again, but he said "ye must be born again," once more. However, Jesus did not say a man "must have two births to be saved" and that "one is past, the other is future." This preacher thinks two births are mentioned in John 3:5. The birth of water he thinks is past and the birth of the Spirit is future. But the verse does not mention two births. It is just one birth—a birth "of water and of the Spirit." The plain English is the physical birth is a water birth, and no doubt, was so considered by the ancients, and that is exactly what the Savior meant by born of water in verse 5.—J. W. Chandler in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

This preacher says Jesus referred to one future birth in his conversation with Nicodemus. He did not say a man must be born twice more, or again and again, but he said "ye must be born again," once more. However, Jesus did not say a man "must have two births to be saved" and that "one is past, the other is future." This preacher thinks two births are mentioned in John 3:5. The birth of water he thinks is past and the birth of the Spirit is future. But the verse does not mention two births. It is just one birth—a birth "of water and of the Spirit." The plain English is the physical birth is a water birth, and no doubt, was so considered by the ancients, and that is exactly what the Savior meant by born of water in verse 5.

What the Preachers Tell Us

W. Curtis Portebe

We can't always believe what preachers tell us. Many preachers are preaching false doctrine, and in their efforts to uphold false theories and to overthrow the truth, they tell us the strangest things. They become desperate in their desire to find some Scriptural sanction for their teaching, and there is hardly an absurdity that does not come within the reach of what they tell us. So don't always believe what preachers tell us. Too many have made that mistake. Let us examine what they say. Compare it with what the book of God says, and you may find they have not preached the truth. From time to time I want to take a look at some things preachers tell us and see just what they look like.

Recently a Baptist preacher, in an effort to tell us that baptism is not essential to salvation and to "pump all the water (baptism) out of John 3:5," went through the following motion:

"The terms again says plainly, man has been born once and must be born once more; he must have two births to be saved, and only two; one is past, the other is future; verse 5, 'Except a man be born of (both) water and spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God.' Are both the water birth and spirit birth future? Then he should have said in verse 3 man must be born twice more; and he said again, once more. Verse 6, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit,' and to complete the analogy, he could have said that which is born of water is water.

The plain English is the physical birth is a water birth and, no doubt, was so considered by the ancients, and that is exactly what the Savior meant by born of water in verse 5."-J. W. Chandler in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

It is true, as this preacher tells us, that Jesus referred to one future birth in his conversation with Nicodemus. He did not say a man must be born twice more, or again and again, but he said "ye must be born again," once more. However, Jesus did not say a man "must have two births to be saved" and that "one is past, the other is future." This preacher thinks two births are mentioned in John 3:5. The birth of water he thinks is past and the birth of the Spirit is future. But the verse does not mention two births. It is just one birth—a birth "of water and of the Spirit." The plain English is the physical birth is a water birth and, no doubt, was so considered by the ancients, and that is exactly what the Savior meant by born of water in verse 5. The Lord's language certainly does not embrace any such absurdities. So why try to "pump all the water out of John 3:5"? There are so many other passages in the New Testament that show the necessity of water baptism? I am sure that even a Baptist preacher could find a better form of religious exercise.

Salvation In Christ

The heading of this topic sounds familiar to people who have been accustomed to hearing the gospel preached in its purity. But it is unusual to find this idea coming from the source from which the following quotation is taken. But here is what a preacher tells us in his own words:

"To be in Christ is to be saved; to be out of Christ is to be lost. There is no middle ground."-Paul Goodwin in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

This statement has the real gospel ring. It sounds like preaching done by preachers who adhere strictly to New Testament teaching. This statement of Paul Goodwin reminds me of some statement made by another Paul—the apostle to the Gentiles. He said: "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature." 2 Cor. 5:17. Also he declared: "Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sakes, that they may also obtain the salvation which is in Christ Jesus with eternal glory." 2 Tim. 2:10. Thus the apostle Paul tells us that men do not become new creatures out of Christ—they must "be in Christ" in order to be "new creatures." Likewise men do not obtain salvation out of Christ, for it was his desire that men may "obtain the salvation which is in Christ." This all means, of course, that if a man is out of Christ, he is lost. To be saved he must be "in Christ." Certainly there is "no middle ground"—he is either "in" or "out" of Christ, saved or lost. I am always glad to believe what Baptist preachers tell us if they agree with what inspired men have said, and Mr. Goodwin surely did it this time.

But I wonder if he didn't think what his statement did to Baptist doctrine. Remember now that a man cannot be saved out of Christ. Both of these Pauls agree on that point. "To be out of Christ is to be lost." So "to be saved" one must be "in Christ." A man, however, cannot "be in Christ" unless he "gets into him." And that leads me to ask: How does a man get into Christ? Whatever it takes to put a man 'into Christ' is necessary to his salvation, for he is "out of Christ" till he gets "into him." Do you know what the New Testament says about it? It mentions just one thing that puts a man 'into Christ.' Notice the language of the apostle Paul: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3:27. I wonder if Paul Goodwin will agree with the apostle Paul here. What does he say? "Baptized into Christ." No preacher can find anything else in the New Testament that
is said to put a man into Christ, and since a man cannot be saved out of Christ, he cannot be saved without baptism. If he can be saved without baptism, he can be saved out of Christ, for he cannot get into Christ without baptism. That principle will stand the test. No preacher has ever been able to overthrow it. So this Baptist preacher will have to give up his doctrine of “salvation by faith only.” Faith only does not put a man into Christ—that which puts a man into Christ comes after faith. So this Baptist preacher will have to admit that baptism is essential to salvation or go back on what he tells us.

