This is not the sort of story you are likely to expect from such a title. It involves a Baptist major, of a Chaplain's Corps, who "stepped off a troop transport at one of our bases in Alaska." At the very first opportunity, he set out to see the city. What do you suppose was the first object of his search? A Baptist church, of course. Now, good Baptists are like that, and I mean it as a compliment. If a man is a Baptist and sincere in the matter, you would expect him to look for a Baptist church if circumstances wafted him into a strange and far-away part of the world.

On the same principles, if a man is a Christian without being a Baptist or anything else of a like partisan nature, and even Baptists admit that he can be, then he would be interested in finding a church where "the disciples" "were gathered together to break bread" "upon the first day of the week" and to perform other acts of worship ordained by the Lord, and that without aid or interference from Baptist usage and things of that sort. He would feel a sense of loss if he failed in his search and would diligently go about to remedy the situation. Finding a Baptist church would not satisfy him at all.

But this story has to do with a search for "a Baptist church" in a strange city in Alaska. I am not calloused enough to feel no sympathy for the brother in the disappointment he encountered. He was told that "We don't have Baptists in Alaska." You can only imagine how that humiliated a Baptist preacher with the rank of Major in the Army of the United States! Baptists are a proud people and the dyed-in-the-wool ones are persistent to the very brink of obstinacy. Drop one of this sort into a place where there is none, or any where else in the world at the time, but if that bothered Paul any he said nothing about it. If he ever made a vow to establish or organize a Baptist church if he ever was found in a place where there was none, there is no record of it in anything he ever wrote or that contemporaries wrote about him. Luke certainly does not mention his being stranded in a strange city and felt a sense of loss. It is said that "his spirit was stirred within him as he beheld the city full of idols." There was no Baptist church there, or any where else in the world at the time, but if that bothered Paul any he said nothing about it. If he ever made a vow to establish or organize a Baptist church if he ever was found in a place where there was none, there is no record of it in anything he ever wrote or that contemporaries wrote about him. Luke certainly does not mention it. He did get busy, disputed with certain ones he encountered and others who encountered him and it resulted in his making a very notable speech to a notable gathering. That speech is on record in the 17th chapter of Acts. It deals with creation, man's duty to seek God, the necessity of repentance, the resurrection of the dead and the judgment. Some men and a woman believed, but there was no outstanding triumph in Athens. There is a significant absence of any mention of Baptists and Baptist churches in the inspired record of Paul's work and in his writings. Baptist history simply does not go back that far. Had this zealous Baptist Major been in Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth or in any other great center of gospel activity in the days when Paul was active he would have been "lost without a Baptist church to attend" because a careful reading of the New Testament reveals not one. Even the name is conspicuously absent. Even in this late day when Bibles are circulated by the millions in hundreds of languages and the readers of them are myriads, nobody can find the Baptist church in the Bible but Baptists and it is generally conceded that they qualify as prejudiced witnesses on this point. Methodists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians and even friendly sinners can't find it, but Baptists can see it spread all over the pages of holy writ. It is an interesting and somewhat disquieting phenomenon. Take a Methodist, for instance, if Jesus says: "suffer the children to come to me," takes them in his arms and blesses them, he has a clear cut case of infant baptism, although baptism is not even hinted at. It is too easy for even an honest man to believe what he wants to without sufficient evidence to
That being true, he should sit down, or go on selling. It is being advocated lately that the elders only were deacons. I need them and they need me, and we need to see things Over With Jimmie Lovell. But it is “Jimmie” who does all the talking whether anybody else is listening or not. And, of course, there are some who listen. Some very fine men on the West Coast have told us that “Jimmie” is a joke out there and that his comics and antics are not worth the attention he receives away from there. That is true—and that is the reason why it is necessary to expose his propaganda. Many people away from the Coast seem to think that he is “some great one” and they actually send him money for “the Lord” to be used “in trust” as he sees fit “for the cause!” Like Don Carlos Janes was, and as B. D. Morehead yet is, Love11 is ambitious to be a one-man missionary agency for the church and for scattered individuals over the nation. The brethren have just had a lesson on this thing, that came with a jolt, in the form of the “Last Will And Testament Of Don Carlos Janes.” Now is the time to follow it up and put an end to this one-man missionary thing that has been allowed to spring up, thrive and grow among the brethren.

Talkative “Jimmie” has told his readers that he is not a preacher—but he knows exactly what a preacher ought to be and do and say, where he ought to go, how far he ought to travel, how long he ought to stay and how much (or little, judging his remarks) he ought to be paid. If he is a local preacher, in order that the church that employs him gets value received, he advises that he be required to “punch the time-clock” and report all visits and calls and consultations. If he is an evangelist, his traveling should be regulated and regimented to see to it that he does not book meetings back and forth across the nation for “sight-seeing” purposes, spending the brethren’s money! He thinks a man should hold his meetings in one area until he has finished in that section, then go into another section and hold them all in that area—whether he ever gets home or not, which requires some “back and forth” traveling. Jimmie doesn’t favor. Talkative “Jimmie” is not a preacher, but he knows all about how the preachers and the churches ought to do it! Personally, I have been “holding meetings” for about thirty years and have made it a practice to return home to my wife and children between every meeting. There have been very few exceptions over the years. I need them and they need me, and we need to see each other often. In all of these years I have never made a financial demand on any church, but if the brethren do not want to pay for this riding, they should get “Jimmie” or some one in the vicinity to hold their meeting. I am not particularly interested in sight-seeing. So far as “sight-seeing” is concerned—the best sights for me are around home. But “Jimmie” is deeply concerned about how much money the preachers spend traveling about over the country “holding meetings.” The elders of the churches need his advice on this point, he thinks, as little use as he has for the elders of any church. So garrulous Jimmie rattles away and rambles on, and some of the dear sisters and guileless brethren think that it is simply “wonderful”!

In addition to letting everybody in on the fact that he is not a preacher (just a perpetual talker) West Coast Jimmie also breaks down and confesses that he is not even a student of the Bible. But he can tell all of the churches, elders, preachers and leaders all about it. To serve the readers a sample of the wisdom of this West Coast sage, who says he is not even a Bible student, we submit a few bits of sagacity from his lathering pen.

The Bible is silent on elders and deacons in the Jerusalem Church. If the seven men appointed were deacons they had deacons before they had elders. There were two requirements in these men—they were filled with the Spirit and had wisdom. What of the deacons where you worship?

This West Coast bureau of information for all the brethren, who in a moment of humility admitted that he knows very little about the Bible, now ventures to say that “if the men appointed, were deacons” there were deacons in the Jerusalem church before elders. Wonder how Jimmie knows so much! In the eleventh chapter of Acts the elders of the Jerusalem church are mentioned. How does Jimmie know when they were appointed? The fact is, he didn’t even know there were any such elders mentioned at all—for he said that “the Bible is silent on elders” in the Jerusalem church. But what else can be expected from one who talks at random on things he knows nothing about? Other passages in the New Testament mention elders in “every city” and elders in “every place.” If Jerusalem was either a city or a place it should be included in these expressions, whether the Bible “is silent” on elders in the “Jerusalem church” or not. But it so happens that elders in the Jerusalem church are referred to in the chapter already cited (Acts 11:29-30) so Jimmie has made at least one statement that all of us can accept—namely, that he is not a student of the Bible and knows very little about it. That being true, he should sit down, or go on selling his gun powder, and let someone else do the talking.

Another thing worthy of remark here for the benefit of some others as we go along: The Jerusalem church had elders, a known and established fact—a fact known as far away as Antioch, even if “Jimmie” doesn’t know it in California. And when the distress came in Judea the disciples at Antioch sent their contributions to the elders at Jerusalem. It is being advocated lately that the elders only have the spiritual oversight of the church, and the deacons have the financial authority in the church. If that is true, the brethren in Antioch made a mistake—they should have sent their contributions to the deacons at Jerusalem instead of to the elders! The West Coast sage says the Deacons were first in the Jerusalem church anyway. In line with that idea there are movements on in various
places to set the authority of the elders of the churches aside, relegating them to the role of mere “spiritual advisors.” It is such empty talking and writing as that which appears in the West Coast propaganda paper, and others of like sort, that puts such unscriptural ideas into circulation.

