PRAYER FOR VICTORY

All prayers must be conditioned on “the will of God.” Even Jesus in the Garden of Gethsemane prayed: “Not what I will, but what thou wilt.” (Mark 14:36.) Jesus taught his disciples to pray: “Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth.” (Matt. 6:10.) No prayer should be offered today except on the condition that God’s will be done. Our will must be brought into subjection to the will of God, and we need not pray if we are not wanting God’s will to be done.


Here two passages of scripture are so used as to show that the writer thought they presented the same idea. Will the reader look again at the two passages, and see if there is any ground for using them as the writer does? In the model prayer, Jesus taught his disciples to pray that men here in this world would do God’s will as it is done in heaven. In the Garden Jesus did not pray that people here in this world would do God’s will. In fact the writer thoughtlessly misrepresents what Jesus said in Gethsemane, when he says that Jesus prayed, “not what I will, but what thou wilt.” The fact is, Jesus prayed, “Remove this cup from me.” Jesus was a mysterious combination of Deity and humanity. His humanity dreaded suffering. He prayed that he might be spared the suffering of the cross: “My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me.” That was his desire—that was his prayer. But he would not be rebellious; he would submit to God’s plans and purposes concerning him. “Nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.” In this statement he was expressing his willingness to submit to God’s will. It is folly to think he was praying for God to go on and put into execution his own plans and purposes. Will any thoughtful person pray for God to do whatever he wills to do? though he may, as Jesus did, express his submission to God’s will.

In many prayers it would be entirely out of place to add, “if it be thy will.” Does that startle you? Then think a little. You pray that sinners be converted, but you do not add, “if it be thy will.” Why not? A wayward child of God comes in penitence, confessing his sins; you pray for God to forgive him, and you pray that he may become strong in the Lord, but you do not add, “if it be thy will.” In such prayers, to add, “if it be thy will,” would imply that you did not know whether he was willing for sinners to be converted or for his penitent child to be forgiven! But every person desires many things. A Christian will not desire anything that he knows to be wrong. If it is right to desire a thing, it is right to ask for it. If a Christian earnestly desires a thing, he will pray for it, even though he knows that God’s will must prevail in the matter, and this brings us to the following from the same editorial:

Someone has said: “We ought not to pray for victory, but that we may be worthy of victory.” If one prays to be worthy of victory, does he not assume that God will give victory, and is not a prayer for victory implicit in that kind of prayer? One should be specific and not evade or merely imply. No one will ever be worthy of the richest blessings of God. Jacob prayed to Jehovah and said: “I am not worthy of the least of all the lovingkindness, and of all the truth, which thou hast showed unto thy servant.” (Gen. 32:10.) This is true of everyone who prays. We are not worthy of the least of God’s blessings. We may pray that we may use victory in a way well pleasing to God.

But Brother Boles does not say plainly whether he would, or would not, pray for victory, but he seems to imply that he would not pray for victory, and that also implies that he does not desire victory, and does not care who will be the victor. If this is not his attitude, he can tell us plainly what his attitude is. I would be glad to see him free himself of any such unsavory position. But what is wrong with praying for victory? If a man desires it, he will naturally pray for it. If it makes no difference to a man who wins, he will pray for the victory, and if he cares not who wins the victory, he will be in poor position to use the victory to any advantage. The people who through “sweat, and blood, and tears,” won the victory, would not care to listen to any man (Continued On Page 5)
In a late issue of the Banner I said:

"I really feel for the schools in the embarrassment some of the crackpots, mostly young preachers, are causing them in these critical times. One writes a book on 'Can A Christian Kill For His Government?' Another sends out a tract ranting against aiding killers, meaning soldiers, our armed forces, by working in munitions factories, buying bonds or even giving them a coup of water."

This idiotic drivel and unpatriotic rot with a lot more like it may be ordered from the 'A. C. C. Bookstore', Abilene, Texas'. The Abilene Christian College Press prints a lot of stuff like that, written by long-faced crackpots.

Of course, it is embarrassing to the school. The president, a swell fellow and personal friend of mine, do& not believe what is dripping from the dwarfed minds of these youths of military age, who enjoy exemption as 'ministers of the gospel', and take advantage of it to attack the war effort. The Board of Trustees, I understand, are on record in full support of the government.

I am in receipt of a letter from President Morris of Abilene Christian College which makes some corrections and explanations, and furnishes more for the record as to the patriotism of the school, and its loyalty to the government in time of war. The letter is dated July 22, 1944 and is as follows:

"Dear Brother Wallace:

I have just read the following statements in your article in the Bible Banner, page three, June, 1944.

'The Abilene Christian College Press prints a lot of stuff like this, written by long-faced crack-pots.'

'This idiotic drivel may be ordered from the A. C. C. Bookstore, Abilene, Texas.'

Reference is made to a tract or bulletin written by a conscientious objector.

Brother Cled, somebody gave you information that is not true. The Abilene Christian College Press does not print and has not printed any conscientious objector literature of any kind. As far as the sale of the booklet you mention is concerned, neither the college, nor the Students Exchange, our store on the campus, has had any part in it. Sometimes those not acquainted with the campus mistake this store, which belongs to the college, for the A. C. C. Bookstore, off the campus, the one for the other. The A. C. C. Bookstore is not operated by the college or anyone connected with the college and is entirely a private business.

Those who have lived at the ACC during the last two and one half years know something of how much has been given from this hill to the war. Bonds and stamps have been on sale on the campus by the college since the beginning of the war. A salary deduction plan for the purchase of bonds by ACC faculty members has been in operation since that plan was inaugurated by the government. This past year ACC faculty members invested between eleven and twelve percent of their total salaries in war bonds. This is all very little. What amounts to much is that approximately eight hundred ACC boys, four of them faculty members on leave, are in the Service. Twelve of them have given their lives in service to the nation; others are missing. The college is proud of these eight hundred boys. I have indicated such many times, in chapel, in speeches in various parts of the state, and on at least one state wide radio hook-up.

Our nation is engaged in a gigantic effort to subdue lawless men and nations on the earth. All should co-operate wholeheartedly and fully in this great task.

Best personal wishes.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Don. H. Morris, President.
FORTY THOUSAND PLUS!

By the time this issue of the Bible Banner reaches its far-flung readers more than forty thousand copies of the Extra Special Bible Banner will have been mailed. We believe this to be an 'all-time record in gospel journalism. It sounds like an issue of a Chicago or Philadelphia daily newspaper. Already it has been hailed as an amazing accomplishment by brethren far and near.

Forty Thousand plus—the plus depends upon the increasing demands that are being made for additional mailings. It now appears that not less than Ten Thousand additional copies will have to be printed to fill these orders and requests.

It was thought and suggested by some that it has been so long since the Norris debate in 1934 that the public issues have become too old to elicit much interest now. I believed all the time that the interest existed now almost if not entirely as great as when the debate was held. Now I know that it does.

Through the wide mediums of radio and press the followers of Mr. Norris have been kept tense by his own blatherings on these very things. The response to that Extra-Special Bible Banner reveals the depth of that dormant but dominant feeling in the hearts of all of our people against the petitfogger, treachery, dishonesty and deceit of J. Frank Norris—a smoldering resentment which time could not smother out or extinguish has fanned into full flame again. The silence has broken into an explosion of facts that can be heard the world around, and which J. Frank Norris can never explain away. For ten years the deepest desire of my soul has been to expose, mercilessly expose the dishonest dealings of J. Frank Norris and thus to render impotent his malicious attacks upon the churches of the Lord Jesus Christ. Heretofore I have not had the financial means nor the advantage of a right opportunity to do so. Evidently Mr. Norris has misconstrued our ten years of silence and glowing over his infamous tirades against the church, he made a final and fatal blunder of believing that he could stage an act in playing the role of an unvanquished challenger by once more defying the churches of Christ. But the performance did not end as he had the stage set for it. Walt Disney wrote a song which bears the title of "Right In Der Fuerher's Face." It runs along in rhyme through several verses, the substance of which is: "When Der Fuerher says, we are de master race—we say p-p-p-phew-ew-ew right in Der Fuerher's face!" In righteous indignation, Christians all over the nation are saying “Phew!” right in Frank Norris' face!

There is but one thing *more* that I would *most* rather do—that one thing is to meet J. Frank Norris face to face on the polemic platform, before gathered thousands, under rules binding him to fair and honorable debate, to again expose his unscriptural doctrine and practice, and to have it transcribed into an accurate record for the generations to come. In a daring moment J. Frank Norris issued a challenge for the 1934 debate to be repeated. When it was accepted, his courage turned to cowardice, and his back-down was inglorious and ignominious. We have no intention of letting the public forget this fact. Nor shall they be ignorant of another fact—namely, the fact that two Dallas men, an editor and his co-editor, became a party to Norris' schemes against the church, helped him in his designs, and furnished him his way out. Their names should go into the record along with those who gave Norris succour before and after the 1934 debate. They should be yoked with J. Frank Norris as a trio in sin and shame, until they repent of their deeds against the churches. Their part in the Norris scheme cannot be disguised by the fiasco of a so-called radio debate. The whole thing is a play into Norris' hands and has been done in the spirit of spite and revenge against the churches of Christ, and the preachers, in Dallas and Fort Worth, who do not indorse these men, nor fellowship them in the repeated things they have done. I refer to the Dallas duet, J. L. Hines and Eugene S. Smith. Their combination should henceforth be known, and doubtless will, as Norris, Hines and Smith. If a "Send-Me-A-Dollar" campaign is renewed, whether ostensibly for the editor's birthday or with an auctioneer's voice on the radio for his "work," remember one thing, the part of it that does not go into personal property and gain will be used in a campaign against the churches of Christ and every loyal gospel preacher in Dallas, Fort Worth, and everywhere, and whoever sends it will be aiding in that ignoble cause.

In a final word—when the Special Issue was announced we had not contemplated the proportions into which it would develop. I thought that it would be possible to hold it within twice the regular size of the Bible Banner. But as the demands increased, the material was too vast and the needs expanded far beyond a mere "double-header." The Special Issue became a 'book instead of a paper. The material in it, arranged in average page size and form, would make a 200 page book.
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copies, delivered. We did not back out of that offer—forty thousand copies are being delivered as promised. But future orders cannot be filled at that figure, as anyone should be able to plainly see. A seventy-six page magazine that would make a 200 page book for five cents-postage paid! It was our offer, we made it, we have kept our word and I am happy. I am happy that so many copies have been put into circulation; I am happy in my heart that a wounded cause has been vindicated—I am happy, unsteadily happy, that it has been my personal lot, regardless of cost or loss to me, to do it.