Then it knocks him out of his “non-essential church” idea. His brethren have always claimed you do not have to belong to the church to be saved—that you are saved out of it. But that idea is blasted now by Mr. Goodwin’s statement, for he says a man must “be in Christ” in order to be saved. But how can a man be in Christ? Certainly by being in his body. We cannot be in the literal, personal body of Christ, but we can “be in his spiritual body.” Paul tells us that his body is the church. Eph. 1:22, 23. So to “be in Christ” is to “be in his body.” But to “be in his body” is to “be in the church.” And since to “be out of Christ” is to be lost, then to “be out of his body, the church, is to be lost.” That puts salvation in the church, right where the New Testament puts it. Read Eph. 5:23: “For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: And he is the savior of the body.” It is an evident statement, for he says a man must “be in Christ” in order to save him without any help. Furthermore, if the Lord “needs no help in saving a soul.” Hence the statement of Paul puts salvation in the church, and Mr. Goodwin’s statement agrees. In this matter he has surely told us the truth, even though he may later tell us something that conflicts with it.

A Clean Sweep

Relative to some “good news” which he “was glad to get” Ben. M. Bogard, Editor of Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, makes the following statement in an issue of his paper:

“Eldrs. Cleates Moore and R. J. Cooper recently held a real revival at Croleys near McKinzie, Tenn. They just about cleaned up all the Methodists, Campbellites and Conventionites—made a clean sweep.”

This sounds more like a “clean up campaign” than it does a “revival.” Evidently a good work was done in cleaning up so many of the ungodly, for very likely all ,the Methodists, Campbellites and Conventionites needed to be “cleaned up.” The Bible, of course, says nothing about these brands of religionists, and any community that is infested with them will be greatly benefited by having them all “cleaned up.” But the report leaves me wondering if the “sweep” was as “clean” as it should have been, for it implies there were Landmarks (Associational) Baptist left. In fact, I gather from the report that this group of religionists was enlarged—that men were “swept” from the Methodist, Campbellite and Convention pile into the Land-Mark (Associational) Baptist pile. That is not a very “clean sweep,” and I cannot see that it helped the community at all, for the same verse of Scripture that authorizes the “Landmark (Associational) Baptists” also indorses the “Methodists, Campbellites and Conventionites.” None of them are mentioned in the Bible and all of them exist (if they do) without divine authority. To make a “clean sweep” as it ought to be made all of these groups should be swept away and a group of Christians left in their place. That does not mean, of course, that these people should be destroyed, but that their unscriptural religious systems should be taken away and the New Testament religion given instead. Then we would have a “clean sweep” that would be worth while.

If we carefully examine what preachers tell us, we will be able to see that often they not only contradict the word of the Lord, but they contradict themselves. In one speech a denominational preacher will say one thing, and in his next sermon he will deny it by telling us something that is in direct conflict with what he formerly said. As proof of this let us take a look at some quotations that follow.

Jesus Saves Without Help

“If we think we must do this or that in order to be saved, then we evidently are not leaving all the saving to the Lord, for we are not fully trusting him, we have not really committed our souls into his keeping, we have not believed in him.

This writer has seen angry men and women leave the house while the preacher was telling this good news (gospel) to the congregation; angry because the Saviour was represented as being a Saviour who needed no help in saving a soul. Man’s pride is insulted by this doctrine. To believe in salvation by grace precludes, yea, destroys, the idea of falling from grace; for if the Lord saves at the start without any help, he will carry on the work without help.”—Ben M. Bogard in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

Before commenting on the above statements, in order that you may see them close together, I want to offer the following quotations from the same source.

“Our preachers must repent * * * and go to work unstintedly and unreservedly for the glory of Christ and the salvation of souls.”—James MacKrell in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

“I have told them, You know that souls have been saved by your preaching!”—James MacKrell in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

“Bro. Smith was saved through the efforts of our Missionary in Hawaii, Brother E. T. Begley, and became a member of the Baptist Church there. Thus we see a fine product of our wonderful missionary.”—Ben M. Bogard in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

Let us now compare these statements. In the first quotation Bogard says we must “leave all the saving to the Lord” and that he had preached that the Lord “needed no help in saving a soul.” Furthermore; that “the Lord saves at the start without any help” and “will carry on the work without help.” Thus it is contended that the Lord saves sinners and keeps children of God saved independent of anything they may do for themselves or of anything that others may do for them. It is all up to the Lord. He saves them “without any help” whatsoever. Man can do absolutely nothing that will help to bring about his own salvation. And no other man can do anything for him that will help in the least, for the Lord “needs no help in saving a soul.” I don’t think there is any danger of anyone misunderstanding the meaning of all this. But the next group of quotations contradicts this. Mr. MacKrell, another Baptist preacher, says that Baptist preachers “must go to work for the salvation of souls” and that he had told some Baptist preachers: “You know that souls have been saved by your preaching.” This is MacKrell against Bogard on the plan of salvation of souls. Bogard says the Lord saves souls “without any help,” but MacKrell says preachers must help the Lord, that they must “work for the salvation of souls.” Also that souls had been saved by their preaching. Hence souls had been saved by the help of preachers. But not only does MacKrell contradict Bogard, Bogard contradicts himself. In the final quotation Bogard refers to a certain man and says: “Bro. Smith was saved through the efforts of our Missionary.” It must be evident, even to a casual reader, that if a man is “saved through the efforts” of some one else, then the Lord did not save him without any help. Furthermore, if the Lord “needs no help in saving a soul” but “saves at the start without
any help,” why have a missionary anyway? Why spend money in sending a missionary to Hawaii or anywhere else? And why maintain a radio broadcast three times daily, as Bogard and MacKrell do in Little Rock, and send out thousands of pieces of literature, at the cost of thousands of dollars each month, when no help can be rendered in the salvation of souls? According to Bogard the Lord needs nothing of the kind, and it is wasted effort, time and money, for they can do nothing that will help in the salvation of any soul. If they can render any service in behalf of the sinner’s salvation, then the Lord does not save without any help. All of this plainly shows the inconsistency of Baptist preachers. Their preaching is self-contradictory.