Another sample of wisdom from the sagacious West Coast Jimmie reads thusly: “Baptism may have made us Christians but if we are even approaching real Christianity I am cock-eyed and crazy.” Readers, how does that sound to sensible people? According to this self-labeled “cock-eyed and crazy” dispenser of expert advice, when one is baptized, he has not even approached Christianity! Being baptized makes a Christian but it does not approach Christianity! Did he mean it that way? Probably not, but that is what he said — and that is the character of everything else he says. He has made a reputation for “talking” so he talks and talks and talks. If he ever thinks, it is too late, for it is after he has talked too long and too much.

Another very important item in these West Coast bits of wisdom pertains to the “Last Will And Testament of Don Carlos Janes” and the missionary question. Here it is:

“Bulk of Don Carlos Janes’ $74,342 estate was left to promote missionary work throughout the world and promote the premillennial doctrine of the second coming of Christ, in which Janes believed. The estate was made up of personal estate of $49,244.45 and a missionary trust fund estate, which Janes has raised, of $34,098.04.” (All of which makes me greatly concerned about holding the money which you have sent me on the youth magazine until paper is allowed. Money lying idle does no one any good; therefore, I am putting it to work. With the world starving to death for the gospel, I do not want to die with funds on hand.)

So Jimmie does not want “to die with funds on hand!” The best way to avoid that situation is for the brethren and the churches to quit sending the “funds” to him. What is Jimmie doing with the brethren’s funds which he has “on hand?” If they are his own “funds” he shouldn’t be afraid to die with them “on hand.” If they are the brethren’s funds, or funds of the churches, he has no business having them “on hand.” Notice Jimmie says: “I am putting it to work.” Who is “putting” it to work? “I” — Jimmie Lovell am putting the “funds” to work! Whose funds? Where is he putting them to work? What work? Don Carlos Janes “put” the “funds” to work — and he did the putting — by loaning them out to Bollite churches, building up trust funds, drawing interest, and then willed it to his proteges. There are a lot of ways to make money work.

Since Jimmie Lovell has expressed the fear of dying with “funds on hand” the brethren should by all means obviate that contingency by doing the putting themselves and wean Jimmie from the missionary teat right now. The longer he “holds the money” (like Janes and Jorgenson) the harder it will be to wean him. The longer he “holds the money” the harder it will be to wean him.

It will be remembered that only a short time ago Jimmie Lovell said in his propaganda paper that he had decided to cooperate with Don Carlos Janes and the Boll group in Louisville, even though they are premillennialists, he said, because they are getting things done in a missionary way. That represents the depths of his convictions on the subject. Truly, Janes and Jorgenson did get things done “in a missionary way,” and the Janes’ Will clearly reveals “the way” it was done! Jimmie turned pale when he read that document, and murmured, “I don’t want to die with funds on hand.” So what will he do? Why will he just “put” these funds “to work.” What had he been doing with these “funds” before the death of Don Carlos brought forth his resolution? He says some of them were “lying idle.” Will the churches and brethren continue to be so gullible as to perpetuate these one-man missionary agencies and bureaus among us? Again we say — surely not!

But run your keepers over this follow-up on the missionary schemes of the West Coast propaganda paper. He is still at it.

*Name and address of a leader,*

Now, should the elders of the churches file their names and addresses with Jimmie Lovell, along with the names and addresses of “all who plan foreign mission work”? Here it is: “I can then give this information to you.” Jimmie proposes to be “information bureau” for all the elders of the churches who “plan foreign mission work.” He wants his hand in all of it. He will give you the information, or to save a lot of trouble, he can just “inform” them to send the money to him and he will “put it to work.” We earnestly and strongly advise the elders, or individuals, who “plan” mission work not to do it — Jimmie might “die with funds on hand” like Janes did. No wonder Jimmie Lovell wants the names and addresses of everybody who has any money for missionary work. Don Carlos Janes spent his life doing the same thing. Shall the brethren continue this sort of thing? We do not aim to quit asking this question. Though we have no desire to speak “ill of the dead,” eternal principles are involved in these matters, which sentiment over a man’s death should not be permitted to smother.

Another bit of talkative nonsense in this West Coast spasm is found in the following:

Jealousy was the basis of persecution of the early church and jealousy is the basis of much of our trouble today. How easily this is seen in respect with many of our older preachers. They not only connive ways and means to wreck the work of the younger preachers but manifest the very spirit of the Devil in their presence. The lowest breed of sinner is a Christian who knows better, yet who seeks to hinder the Christian work of a brother.

It is to be “easily” seen, says Jimmie Lovell, that “our older preachers” are actually “conniving” various ways and means to “wreck” the work of young preachers. These older preachers have the “spirit of the devil” and are the “lowest breed of sinners.” That is some charge. And it is a general charge. He did not say some or a few older preachers, which would have been untrue, but he said “our older preachers,” a general indictment. Now, what are our older preachers doing? According to James L. Jimmie Lovell they are premeditatedly, with malign aforethought, conniving every possible way of wrecking the work of young gospel preachers. The older preachers who are conniving to wreck young gospel preachers “manifest the very spirit of the devil” and are classed as “the lowest breed of sinner” by Jimmie Lovell. All of the older preachers, grand men and great preachers, will take notice of that indictment. All decent young preachers will regard that statement with contempt. It is Jimmie Lovell who has so much deplored what he calls harsh condemnations in preaching and writing. It is he who has had so much to say about teaching and writing in the “spirit of Christ”! How nasty-nice the sweet brethren are with their sweetness! These irrational eruptions of West Coast Jimmie are worse than insulting — but the older preachers will consider the source, if any of...
them chance to read the sheet that contained it. It makes me blush to pass it on.

Numerous good brethren on the West Coast have told us all that these Jimmie Love tergiversations are not worthy of this attention, and should be ignored. That is true. But there are angles to it. Many people over the nation, good people in good churches, have been led to believe that the “West Coast Christian” is really Christian and a sound, safe, scriptural missionary outlet and medium of general good works. This West Coast propaganda paper is sent in bundles to churches over the nation and is often found in the literature racks in the lobbies and vestibules of the buildings where the churches meet. Brethren should know these facts. The elders of the churches will not be faithful to their trust who permit this unsavory medium of propaganda for unscriptural things to be promoted in any such manner and method among the members of the body over which they are shepherds and bishops. It’s time to call the halt on such as this. We all know what has happened in the Louisville case. It is on record now and none can deny it. It must not continue to happen in churches of Christ. But it will continue to happen if the brethren are not properly informed on these matters now. The Don Carlos Janes affair is no different in principle from what is being done by these other men. It is high time for the elders of the churches to quit turning their “funds” over to just anybody who wants to “put it to work.” They ought to put their own funds to work where they can both see and oversee the work that is being done. It is also time for editors to quit giving impetus to the movements of these men by giving them space and paying them compliments. If Baal be God, serve him; but if God be God, serve Him! There can be no righteous toleration of compromise on these issues—F. E. W. Jr.

Cogdill’s “New Testament Church”

By Roy E. Cogdill

In this issue of the Bible Banner will be found a full page ad introducing to the readers an exceptionally fine treatise on the New Testament Church by our well-known and capable evangelist, Roy E. Cogdill. While his book has been in circulation for some time the Bible Banner has not had opportunity to call attention to it in this way. We are inserting this announcement of “The New Testament Church” not only in recognition of its value, but also of the worth of its author to the Cause of New Testament truth in his teaching and preaching. He does not have a superior as a preacher of the plain gospel. His book reflects his preaching. It is in outline form, but with comments full enough to make it a treatise on the many phases of the New Testament Church, which makes it not only adapted for special use in classes but for general use and private study. It is bound in cloth, and is a good book for the library shelf. About one thousand copies of this book remain of its second edition. They should be ordered in lots by the dozen for classes or single volumes for individuals. We would like to know that this announcement in the Bible Banner will exhaust the second edition and make it necessary for Brother Cogdill to bring out the third in order to supply the demand for it.—F. E. W. Jr.