The task has been immense and it has required time. It has been impossible to answer the inquiries that have come, due to the delay in delivering the Special Issue—but it is now the answer in itself and will explain the delay. We do not have a perfect set-up and some mistakes will occur—but if any reader does not receive the Special, or if any reader knows of anyone who ordered a copy who did not receive it, please send us a card, and it will come, no postage necessary, just a card and we will correct any error with dispatch.

To all who have helped to make this work possible, to churches and preachers all over the nation, north, south, east and west who ordered these copies by the dozen, the hundreds and the thousand, and to all who ordered even one, I want to say “thank you,”—with all my heart—and God bless you. And to J. Frank Norris and those who have paid! It was

The Church In Salem Oregon

The Church of Christ, which formerly met for worship in the Moose Hall, corner south 12th and Leslie street, Salem, Oregon, has recently purchased the meeting place known as the Madison street Tabernacle, located on the corner of Madison and Baker streets, and just two blocks east of Highway 99. When in Salem visit the church of Christ, at this location.-L. L. Freeman, 105 Park Avenue.

The Work In Philadelphia

The Philadelphia Church at 56th Street and Warrington Avenue announces that James P. Miller is leaving on the last Lord’s day in June. His place is to be filled by Elza Huffard of Lincoln Park, Michigan, who will take up the work in what is known by the Brotherhood as the great northern field, and carry on in the same aggressive manner.

Brother Miller was the first full-time evangelist the Church at Philadelphia had. He came to Philadelphia four years ago, and by his earnest, hard work in “selling the field” to all the Churches of Christ in America, some strong congregations sent their best preachers and money to assist. Through radio and evangelistic preaching within a radius of fifty miles, new congregations have been established at Wilmington, Delaware, and Wilkes-Barre and West Chester, Pennsylvania, and there has been a revival of the work among the colored brethren in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The Church in Philadelphia is anxious to continue the same type of work. We feel that Brother Huffard will preach the same gospel message.

Thomas J. Patton A. H. Drinkwater Elders.

I must charge that Lt. John W. Wallace, son of Cled is the victim of unfaithful teaching by his father and that his father must face the whole thing in the judgment.

Abraham offered his son to Jehovah; while Cled offered his son to the god of war. Brethren Cled and Foy Wallace, Jr., are doing more to carnalize the churches than all others combined.

The reference is to my son, John, who was reported “missing in action over Italy, April 21st.” Jake refers to me as “My good friend, Cled Wallace.” It appears that Job also had some friends! He cannot “make the burden heavier for” me, for I neither respect his sentiments nor his tactics highly enough to be affected by them. I have been warned more than once that some fanatic with a medium for expression would take advantage of my personal misfortune to do as Jake has done. I am not surprised at the source from which it came. It will not have the effect on brethren generally that the author of it hopes. It will have the very opposite effect. Only a man without a father’s heart, who has no children, could sit drooling over the prospect for the judgment for fathers whose sons are “missing in action.” Fathers will probably, as I do, feel more pity than censure for such desolation of mind and heart. Sensible people will doubtless conclude that this is not the judgment day and Jake is not the judge anyway. Besides, it is too early for him to preach my son’s funeral, especially since he has not been given an invitation to do so. There has been no announcement of the boy’s death. We still entertain strong hope that he is alive and shall do so until we are informed otherwise. S

In this connection it may be interesting to note that Jake. Hines took quite a hand in the recent campaign to oust the sale of liquor from Dallas county. In the Dallas News of July 6th he wrote:

“Remember the fight is on, so all you fellows who are for selling America to the gutter; come on out and fight; but if you are afraid, then we are going to blast you from your filthy den.”

Minister, Sunset Church of Christ, Hollywood and Wentworth, Dallas.

“Come on out and fight”! “We are going to blast you from your filthy den!” Now, how can “we” do a thing like that without the use of force? A voting non-resister! Vote it out and close the dens and enforce the law. Jake was in that fight but if the nation arms and defends its existence and protects its citizens, including silly Jake, against foreign hordes, it sins, and everybody involved in it is a murderer, and fathers whose sons die fighting for liberty are going to face the judgment for not teaching them better! If they did not know more than Jake does, where would we be? The brethren are being treated to a
burlesque show, staged in all seriousness. Jake and Gene, Siamese twins of fanaticism, are declaring and carrying on war against us and most of the churches and preachers of Dallas and Fort Worth. They are now bosom friends of Frank Norris! What nice things they say about him, and how unfairly we have treated him! The way they giggle and make eyes at him a real romance may be in the making. And Frank is giggling back. And what makes the silliness more astounding, J. Frank Norris is a premillennial Baptist and is not a conscientious objector. He is attacking the churches and preachers. So is Jake and Gene. He is taboo as far as most Baptist churches are concerned. Jake and Gene are fast becoming so with churches of Christ. I'm not holding up the terrors of the judgment to them. The mesh of the seine will probably let their size through.

Prayer During War
(From Page 1)

who did not care whether or not they gained or lost the victory.

Then note carefully this sentence from the same editorial: "It seems that parents and others may pray 'for our boys' and for others that the war may come to a just conclusion and our loved ones returned home." "A just conclusion!" With the ideas entertained by Brother Boles and others, I do not see how they can think that any conclusion arrived at by force of arms can be a just conclusion. And if, as these brethren think, our boys in the army are killers and murderers, why would they pray for them to be returned to us? Will they pray for this country to be filled with men whom they consider murderers and killers? Yes, I desire victory for this country, and pray for it; and yet I know the final disposing of all things rests with the Lord.

And finally, is there not a prayer for victory as plainly implied in the prayer "that we may use victory in a way well pleasing to God" as there is in a prayer that we may be worthy of victory?

Bogard Spoils His Pet Theory

Some weeks ago I heard a part of a radio address by Ben M. Bogard. I did not hear the beginning of his speech, but I heard enough to know that he was talking about the Bible and science. He dwelt on the well known dictum that acquired characteristics cannot be transmitted to the offspring. "That," said he, "is the reason the righteousness of parents cannot be transmitted to their children." But cannot Mr. Bogard see what that does for his pet doctrine of inherited depravity? Whatever depravity or sinfulness Adam and Eve had was an acquired characteristic. The creeds so teach, and so does Mr. Bogard. There was no depravity, or sinfulness, about them till they acquired that characteristic by disobedience. But acquired characteristics of parents cannot be transmitted to their children; so argued Mr. Bogard. In view of this all the Presbyterian and Baptist preachers in the land cannot fix this up. Will Mr. Bogard try it? If not, will some one else try to fix it for him?

-W. L. Whiteside.

Consistency—A Jewel
CHAS. H. CAMPBELL

In the January, February, March issue of B. D. Morehead's "World Vision," a sizeable advertisement, prominently displayed, gives emphasis to the title of a booklet which is in the form of the question "Can a Christian Kill for His Government?" Then, before the reader can purchase the booklet and read the argument presented, he is given the answer in the advertisement itself. "The answer is no!" says the advertisement.

Now, waiving the question and not pausing to discuss the issue, but simply considering the consistency of the paper, we read again in another advertisement: "Buy defense bonds with the dollars I save you on fire insurance." etc., etc. So, Morehead will sell the advertisements that sell defense bonds, (maybe he and others want to be defended), that furnish the men and guns to "kill for his government," and, thus make money on both sides of the proposition! Then to cap the climax, Morehead writes some notes for his paper, and he goes all out in trying to persuade the churches to buy his tracts and send them to the soldiers. He succeeded too. One "small, rural church bought $85.00 worth at $25.00 down and $5.00 a month. "It was then arranged to send 1,000 tracts to each of the five army chaplains, members of the church, at the expense of the church." Now, why send tracts to "chaplains," "members of the church," who are aiding and abetting those who "kill for the government?" Especially, since they contend that no Christian can kill for his government ("the answer is no!"") And if the rest were converted, no one would fight to defend Barney and the "other leading preachers" who recommended the booklet, "Can a Christian Kill for His Government?" and who, declare "the answer is, no."

Then, no one could sell "defense bonds" so, no one would advertise them, and Barney could not make any money—at least, not on advertising. Better be careful, Barney, you may "kill" your business, and that would be bad, for your one man missionary society is on its way out; that is, unless some brethren are still blind after reading the Don Carlos Janes Will,

Agencies And Trust Funds
G. K. WALLACE

In regard to the "Janes will" it occurs to me that Janes collected money under the pretense of serving as a "forwarding agency only." He claimed he could save the brethren money in sending to the missionaries. There is quite a difference in a Trust Fund and a Forwarding Agency. The Firm Foundation is serving as a forwarding agency for monies to be sent to "conscientious objectors." Is the Foundation building a trust fund with this money? George Benson is "receiving" money to "forward" to missionaries (so I am told) and it would be interesting to know if the money is being sent or held in a trust fund.

In our debates with the Christian Church we defended the work of the Advocate and other papers on the ground of simply forwarding the money. Now it turns out to be "a trust fund."

Too, what about the money being collected for "Post War Work" by Benson? Is this a Trust Fund?
In the latest issue of the Christian Unity Quarterly, of which James DeForest Murch of the Christian Church and Claud F. Witty of the Church of Christ are joint-editors, we have a solution of the problem of division between the two bodies suggested by Ernest Beam of Long Beach, California. Bro. Beam read a report in the Christian Evangelist that there "was not the least sign of those using the instruments surrendering the use of them nor of those opposing the instrument abandoning the opposition to them." So it is evident that some Christian Church preacher is able to see that no headway had been made toward actual unity between the two bodies, even though a number of years have been spent in the effort. Anybody can read the Unity Quarterly and see that those who use the instrument in the worship have no intention of giving it up. Every expression made by them is a bold declaration of this fact. Yet some of our own brethren are so gullible as to be led away with the idea that unity is about to be accomplished. And Judge Beam himself thinks that "a victory has already been achieved and now needs but to be maintained." A victory for whom? If any victory has been achieved, it has been a victory for the Christian Church, for not one inch have they given of their ground of innovations. All you need to do to know that this is true is just to read the Unity Quarterly.