But what does the New Testament say about it? In Rom. 1:16 Paul said: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.” And in 1 Cor. 1:21 we read this from the same inspired writer: “It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.” It is not a question of what the Lord is able to do. I would not undertake to limit his power. But what does the New Testament say? In Rom. 1:16 Paul said: “For I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth; to the Jew first, and also to the Greek.”

And in 1 Cor. 1:21 we read this from the same inspired writer: “It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe.” It is not a question of what the Lord is able to do. I would not undertake to limit his power. If it had pleased him, he could have saved men without the gospel, but it did not please him to do so. Such was not his plan: Hence the Lord is not able to save souls without help and at the same time have the gospel as his power to save, for Jesus is not personally preaching the gospel to men. That is being done by preachers, by human beings, and “by the foolishness of preaching” it pleased God to save men. No man can be saved without the gospel, but the gospel never reaches any man today except through the agency of some other human being. It must come to him in either written or spoken form. Do these statements have to do with the salvation of a sinner? According to Bogard, they do not, for the “Lord saves at the start without any help.” Well, then, do they have to do with the salvation of the child of God? No, they cannot refer to that either, if Bogard’s position is correct, for the Lord not only saves the sinner without help but he will “carry on the work without help.” So I am curious to know just how the gospel is the “power of God unto salvation” and how the Lord saves men “by the foolishness of preaching.” Maybe Bogard will see fit to tell us sometime; or if he does not, perhaps some of his preaching brethren will. Surely some of them should be able to work this out or quit preaching.

When writing to the Corinthian brethren Paul said: “I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.” 1 Cor. 9:22, And James agreed with this in the following language: “Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death.” Jas. 5:20. Both of these inspired writers knew they might be of some help in saving men. Certainly they recognized Jesus as the Saviour, and they made no effort to detract from that fact, but they knew that the Savior used instruments and means to accomplish the salvation of souls. And they understood that men could serve as such instruments and that the Lord did not save men “without any help.” Jesus himself recognized this principle when he gave Paul his commission to the Gentiles. He said: “Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee, to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me.” Acts 26:17, 18. It is too bad that blundering Ben Bogard was not there to tell the Lord that he “needed no help” in “turning men from darkness to light,” or “from the power of Satan unto God.” And since he could “save from the start without any help,” he need not send Paul “to open their eyes.” All of that should be left to the Lord, according to Bogard; but it was not, according to Jesus.

I note also that Bogard said in our first quotation from him: “If we think we must do this or that in order to be saved * * we have not believed in” the Lord. Of course, Jesus said: “Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.” Mat. 7:21. Yet if a man even thinks he must do what the Lord said, that is evidence that he does not even believe in the Lord. The man who really “trust in Jesus,” according to Bogard, is the man who thinks he can ignore what Jesus said and be saved anyway. In other words, if you want infallible proof that you believe in Jesus, then brazenly deny what he says. That’s the best sort of evidence, according to my friend. We must not think we must “do this or that” in order to be saved. However, Paul wrote to Timothy after this fashion: “Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine: continue in them: for is doing this thou shalt both save thyself, and them that hear thee.” 1 Tim. 4:16. Do you “think” that Paul was right in telling Timothy what he did? Do you think that Timothy could be saved in “doing this” (what Paul told him)? Paul said so, but if you “think” he was right about it, Bogard says you “have not believed” in the Lord. Of course, Paul nor Timothy had ever believed in the Lord; according to Bogard, for he said: “If we think we must do this or that in order to be saved, then we evidently are not leaving all the saving to the Lord, we are not fully trusting him, we have not really committed our souls into his keeping, we have not believed in him.” Which will you take—Bogard or Paul? Paul, the great-gospel preacher and apostles to the Gentiles, tells us one thing; Bogard, the great Baptist preacher and debater, tells us something else. We cannot believe what both of them tell us about this. So I think I’ll just string along with Paul. You may take Bogard, if you so desire, but I have shown you that he contradicts himself and Paul too.
SOME STARTLING ADMISSIONS
D. H. HADWIN

On the cover page of the Christian Standard, December 4, 1943, is the following announcement: 'The management of the Standard Publishing Company desires to announce that beginning January 1 there will be a very definite change in the policy and character of the Christian Standard. Instead of continuing chiefly as a home paper of general religious information and instruction, we shall offer this journal as a rallying center for all who believe implicitly in the authority of Christ as revealed to us in the divinely inspired New Testament Scriptures.

"It will become: First, a vigorous proclaimer and advocate of New Testament doctrine and life, and of the New Testament policy in which once we were a great united brotherhood.

"Second, it will as vigorously protest every instance of the substitution of human expediency for the authority of Christ. It will help all who are like-minded to put a stop to misrepresentations of the historic position of our movement which is founded on His authority.

"Where the Book speaks, we shall not tolerate the substitution of expediency in the name of disciples of Christ to go unrebuked.

"Where the Book is silent, we shall champion the right of any Christian to uphold his own opinion in a Christian spirit.

"We shall devote the Christian Standard in the months to come to this issue which is as widespread as Christendom and which is today troubling every Bible-loving people: Will you follow the orders of Christ or the expediencies offered by ambitious men?"