Dear Brother Wallace:

Would you mind announcing in the next Banner that I am to be guest speaker on WLW, “The Nation’s Station,” Lord’s Day morning, May 21, on “The Church by the Side of the Road” program? This broadcast begins at 8:45, central war time, and is a station sponsored arrangement—except all the subject and truth discussed in it as I shall speak on “The Present Truth.” As it is not every day that gospel preachers are invited to speak on such a popular station and to such a vast audience as “The Nation’s Station” enjoys, I shall be pleased to have as many as possible of Banner readers. If any can use a few or more small cards, to be distributed at services, such will be supplied upon receipt of card or letter stating the number that can be profitably used. Address me at 711 West Ninth, Anderson, Ind.—F. L. Paisley.

“GIVING THANKS FOR THE OFFERING”

(Continued from page 5)

for what he gave—“the offering.” The Savior mentioned this but without commendation of this exceedingly religious professor. Read Luke 18:9-14. He thought himself to be “righteous and despised others.” We should thank the Lord for what we receive from him, not for what we do for him,
I have received quite a number of inquiries along the line of thought suggested by the above heading. I hardly feel that I am the most suitable one to write on this question. I love to assist my brethren, when I can, in their study of the Holy Scriptures, and to point out the teachings of God's word on the questions and problems that come to my attention, if and when my services may be of assistance. It is needless to write or speak where we can not help.

The trouble with some things we do, is not at all in regard to what the Bible reveals, but where the silence of the Bible is conspicuously apparent. Anyhow, brethren keep writing me to know whether they should thank God for “the offering,” or would it be better to thank him for “the privilege,” or for “returning to God a portion of what God has given us.” (The rest of it of course, to be kept for our own use.) And why not return it all to him? All we have and are is the Lord’s already, provided at least that we have first given ourselves to the Lord (2 Cor. 8:5). And some of the brethren have decided that they should “first take up the offering” before they give thanks for it; they do not want to be found giving thanks for what they don’t have. And then it has occurred to others that the “offering” is not theirs, and why give thanks for what they do not receive, and what is not theirs? It is the Lord’s offering. (Maybe the Lord should give thanks for it?) But the earth is the Lord’s already. And the fulness thereof (Ps. 24:1; 50:12, 89:11; 1 Cor. 10:26). We are not our own. “And ye are not your own; for ye were bought with a price” (1 Cor. 6:19, 20; 7:23). Read 2 Corinthians chapter 9. And particularly, verses 10 to 15. There the matter of thanksgiving is considered in connection with free-will offerings; and you will note that it was the ones who received the offering and the benefits of it who thanked God, not the ones who made the offering. And, if now, you take a poor widow, a bushel of potatoes or a ham of meat, and she is one of God’s children, she will most certainly give thanks to God for this ministration at the hand of one of his servants. But it is not in place for you to thank God for what you have done, for the small and pitiful service you have rendered to him, for all we do is so small in comparison with what God has done for us.

Our “offering” on the Lord’s day is a simple service that we render to him and should not be confused with the worship. For orderly and convenient arrangement, it is entirely suitable to make this offering on the first day of the week, in keeping with Paul’s order to the Corinthian and Galatian churches when they were making up a collection for the poor saints (See 1 Cor. 16:1-4). Not that this is the only time when an offering may be made. This, of course, can be done and must be done, as we have opportunity (Gal. 6:10). The requirement of the primitive churches (1 Cor. 16:1f.) for a special offering on the first day of the week when they assembled for the breaking of bread, as made by Paul, was for a scriptural purpose, and it is a safe precedent for our offerings for scriptural purposes. And this is all that this passage teaches or authorizes. It certainly does not mean that Paul meant to augment, increase or enlarge the items connected with the worship, itself, known as the Lord’s supper. It is reasonably certain that the offering at that time were not made, as a formality in immediate connection with partaking of the bread and wine in memory of Christ. They most likely followed the general custom of the time. When Christ paused, and beheld how the Jews “cast money into the treasury” (Mk. 12:41) they were putting the money into a box or chest, provided with an aperture for receiving the money. The “chest” was in a side room, or court, probably “the court of the women,” and was not in the place of worship in the temple. The early disciples most likely followed this custom in the absence of any divine precept prescribing any formality for making the offering. Any special formality, or show, or ostentation, or exhibition of vanity, was then out of place. It was not in keeping with the genius and spirit of the Christian system in the primitive days of the gospel era. It remained for the decadent days of the great apostasy to bring about all the fanfare, boast and bluster, and the extolling of the names of rich men, big men, and big gifts, such as has characterized many sects and parties during medieval and modern times. Because these flatteries please men they bring them into the worship and service of God. They overlook the greatly significant and sublime truth of heaven that “man looketh on the outward appearance, but Jehovah looketh on the heart” (1 Sam. 16:7), and that a very small gift presented by the poor, is often far more precious in heaven’s sight, than princely gifts from the worldly wealthy.

But just a few words more concerning thanksgiving and “the offering.” Some of the embarrassing features relating to thanking God for what we do, for what we give, may be the better understood by referring to the time of the institution of the Lord’s supper, and by noting what our Savior did, and what becomes an example to all his followers. He gave thanks for the bread and then the disciples ate of it; he gave thanks for the cup and the disciples all drank of it; he did not give thanks for the offering. And it does not appear that an offering was any part of this worship—this initial observance of the Lord’s supper. (Read Matt. 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:19, 20; 1 Cor. 11:23-29). Here we find Paul agrees with the synoptics. All four of the accounts are in perfect agreement in regard to what was done by our Lord in the institution of the supper. None of them call it “the sacrament”; none of them say, or intimate, that the Lord gave thanks for both the bread and wine at the same time, and then started the distribution of the bread and the fruit of the wine all at the same time. In fact, the record states the opposite of this procedure—a practice that seems to be growing in popularity at the present time. But the precedent did not come from the Savior or the church of the New Testament times. Neither did the Savior “give thanks for the offering”; nor do we find mention in the inspired writings of any such practice among the early Christians. It sprang up away later, and after the popes of Rome had started the practice of blessing water and many more material things in order to make them “holy” and thus acceptable to the Lord. Some of our practices are borrowed bodily from the sectarian churches about us, and they borrowed them and many more from the Catholics. Usually the best thing to do with borrowed property is to return it to those from whence it came. It is seldom that matters of history, in connection with the Savior’s life, are recorded by as many as four writers of the New Testament. But such is the case with the institution of the Lord’s supper, and, moreover, with an unusual detail. Is this meaningless? It is the only commemorative institution of the new dispensation and the simplicity of its observance in the beginning must not be overlooked.

We find in the New Testament just one example of where any one gave, thanks for “the offering.” This was the Pharisee who went up into the temple to pray. He thanked God for what he was, for what he had done, and

(Cont. bottom of page 4)
In recent months we have heard much about "unconditional surrender" in contrast with a "negotiated peace." Our country and our allies in this struggle for existence are demanding that our enemies surrender unconditionally. They are not offering a negotiated peace. If peace could be obtained by negotiation, perhaps our enemies would be ready to quit now. But to surrender unconditionally is quite a different matter. But there is another conflict — a war between God and Satan, between the forces of righteousness and unrighteousness — in which an unconditional surrender is also demanded. God does not offer to the enemies of righteousness a negotiated peace. He requires the unconditional surrender of aliens. Jesus said: "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Mat. 6:24. Thus we are informed that the man who would serve God acceptably must serve him unconditionally.

Relative to the principle of unconditional surrender the following statement has been made in a Baptist paper:

"The man who thinks that his baptism, church membership, good works, good feeling, 'holding out faithful,' prayers, dreams, or anything else or all of these things combined even helps to save him is not saved and never will be until he gets such an idea out of his mind and unconditionally commits himself into the Lord's hands." Ben M. Bogard in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight of Sept. 10, 1943.