What is to be done where there is strong conviction on both sides of the instrumental music question? Bro. Beam has found the answer. And here it is:

"How often I have heard my preaching brethren use the illustration of the old negro on faith, 'If'n God say to jump through dat wall it's my business to jump. It's his business to get me through.' Well, the Lord wants this wall that separates brethren penetrated and broken down. It's our business to jump; it's his to get us through."

A few years ago Claud Witty solved the problem by suggesting some wirewalking, and now Ernest Beam has worked out by a process of wall-jumping. The wall that separates the Christian Church and the Church of Christ and that has destroyed the fellowship between them is the wall of innovations-instrumental music, missionary societies and many other human inventions in the work and worship of the church. Fellowship cannot be restored as long as this wall is between them. So what is to be done about it? Bro. Beam says to jump through it—"it's our business to jump; it's the Lord's business to get us through." Notice that he says "it's their business to jump." I wonder whom he means by "their." Evidently he included himself, and the brethren who stand on the same side of the wall with him must be meant. He didn't say that it is "their" business to jump, but it is "our" business to jump. Well, if we jump, and the Lord puts us through, we will be on the same side of the wall with the Innovationists. We will stand right where they stand. And that is exactly what they want. Unity can be secured that way, no doubt, but it will not be the unity the Lord wants, for then all of us would be on the wrong side of the wall. Do we stand on the right side of the instrumental music wall? If we do, then why is it "our business" to jump through to the other side? I think Judge Beam has a very poor conception of what "our business" really is. As long as I am on the right side of that wall I am not even going to try to jump, and I know hundreds of other brethren who feel the same way about it, for I don't believe the Lord would have anything to do with putting me through. I might get through but it would be without the Lord's help or sanction. If Bro. Beam thinks it is his business to make an effort to jump through that wall, let him go to it. Then he can notify us where he stands after the jump is completed. The Christian Church built the wall between us and destroyed the fellowship. Do they want to restore that fellowship? Then let them remove the wall or do the jumping through. They are on the wrong side of it—"it is their business to jump." And when they jump through and stand with us on Scriptural ground fellowship can be had and unity will be achieved. But if they expect that unity to be reached as a result of our jumping, I am afraid they will be disappointed, for there are many of us who consider it "our business" to stand on apostolic ground. However, I would not be greatly surmised to hear that Witty, Beam, Wm. Wayne Allen, John Richard Pack, Jimmie Lovell, and a number of others, including all the premillennial group, had actually jumped and made it through. And if that is their intention, the quicker they jump the better. Then brethren who are in doubt will know where to place them.

I have thought for a long time that there is no reason why this "unity movement" should be limited to the Christian Church—why not start a similar one with many of the denominations. If brethren can give up their defense of the truth against the encroachments of human authority in the Christian Church and just "love it out," why not do the same with other religious bodies, and now I would not be greatly shocked to see a movement of that kind started, for Ernest Beam further says:

Such meetings should be extended to include similar arrangements for and with all those who profess to take the Bible alone as the only rule of faith and practice.

There you have it. These meetings should be extended beyond the confines of the Christian Church. Let "similar arrangements" be made with all other groups who claim the Bible as their only rule of faith and practice. This will take in the Holiness groups of various kinds, the Assembly of God and other groups of Pentecostal% the Nazarenes and even the Baptist Church, for while Baptists do have their manuals they even "profess" in those manuals to take the Bible as their only rule of faith and practice, for they claim the manuals to be based upon the Bible. So it should not be long now till Beam will be telling us it is "our business" to jump through the walls of modern tongue speaking, miraculous healing, the mourner's bench system of getting religion, total depravity, the direct work of the Spirit and close communion. All of
these are held by people who claim the Bible as their only rule of faith and practice, and since we should, according to Beam, "extend these meetings" to include them, why should we not "extend this jumping" to reach them? I would just as soon jump and expect the Lord to get me through one of these walls as I would the wall of instrumental music. This article is being written in Indianapolis, Indiana, where I am engaged in a meeting with the Garfield Heights church. We have had in attendance at our services Bro. E. C. Koltenbah, who was formerly a preacher in the Christian Church. He is now in full fellowship and unity with us, but such was not accomplished by our jumping through the wall to him. He saw his mistake; he saw he was on the wrong side of the wall and he moved over to where we stood-on Scriptural ground. When others of the Christian Church have the same courage and take the same steps he did, there will be unity with them; but until they do that, the wall will still separate us-and we refuse to jump.

But Christian Church preachers who are taking part in the "unity movement" have no intention of doing that. They are expecting us to jump through the wall to them. And as long as fellows like Ernest Beam keep saying that it is "our business" to do so, they will keep looking for it to happen. Why do not these Church of Christ preachers, mixed up in the movement, tell them upon what grounds they can have fellowship? Is it because they are really preparing to "jump through the wall" to the other side?

A few quotations from some of the writers to the Unity Quarterly will show that they are expecting us to do the jumping. James DeForest Murch, co-author with Witty of the unity movement, says: "While they do not actually ask candidates for church membership* * *, 'Do you believe in Christ and hate instrumental music?' it must be admitted that unwritten man-made creeds are made, essential to our Christian fellowship." It is evident from this that he believes the opposition to instrumental music in the worship is an "unwritten man-made creed." And if we expect them to give it up in order to have fellowship with us, we are making a man-made creed essential to that fellowship. That he does not intend to do so is shown by his next sentence: "This dangerous practice is responsible for much of our trouble today." The use of the instrument in the worship, according to Murch, is not the cause of the trouble, but it is the opposition to instruments that is causing the trouble. And certainly he is not going to follow what he thinks is a "dangerous practice," and he thus serves notice on Bro. Witty and all the rest of the compromising preachers who stand with him that he has no idea or intention of giving up instrumental music. Calvin H. Smith, another Christian Church preacher, insists that "we should by all means come together now." And in order to get us all together now he lists the old slogan: "In Essentials—Unity; In Non-essentials—Liberty; in All Things-Love." Then he goes on to say:

"It is my honest and humble opinion that if Christ neither commanded nor forbade it, it must be classed as non-essential, for in this so great salvation surely God has revealed all the essentials in the Book: Now in this case the use of instrumental music must be left entirely up to the individual or local congregation. If a congregation cannot conscientiously have an organ, let them omit it. On the other hand, if a congregation has in the past and does yet use the organ in worship, and believes in it, then let them use it and in each case recognize the other as a sister Church of Christ."

How does that sound for progress toward unity? He could have just as well said the same thing about sprinkling for baptism, infant baptism, the burning of incense, animal sacrifice, prayer to the Virgin Mary, and cake and ice cream on the Lord's table. If "Christ neither commanded nor forbade" them, they "must be classed as non-essentials." So it should be left entirely to the individual or local congregation. If a congregation cannot conscientiously practice these things, let them omit them. But "on the other hand" if a congregation has in the past practiced sprinkling for baptism, and has baptized babies, or burned incense in the worship, or has offered animal sacrifice, or prayed to the Virgin Mary, or has used cake and ice cream on the Lord's table, and they still believe in such, let them go ahead and use such things, but in each case recognize the other as a sister Church of Christ."

What is the difference between this and the course suggested with respect to instrumental music? None whatever. All of them are forbidden in exactly the same manner. So this is the ground upon which Calvin Smith looks for unity. The matter of instrumental music "must be left entirely to the individual or local congregation." It is not to be determined by the teaching of the New Testament, but must be decided by human wisdom and desires. This agrees perfectly with what Ernest Beam thinks is "our business"-they are expecting us to jump through the wall to them. They want us to fellowship them in their unscriptural practices. If we do not want to use the instrument, they will not object; but if they do want to use it—which they do—we must fellowship them as "a sister Church of Christ." Upon this ground unity and fellowship could have always existed between the two bodies, but, thank God, there were men of faith and loyalty who refused to have fellowship with their unscriptural practices. And there are many men today who have the same faith and loyalty. If they expect fellowship with us, let them come back to the original ground revealed in the New Testament. Until they do that the unity movement is nothing but a colossal failure for the Church of Christ and an outstanding victory for the Digressives—the Christian Church with all of its innovations. Let them remember that they are the ones who moved away from Scriptural ground and built the wall between us. If the wall is to be penetrated, they are the ones who will have to jump through. And if they will jump the right direction, the Lord will put them through, but he will never assist any one who tries to jump through to the wrong side.
Several months ago I put a number of copious quotations from David Lipscomb's book, CIVIL GOVERNMENT, in the Bible Banner. Though our papers have been full of efforts to shout them down, they are still in the book and I disbelieve them as much as ever. No effort has been made by anybody to do more than become hysterical, or whimperingly sentimental. No one has challenged a single quotation, though I have been accused of everything from garbling to "digging up David Lipscomb's bones"! And still I do not believe the book. In my former article I did no more than present the quotations; I will now give a more detailed analysis of the book.

Alexander Campbell once argued as stoutly as any sectarian preacher today against the name Christian and was just as much in error as they, but I believe that in spite of this, and other errors he was a great and good man. I believe, likewise that David Lipscomb was a great and good man, though I do not accept a great many things he taught. The whole issue is, must their books which are still printed and sold enjoy an immunity they certainly did not have while they lived? Paul felt complimented and the Bereans were commended by the divine writer for measuring the teachings of Paul by the sacred scriptures (At. 17: 10, 11). Should Lipscomb and Campbell be treated with more reverence than Paul?


There is a very important point in Lipscomb's book with which I agree. He says:

There is a very important point in Lipscomb's book with which I agree. He says: "The human governments of the New Testament dispensation were but a continuation of those of the Old Testament, and of precisely the same nature." (p. 76)

Let us not lose sight of this point. I differ from him as to the origin of these matters. He says they were from the devil; I say they were ordained of God.

2. Some Inconsistencies

All those, as far as I have observed, who have gotten most excited over these matters, and have rushed into print glorifying the "conscientious objector," as though no one else in the church was doing as the Lord would have him do, if they have children of military age, or have sons in the army and navy. Not a one of them has a son in the "conscientious objector's camp." Lipscomb said all affiliation with the government was treason, rebellion, fornication and adultery. These brethren say Lipscomb taught the truth on these matters. Have any of them instituted proceedings to exclude their sons and others from the congregation? If Lipscomb is right and they do not do so, they have violated the law of God which says "withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly." (2 Thes. 3:6). They have not now and they are not dreaming of doing such after the boys come home. That casts grave suspicion over their contentions.