The Christian Standard, as you may know, is the leading publication among the conservative element of the digressives. The above announcement is interesting to us especially because of the startling admission that are made therein. This announcement is an admission that the Standard has not been "a vigorous proclaimer and advocate of New Testament doctrine and life, and of the New Testament policy in which once we were a great united brotherhood."

No wonder the Christian Church (or Disciples of Christ) has continued headlong in its departure from "New Testament doctrine and life," when its leaders have failed to vigorously champion these things. Too late, they begin to see the need for some vigorous action. I say "too late" because they have departed too far from the New Testament position ever to return. They are too involved in their "human expediencies" to ever return to the New Testament pattern of things.

This announcement is also an admission that there have been "substitutions of human expediencies for the authority of Christ" among them. They now declare that they will "vigorously protest every instance of the substitution of human expediency for the authority of Christ." I wonder just how far they will go in their determination?

They have tried to justify their use of instrumental music in the worship on the ground of expediency. Will they now begin a "vigorou protest" against it? I wonder. We have the authority of Christ for singing in the worship. But where is the authority of Christ for instrumental music in the worship? They cannot shrug their shoulders and say that this is a matter of indifference, for this, and similar human expediencies, have caused division in what was once "a great united brotherhood."

They have sought to justify their missionary societies, and kindred organizations, on the basis of expediency. Will they now begin a "vigorou protest" against all such organizations that have been set up to do the work of the church? It is my opinion that they have no intention of doing so. It is my opinion that they will continue to do nothing in regard to the fundamental issues that have divided what was once "a great united brotherhood."

The church itself is the organization that God called into existence to accomplish His purpose in the world. He instituted no suborganizations nor super-organizations to do His work. Paul made this very clear in Eph. 3:10-11, when he said, "to the intent that now unto the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places might be made known through the church the manifold wisdom of God, according to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord."

The largest (and the smallest) unit of organization in the New Testament is the local church. The officials of this organization are clearly defined, and their qualifications are carefully set forth in the third chapter of 1 Timothy. Where is "the authority of Christ" for the officers of a missionary society? We shall all watch with interest to see when the Christian Standard begins to "vigorously protest" this "substitution of human expediency for the authority of Christ."

How can they justify their disgusting practice of using all kinds of money-raising schemes to finance their work, except on the ground of expediency? They do not have "the authority of Christ" for such practices. The only way that the New Testament church was financed was by giving. They gave as they were prospered upon the first day of the week. Since there is no other method taught in the New Testament for financing the church than giving, all other methods must be mere human expediences. And the Christian Standard says that it will now "vigorously protest every instance of the substitution of human expediency for the authority of Christ." We shall wait and see.

They will no doubt say, "We did not have such things in mind as instrumental music, missionary societies, money-raising schemes, etc., when we announced our change in policy." But the language that they have used in their announcement certainly puts them on the spot. If they will carry their announced intention to its logical conclusion, they will have launched a real unity movement. If they are going to "vigorously protest every instance of the substitution of human expediency for the authority of Christ," they must protest against the things mentioned above. Will they do it? It is my opinion that they will not even attempt it.

Again, they say, "We shall devote the Christian Standard in the months to come to this issue which is as widespread as Christendom and which is today troubling every Bible-loving people: Will you follow the orders of Christ or the expediencies offered by ambitious men?"

This is a stirring challenge, but it is also an admission that their people have not followed the orders of Christ, but the expediencies offered by ambitious men. Missionary societies were not brought into existence because men were following the orders of Christ. They were substitutes for the New Testament plan, offered by ambitious men. This is also true of instrumental music, choirs, etc. It is likewise true in regard to the use of money-raising schemes to finance the work of the church. If we "speak where the Book speaks, and are silent where the Book is silent," all such expediencies of ambitious men must go.
THE PREACHER - HIS WORK - HIS PAY - HIS WIFE

ALLEN E. JOHNSON

I. HIS WORK

The preacher's work is preaching; or as W. E. Brightwell put it a few years ago, "some Christians preach." Some ways of doing things become crystallized in the minds of some brethren, and so becomes an "unwritten law." To show you what I mean, I saw an advertisement in one of our religious papers from a large church for a preacher to do mission work. It mentioned nothing about whether he should be a good preacher, nothing concerning his soundness or success in proclaiming the word, but emphasized that he must not be one who "merely held services, but who was unafraid to go from house to house." I came to the conclusion that they didn't want me, but it made me picture the kind of man they had in mind. They didn't want a preacher, they wanted a "door bell ringer" or, as the case would be in my country, a "door knocker." I would denominate him a "peddler." Is this the way to do mission work? Going up one side of the street and down the other, "knocking doors" and "sticking your foot in the door" when the occupant is about to close it in your face? Well, that seems to be about the idea conveyed in that ad, and the idea that a lot of brethren have about it.

The Jehovah's Witness sect, the Mormons, the Adventists and others "have made themselves and their religious beliefs obnoxious to the majority of citizens in my part of the country by such methods. No preacher is averse to doing house to house work if the people in those houses where he goes is interested in learning the truth; and the great preacher Paul did some house to house work in Ephesus, as he reminded the elders in Acts 20:20; but I am also certain that he did not make himself obnoxious as the above mentioned sects have done, and which some of the brethren insist on doing.

Spreading the gospel is a dignified work. You must obtain and hold the respect of the people you are endeavoring to teach or you fail. The preacher who goes into a new field must gain the confidence and respect of the people by conducting himself in a manner befitting the gospel of Christ, and he cannot do it by the "peddler" method, at least, not in my country. The representative of Jesus Christ who brings to a community the force that is "God's power unto salvation," and that has changed the course of powerful nations, must not lessen the force of that power by appearing as a common house to house peddler.