If a man "unconditionally commits himself into the Lord's hands," that is an unconditional surrender, of course. But Bogard has some strange ideas about what is involved in such a surrender. He thinks that "unconditional surrender" means an "unconditional salvation," that the man must "depend entirely on Christ for salvation" and meet no requirements as conditions of that salvation. This, however, is far from the truth of the matter. When Germany and Japan surrender unconditionally to the United Nations that will not mean they will depend on the United Nations to grant them an unconditional peace. An unconditional surrender will not mean unconditional peace, but it will involve the idea of a peace upon certain conditions. The conquerors, not the conquered, will have the sole right to dictate the terms of peace. And the conquered nations will have to submit themselves unconditionally to the terms required. So an unconditional surrender to God will mean a conditional, not an unconditional, salvation. God dictates the terms of peace or salvation and the sinner must yield himself to divinie requirements. And this is altogether different from Bogard's idea of it. He has an idea if a man meets any requirements as conditions of salvation, he has not submitted himself unconditionally into the Lord's hands. He certainly needs to restudy his position about this.

Some of the things he mentions in his list of unnecessary requirements have never been commanded as conditions of salvation, and I know of no one who believes them to be such. So we may eliminate "good feelings" and "dreams" from the list. I have never heard anybody preach "good feelings" as a condition of salvation, but many of Bogard's brethren have depended on their good feelings as evidence of their salvation. The Bible, however, never gives such as a condition or as evidence of salvation. And dreams? Well, I suppose some men have dreamed they were saved, but I have never known of dreams being proclaimed as a necessary condition of salvation. So we can just skip these two. But how about the rest of the things listed by Bogard? Let us take a look at these conditions and see if they help to save a man.

1. "His Baptism"

In the first place we will see what Peter thought about it. On the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem when sinners inquired what to do, Peter said: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts 2:38. In this passage Peter was not talking to saved men but to men who desired to be saved. And he told them to "be baptized for the remission of sins." So he must have thought that baptism had something to do with a man's salvation. If not, he never would have told men to be baptized "for the remission of sins." And when writing to scattered strangers he said: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." 1 Pet. 3:21. This does not say that baptism is a "figure of salvation," as Baptist preachers would have it read. Nor does it say anything that remotely resembles that. Furthermore, it does not say that baptism does not save us. It distinctly says: "Baptism doth also now save us." But Baptist preachers say that baptism is only a figure and figures do not save us. Well, Peter says baptism does save us, and if it is only a figure, then a figure saves us — or Peter falsified about it. Consequently, Peter thought baptism had something to do with salvation.

And then there is the language of Ananias to Saul of Tarsus. He said: "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins." Acts 22:16. Thus he made baptism a condition upon which sins may be washed away. No one contends that this means that "water literally washes away sins," but it does mean that baptism is a condition of forgiveness. So Ananias must have thought baptism has something to do with a man's salvation, or he would never have commanded Saul as he did.

And Saul himself — later called Paul — had the same idea of it. He said in Gal. 3:27: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Similar statements from his pen elsewhere reveal the same idea.

Is it true that Peter, Ananias and Paul were all unsaved when they made these statements? Such is true, according to Bogard, for he says: "The man who thinks that his baptism * * * even helps to save him is not saved." And he went beyond this and said such "never will be saved "until he gets such an idea out of his mind." As far as I know, Peter, Ananias and Paul never did get "such an idea" out of their minds as long as they lived. At least, there is no record that they ever retracted their statements about baptism. When they died they left their statements on record just as I have given them. And without a change of ideas, they never could be saved, according to Bogard. So Baptist doctrine consigns poor old Peter, Ananias and Paul to hell for thinking baptism had anything to do with a man's salvation. And how about unconditionally submitting themselves into the hands of the Lord? It strikes me that the man who would claim to be saved by faith alone and who would refuse to be baptized for the remission of his sins (knowing the Lord had commanded him to do so) is the one who fails to make an unconditional surrender. A man who surrenders unconditionally is the
man who submissively obeys the commandments God has given. It is not the man who refuses to obey.

2. Church Membership

Bogard further claims, according to the quotation already given, that if a man thinks his “church membership” will “help to save him,” he is not saved and “never will be” until he changes his idea about it. Many inspired statements might be given showing the attitude of divine writers about this, but one statement from the pen of the apostle Paul will suffice. He said: “For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church; and he is the saviour of the body.” Eph. 5:23. I think even Bogard will admit that the body of which Christ is here said to be the Savior is the church. If so, then Christ is the Savior of the church. Furthermore, he is the Savior of the church whether Bogard admits it or not. So Paul evidently thought “church membership” had something to do with a man’s salvation. If this is not so, then Jesus is not “the saviour of the body.” He could not be “the saviour of the body” if everybody is saved before he enters the body. This statement ought to settle the “church membership” question. It does for men who are willing to take the word of God for it. But for men like Bogard it is not sufficient. He would have to think that Paul was not saved when he made that statement, and that he never could be saved till he changed his mind about it. Since Paul never did change his mind, as is proven by the fact that he never changed the record, Bogard’s position again consigns the apostle Paul to hell.

3. “Good Works”

Bogard is not altogether opposed to good works, but he preaches that a man is saved without such — that he is saved “by faith without works” of any kind. Not only does he claim that a man may reach the forgiveness of his sins without doing anything, but he claims he can reach heaven at last without it. James said: “Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.” Jas. 2:24. But, of course, Bogard and his brethren do not believe this, for they say that “justification is by faith only.” I would rather take the statement of James, however, for I think he knew more about it. And he says a man “is justified by works.” I do not think that even Bogard would say the works James mentioned are “evil works.” So they must be “good works.” And if so, then James thought “good works” might have something to do with a man’s salvation. That, according to Bogard, properly qualified James for hell, for he thinks a man who holds “such an idea” is not saved and never will be till he gets rid of it. If James ever got that idea “out of his mind,” we are never told about it. So I guess James died and went to hell — or at least will go to hell at the day of judgment.

4. “Holding Out Faithful”

Bogard’s theology knows nothing but a “present salvation.” He will claim, even in debate, as he did with me, that the only salvation the Bible knows anything about is “present salvation.” And since, as he thinks, there is no “future salvation,” then there is no need of a man “holding out faithful” that he may be saved. We hear salvation from past sins, he gets it all, according to Bogard, and that salvation is eternal, and he never can lose it. Hence, he cannot fall from grace and does not need to “hold out faithfully.” You may show him there is a future salvation, proven by the statement of Paul in Rom. 13:11: “For now is our salvation nearer than when we believed.” You may ask him how “our salvation” could be “nearer than when we believed” if we got all the salvation we will ever get the moment we believed. He will tell you that this has nothing to do with the salvation of the spirit, but simply refers to the salvation or redemption of the body from the grave. And he may go on, or at least he did with me, and say that there is no “future salvation” for the spirit, that the Bible never says anything about the spirit being saved at some future time, but it gets all the salvation it will ever get the moment one trusts in Jesus. You may then remind him of the statement of Paul in 1 Cor. 5:5, made regarding a man who had committed a grievous sin, in which he said: “To deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.” You may call his attention to the fact that here is a salvation of the spirit — “that the spirit may be saved” — that is future, for it is to be “in the day of the Lord Jesus.” Then Bogard will begin to talk about something else, for he is in a hole and can’t get out.

Since, then, there is a “future salvation” for the spirit, it might be necessary for a man to “hold out faithfully.” That very thing, in fact, is required, for Jesus said: “And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold. But he that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.” Mat. 24:12, 13. I have heard Baptist preachers say that salvation is to be enjoyed, not endured. I do not believe a man must “endure salvation,” but I believe he must endure trials, temptations, persecutions and the like that he might reach the future salvation of his soul. It is impossible for a man’s love to wax cold if he has never had any love. And the man whose love waxes cold is not the man who will be saved — it is the man that “shall endure unto the end.” This is true if Jesus told the truth. But Bogard denies it all and says if a man even thinks his “holding out faithful” will help to save him, he is eternally doomed unless he changes his mind.