They all are laboring with congregations which have members who are working in war plants, making guns, bombs and planes or some other essential of war effort. Are these members just as loyal to God as the ones in the "conscientious objector's camp"? Are they not aiding and affiliating?

When the Nashville Bible School was established it was chartered by the state. That is an act of "affiliation" with government. The document executed at the time, setting for the purposes of the school, said that it was intended to give "training for citizenship." Why train for citizenship in the devil's government? I was informed by one who was a teacher at the Nashville Bible School in its early days, that the school petitioned the authorities (the devil according to this theory) to remove a sign at a street corner where they boarded the street car. They thought it was suggestive. But David Lipscomb said that you should not appeal to the devil's government. This is treason and adultery!

Since Lipscomb said all affiliation with the "powers that be" was treason and adultery and therefore he specifically stated that we could not "appeal to" them nor "depend upon" them for aid or help and since Christians themselves cannot use "force" I am wondering if they would not have both resorted to force and called upon the "law" if some one had started a gambling den or distillery on the grounds of the Nashville Bible School, or if some human beast had broken into the girls dormitory. But the "devils government" was doing such a good job of providing public security, fortunately none of these things happened. I am wondering if the parents of those girls would have trusted them in their charge if they had thought they would neither protect them themselves nor call for the police, in case their safety was threatened. Should a man sit quietly by and see his wife and children mistreated, unable to protect them, or to call the police?

These inconsistencies should weigh heavily in this discussion.
3. All Governments Alike Are Entirely of the Devil

“Christ recognized the kingdoms of the earth as the kingdoms of the devil, and that they should all be rooted up, that all the institutions of the earth, save the kingdom of heaven, should be prevailed against by the gates of hell.” (p. 86).

Since the Nashville Bible School is not the Kingdom of Christ, and is an “institution” will it not be rooted up? Notice, he did not say that a part should be rooted up. Lipscomb recognizes no differences in the kingdoms. The United States government is just as bad as the rest. The government that gives so much freedom to Christians is no better than one that persecutes them! On page 152 he says that the devil is the head of all governments. The devil is then the head of the United States government.

4. Entire Work Against Church

“Here the human governments are placed among the powers of the wicked one, and their entire work was against the church, and the Christian must needs clothe himself with the whole armor of God, that he might withstand them and fight against them as the enemies of God.” (p. 79).

If “their entire work was against the church” they were working against the church when they removed the sign at the request of Nashville Bible School! They were against the church when they delivered the mail for Nashville Bible School and the Gospel Advocate! The government does a lot of public health work, but that is against the church, for “their entire work was against the church!” They build good roads, but that is against the church! They protect us while we worship, but that, according to this theory, is against the church! They restrain the vicious to prevent them from praying upon society, but that is against the church! Lipscomb does not deviate from his general thesis that the government-any government is fighting against God and “their entire work” is against the church, when he tackles the question of the government championing the moral side of such things as liquor, gambling, racing etc. That is he maintains that “their entire work” is against the church when they restrict and prohibit sin and thereby the church (P.144)! That is, they are still wrong when they are right!

“Every act of affiliation, partnership, friendship or treaty with them was regarded and punished as treason against God.” (p. 89).

“All affiliation of the government of God, or of the subjects of the government with human government, or its subjects was declared of God, from the beginning, to be adultery.” (p. 102).

“God always forbade that his subjects should join affinity or affiliate with the human government, or that they should make any alliance with, enter into, support, maintain and defend, or appeal to, or depend upon, these human governments for aid or help.” (p. 41).

He not only said we could not have any “affiliation” with the devil’s government but with the subjects as well. So hereafter beware of the soldier, the school teacher and the postman.

4. Christ Against the Government

“Christ thus was recognized from before his birth as coming as the enemy of and to make war upon human government, and rulers sought from his birth to kill him.” (46).

This is another of Lipscomb’s assumptions. It is either true or false, so let us examine the scriptures. In Mat. 8:12, Jesus uses the expression “children of the kingdom” of those who are rightfully under it. He uses the same expression in Mt. 17:26 when he classes himself and Peter as children of the Roman government, which I am sure he would not have done had he not recognized its authority. “And when they were come to Capernaum, they that received tribute money came to Peter, and said, Doth not your master pay tribute? He saith, Yes. And when he was come into the house, Jesus prevented him, saying, What thinkest thou, Simon? of whom do the kings of the earth take custom or tribute? of their own children, or of strangers? Peter saith unto him, Of strangers. Jesus saith unto him, Then are the children free. Notwithstanding, lest we should offend them, go thou to the sea, and cast a hook, and take up the fish that first cometh up; and when thou hast opened his mouth, thou shalt find a piece of money: that take and give unto them for me and thee.” (See. P. 64).

Again Jesus said, “Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s; and unto God the things that are God’s.” (Mt. 22:21). If this were done the rule of God and Caesar could exist in the world together without conflict.

In John 18:36 Jesus convinced Pilate that there was no conflict between the government of Caesar and his own, and contrary to the statement of Lipscomb that the Roman government of Caesar was trying to kill him, Pilate was trying to turn him loose and asks, “What evil hath he done?” and describes him as “that just person,” and also said, “I find in him no fault at all.” Lipscomb’s assumption contradicts the Bible. (See P. 61-62.)

5. Paul Claimed Roman Citizenship

Paul acknowledged the authority of the Roman government and enjoyed blessings he could not otherwise have had. He had been falsely accused, as any person might have been, and had been thrust into prison. It certainly was not part of a concerted plan by the government to persecute Christians. The authorities there knew nothing of Christianity. Paul was the first Christian in those parts. After the local authorities learned that they were Roman citizens they asked them to leave privately but Paul proudly demands that they be treated with becoming courtesy as Roman citizens. “But Paul said unto them, They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now do they thrust us out privily? Nay verily; but let them come themselves and fetch us out.” (Acts. 16:37).

When David Lipscomb says that the government was the enemy of God, that “their entire work was against the church” he strangely assumes that every time Christians were arrested it was simply a part of a universal
plan on the part of the devil, through the government, to persecute Christians. Just a casual reading of the Acts of the Apostles will show that that is not true. In the latter part of the twenty-first chapter of the Acts Paul was being assailed by a mob, (not the government,) and the captain with soldiers rescued Paul. In the latter part of the twenty-second chapter we learn that the officer was about to treat him as was customary for criminals, thinking that he was a very desperate person, to have aroused the mob, but Paul again claims Roman citizenship in the following language: “And as they bound him with thongs, Paul said unto the centurion that stood by, is it lawful for you to scourge a man that is a Roman, and uncondemned? When the centurion heard that, he went and told the chief captain, saying, Take heed what thou doest: for this man is a Roman. Then the chief captain came, and said unto him, Tell me, art thou a Roman? Ye said, Yea. And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born. Then straightway they departed from him which should have examined him: and the chief captain also was afraid, after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had bound him.” (Acts 22:25-29) How did anybody ever get the idea from such readings as this, that the government was wholly of the devil, that the devil was its head, that this was a case of persecution of Christianity by the government, and that Paul was refusing to have any affiliation with it?

In the twenty-third chapter of the Acts forty men band-ed themselves together who “had bound themselves under a curse, saying that they would neither eat nor drink till they had killed Paul” (verse 12). This is not a case of persecution by the government, but as we read on, we learn that Paul appealed to the authorities for protection and claiming his Roman citizenship again and was rescued by the army. How did David Lipscomb get the idea from this, that the “entire work” of the government “was against the church”?

In the 25th chapter of Acts, standing before Caesars judgment seat, Paul declared that he was before the right tribunal where he should be judged, and before the right tribunal where he should be judged, and appealed unto Caesar for guarantee of that right. Read “the passage”

“Then said Paul, I stand at Caesar’s judgment seat, where I ought to be judged: to the Jews have I done no wrong, as thou very well knowest. For if I be an offender, or have committed anything worthy of death, I refuse not to die: but if there be none of these things whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them. I appeal unto Caesar. Then Festus, when he had conferred with the council, answered, Hast thou appealed unto Caesar? unto Caesar shalt thou go. And after certain days king Agrippa and Bernice came unto Caesarea to salute Festus. And when they had been there many days, Festus declared Paul’s cause unto the king, saying, There is a certain man left in bonds by Felix; about whom, when I was at Jerusalem, the chief priests and elders of the Jews informed me desiring to have judgment against him. To whom I answered, ‘It is not the manner of the Romans to deliver any man to die, before that he which is accused have the accusers face to face, and have license to answer for himself concerning the crime laid against him. Therefore, when they were come bither, without any delay on the morrow I sat on the judgment seat, and commanded the man to be brought forth. Against whom when the accusers stood up, they brought none accusation of such things as I supposed: But had certain questions against him of their own superstition, and that one Jesus, which was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. And because I doubted of such manner of questions, I asked him whether he would go to Jerusalem and there be judged of these matters. But when Paul had appealed to be reserved unto the hearing of Augustus, I commanded him to be kept till I might send him to Caesar. Then Agrippa said unto Festus, I would also hear this man myself. Tomorrow, said he, thou shalt hear him. And on the morrow when Agrippa was come, and Bernice, with great pomp and was entered into the place of hearing, with the chief captains, and principal men of the city, at Festus’ commandment Paul was brought forth. And Festus said, King Agrippa, and all men which are here present with us, ye see this man, about whom all the multitude of the Jews have dealt with me, both at Jerusalem, and also here, crying that he ought not to live any longer. But when I found that he had committed nothing worthy of death, and that he himself hath appealed to Augustus, I have determined to send him. Of whom I have no certain thing to write unto my Lord. Wherefore I have brought him forth before you, and especially before thee, 0 king Agrippa, that, after examination had, I might have somewhat to write. For it seemeth to me unreasonable to send a prisoner, and not with all to signify the crimes laid against him.” (Acts 25:10-27).

If Paul and Jesus had been urging the things that Lipscomb has in his book, the destruction of the government, they would have had what they thought was ample ground to put them to death. The government, as we see in these examples, was not the persecuter but the rescuer. I have been living sometime and the United States government has never persecuted me for my religion. If that is the way the devil resists the church it seems to me he is wonderful. I think also he was right nice to David Lipscomb, too! What if a representative of civil government does something sometimes against a Christian, do not church members sometimes do the same? If that is just reason for concluding that the government is therefore of the devil, would it not be equal reason for deciding that the church was of the devil also?