II. HIS PAY

The preacher of days gone by did not preach much on giving lest someone misunderstand his motive and say he was preaching for money. This attitude toward the money question in the church, and particularly as it applies to paying the preacher, still largely influences churches. It has become an "unwritten law" with many that paying the preacher is a subject not to be mentioned out loud until the very last thing, and then the first suggestion made by some of the leaders is the one acted upon. It is not my intention to wax eloquent nor dogmatic on the proposition, but I believe the subject needs an occasional "airing."

What is the basis for paying a preacher? Some brethren say: "Pay him all we can." Another says: "I think he should be paid about the average salary received by the members of the congregation employing him." Still others say: "Pay him a living wage." There are possibly others, but that will suffice. Since the preacher has no "bargaining agent" and he is expected to "keep silent in the church" on that matter, then who decides the matter and how? That the present system is haphazard and unbusinesslike, and many times, unjust, most preachers can verify. It is not a question of making money, for no conscientious man enters the ministry with that in mind. One sister told me one time, "I don't care especially how I look, but I want my preacher to always look nice." Perhaps not too many would express themselves that way, but the sentiment is universal. But can a preacher "look nice," pay his debts (which is a hard and fast requirement) and generally be a "credit to the church" on the general salary scale now prevailing?

Then, there is another thing which is a direct result of this haphazard system: many times churches that I know have received requests from preachers who have given their lives to the ministry of the word, but who are old, no longer able to preach, the churches do not want them; they have no way of making a living, but they need some money for their remaining needs. Did it ever occur to you why these men are in that condition? In their active years they were paid according to our present method. But some brother comes forward and says, "Why, the Lord will take care of those things. What are you worrying about?" The Lord takes care of our daily needs—I believe the Bible teaches that—but the Lord has also said, "If any will not work, neither let him eat." (2 Thess. 3:10) And, "The laborer is worthy of his hire."

The apostle Paul has something to say on this question in connection with his work at Corinth: "My defense to them that examine me is this, Have we no right to eat and drink, Have we no right to lead about a wife that is a believer, even as the rest of the apostles, and the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas? Or I only and Barnabas, have we not a right to forbear working? What soldier over serveth at his own charges? Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not the fruit thereof? Or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? Do I speak these things after the manner of men? or saith not the law also the same? For it is written in the law of Moses, Thou shalt not muzelle the ox when he treadeth out the corn. Is it for the oxen that God careth, or saith he it assuredly for our sake? Yea, for our sake it is written: because he that ploweth ought to plow in hope, and he that thresheth, to thresh in hope of partaking. If we sowed unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your carnal things? If others partake of this right over you, do not we yet more?" Nevertheless we did not use this right; but we bear all things, that we may cause no hindrance to the gospel of Christ. Know ye not that they that minister about sacred things...
eat of the things of the temple, and that they wait upon the altar have their portion with the altar? Even so did the Lord ordain that they that proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel." (I Cor. 9:3-14).

That Paul did not use the right "to live of the gospel" at Corinth, does not mean that he didn’t have it. He had a special reason for not using it at that time, as the following language from his second letter shows: "Or did I commit a sin in abasing myself that ye might be exalted, because I preached to you the gospel of God for nought? I robbed other churches, taking wages of them that I might minister unto you; and when I was present with you and was in want, I was not a burden on any man; for the brethren, when they came from Macedonia, supplied the measure of my want; and in everything I kept myself from being burdensome unto you, and so will I keep myself." (2 Cor. 11:7-9).

Also bearing on the same subject of his support while at Corinth he said: "For what is there wherein ye were made inferior to the rest of the churches, except it be that I myself was not a burden to you? Forgive me this wrong," (2 Cor. 12:13).

This is sufficient from God’s word to all who believe and sincerely strive to practice it. Paul had the "right" to expect a support from the Corinthians; Barnabas had the same "right." His even so did the Lord ordain that they that proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel" is final on the proposition. And it should not be a makeshift or a "get by" sort of measure, as so often happens. I notice many preachers are "muzzled" in the preaching, for they are obliged to try to make an inadequate salary stretch out in an endeavor to cover all expenses.

Another thing connected with the question is this: when the time comes to pay the preacher, the treasurer will apologize for the smallness of the check by some thing like this, "we had to put a new roof on the building this year," or, "we had to redecorate the building—it was so run down people were ashamed to come;" or, "the plumbing froze up and burst last winter and we had a big plumbing bill," or, "we are not raising your salary this year, because we talked it over in business meeting and decided that you would have to pay it out in income tax anyway." Perhaps there are other excuses—you’ve heard them. The preachers are many who have paid for the meeting, built, or helped build church buildings and redecorated them; and as respects the brethren withholding my income tax, just pay me and I’ll pay my own income tax and get the credit for it! Also give me a chance to redecorate church buildings, and do mission work of my own accord. Who likes to make forced donations anyway?

I have nothing personally to complain of but I speak in behalf of those who are underpaid, and because churches need to have “fruit that may abound to your account. I asked him if they were figuring on employing her. He gave me a grieved look and said nothing. Several years ago I was talking the matter of employing me over with a group of elders in a certain church in the West. Among other questions they asked me was this: "Can your wife do personal work?" I asked them in return, "Do you want to hire her, too?" Naturally they didn’t want me—and I didn’t want them to have me.