5. “Prayers”

Regardless of what the Bible teaches about this, even Bogard’s brethren do not agree with him. He now claims that prayer has nothing to do with a man’s salvation, and even if a man thinks that prayer helps to save him, he is not saved and never will be till he changes his mind about it. But it is a well known fact that Baptists have long followed the practice of having sinners “pray through” to salvation at the “mourner’s bench.” And it has been their belief that a man cannot be saved unless he prays for it. My readers know this as well as I do. And Bogard himself knows it. So let me say to all Baptists who may read this article: If you think salvation depends in any way upon prayer, Bogard says you are unsaved. Furthermore, you never will be saved till you get straightened out on this matter. You may have had an “experience of grace” that satisfied your brethren that you were saved, and they may have passed on you and voted that you were saved and eligible for membership in the Baptist church by being baptized, but the whole bunch was mistaken about it if you think prayer had anything to do with it.

And Bogard himself is not immune to this consequence. A good many years ago he had a written debate with Joe S. Warlick. That debate was published in book form. During that discussion Bogard affirmed that “a sinner is saved in answer to prayer before baptism.” As I am at this writing more than two thousand miles away from home and do not have access to my library, I am unable to check the exact wording of that proposition. But if this is not the exact wording, it is nearly so, and presents the principle which they discussed. As I recall, Bogard offered the woman of Samaria as an example of one praying for salvation. Jesus said to the woman: “If thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give me to drink; thou wouldest have asked of him, and he would have given thee living water.” John 4:10. And the woman said:

(Continued on page 9)
SOUND WORDS AND LOOSE SPEECH

L. R. WILSON

Writing to the evangelist Timothy the apostle Paul said, "Hold fast the form of sound words" (2 Tim. 1:13). The apostle Peter said, "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God" (1 Pet. 4:11).

God thought it so important that those who made known his will should do so just as it was given, that he did not permit them to speak except by a direct revelation from him. Before leaving this earth Jesus promised to send the Holy Spirit to guide them into all truth, and hold them that when they were brought before the judges of this earth to "take no thought of what ye shall speak: for it shall be given unto you that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you" (Matt. 10:18-20). Just before his ascension he told his disciples to tarry in Jerusalem "until ye be endued with power from on high." Ten days thereafter he sent the Holy Spirit upon them. "And they began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." Jesus did not want them to deviate in the least from what he told them to speak. We do not wonder then that the apostles urged their readers to hold fast the form of "sound words," and to speak as "the oracles of God" directed. If they were living on the earth today and were to listen to the babble of tongues in this so-called "Christian world" they would be astonished to know how little their admonition had been heeded.

Time does not permit me to call attention to the many terms that are used now almost daily by the religious world which are wholly foreign to the word of God. Any effort to do so would be almost equivalent to compiling a dictionary. I do want to suggest a few terms however which are in common use, contrary to the "sound words" of the New Testament. I call attention first to the many high sounding titles which the religious teachers have arrogated to themselves. These are so numerous that I could not mention all of them if I tried. Some of the more common terms are reverend, doctor, father, and such like. Let no one think that I have a prejudice against these terms. This is not my reason for disdaining them. My objection is that they are never used in the word of God to designate religious teachers. I cannot so use such terms and still "hold fast the form of sound words"; nor can I do so and yet speak as "the oracles of God." Of course, I would like to be reverend and consecrated in my life and practice. Indeed, I try to show reverence for God in all that I do. But for me to assume the title of reverend, a term which is applied exclusively to God in the Holy Scriptures (Ps. 111:9), would be presumption. I would be afraid to do so, no matter how much I might desire it. Furthermore, I cannot conscientiously apply this term to any other man of this earth. In Matt. 23:8-12 we hear Jesus saying, "But be ye called Rabbi: for one is your master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father which is in heaven. Neither be ye called master: for one is your master, even Christ. But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. And whosoever shall exalt himself shall be abased: and he that shall humble himself shall be exalted." I simply cannot fly in the face of this language uttered by the Son of God and call any man on earth by these terms, religiously.

There can be but one reason for men arrogating to themselves so many different titles of honor: they love the praises of men. At no time did any of the apostles ever begin a letter by such terms as "The Reverend Peter," or "Doctor Paul," or any other title of a similar nature. Furthermore, I cannot always say, "Paul, a bondservant of Jesus Christ," or "Simon Peter, a bondservant of Jesus Christ." Even James and Jude, who were half brothers to our Lord, according to the flesh, began their letters by using the same manner of address. They never arrogated to themselves any worldly honor because of their blood relationship to Christ; neither did they adopt any flattering titles for use in courting the favors of men. Instead, they both spoke of themselves as "bondservants of Jesus Christ."

Furthermore, the Bible never refers to the man who preaches for a particular congregation as "the pastor." In fact the New Testament never uses the term "pastor" in the singular number. It is a term used to designate the bishops or elders of a congregation. Here it will be necessary to explain that in the New Testament the bishops, elders, and pastors were the same men. This will be clearly seen by a casual reading of Acts 20. In verse seventeen we read that Paul sent for the "elders of the church" at Ephesus to come down to Miletus. When they arrived he said to them, "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock, in which the Holy Spirit hath made you bishops, to feed the church of the Lord which he purchased with his own blood" (vs. 28). Here he addresses the elders as the bishops, and tells them to "feed the flock." The expression "feed" is a term which literally means "to be shepherds" to the flock, or "to be pastors" of the flock. Hence, the elders, bishops and pastors were the same men in Paul's time. Each congregation had a plurality of such men who served as the overseers of the congregation. There was no such thing as one pastor over one congregation, with one elder over a large number of congregations, and one bishop over a still larger number of congregations. We are certainly not holding to the "form of sound words" when we set up a system of this kind.

Almost every day I receive letters addressed to "the pastor" of the Denver Heights Church of Christ; or to "Reverend Wilson;" or to "Doctor Wilson." Very naturally I do not become offended at those who thus address me. Indeed they do not mean to offend me, but rather to flatter me. They have been taught that this is the proper manner in which they should refer to a preacher of the gospel. The fact however that people seek to do me such honor does not excuse me before God for accepting it without any effort to teach them better. I am sure that those who have been listening to these broadcasts have noticed that the announcer always refers to me as "L. R. Wilson," or "Mr. Wilson." This is because I have asked him to speak of me in
We have come to observe so many "holy days" have resulted in a great deal of loose practice, it may be that one would think they can be read on almost every page of the Bible, if he did not actually know better. No inspired writer ever used either of these terms. The apostles and evangelists of the New Testament talked about obedience to the gospel and being added to the church. They did not encourage the idea of trying to "get" something and then picking out something to "join." Instead, they stressed the importance of doing something and leaving it with the Lord to put us into what he thought best.

Sometimes I am reminded that we are not under any obligation to observe the "letter of the law," as long as we observe the spirit of it. I am told that it does not matter so much about what we believe or practice just so our heart is right. The trouble with such sophistry is that one's heart is not right when he refuses to comply with the will of God. When the inspired writers admonish us to hold fast to the form of "sound words," and to speak as the "oracles of God," and we give no heed whatever to such, our hearts are not right with God. Do not think I am your enemy because I call your attention to these matters. I am not trying to stir up trouble for anybody. I am merely stressing the need of loyalty to Christ and his word.