6. Godly Men In Old Testament Affiliated With Government

Lipscomb, while stating that governments are the same in the Old Testament and the New, dismisses the cases of “affiliation” in the Old Testament, such as Joseph, Daniel and others as being beside the point, because, he said, they only affiliated as “servant&.” If that would excuse Daniel of any odium for being “President” in the greatest government on earth, why did he hesitate to do some things he was commanded. If simple affiliation with the government was treason against God, and also adultery and fornication, as Lipscomb says, I ask, was eating certain kinds of food, worse than those sins. You remember he refused to eat them. If affiliation in government is adultery or fornication and Joseph was excused because he was a servant, would he not have been also excused if he had committed adultery with his mistress? Did God expect him to obey his master but not his mistress? I suppose if we were slaves we could “affiliate” with impurity. If Germany, and Japan win in the present conflict these brethren, will hate their opportunity to affiliate!
They might carry the mail, or black Hitler's boots! With me that is not reason enough for dismissing the Old Testament cases.

7. Christians in the N. T. Affiliated in Government

Not only did Paul avail himself of the blessings of Roman citizenship but others did also. In Acts 8:27-40, we are informed that the Eunuch was treasurer of a great country when he became a Christian, and if such a connection is fornication and treason surely he would have been given a slight admonition? Since this is evidently in the Bible as a model for us, is it not strange that there is not a shadow of hint that he gave up his office?

Lipscomb challenges for a case of a person who exercised some function of government after becoming a Christian and suggests that one case would prove his theory wrong. (PP. 108, 109). Well here it is! You remember that the Jailor of Acts 16 was baptized "the same hour of the night" that he heard the preaching which was shortly after "midnight." I suppose Lipscomb would agree that the Jailor became a Christian when he was baptized. But some time thereafter-after he became a Christian—we read: "And when it was day, the magistrates sent the sergeants, saying, Let those men go. And the keeper of the prison (notice he was still in office!) told this saying to Paul, The magistrates have sent to let you go: now therefore depart and go in peace. But Paul said unto them, They have beaten us openly uncondemned, being Romans, and have cast us into prison; and now they thrust us out privily? Nay verily; let them come themselves and fetch us out out."

But listen to Lipscomb:

"Then neither, Matthew, nor Paul, nor Cornelius, nor the Jailor (emphasis mine, O. C. L.), nor Erastus held office after being Christians. They could not have retained office." (p. 115).

What, could you want for a clearer contradiction of the Bible? The Methodist preacher "overlooks" the fact that the jailor "brought them out" of the prison before the baptism, which fact makes a great difference in the meaning of the passage. It is not less blameworthy that Lipscomb "overlooks" the fact that the Jailor was still exercising his office the last time we hear anything about him-after he became a Christian. Is that a mistake of the Bible or a mistake of Lipscomb? This one fact, by itself, overthrows the whole contention of Lipscomb's book!

Brother Boles says he wants a debate—at least he once did. Will he deny, as Lipscomb did, that the Jailor continued in office? Or, maybe the brother from Birmingham who "sat at the feet of David Lipscomb" too long (I wonder if that accounts for his choleric disposition?) will do it and then the advocate can copy it on its editorial page!

Lipscomb said he did not continue in office because he "could not." Why could he not? For him to do so would violate the main contention, the corner stone of Lipscomb's theory! But the fact that Lipscomb says he "certainly did not" and "could not", while the New Testament says he did, shows that the writer of the New Testament did not have the same theory as Lipscomb!

Lipscomb argues at length on the evil results of Christians holding office, but again the Lord evidently did not see things as he did! The Methodist preacher sometimes pictures to his audience or his readers the evil effects of immersion!

"It is certainly true that neither Cornelius nor the Jailor continued in office. (p.110)."

"Then Erastus was certainly not the treasurer of the city." (p. 112).

Lipscomb says that chamberlain meant treasurer. Substituting treasurer for chamberlain the passage in Romans 16:23 reads: "Erastus the treasurer of the city saluteth you." The Bible says he was; Lipscomb says he certainly was not!

1. Erastus was the chamberlain of the city-Bible.
2. Erastus was certainly not—Lipscomb.

But you may be wondering what evidence he had that is not in the Bible to justify him in making such a statement. Hear him:

"It is morally impossible, the government seeking to annihilate the church, should in so prominent and influential a city as Corinth, having constant communication with all parts of the empire, tolerate a Christian in so high and important an office as treasurer of the city. It is impossible that it should have tolerated so active, well known, and earnest a Christian as was Erastus." (p.110).

What have we now? It was morally impossible for what the Bible says to be true, it must mean something else! It seems to me I have met with this sort of treatment of scripture before! I am told by others that it would have been impossible for three thousand to be immersed on the Day of Pentecost, and therefore they were sprinkled!

In the discussion of the case of Erastus, Lipscomb uses these expressions: "may have been," "indicates the probability," "doubtless," 'most likely," "it is doubtful," "But I think it simply means," "must have been." That is the way the Methodist preacher gets Lydia's babies sprinkled! After this sort of thing for a page or two, he concludes the discussion of Erastus thus:

"Thus vanishes the last vestige of an example of a Christian holding office in New Testament times." (p.p.110-112)

8. Can A Soldier Be Moral?

Another erroneous assumption of Lipscomb's book is that a man cannot be moral and be a soldier. Remember he said there was no difference on this question in the Old Testament and the New, and I agree with him on that point. John the Baptist certainly was moral and taught...
morality. In the third chapter of Luke, soldiers came to John and asked, “And what shall we do?” If it was immoral to be a soldier, I ask, Why did not John warn them to desert the army and take the consequences? They had armies, wars and soldiers then, why do we not read something about a ‘Conscientious Objectors’ Camp’?

I have always regarded Joshua, Caleb, Gideon and Cornelius as high examples of morality, and they were all soldiers. Will those in the conscientious objectors’ camp claim to be more moral than Joshua or Cornelius? One of the highest compliments ever paid to human beings, was given by God to Joshua and Caleb: They “wholly followed the Lord God of Israel.” (Joshua 14:14) They were soldiers.

Lipscomb says that God never ordained good men as avengers.

“Now God never ordained one of his true, obedient and spiritual children as an avenger to execute wrath, either in this world or the world to come. In the world to come the devil is appointed to execute wrath on the evil doers.”

“But that he always ordained the wicked to do the work here assigned (Rom. 13:1-7) these ‘Minister’s of God’.” (p. 148).

On page 137 Lipscomb argues the fact that the civil government uses force as one of the reasons why a Christian can have no part in it.

The following cannot be misunderstood:

“A bloody, cruel work demands a bloody, cruel character to perform it. A bloody, cruel destiny is God’s reward.” (p. 151).

Saul was “commanded” to go down to the land of the Amalekites and kill every living thing. Lipscomb says God uses one wicked people to punish another. That may look all right as a theory, but in this story Saul was rejected as a bad man not because he carried out this command, but because he did not do so! According to that reasoning Saul would have been more moral than God!

Since some one wants (?) a debate on these issues. Here is another proposition: I affirm that Samuel was moral when he “hewed Agag in pieces before the Lord in Gilgal.” (I Sam. 15:33), and that Saul was immoral when he did not do so. Remember it is Lipscomb who says the principle is the same in the Old Testament and New Testament.

According to Lipscomb, (and these brethren say he taught the truth on these matters) Samuel was not one of God’s true, obedient children, for he executed vengeance for the Lord. You know, it must take a “bigger mind” than I have to believe that Samuel was “a bloody, cruel man” and “that a bloody, cruel reward” will be his!

Elijah killed four-hundred and fifty false prophets. According to Lipscomb’s theory he was a “bloody, cruel man,” but I do not begin to believe it. Lipscomb says there is no difference in Old and New Testaments on this government issue.

In Numbers the twenty-fifth chapter we have the story of the death of “twenty and four thousand.” They had sinned and God said to Moses in the fourth verse, “Take all the heads of the people; and hang them up before the Lord against the sun, that the fierce anger of the Lord may be turned away from Israel. And Moses said unto the Judges of Israel, Slay ye every one his men that were joined unto Baal-peor.”

As the passage proceeds Phinehas, the grand-son of Aaron is said to have made an “atonement for the children of Israel” because he killed a man and a woman at one stroke. A person is hard-pressed by a theory to conclude the Phinehas and the judges who killed twenty-four thousand wicked people here, at God’s command, were “bloody, cruel men” and they would be rewarded with a “bloody, cruel reward.” I do not believe it.

9. The Command To Kill And Not To Kill

Both commands are in the same Bible; both are commands of the same Lord. They were parts of the same law. Every person under the law of Moses was commanded not to kill and every person under that law was commanded to kill! Only the infidel would be so unfair to the Bible as to think that these are contradictions. A person would be an unbeliever who would believe only one of these statements. The truth was that they were not allowed to kill as individuals without a special command to do so, but as an organized society they were strictly commanded to do so for certain violations of law. In this way, through organized society, God executed vengeance just as he does today.

1. Deut. 5:17 says: “Thou shalt not kill.”

The latter passage reads: “If thy brother, the son of thy mother, or thy son, or thy daughter, or the wife of thy bosom, or thy friend, which is as thine own soul, entice thee secretly, saying, Let us go and serve other Gods, which thou hast not known, thou, nor thy fathers; namely of the Gods of the people which are round about thee, nigh unto thee, or far off from thee, from the one end of the earth even unto the other end of the earth; thou shalt not consent unto him, nor hearken unto him; neither shalt thine eye pity him, neither shalt thou spare, neither shalt thou conceal him: but thou shalt surely kill him; thine hand shall be first upon him to put him to death, and afterwards the hand of all the people. And thou shalt stone him with stones that he die; because he hath sought to thrust thee away from the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt, from the house of bondage. And all Israel shall hear, and fear, and shall do no more any such wickedness as this among you.”

Every man was to have a part in all such executions. Lipscomb’s theory is that the Lord never ordained that his true, obedient children execute vengeance, but all Israel was commanded to have a part in it.