Now I just wonder if a preacher has the right "to lead about a wife that is a believer . . .” only on condition that she is a good personal worker or that her services are valuable to the church employing him? The younger preachers ought to be informed of this so they can include the question in their marriage proposals. The fact of the matter is that brethren have imposed a condition where the Scriptures have not. It is "chimney corner scripture” that a preacher’s children are meaner than other children. Of course, they get most of their “meanness” from running with the children of the brethren. Granting it to be true, wouldn’t it be the fault of the brethren to a large extent, for expecting the preacher’s wife, the mother of his children and the keeper of his home, to give the greater portion of her time to public work to the neglect of her home and children?

Is the preacher’s wife obligated to do more personal work than any other sister just because she is a preacher’s wife? Evidently not, for I read of no such requirement in the Bible. Then why bind where the Bible has not bound? Another thing—the preacher’s wife has less time, as a rule, than the other women in the church. A lot of preachers coming through town stop at her house to be fed and housed; and sometimes he brings his family along: all of the "wandering minstrels." wind up at her house for the same free meals and beds. Then there are nearly always several thoughtless sisters in the congregation who seem to think they are at “mama’s” house when they visit her, for they turn their youngsters loose on the house while they talk. When they leave the house is a wreck and must be cleaned again. In many places her house is used by the sisters as a “powder room,” especially if it happens to be the “parsonage.” All of which adds up to the fact that she has more work to do in her house than most women in the church. Couple that up with answering the telephone all day and keeping down discord among the women by keeping them busy, and she has more than one woman can do.

The truth of the matter is that the place of the preacher’s wife is in her home, taking care of it and her children just like any other woman in the church: neither should she be expected to do more than her individual part of the visiting.

Another angle to the case comes in just here—the “Mrs. Preacher” who seems to think that she should have a hand in all the affairs of the congregation. She wants to teach, on Lord’s day and through the week—the Ladies Bible class, and as many other classes as she can. Now it is all right for “Mrs. Preacher” to teach, with scriptural restrictions, if she is qualified and the elders of the church want her to. But there are instances where she has been known to want to teach regardless of the wishes of the elders and the fitness of things. Perhaps, she wouldn’t be so hard to control, if she were not pushed by her husband who features her as a great “asset” to his ministry. There is nothing wrong with a preacher’s wife assisting him in his work, but when she decides to run the preacher and the church by “remote control,” and sometimes by control not so remote, the elders should take a hand. They usually do.
THE CHRISTIAN AND CARNAL WAR
T. B. WILKINSON

During the first world war I read many articles from brethren on both side of the war question, and I have been a close reader of such articles since the present war came up, and I think I was in a position at all times to consider what I read without the least bias towards either side. Now after about thirty years of such reading, and after long and careful study of the subject, I have some definite conclusions which I think the New Testament supports.

I know that the Christian armor is not carnal, and the Lord never expected us to use a carnal sword to advance the cause of his kingdom. As a Christian soldier I am to use the sword of the Spirit and no other, for the cause for which we fight can be advanced in no other way. But every Christian is also a citizen in some human government which governs the Lord, "ordained" for the good of mankind, and, while the Lord never placed a carnal sword in His spiritual kingdom, he did give it to civil government, and for a definite and specific purpose. That purpose is to maintain government, restrain evil, and to avenge wrongs. As a citizen of the human government I am commanded to "be in subjection to the powers that be", and obey them who have in the rule over me for righteousness sake.

"Whosoever resisted the power resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For rulers are not a terror to good works but to evil .... For he is the minister of God to thee for good, but thou do evil be afraid for he beareth not the sword in vain. For he is the minister of God, a revenger of wrath upon him who doeth evil". Read the entire thirteenth chapter of Romans which treats on our relationship to civil governments.

We see then a line of duties which we owe to our civil government as well as duties which we owe to God. They are not the same in every respect, and their objectives are reached in different ways. But they should not conflict, and will not unless some on one side of the line goes wrong. Either the civil government requires more of us than the Lord has entrusted to them, or we are unwilling to give it as much as the Lord demands of us. In this latter case we know what the penalty will be, Paul tells us in so many words, "he that resisteth the powers resisteth the ordinance of God", and such will receive to themselves damnation.

In the hands of legally constituted civil powers the Lord ordained the use of the carnal sword, therefore he gave it to them. Logically this restricts it to them, and the State alone has the right to use the sword, or have it used, which is the only way it can use it. No clique, clan, mob, or individual, has the right to use it, and to assume such a right they must constitute themselves judge, jury, and executioner, which involves too much authority. The command, Thou shalt not kill, will cover all such uses of the sword, and make them unlawful. The sword belongs exclusively to the State, and any other use of it is unlawful.

The evil doers might arise from inside of the State or they might be an outside power which attacks for the purpose of plunder, robbery, and murder. We have constituted officials in each State, peace officers of various kinds, judges, juries, sheriffs, marshalls, etc., and for special occasions when more is necessary we have a regular army of militiamen, whose duties require them to maintain order, apprehend criminals, protect the lives of the people, and execute the laws. In case of aggression from a foreign power something often becomes necessary more than the protections I have mentioned, the country is forced to raise a great army and go to war, and put the entire country on a war footing.

It would be foolish to argue that there are no such nations since we know that our country is right now fighting for its life and the lives and property of its people from just such an aggressor nation. Informed people know this is true, and uninformed people should not rush into print. The cause of this war, and the infamy of Pearl Harbor are too well known to waste time arguing it.