UNCONDITIONAL SURRENDER
(Continued from page 7)

"Sir, give me this water, that I thirst not." John 4:15. So Bogard claimed she prayed for salvation, and the Lord gave it to her in answer to her prayer. Her prayer, according to Bogard then, had something to do with her salvation. But now he says that the man who thinks his prayers "even help to save him" is not saved and "never will be" till he gets "such an idea out of his mind." We must conclude, therefore, that at the time of Bogard's debate he was not saved and never would be till he renounced the position he affirmed in that discussion. But he had been preaching and debating for many years before that discussion, and the date at which he claimed salvation was far in the past. He was either mistaken when he thought he was saved and for many years thereafter or he is mistaken now. And, in reality, he was mistaken both then and now with regard to much that he has said. Since, according to his present position, he was unsaved at the time he affirmed that "sinners are saved in answer to prayer before baptism," I am curious to know just when he became saved. He had to "get such an idea out of his mind," and somewhere down the line he did so, for he preaches otherwise now, and I am just wondering when he made the change. If he was saved at the time he formerly thought he was, prior to his debate with Warlick, then he fell from grace, for he held at the time of that debate ideas that insure one's condemnation. He believed then that man's prayer had something to do with his salvation, but now he says a man can never be saved as long as he holds "such an idea." So if he was saved prior to that debate, he fell from grace and lost his salvation. But if he was not saved till he got that idea out of his mind, then his former "experience of grace" was deceptive and such experiences cannot be depended on. Hence, I would like to know just when Bogard "unconditionally submitted himself into the hands of the Lord." It would be very interesting for him to tell us in the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight. I shall eagerly search its pages for the information.
Eugene S. Smith wants to debate the war question. He has even framed the proposition which he wants his opponent to affirm. As usual in such cases the proposition does not state the issue fairly. It is customary in debate for each man to frame his own proposition, and he is required by the rules to define the terms of it so clearly there can be no misunderstanding what he means to affirm.

I suppose the editorial in which the challenge appears is a sample of the kind of argument Smith means to use in the debate. Such debates are supposed to be a search for truth, and when held between brethren at least the debaters are supposed to meet upon terms of equality. But he evidently does not esteem his would-be opponent very highly regardless of whom it might be. They are "false teachers who crept in, and despising the souls of men, and loving the praise of man, they have deceived many."

Further, "they fear the weight of public opinion engendered by mammoth governmental propaganda; they have taught Christian boys to march away with smoking guns seeking the lives of the enemies;" and all of this is un-Christian, and contrary to the will of God." Furthermore, "these few war-minded preachers are riding the crest of public sentiment, and are filled with the spirit of war instead of the Spirit of Christ, and are misleading these Christian boys into the conflict as combatants, and this is not the spirit of Christ. These false teachers are responsible, but if the blind lead the blind, all will fall into the pit together."

The pit, of course, means hell, and if this editor is correct all the preachers on the opposite side of the question from him, and all the boys who bear arms for the government, are sure for hell.

For fear that this stern rebuke might pass over the heads of some he wishes to chastize, he names two of them personally, and points out their particular sins. Brother Flavil Colley is one, and he holds him up as a good example of Satan's angels being transformed into ministers of light; while Foy E. Wallace Jr., is not honest and does not even believe in what he is preaching. This he proves by some un-named sister who told him Wallace did not believe what he is teaching, and he says that he has contended this all the time.

It is very nice of him to grant Brother Wallace the privilege of selecting some one else to conduct his side of the debate, but I suppose since they are all one of a kind, false teachers crept in, ministers of Satan, and sure for the pit, it would not make much difference which one was selected for the slaughter. But a man filled with the spirit of Christ, so humble, and with a spirit so gentle as this editor manifests in his editorial to have to debate with any of them will be a trial of his faith, and a blot on the mantle of charity. Charity we know is kind, vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, thinketh no evil, and is not easily provoked. It beareth all things, hopeth all things, believeth all things, endureth all things. Is it not possible to mistake a hot-head for the spirit of Christ? and an over-developed egotism for Christian zeal?

I am not angry with this brother in spite of the things he shows in this editorial that he thinks of men who believe like I do. I think he is misguided in his thinking, and does not know what he is talking about. Men who have papers of their own, supported by the suffrance of the brotherhood can rush into print with half-baked ideas, and prove to their own satisfaction that the whole church has gone astray, and I, even I alone, am left, and they seek my life. I do not think these men are wilfully corrupt, they are just immature, and when they grow older they will learn better.

Old preachers have most of them been young preachers at one time, and should be able to remember the time when they felt like the whole cause rested upon their feeble shoulders. They felt very important to the cause in those days, and even wondered how the church managed without them before they were born, or what it would do when they were gone. Most young preachers have to pass through a stage like that and with some old brother telling him that he is the greatest preacher since the days of Campbell, and good looking sisters flattering him, it is not a wonder that many of them lose their heads. If they could have been born sooner, and could have been born in quadruplets, it would have been such a blessing. But the church got along without any of us preachers once, old and young alike, and it will still be here when we are gone, so we might as well keep our shirts on.

In one editorial this editor proved to his own satisfaction that all the preachers on the side opposite to him on the government question are premillennialists. I don't think he proved it, especially against such men as C. R. Nichol, Foy E. Wallace Jr., R. L. Whiteside, and dozens of others, who were exposing premillennialism when Eugene Smith was in knee pants, and even further back than that. And these men knew what it was and how to fight it. All the editor proved was that he knew as little about premillennialism as he does about the war question.

About that challenge and the proposition. It does not even state the issue. None of us believe in war, or believe that God gave any nation the right to wage war on other nations. Wars are inspired by the devil, and are an evil, and the only kind of war that God ordained is one which executes wrath upon him that doeth evil. No Christian could fight with Japan in her evil war of murder, robbery, and torture, and not be guilty of her crimes. I could not affirm a proposition which would make me endorse that kind of war for I don't believe it.

But I am glad to defend the use our government is making of the sword in this war against Japan and Germany, for that is the very thing God ordained, and why he gave us the sword. The Lord never has ordained that which is wrong, and he did ordain the use of the sword to execute wrath upon them that do evil. Will the Lord ordain for man to use the sword in executing wrath upon evil doers and then send him to hell for doing the very thing he ordained he should do?

The war that Japan and Germany is waging is evil and is the very thing the Lord ordained the use of the sword to prevent, or if not able to prevent it, then to execute wrath upon the evil doers. Our boys, that he mentioned, who marched away with guns are standing between their mothers, sisters, wives, children, and homes, and as bloody a band of murderers as ever cursed the earth with evil. They are using those guns for the very purpose God ordained they should be used, to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil, and they are God's ministers when they so use them.

All wars are evil, this war is evil, and it was inspired of Satan, and we did everything humanly possible to prevent it, even to feeding the rapacious appetites of the beasts of Berlin and Japan, to satiate their ambitions. Are their ambitions wicked, and therefore evil? Then God gave us the sword to execute wrath upon them, and if we failed, or refused, we would fail the Lord, and Paul says we would bring upon ourselves damnation. This is how I feel towards this war, and I believe it properly represents the feelings of those who are my brethren in the fight for truth on this and all other questions.
AN ORDINARY MEMBER’S OPINION

(W. L. Jamieson, in Firm Foundation)

I am not a preacher, am not even related to any preacher. I am not a real good Bible scholar. I am just what the Methodists call "an ordinary lay member" and possibly, very ordinary at that. For sometime I have been reading the arguments pro and con in the church papers about the attitude of the church of Christ and Christians toward the Government of the United States during the Second World War. I think that it is time that the ordinary lay member was heard on this question. I am going to say what I think, and I think that my attitude represents the attitude of ninety-nine percent of the members of the different congregations that make up the brotherhood.

First, I want to say that it is an individual matter to be decided by one’s own conscience, and not by any set of elders, preachers, or church papers. No particular group of preachers or church papers has any New Testament authority to claim to speak for and represent the church on this matter. When any set of preachers or church paper does try this, they are trying to make a denomination out of the brotherhood and are trying to drag us down to the level of the Jehovah’s Witnesses Sect and put us on record as a sect, composed of conscientious objectors to defensive war and civil government in general.

I resent this attempt of the conscientious objector group to force this silly doctrine of extreme Hindoo type pacifism on us; but I also deny that the New Testament teaches any such nonsense, that the political government of the United States is of the devil, or that it is sinful for a Christian to fight for the United States Government, or to vote in our elections, serve on a jury, hold office or favor the death sentence for convicted murderers.

Now, it is admitted that the kingdom of Christ is a spiritual kingdom and its end and object is to accomplish spiritual and moral salvation for the race, and that nothing but persuasion can be employed to promote spiritual righteousness. Hence, all that Christ said exalting moral and spiritual motives above physical force comes under this head.