I gave you the quotation from page 148 that the “devil is appointed to execute wrath on evil doers”. “in the world to come.” My Bible says that “the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone ... and shall be tormented day and night forever and ever.” (Rev. 20:10). The devil is not the ruler there, but
is there to be punished. I am afraid David Lipscomb had been reading the fables of the Catholic Church. Hear him again: “Satan rules in hell” (p. 73). He says in the same connection that Christ rules in heaven. 1 Cor. 15:23, 24 tells us that at coming of Christ and the resurrection of the dead that Christ will deliver up the kingdom. If Christ gives up the kingdom before the dead go to their final reward in heaven what will Christ rule over in heaven? But he says in his commentary on Eph. 4:8-10 that the coming of Christ will “usher in the glorious millennial morn,” and since a millennium is a thousand years, does he think that Christ will reign a thousand years after he delivers up the kingdom?

Lipscomb envisions some future day that the civil governments will all be removed. Because he says all men will be Christians. He further teaches that this will all have to be accomplished before Jesus comes again. But Jesus asks, “When the son of man cometh shall he find faith on the earth?” (Lk. 18:8). If these brethren who are championing Lipscomb’s Civil Government had been there they could have said. Oh yes, Lord. David Lipscomb said all people will be believers then. I guess that would have relieved the Lord’s anxiety on that point.

If they had gotten the letter from Paul that Timothy got, which said, “Evil men and seducers, shall worse and worse deceiving and being deceived.” (2 Tim. 3: 13), they could have comforted Paul exceedingly and saved him from such pessimism, by assuring him that David Lipscomb’s theory is that they will get better and better! Furthermore on the kingdom question Lipscomb said, “Human government bears the same relation to hell that the church bears to heaven.” (P. 73).

I take it that Lipscomb believed with the rest of us that the only way to heaven for the responsible being was through the church. Since he says the human government bears the same relation to hell. I take it, he believed it would be impossible for a responsible being to go to hell except through the human government. But further, many in the church will not go to heaven, but a bad church member might at the same time have nothing to do with human government. When he dies where will he go? He cannot go heaven, he was not good enough; he cannot go to hell because he is not in a human government!

David Lipscomb certainly had strange ideas with reference to the kingdom. Hear him.

Nine-tenths of the rulers and officers of all the civilized governments of the world, are citizens or children of citizens of the divine government.” (p. 88).

Did ever a writer in the Church of Christ make a stranger statement? Before that could be true, every Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, Catholic, Mohammedan, Buddhist etc., would have to-be in the “Divine Kingdom.”: No wonder he was wrong on sectarian Baptism! Will the brethren who want a debate, and who say he taught the truth on these things, affirm that Lipscomb was right about this? I will deny it.

But he was so blinded by his theory that he made another statement which flatly contradicts the New Testament.

"God could not choose Christ to minister wrath in hell. Hell, Recognizing fully the righteousness and justice of punishment of the rebellious in hell, it would yet have been inflicting the torments of hell upon Jesus to require him to stir up the fires of wrath, and execute vengeance in hell on the wicked. God chose the devil, one fitted in character for this work." (p. 74).

If it would torture Jesus so to punish the wicked, why would it not torture his Father? I wonder if David Lipscomb never read 2 Thes. 1:7-8? “And to you are troubled rest with us, when the Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels, in flaming fire taking vengeance on them that know not God, and that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ: who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of his power; when he shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired in all them that believe (because our testimony among you was believed) in that day.” Lipscomb asserts that Jesus could not take vengeance; the New Testament says that is what he is coming again to do.

10. Affiliating in Government

Distrusting God

Speaking of affiliating with civil government Lipscomb said, “To do so is to distrust God.” (p. 145).

After telling us over and over again that we should not "appeal to," "support," claim protection of," "seek help of," "rely upon," "participate in," "affiliate with" the government or the subjects of civil government, he tells us that it is unnecessary in these words:

"While his servants were faithful to him in this government, he permitted no evil to befall them, fought their battles for them, delivered them from their enemies, and kept "in perfect peace those whose heart was stayed on him." (p.42) and again; "no evil shall come to him that trusts in the Lord." (p.137).

He is insisting that we need not do anything to promote. public security, that God will take care of us, and when we attempt to do something in that direction, we are distrusting God.

The Holiness, using this same reasoning, refuses to have a doctor for his wife or baby. The Primitive Baptist argues that we need not get in a storm pit when the cyclone comes, and to do so is to distrust God. I have noticed that God will let a Christian die when he fails to have a doctor and take medicine; he will let a Christian get wet if he does not wear a rain coat when it rains. He will let a Christian freeze to death if he does not try to help himself. Though we are taught in the Bible that the Lord gives us our daily bread (Mat. 6:11) he would let us starve to death if we do nothing ourselves, and I am sure the man is not distrusting God who works, for his daily bread.

The average , sectarian preacher will tell you, if you are baptized for remission of sins, that you are distrusting God, and so they say, “Only trust him!”

When I try to do something for the betterment of the world through the government he ordained, I am not distrusting him. If Lipscomb were right then Paul distrusted God when he appealed to the authorities for protection! To use the human is to reject divine wisdom and divest ourselves of divine help.” (p. 146).
11. Acts Classified—All Same in God’s Sight

Another assumption fundamental to the anti-government idea is the unscriptural notion that human acts are always to be classified in the same way. If an act is ever classified as moral it is always immoral, or if it is immoral at one time it is always immoral. This fallacy is exposed by the fact already presented, that killing under certain circumstances is forbidden and under other circumstances is commanded. But let us notice some additional proof. Ordinarily to borrow with no intention of paying back would be immoral, but when God commands it, as he did to the Jews on one occasion (Ex. 3:22), it is the right thing to do. To tell something contrary to fact is usually an immoral act, but in the cases of Rahab the Harlot (Josh. 2:1-7; Josh. 7:17, Heb. 11:3) and Elisha (2 Kings 6:19), it was right. When God commands to kill it is right to kill. (Deut. 3:6-11; 1 Sam. 15:3; Num. 25:4-9)

There is only one standard of right and wrong, not what some man thinks is right or wrong, but what God commands. “For the word of the Lord is right; and all his works are done in truth.” (Psa. 33:4) “As for God his way is perfect: the word of the Lord is tried.” (Psa. 18:30) “The word of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.” (Psa. 12:6) When Abraham was commanded to kill his son, he did not say, I can’t do that Lord, that’s immoral! Neither is it immoral when the government which God ordains uses the sword he ordains. (Rom. 13:1-7; The Jailor had a sword (Acts 16:27) as an officer of the law is ordained to have, and he was exercising his office the last we hear of him in the New Testament, the day after he was baptized.

12. The Government Ordained of God

In spite of the plain Bible statement that the government is ordained of God, Lipscomb spent a lifetime trying to prove that it is ordained of the devil! He cites certain passages (John 12:31; 14:30; 16:11) which speak of the devil as the prince of the world and he assumes that this simply means the government. Are not a great many bad people spending their lives in opposition to the government? Does the devil not operate through them? Lipscombs labors to prove that man committed treason against God, set up a government at the instigation of the devil, of which the devil was head and that when this was done “God ceased to be ruler.” Does the Bible say that God ever ceased to be ruler? Let us see. “And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power.” (Col. 2:10) “Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.” (Rom. 13:1-7)

There is only one standard of right and wrong, not what some man thinks is right or wrong, but what God commands. “For the word of the Lord is right; and all his works are done in truth.” (Psa. 33:4) “As for God his way is perfect: the word of the Lord is tried.” (Psa. 18:30) “The word of the Lord are pure words: as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.” (Psa. 12:6) When Abraham was commanded to kill his son, he did not say, I can’t do that Lord, that’s immoral! Neither is it immoral when the government which God ordains uses the sword he ordains. (Rom. 13:1-7; The Jailor had a sword (Acts 16:27) as an officer of the law is ordained to have, and he was exercising his office the last we hear of him in the New Testament, the day after he was baptized.


Since this is “the most complete statement of the Christians relation to civil government found in the New Testament,” let us study it carefully in connection with Lipscomb’s theory. In this passage, three times representatives of civil government are called the “ministers of God,” while Lipscomb says they are the servants of the devil and the enemies of God. What are we commanded to do toward the government? “Be subject to.” Can we by any stretch of the imagination believe we should be subject to the devil? If the government is entirely of the devil, should we not resist. James says, “Resist the devil.” (4:7) Does James contradict Paul. In Rom. 13:2 Paul says, “Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.” Lipscomb says “their entire work” is against the church, but Paul says here (v. 3), “For rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil. Wilt thou then be afraid of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise of the same: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God’s ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.” (Rom. 13:1-4)

“For he is the minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God’s ministers, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor.” (Rom. 13:1-4).

This teaches beyond the possibility of a respectable quibble that the government is God’s method of taking vengeance on evil doers to the point of taking life, just as he did in the Old Testament. Lipscomb said he could not “support” (p. 28) the government, give it part of “his means” (p. 84). What does a man do when he pays
his taxes, as he is commanded? It seems to me a Christian in that case would have to obey God rather than Lipscomb!

14. Christians Must Furnish Sword for Government

After telling us in verse 4 (Romans 13) that the government ordained of God to take vengeance for him would not bear the sword in vain, that is, they would use it on occasion, as he had ordained they should, he says (verse 6), "For this cause pay ye tribute also." Christians then not only may but must furnish the sword. Let us see what we have according to Lipscomb's theory. The government is wholly of the devil, everything they do is evil and against the chin-ch, but Christians are enjoined to so enter into this wicked work against themselves as to provide instrument of their own torture and death! I am glad Christians do not have to believe what Lipscomb said to be saved!

How much worse is it to furnish the sword than to use it? If a man works on the railroad the hauls munitions and soldiers, if he works in the mines or the fields he is essentially aiding in the war. It could not go on without his work. Which is worse to build the bombers he is essentially aiding in the war. It could not go on without his work. Which is worse to build the bombers he is essentially aiding in the war. It could not go on without his work. Which is worse to build the bombers he is essentially aiding in the war. It could not go on without his work.

15. House Divided Against Itself Cannot Stand

Jesus shows the absurdity of thinking that the devil is foolish enough to be working against himself. He does not cast out his own. Practically all the laws of the civil government are against the very things that the devil would like for me to do, therefore, it is not of the devil, but of God, as Paul said. If because some in civil government are under the control of the devil, the government therefore, is of the devil, could we with the same logic conclude that the church is also of the devil, because there is no denying that some in the church get under the devil also!