After Pearl Harbor there was nothing our country could do but fight, or surrender our country and people to the murderers and robbers. They had in their hands a sword which the Lord had given to our rulers for the punishment of just such criminals and murderers as the Japs were. Had our government failed to us it, not only would it have been a disaster for our country and people, and a crime against all civilization, but also it would have failed the Lord who gave it the sword for that very purpose. It is no answer to this argument to say that the Lord also gave Japan a sword, the Lord never gave any country a sword to use in aggression, and robbery, and murder, but only to suppress, and punish such crimes.

God only gave the sword to the nations for a single purpose, and that purpose I have already stated. If you cannot see a difference between the use Japan is making of the sword, and the use our country is making of it, you are to be pitied, and I do not think arguments will do you much good. The man who places our soldier boys on the same plane with Japanese savages and murderers needs information of the most primary kind, and I waste no time on such hopeless cases.

After Pearl Harbor our country had to fight or surrender a helpless people which God had entrusted to it to the most ruthless and cruel band of international bandits and cutthroats known in history. They delight in murder among helpless and innocent people, especially women and children, and Germany is no better. Robbery, and murder, ruthless destruction and burning of property, women ravished, and their children murdered before their eyes to get rid of them, that is the kind of thing our nation is called upon to resist. Should it use the sword God placed in its hands since that is the only kind of force that can succeed?

Do you say such things never could happen over here? There is only one possible thing to keep it from happening, and that is the sword which God placed in the hands of our nation. Pacifism will not stop them, we tried that too long before Pearl Harbor. Prayers will not stop them, they refuse to recognize our God, and deny him, and worship their son of heaven. The Lord will not stop them unless we are willing to use the means he has placed in our hands for that purpose, and if we refuse to use the means He has given, our prayers would be vain.

God will only hear our prayers when we have used all the means he has placed at our disposal, and He will only give us more strength when we have used all that he has given us. I like the words of that song, Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition, and that other, Coming in on a wing and a prayer. God expects us to use all that he has given us, and when we reach the limits of our power he will supply all we need if our cause is a righteous one.

Do you argue that our country should use the sword in mutual defense but should not require Christians to bear arms. I think the whole argument hinges right on the single point, should our country have gone to war with Japan and Germany? If it should then the obligation is as
much upon one citizen as upon another, everything else being equal. Are not Christians citizens of the country and equal partakers of the benefits and blessings of Citizenship? Shall they become sponges, and bums, in the country in which they live, owing it no "Honor to whom honor is due, fear to whom fear, custom to whom custom, tribute to whom tribute is due, fear to whom fear, custom to whom custom, tribute"? If God gave the sword to the State for this purpose to punish evil doers, can Christians fulfill their duties to the country if they refuse their help?

If the defense of the lives and property of Peaceful citizens from robbers and murderers was not the purpose of God when he ordained the sword, then what was that purpose? Why did he give the sword to the State if it is not to be raised against such ruthless criminals as Japan and Germany? "He beareth not the sword in vain for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil."

To quote, Thou shalt not kill, as an excuse for not helping your country in perils like those we now face displays a weakness that is deplorable in men who claim to know enough to be a Christian. The same God who said, "Thou shalt not kill, provided the death sentence for some twenty different offenses under the law. Who did he expect to execute those sentences? How could they do it without killings? The "powers that be" were to execute those sentences under due process of law. Did God contradict himself in his laws? Such arguments require capital punishment in a number of different offenses. If a nation were of this world then would my kingdom were of this world then would my

That the Lord ordained the use of the carnal sword in civil government is easily established from both the Old and New Testament. Under the law the giving of statutes requiring capital punishment in a number of different offenses implies the use of the sword in the hands of the "powers that be," whoever those powers might be whose duty it was to uphold the law, "For there is no power but of God, for the powers that be are ordained of God." We can't argue that question with the inspired apostle, and unless we do the point is settled.

Perhaps the oft quoted, and badly misunderstood, and misapplied passage from the Savior himself is all the proof we should require. "My kingdom is not of this world, if my kingdom were of this world then would my disciples fight. That I should not be delivered unto thee". He did not mean to teach that there are not some kingdoms which are of this world, and rightly so, for he Himself had taught his own disciples to render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things which are God's. He did not seem to think there should be any conflict, and his own language clearly declares that if his kingdom had been of that kind his disciples would have been taught to fight for him.

He came to set up a different kind of kingdom, one above all such kingdoms, and which should be over all of them. But he never hinted that man could live without such organized government, or should live without them, and just so long as men live in the world there will be civil government, and some will be good and some bad, perhaps. God will bless and help the righteous rulers, and we are taught to pray for them, and be in subjection to them, and therefore we should work as we pray, for we should work to bring about an answer to our prayers.

"If my kingdom were of this world then would my disciples fight." That one passage settles the Christian attitude toward wars of the kind our country is fighting right now. We are citizens of our country, we owe it all we have, and when it is the subject of wrongful attack the Master has made it our duty to fight. What else can his language possibly mean?

I think the whole proposition settles around a single question, Is a nation ever justified in going to war for any cause? Then there is another that is related in an essential way, are Christians citizens of the nation in which they live? and do they owe it the same allegiance that other citizens do? Both of these questions can only be answered in the affirmative in the clear light of New Testament teaching. That can only mean that when a nation is justified in taking up the sword, its citizens, including Christians, are likewise justified in using it. Christians are not just part citizens of their country, they are full citizens. Whatever legitimate citizenship involves, Christians owe that to their country, and must give it.