Jesus said in John 18:36, "My kingdom is not of this world: If my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight." He explicitly says here that the sole and only reason that his servants did not fight to protect him is not because of the fact that fighting in self-defense is wrong but solely because of the fact that his kingdom is not of this world. He goes on and says that his servants would certainly fight if he had a worldly kingdom.

In Romans 13th chapter, 1-7 verses, the apostle Paul discusses the relation of the Christian to the civil government and tells him he is subject to and a member of the civil government. In verse 4, he speaks of the civil government bearing a sword not in vain against evil doers.

Some civil governments may be corrupt, and our form of government is not perfect, but what big preacher or church paper would like to move to some other country, Germany for example. The marriage institution has been destroyed by the Jews, while he goes to hell for protecting me."

I notice that one big preacher refers to the Revolutionary War and another refers to the attitude of some preachers during the Civil War. That has nothing to do with the question of 1944. It is this, Shall the Christian of this United States help protect his government and family against the Japs and Germans who would put us in slavery and rape our women, or shall he stand idly like the Pharisee who passed by the wounded man and left him to the Good Samaritan to pick him up and take him to a hotel and have his wounds dressed. There is only one answer to such a silly, foolish question and I am glad to state that the great brotherhood of members of churches of Christ in the United States have answered this question in the right way. We have thousands of Christians serving our country today in the armed forces and less than 100 members in the conscientious objector’s camps.

Here at Magnolia, Ark., we have a small congregation, but we have proudly sent our boys to the Army, Navy, Sea-bees, Marine Corps, Air Forces, Medical Corps, Merchant Marine. We are proud of our boys. Many of them will be killed. Many of them will lose their arms, their legs, their eyes. They will come back maimed, disfigured. They are doing what we are told to do as Christians, to lay down our lives for ourselves for the other fellow.

It is a disgusting thing, humiliating and makes one think of the utter silliness of some so-called preachers for them to say, “Let me enjoy the peace and blessings of government, and the other fellow risk his life and die for it, while I keep my religion pure and holy and go to heaven in comfort and security; bought with the other fellow’s blood, while he goes to hell for protecting me.”

I want to especially thank Brother W. W. Otley, George B. Curtis, Foy E. Wallace, Ced Wallace, R. L. Whiteside and others who stopped this movement to turn our great brotherhood of Christians, bought and paid for with the blood of Jesus, into an unholy, denominational, Quaker-like mixture of Jehovah’s Witnesses and Hindoos.

I want to pay special tribute to R. L. Whiteside, I think he is a real Bible scholar, the peer of all commentators, living or dead. I think that I am capable of deciding for myself what the Bible says, but if I ever need any man’s assistance, I will call on some real Bible scholar like Brother Whiteside. I hope he lives to be 100 years old in full possession of his strength of body and intellect.
THE WORD OF GOD
WALLACE W. THOMPSON

"Hear, 0 heavens, and give ear, 0 earth: for the Lord hath spoken." (Isa. 1:2) This declaration commands heaven to give audience, and the earth to heed the spoken things of God. Christ Jesus declared to the world the God of heaven. (Jno. 1:18) Again, "For he whom God hath sent speaketh the words of God." (Jno. 3:34) In the light of his face, and in the brightness of his raiment the apostles learn they are to "hear him." (Mt. 17:5) On a throne exalted and with power unlimited the Holy Spirit announces "God... hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son." (Heb. 1:1, 2)

Its Power
It is "sharper than any two-edged sword." (Heb. 4:12) The "sword of the Spirit is the Word of God." (Eph. 6:17) So keen, sharp, and pointed is the word of God that it is the most potent weapon in all the world. To Cain the Word said, "Sin lieth at the door." (Gen. 4:7) To Belshazzar, "God hath numbered thy kingdom and finished it. Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting." (Dan. 5:26, 27) To the Pharisees, "For if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." (Jno. 8:24) To the young rich man, "Sell that thou hast and give to the poor." (Mt. 19:21) To the rich man, "Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee." (Lk. 12:20) Some day the Word of God will paralyze unbelievers, stagger the unfaithful, and sentence all the wicked into the corridors of eternal misery, and, at the same time, beckon to the faithful, "Come ye blessed of my Father." (Mt. 25:34)

Its Authority
God's Word is the "first and the last," "the beginning and ending" the a and the z, in all matters pertaining to salvation. It is the voice of origin, "In the beginning," and will be the voice of destiny at the final day of account. Science can discover, but it cannot create; it can imitate, but it cannot duplicate; it can copy, but it cannot originate. Thus, God's Word hurls a challenge to the sages of the day, to those gone by, and those to come hereafter. Until man can create, duplicate and originate we cling tenaciously to God and his Holy Word. The Bible is the oldest legal document in all earth; herein we have the "voice of law." God's laws were given to be kept, not broken. Adam, the patriarchs, and the Jews testify to this fact. "The voice of the heavens" breaks forth in exaltation, "the heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork." (Ps. 19:1) There is nothing unreturned to God; everything begins with God, and everything ends with him. Finally, the Word of God is the voice of the kingdom of Heaven. It is employed in its commands, promises, blessings, and curses. "If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God." (1 Pet. 4:11).

Its Office
This office is seen clearly in Jno. 1:1, 8, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light." To reveal the truth in light and life was Jesus' mission. (Jno. 8:32) God declared his Son twice on earth. (Mt. 3:13, 17) and Mt. 17:1, 5) His great resurrection from the tomb further established this fact (Rom. 1:4) and declares him to be the Son of God. The dignity of the Word is seen in Hebrews 1, as being the brightness of his glory, the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, is seated at the right hand of the Majesty on high. His name is greater than that of angels, greater than any name in all God's realm. He is our object of worship. His throne is forever and ever. He laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of his hands. They are to perish, but he is to remain. Seeing his exalted position, why look for anything higher, than Jesus Christ or better than his Law?

The Bible has weathered every fierce storm, escaped the flames of fire, endured the battering rams of centuries, and has outlived every book on earth. Infidels have denied it, many have forsaken it, some betrayed it, others scoffed it, and while it stands they lie at its feet in the dust of earth. It changes tears of sorrow into smiles of joy and lift the burdens of life. It transforms the sinner into a child of God and changes ugliness into beauty. It is responsible for enlightenment, education, sanitation, respect, hope, love and faith. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." (Mt. 4:4).

THE NEAL-WALLACE DISCUSSION
We have purchased from the owner the remainder of the Neal-Wallace Discussion on Premillennialism. We are able to offer about three hundred copies of this important debate to the public. When this supply is exhausted this book will be out-of-print. We advise preachers and teachers to obtain a copy while it is possible.

The special offer on this book made by the publishers has been discontinued. We offer the remaining copies of this book at its publishers' price. It is a three hundred and fifty page book, beautifully bound in cloth. Price .......................................................... $2.00
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Contains twenty-six lessons on these subjects: "Meaning and Usage of the Word 'Church'"; "Beginning of the Church"; "Church Membership"; "Church Government"; "Apostles in the Church"; "Elders of the Church"; "Evangelists of the Church"; "Deacons of the Church"; "Women's Work in the Church"; "Financing the Church"; "Church Music"; "Church Evangelism"; "Purity of the Church"; "Unity of the Church"; "Church Membership"; "Church Government"; "Apostles in the Church"; "Elders of the Church"; "Evangelists of the Church"; "Deacons of the Church"; "Women's Work in the Church"; "Christ Coming for the Church." This book guides the student into a knowledge of what the Bible itself teaches concerning the church, and makes it easier for the earnest truth-seeker to distinguish between the church of Christ and denominationalism.

Teachers will find these lessons to be an efficient means for building up class attendance and interest. Parents, whose children do not have an opportunity to attend a Bible class where these lessons are taught, can use this book to great advantage in teaching their children the divine principles pertaining to the kingdom of God.

"Church Studies" is an excellent, yet inexpensive, book to place in the hands of people who have never learned the difference between the church that Jesus built and those of human origin. It will help them to learn that difference.