16. Christians Must Fight Government—Lipscomb

"Here the human governments are placed among the powers of the wicked one, and their entire work was against the church, and the Christian must needs clothe himself with the whole armor of God, that he might withstand them and fight against them as the enemies." (p. 79) "There can be no hope for the conversion of the world, until these two kingdoms be recognized in their true, antagonistic spirit, mission and destiny." (92.) "Deliverance can come to the world only as man chooses to resist the devil and obey God." (82)

"This declares that everything that is in the world, that exercises rule, authority or power (that would include the Nashville Bible School-O. C. L.), save as that rule, authority and power come directly from God, and are used under his directions, to promote the rule and dominion of God, is an enemy of God, and his Son Jesus Christ, and must be destroyed by the rule and dominion of the Son before the kingdom and dominion of the world can be delivered up to the Father." (82)

"Christ's mission—the mission of his kingdom—is to put down and destroy all these kingdoms, and destroy everything that exercises rule, authority and power on earth (we ought therefore to start in on the Nashville Bible School—O. C. L.). How can the servants of Christ and the subjects of his kingdom enter into, strengthen (as we certainly do when we pay taxes—O. C. L.), and build up that which Christ and his kingdom are commissioned to destroy. How can the Christian enter into and serve the human (like the Nashville Bible School), how can he divide his fealty, his love, his means (such as his taxes—O. C. L.) and his time, his talent between the kingdom of God and the kingdom of the evil one." (p. 93, 94).

"But if every man converted to Christ withdrew from the support of the earthly kingdoms (refused to pay taxes—O. C. L.), these kingdoms would weaken and fall to pieces for lack of supporters; 'little by little' giving way before the increase and spread of the kingdom of God." (p. 90.

"War of extermination" (14).

"All of which Christ came to destroy, and which must be destroyed, consumed, before Jesus Christ the Saviour delivers the kingdom up to God, the Father, that God may be all in all." (p. 115).

"He wishes human government to continue as long as man continues to sin."

Here let me pause to observe that he expects man to get better and better and while men are still on the earth to get so good they do not sin! How contrary to all human "Evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse" (2 Tim. 3:13!)

In his comments on Eph. 4:6-9 he gets the kingdom which was established on the day of Pentecost "reestablished" which he asserts will be a fulfillment of Isa. 11:6-9. But Paul said in Rom. 15:12 said that prophecy had already been fulfilled! Lipscomb vs. Paul: which will you take?

Lipscomb not only expects men to get to be so good that there will be no more sin before Christ delivers up the kingdom, while men are still on the earth, but he expects a miraculous change to come over the wild animals, or at least, some of his devotees think that is what he meant.

17. Must We Be Good To The Devil?

Let us sum up. According to the Lipscomb theory we are commanded to obey the devil, be subject to the devil, honour the devil, pay tribute to the devil, fear the devil and pray for the devil; for all those things are commanded with reference to the government and rulers!

After Lipscomb said that "God ceased to be the ruler, and the devil became the God of this world" (p. 54), a way back in the days of Nimrod, and has never ruled since, but will "reestablish" his kingdom in the future sometime, when men cease to sin and lions cease to eat lambs, God said, "the most high ruleth in the kingdom of men and giveth it to whomsoever he will" (Dan. 4:25), I lose faith in the Lipscomb Lion and Lamb story! When Paul said, "there is no power but of God" (Rom 13, 1, 2), I believe it. When it is said of Christ, "He is Lord of all" (Acts. 10:36) I know he will never have any power that he does not now possess.

18. Christ Antagonistic to God

This would not be complete without a sample of Lipscomb's exegesis, or wrestling the scriptures to, make a point. Here it is:

"Be subject to," 'submit to,' both translated from
one word, are the terms that the Spirit of God uses, to define the Christian’s connection with, and prescribe the duties he owes to these governments. ‘Submit’ means, ‘to yield one’s person to the power of another, to give up resistance, to surrender.’ It carries the idea that the person or body that submits, is entirely distinct and separate from and in antagonism to the person or body to which it submits.” (p. 76).

If a person is permitted to make his own definitions to Bible words he can make it mean whatever he wishes. Let us see how his definition works when applied to the scriptures. This same word is also used as follows:

“...and came to Nazareth and was subject to (in antagonism to) them.” (Luke 2:51) !!!

“Wives submit yourselves unto (be antagonistic to) your own husbands, as unto (antagonistic to) the Lord.” (Eph. 5:22).

“Therefore as the church is subject unto (antagonistic to) Christ, so let the wives be (antagonistic to) their own husbands in everything.” (Eph. 5:24)!

“Then shall the son also himself be subject unto (antagonistic to) him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all.” (1 Cor. 15:28) !!!

I don’t like Lipscomb’s definition, do you? It requires children to be antagonistic, to parents, wives to husbands, Christ to his mother and to God! Since it does not and cannot mean this, neither does it require us to be antagonistic to civil government. Nobody would advance such a ridiculous thing unless he was blinded by a foolish theory. “A thing that proves too much proves nothing.”

19. Final Summary

Lipscomb said nine-tenths of the rulers of civilized nations today were either in the kingdom or children of those in kingdom. This is not true.

Lipscomb said Christ could not take vengeance; the Bible says he will.

He said, “Erastus was certainly not the treasurer of the city,” the Bible said he was.

He said “he [Christ] was subject to” meant to be in antagonism to. That is not true.

He said the devil was the head of the government; The Bible says that God rules.

He said “Devil rules in hell, world to come; the Bible says devil “cast into hell,” “tormented”.

He said “their entire work was against the church,” but Rom.13:3, 4 says just the opposite.

Paul said “worse and worse,” Lipscomb said, better and better.

He says affiliation with government is treason, adultery, and fornication, but the Bible gives both precepts and examples for affiliation.

He said Cornelius, Jailor gave us office; the Jailor kept his, and there is no hint tat Cornelius resigned his captivity.

Lipscomb said fight against, resist and exterminate ‘the government; the Bible said be subject to.

Lipscomb said we could not support nor give it our means, and the Bible says, “pay ye tribute.”

Lipscomb said that they are the agents and servants of the devil; the Bible says they are “the ministers of God.”

He said Christians should not affiliate; be affiliated

He said no good man ever was chosen to take vengeance for the Lord; the Bible tells of Samuel, Elijah, and hosts of others who were.

He said no one ever exercised the functions of a civil office after becoming a Christian; the Bible tells us that the Jailor did.

He said Christians must not appeal to the government; Paul did.

He said the government persecuted Christians; but he was never so persecuted.

---

**BUY THESE BOOKS WHILE YOU CAN**

**THE POLYMATHIST**

This book of “many themes” was published in 1871 and has been out-of-print for many Years. We have fortunately found about two hundred copies of this rare collection of sermon themes and sketches, of lines with full comments, by the greatest preachers of that period. It is one of the greatest homiletical works ever published by an array of gospel preachers. Price $2.00.

**THE NEAL-WALLACE DISCUSSION**

We have purchased from the owner the remainder of the Neal-Wallace Discussion on Premillennialism. 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 cloth-bound book of 450 pages, with not less than two hundred sermons and outlines in synoptical form. Price $2.00.

**ORDER FROM**

TINIUS-SANDESON

TULSA, OKLAHOMA

228 E. THIRD

Page Sixteen

September 1944
A WORD TO "WORLD VISION"

A. B. KEENAN

Your 1944-45 catalog duly received and contents noted. In reply would say the legs of the lame are uneven. It is attractively printed on good paper. Much of what it recommends is beyond criticism. But there are one or two things on which I should like to animadvert.

"An improved service."

My idea of World Vision has been that one or two individuals were zealously trying to get the brethren to take more interest in foreign missionary affairs, and in their behalf to publish a quarterly so named. Now I notice what ought to prove a lucrative business operating in conjunction and with great opportunity to benefit by the association.

“But 'tis strange;
And oftentimes, to win us to our harm,
The instruments of darkness tell us truths,
Win us with honest triles, to betray's
In deepest consequence."

"Our deepest concern."

You say on page three, is to satisfy your customers. This may be hyperbole. If it isn't, I don't expect you to be in business very long. Most people don't engage in trade for their health, except indirectly of course.

"Heart-shield Testament."

True, I don't notice your listing of any St. Christophers to ward off the evils of travel in general and of battle in particular, but this "heart-shield testament" will almost do the same. You do not stress the necessity of reading it half so much as you do the carrying of it in the breast pocket as heart armor. You mention the miraculous in this regard. Do you not recall that the age of such died with the Apostles?

"Rev. F. N. Peloubet."

We cannot prevent the occasional sectarian newspaper or other referring to us preachers as "Reverend." But we can eschew the use of the title among ourselves, and refrain from kowtowing to sectarian preachers by using it on them. Why should it occur in any of "our" publications then? Maybe this point is not as weighty with you as it is with some others.

"Great Songs of the Church."

Granting only for the sake of argument that is a good book, the brethren publish better. Is it at least not venal (if not mortal) to use the good when the better is neglected? Powerful winds of division, fanned by unwarranted speculation, blast the brotherhood from whence "Great Songs" is spawned.

"Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Dr. Wm. F. Albright."

These, on page nineteen, recommend a map of Palestine. Wallaces, I know; Tant, I know; Douthitt, I know. But who are these? Is there not one wise man among us, even one able to judge the value of a Biblical aid and commend it to the brethren?

September 1944

“Christian Calendar."

Your subhead declares the 1945 to be the “34th Annual Edition.” My own memory of these calendars goes back nearly thirty years. You say “Societies are enthusiastic” about them. Surely not those we've been condemning as unscriptural lo these many years. Further: “Placing them in every home is an excellent means of spreading the gospel in your community.” This must mean that the gospel is composed of isolated, disjointed, unrelated, and context-separated verses of Scripture. To this theory I cannot subscribe.

“D. D.”

Are you encouraging the rise of this degree among us by your liberal use of it in recommending Hurlbut's "Story of the Bible" on page thirty-five? “Recommended by all denominations.” Including the leading people in ours? Fie for shame. This is an obvious betrayal of all we've ever stood for.

"Civil Government."

You seem to be of that sinister nature that gladly sells ammunition to both sides in a war. Remember that on page eleven you call an American soldier a “hero.” On page forty-nine, in connection with the “U. S. A. Service Roll,” you term him our “lad.” If I understand the implications of Uncle David's dogma correctly, the American soldier had better be called “our heel.” Maybe John T., James D., and Eugene S. can make sense out of all this, but I'm stumped. You, dear Vision, remind me of Stephen Leacock's famous horseman, who, mounting his steed, rode rapidly in all directions.

"Dr. Hunley."