This would only involve the use of the sword for the purpose for which the Lord ordained it, or gave it to the civil government. He did not give it for the purpose of aggression, robbery, or murder, but for the avenging of just such crimes when committed by others. If a nation is engaged in a war of aggression a Christian can not help in it without partaking of their nation's sins, and hence would become proper subjects for punishment themselves. I have heard something about one Christian killing another, or brethren fighting against each other, in wars. Some wars, maybe, but not in the present war. If you are a Christian boy in the army of Uncle Sam I don't think you need to worry much about your bullet hitting some Christian brother in the Japanese army, or in the German army. If they ever had been, the cause in which they are fighting would be enough to condemn them.

Christians don't fight wars of aggression, and they do not rob, and murder, and burn down homes ruthlessly, or ravish innocent women, and kill their children like rabbits just to watch them kick. They don't bomb hospitals, and hospital ships, and sink them with wounded soldiers, or commit any of the horrors unnecessary to the winning of the war, and the restoration of peace to the world.

WANT TO BE A DOCTOR?

I am in receipt of literature from the "American Bible College" of Detroit, Mich., and Wilmington, Del., offering honorary doctor of divinity degrees. They state that they have selected ten "ministers of the church of Christ" for this honorary Degree this year and, of course, I am one of the ten. It very definitely states that there is no obligation of any kind upon the recipient but of course ample opportunity is given for the "honored one" to make a "love" offering. They state that since the cost of "college degree parchment" and "engraving and printing" has increased considerably, they (the board of trustees) would appreciate it if I would send $5.00 to cover the cost of that. A good degree should be worth at least that much! But I am afraid they might cut the price some day. I would hate to think I had paid $5.00 for it when it might have been had a little later for $3.98. Looks like I am on someone's "sucker list." I would like to know how many of "our preachers" got this thing. I would almost venture the guess that somewhere in the line-up they will sell one. Such things need to be exposed. I wonder if one of "our" colleges ever sold one? This might be a good way for them to raise money.-Loyd L. Smith, Lawton, Okla.
A Conscientious Objector to This

G. K. WALLACE

Recently a Dr. Dakin, sometime Bishop of the Methodist Church, was in Kansas City as a representative of the Conscientious Objectors Camps and asked to see me. Dr. Dakin is from Washington D. C. The following is the story as he told it to me:

"In the last war the government made very little provision for the conscientious objectors who were not members of the 'historic peace churches.' Men were drafted and turned over to the army and the army proceeded to make soldiers of them, whether they liked it or not. Many of them were court martialed, and imprisoned for long terms. As our government faced a new war this situation arose: the three 'Historic Peace Churches' went to General Lewis B. Hershey and asked permission to take care of all their boys. They were told by General Hershey that they could provide for camps for their conscientious objectors if they would take all conscientious objectors. This was objected to but General Hershey said, "If I can't have all or none, then these three churches through their leaders said, 'We will take all.'"

"When these three churches, the Quakers, the Mennonites and the German Baptist (or Brethren) began this work they found the task was larger than they expected. Too many came from other churches. You people of the Church of Christ now have one hundred boys in these camps. The total cost for taking care of your boys from January 1, 1945 to December 31, 1945 was $36,680. This has been paid $12,015. Seventy-five percent of this was paid by parents of the boys in camps. Thus about $3,000.00 has been raised by your churches. Your responsibility to these churches who assumed this task is now about $36,608.00. I recently visited G. H. P. Showalter, B. C. Goodpasture, and A. M. Burton, one of your rich members. Mr. Goodpasture had the church of which he is pastor take up a collection. They gave in $500.00. The Catholics now operate two of these Camps. These boys are all under church leadership. Boys placed in these Camps will be preserved for democracy and developed for leadership in the church.

There are four places to which you may send your conscientious objector: 1. The Fellowship of Reconciliation; 2. The American Friends Service Company; 3. The Brethren Service Company; 4. The Mennonite Central Committee."

Now in view of the foregoing I would like to ask some questions. When Brother Goodpasture and the church for which he worships took up the collection for $500.00 to which place did they send the money-the Catholics, Mennonites, Quakers or the German Baptists?

Every year the Salvation Army promotes a big Christmas dinner. This is an affair of the Salvation Army, without any suggestion on the part of the churches of Christ. When the job gets too big more folks come to dinner than they can feed that station sent a woman on one street corner to ring the bell for Christmas dinner, and a man on another to beat a tambourine, and beg for money.

Now brethren, if it is right for me to send money to the Catholics and German Baptist Quakers and Mennonites to feed certain folk why would it be wrong for me to give to the Salvation Army?

No one asked these "Historic Peace Churches" to assume this obligation. They contracted a big debt and are now asking the churches of Christ to pay it. You will please excuse me; I am a conscientious objector to giving money to German Baptists, Quakers, Mennonites and the Catholics. I even object to giving it to the Salvation Army. When any of them run a deficit they need not ask me to help pay it. A certain paper in Dallas may raise the money and a certain church or "rich members" in Nashville may pay their bills, but excuse me.

I am a conscientious objector to doing charity work through the Pope. I am a conscientious objector to making donations to the Mennonites, Quakers, and the German Baptists.

The supreme need of our time is confidence in the Bible as the word of God. Let us return to the suggestion that if the Bible we have is not the truth of God, we do not have it. What can we substitute for it? Critics exalt the classics and talk volubly about science, literature, art and culture. "The world through its wisdom knew not God" and knows not God. Science cannot settle the question of the ultimate in human existence and eternal hope. The best that there is in the Bible, as art and culture has been inspired by the Bible. Without the Bible the best of it could not have been. It is true of the best in our civilization. It follows that the best can be attained only by taking the Bible without reservation. A return to the Bible is a return to God. We need the God of the Bible, the Christ of the Bible, the church of the Bible and the salvation the Bible offers. We suffer an eternal loss without these. This is not bibliolatry, it is the happy union of reason and faith.