Preachers, elders, and others will find this book to be a thought-provoker and time saver in their preparation of a series of discourses on the New Testament church. Each of the twenty-six lessons contains ample material for a sermon.

Price: single copy 35c, three copies $1.00, six or more, per copy 25c.
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These four books, having proved helpful to both student and teacher, are gaining an ever-increasing circulation.

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

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

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

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

WHAT OTHERS SAY

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

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

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

Many other unsolicited letters of commendation have been received.

Price: Single copy, 35c; Three copies, $1.00; Four copies, $1.25; Six or more, per copy, 25c.
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“THE BATTLE OF ARMAGEDDON”
TED W. MCELROY

Over the radio and through the press much is being said concerning the so-called “battle of Armageddon.” Since it is a living issue, it is fitting that we study it. The theory about this battle is an essential phase of the pre-millennial doctrine, Russellites and other premillennialists teach that this battle will prepare the way and inaugurate the reign of Christ in the earth on the literal throne of David from Jerusalem. They differ on the details of the battle but most of them agree that this carnal battle begins the literal kingdom on earth.

From a little book by the late Judge Rutherford entitled “The Final War,” I will present the prominent points of his description of the battle. Other premillennialists will agree more or less with his view. He says, “Satan, the Devil is the god of this world and all nations from a part of his organization” (Page 8), thus he plainly asserts that the armies of the world are under the devil’s control and hence will be used by him in this battle. On the other side of the battle of Armageddon, Rutherford describes the divine organization, “The 144,000 who are associated with Jesus Christ” (page 14) reinforced with a “host of angels” (page 48). Thus they imagine the stage is set for the battle, a carnal warfare in which much literal blood will be shed.

Even though the doctrine has no warrant in the scripture, and is contrary to common sense, it has gathered a multitude of followers through its fantastic, imaginative, and carnal appeal. Some have even forsaken the gospel and the church of the Lord to build their hopes on the sands of this speculation.

First let me emphasize that the phrase “battle of Armageddon” is not in the Bible, hence I am certain since the words are not there that the ideas conveyed by the words are not there either.

The word “Armageddon” appears but one time in the Bible, Rev. 16:16, and is the same place spoken of in the Old Testament as Jezreel, valley of Megiddon, the Great Plain. The Americana Encyclopedia Vol. 10 page 497 gives the size of this place, 36 miles long and 15 miles wide. The place is not large enough for the things the premillennial theory claims for it; there just is not room in the valley for all the armies of the world plus a host of angels to engage in battle there. The Crimean battle line of present war between Russia and Germany is 200 miles long, and that is just one sector of the battle between those two countries; add to that the other fronts and battle lines of the present world war, and you can readily see the absurdity of a theory that condenses the armies of the whole world and a host of angels to a battlefield in a 36 mile valley. The theory is a physical impossibility.

The name of the place Armageddon is used in Revelation because it had a symbolic meaning to the people of that time. It’s symbolic meaning is derived from its history. Two great victories were won there: Barak over the Canaanites (Judges 5), and Gideon over the Midianites (Judges 7). Two great disasters are connected with the place: Saul was killed (1 Sam. 31), and Josiah was killed (2 Kings 23). Because of its history it had a traditional symbolic meaning of glorious victory, great slaughter, and terrible retribution.

In Rev. 16 the place Armageddon has no more a literal meaning than does the river Euphrates vs. 12 of same chapter. Both have a symbolic meaning derived from their history. The course of the river Euphrates was changed so that the conquering army might enter into Babylon and destroy the city, hence the river Euphrates is used as a symbol in connection with the destruction of spiritual Babylon. Likewise Armageddon is used to donate victory and retribution because of what happened there.

The theory of which the imaginary battle of Armageddon is just a part is fundamentally wrong and contrary to the scripture. The theory is that when Christ comes again he will begin, his reign upon the earth and will reign a thousand years. To the contrary the scriptures teach that Christ is either reigning now at ‘God’s right hand or he is still in the grave (Heb. 1:13; Acts 2:29-31;), and that when he comes his reign will cease (1 Cor. 15:24-25).

Jesus said, “My kingdom is not of this world” Jno. 18:36, and as long as these words are in the Bible, all pre-millennialists are wrong whether they be Russelites or those that went out from us.
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establish his case. This has been and still is the source of many and grievous errors in religion.

Why was it so important to “organize the first Baptist church in Alaska?” The brother makes an effort to answer the question in these words:

“I was lost without a Baptist church to attend. Thousands of souls in Alaska are lost without Christ. It behooves me then as a Baptist to lend every assistance possible—prayer, personal witnessing, personality, purchasing power, preaching, planning, and procuring, to lead these souls to the Saviour.”

There were thousands of souls in various parts of the world lost without Christ in the days of the apostles. Every assistance possible was rendered by such men as Peter, James, John, Paul and others. It did not “behave” them as a Baptist to pray, witness, preach, plan and procure. They did it simply as Christians and they belonged to nothing except the church, the body of Christ of which all Christians were members because they were Christians. There were no denominations in these vigorous days when the gospel was spreading throughout the earth with its blessed and saving influence. They glorified only in the cross of Christ and glorified God as Christians and never even once referred to the fact that they were Baptists, because it was not a fact. They were not Baptists, or anything else in a party, or denominational sense. It ought to be that way now. Sect and party has so fastened itself on the thinking and planning of even good and devout men today that it makes it very difficult for anybody to steer clear of party lines and denominational machinery. Even so, some of us are trying with varying degrees of success and it may do some good to occasionally or oftener call attention to these things.
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LESSON II
"THE HOUSEHOLD OF GOD"

I. The Family Feature of the Church:

II. Salient Features of God's Family—the Church:
1. God is the Father (Eph. 3:14; 4:6; Matt. 23:5; I Cor. 8:6).
2. Christ, a son over the House of God (Heb. 3:6); Christians His Brethren (Heb. 2:12; Matt. 23:3-40).
3. All Christians are children of God:
   (1) Sons and Heirs (Rom. 8:15-16; Gal. 4:7);
   In Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:26).
   (2) Children of God-Children of Devil (I Jno. 3:10).
   (3) "Church in God the Father" (I Thess. 1:1).
   (4) Conclusions:
       a. All of God's children are in God's Family.
       b. God's Family is the Church.
       c. Therefore all of God's Children are in the Church.

III. Blessedness of this Relationship:
1. Approach to God as Father (Matt. 6:6-9; Eph. 3:14).
2. Christ our Great High Priest and advocate to plead our cause (Heb. 4:14; 10:21; I Jno. 2:1).
3. Holy Spirit to lead and guide us (Rom. 8:14).
   (1) Receive Holy Spirit because we are sons (Gal. 4:6).
   (2) To walk by Spirit (Gal. 5:16).
   (3) Spirit is the Truth (Jno. 1:17, I Jno. 5:7).

5. God's Fatherly Correction (Heb. 12:4-11).
6. God's Fatherly Protection (Phil. 4:5-7; I Cor. 10:12-13).
7. God's everpresent Love (I Jno. 3:1; Rom. 8:3).
8. Heir of God (Rom. 8:17; Gal. 3:29; I Pet. 1:3).

IV. This Relationship Demands:
2. Obedience as Children (I Jno. 3:10; I Pet. 2:15-16; Eph. 5:6; Rom. 8:12-17; Walk not after flesh [Jno. 1:6-7]).
3. Wear family name (Acts 4:11-12; 11:26; 14:15-18; Col. 3:17).

V. How We Become Children of God:
1. By being born again (Jno. 3:3-5).
2. By Faith and Baptism (Gal. 3:26-27).

Questions for Discussion:
1. If the Church is God's family, how many churches does God have?
2. How many of God's children are in the Church?
3. What blessings are available to God's children?
4. How do we become children of God?
5. As children of God, how must we treat one another?
6. What position in God's family is accorded to Christ?
7. What is demanded of God's Children?
8. Can a child of God be finally disinherited? (I Peter 1:3).