Since when has this estimable gentleman become the Voice of Experience to our distraught brotherhood? I believe he is soundly premillennial, will not worship without an instrument, endorses digression, and enjoys his own contributions to the "Christian Standard." Your display ing of his writings on page forty may be taken by some to be an acceptance of most of what his name connotes.

"The modern pastor."

Too many of his kind are plaguing the Church of the Lord. Page sixty-two offers a book for his delection. Is this one of the bolder recognitions of what was in the recent past a whispered fear of what has been afflicting the churches? Had I died before this event, I had lived a blessed time.

Occasionally, in some dark, sectarian mood, I have known myself to buy sectarian material from unblushing sectarians. But I have always been slow to encourage sectarianism in those who profess to be my brethren. They profess, but they do not possess my money, not yet for a while at least. More in sorrow than in anger do I consign your catalog to my open-top file, to wit, my wastebasket.
Jacksonville, Tex.
April 15, 1944.

Dear Brother Wilkinson:

I have just finished reading your article in The Bible Banner, “The Christian And Carnal War.” I agree with you in many of the things said in that article, and principally in the idea that the use of the sword in the punishment of evil doers is assigned to civil rulers or earthly governments; that “no mob, clique or clan, or individual has the right to use it.” But this position is contrary to that held by others who hold similar views to yours. For instance, brother W. W. Otey in the Firm Foundation declared that any one who would not defend his home against intruders would be consistent in refusing to defend his country against aggressors. Brother Otey thinks if it is consistent for a Christian to defend his country it is equally consistent to defend his home. He said one could not defend his home against such by “moral persuasion or by merely calling the police out.” Do you agree with Otey and the Editor of the Banner in this?

The issue, as I see it, is not does the government have a right to “punish evil doers,” but do Christians have a right to share in that punishment? It is not enough to quote, “be in subjection to the powers that be,” to prove that it is a “Christian duty” to use the sword unless we have an example of where some Christian did that. Wives are commanded to “be in subjection” to their own husbands. But are we to take this as evidence that she is to “be in subjection” in all things which he might demand? Are we to construe this to mean that, regardless of the demands made, she is to “be in subjection”? Certainly there are demands made of Christians by civil powers, such as paying tax and obeying such laws as are in harmony with Christian principles, and it is a sin against God for a Christian not to meet these demands. But no civil power has a divine right to exact of a Christian anything which contradicts his profession. I do not believe that Christianity would encourage any follower of Christ in doing anything which in any way would defeat the very purpose of its mission in the earth. Christianity came to save men’s lives, not to destroy. Christ came to teach the world how to get along without the use of the sword. When, therefore, a Christian turns to its use he defeats his very purpose in being a Christian. Never mind about those who will not be Christians and follow after Christian principles. The purpose of civil rulers is to take care of them by the use of the sword. God uses the Christian bearing “the sword of the Spirit” in overcoming evil in the world; but to those who are not subdued thereby He has “ordained” the use of the carnal sword in the event they continue in evil. But doubtless you will say, as many others have, “Well, if God uses civil rulers to punish evil doers by means of the sword, then what would be wrong in a Christian helping to bear it?” My answer to that is, such is not a Christian assignment. No Christian was ever assigned this duty, else we would have proof of it in the Bible and it would have been repeatedly quoted by the Bible Banner.

Though you stated that is is “a Christian duty” to help bear the sword in the punishment of evil doers, the only proof that you gave was your assumption, Do we have to assume that it is right for the Christian to pay tax? Do we have to assume that it is right for a Christian to do anything consistent with New Testament principles which may be enjoined by civil authority? Certainly not.

Are you -willing to affirm that bearing the sword is equally binding with paying tax or proforming any other duty enjoined by civil authority which is in harmony with New Testament teaching? If so, the issue is drawn, and I am willing to deny it.

Sincerely yours,
John W. Hedge.

Dear Brother Hedge:

I have your welcome letter and criticism of my article in the Bible Banner on civil government and carnal war. It is a kindly criticism, and confirms me in the high esteem I have always felt for you as a Christian and an able minister of the gospel. I am glad you can agree with my position in part, but believe you are mistaken when you say it conflicts with a position held by Brother Otey, and the Editor of the Banner on a Christian’s right to defend his home against unlawful attack. It rather confirms their position, although they are separate questions, and rest upon different bases.

I do not think it will contribute to an argument on the relation of a Christian to civil government to confuse it with his duties as head of a family. They may in a sense be related questions, but they are not identical. Man as the head of the wife, and her children, is their natural protector, and provider, as well as director, and owes duties to them which no other man can perform. God put them under his care and in a sense they are helpless except as he provides them protection and care, and I cannot conceive of a Christian father failing to provide it even at the cost of life to himself.

But right at this time in our national crisis the burning question is the duties we owe our government in this hour of peril in which it is under unlawful attack, and unprovoked attack, from an evil power. You agree with me that the Lord gave our government a sword, and authorized it to use it in just such a case as this one to resist an evil attack,
and punish evil. The only way it can use the sword is through its citizens, therefore your agreement places the sword in their hands, and obligates them to use it to punish this evil.

I think you also agree with me that Christians are citizens of the government where they live, and owe it obedience in all things belonging to such civil powers committed to them by the Lord. You have agreed that the use of the sword to punish evil doers was given to the civil powers by the Lord, and that it is a God-given function for the state to so use it, an ordination of the Lord for the good of men and human society in the world, Christians as citizens owe the state obedience in all rightful functions, and the use of the sword, you agree is a rightful function. Then a Christian as a citizen should bear arms when called upon lawfully.

You agree that a Christian should pay his taxes, and perform all other duties of citizens except the single one of bearing arms. Right here is the issue between us. I contend that if God committed the sword to the civil powers for this specific purpose, it meant for it to use it through the help of its citizens, the only way it could use it. If Christians compose that citizenship, or any part of it, they as citizens are obligated to use that sword when called upon to do so to punish evil, or they will resist the ordinance of God.

You imply, but offer no proof, that God has made an exception in the case of Christians who are citizens-they are exempted from such service. It is a duty imposed upon citizens by an ordinance of the Lord, but Christians are exempted. If such an exemption was made it would have to be done by special statute, and we find not one word in our Bible about any such exemption. We find plenty against killing people, or taking a life of a neighbor, but they are prohibitions against the unlawful use of the sword, and the unlawful taking of life. None of these passages apply to the Christian specifically, they apply to all men, not only as citizens of the state, but of the world, and to the unlawful use, of the sword. Such unlawful use of the sword is evil, even in the hands of the civil powers. That is why an aggressive war is evil.

You say an example will be necessary to prove a Christian should use the sword under his government to punish evil. Command, or precept, which means teaching, will not be? sufficient, you demand an example.

We sometimes prove matters by finding a command, or a 'precept, or an example, and say either should be sufficient, but now you have a matter which you say can only be proved by an example. It is nice when we can prove a matter by all three-command, precept, and example—but it is not always possible, and neither is it by any means necessary. I might call for an example of a conscientious objector in New Testament times, or when some Christian plead for deferment on the grounds that he was a Christian and objected to bearing arms.

But in the matter of example what about Cornelius, captain over a band of a hundred armed men, all soldiers? Peter was sent of God to tell him words whereby he could be saved, but if you brethren are correct Peter failed to tell him the most important thing of all, that is that he must first lay down the sword; We have an account of what Peter did tell, and they were words that would save him, but not one word about him laying aside his sword, and resigning his command. I am sure that I know preachers today who would have used that in his first line of argument, he would be told that he could not serve in the army and be saved. Lay down your sword, resign your command, then you can be baptized and be saved.

There was also the Phillipian Jailer whose duties required him to use the sword, and Paul preached to him. Did he ask him to resign his post as jailer as a condition of salvation? Peter's sermon to Cornelius, and Paul's to the Jailer, would have been mockery if they could not be saved, in their present occupations.

The wife should be subject to her husband in all things which the Lord has committed to the husband as head over his wife. No more, and no less. But certainly in all things the Lord ordained. If he demands submission in something evil which the Lord did not commit to him, she will obey him at her own peril. The same is true of our government. If it calls upon us to obey it in some function the Lord never committed to it, we will do so only at our peril, something like aggressive war for instance. The Lord did not give it a sword to use in aggressive war, that is an evil, and a Christian cannot engage in such a war without sin.

I agree that a Christian should not obey his government when it demands something of him which contradicts his profession. But you have not proved that the use of the sword to punish evil doers contradicts the Christian profession, and you cannot do so without making God contradict Himself. How can that which the Lord ordained contradict the Christian profession?

I agree that the enforcement of civil laws is not a Christian assignment, neither is banking, farming, school teaching, or collecting taxes. It is a civil duty—a civil assignment, therefore—but if called upon to perform such a duty, we resist them, we will be resisting God, for the powers that be, the civil powers, are ordained of God. That does not mean that God ordained any wicked powers, either. God ordained the powers, and they made themselves evil if they are. God made man, and he made Satan, but He did not make them evil, they made themselves evil, and God is not responsible for their evil.

You say I have only assumed the argument that it is a Christian's duty to help bear the sword in punishing evil doers. It is not I, Brother Hedge, who has assumed the argument. You and I have agreed God gave the sword to the state for that specific purpose, and Christians are part and parcel of the state, they help to make up the state. Now you assume that Christians are exempted from this one particular duty which citizens owe their state. You agree the duty should be performed, evil should be punished with the sword, but Christians are exempted. Prove the exemption, and you will have proved something.

That is what ails your proposition, you want me to affirm a negative. You admit all the proposition contains except the bearing of arms by Christians—you say they are exempted. Then you should affirm the exemption. I deny it. I say they should perform all duties which comes within the lines of citizenship, and the powers God conferred on the civil government. You say all except one, it is exempted, and here is the issue between us. Prove the exemption.

Your Brother, T.B. Wilkinson,
Dear Brother Wilkinson:

I have your letter of April 25, and will say in reply that I appreciate the spirit in which you wrote and the good things said about me. I have never been able to see why Christians could not discuss matters over which they differ in a kindly spirit. Let us cherish the hope that what we say in support of our respective positions will not destroy that mutual friendship which we know to exist between us, and especially our love as Christians.

It seems that we have the issue "boiled down" to this: Sword bearing is equally binding upon Christians as much so as paying tax or meeting any other governmental obligation consistent with the Christian's profession. This is what you affirm and which I most earnestly deny. Although you say that I am under obligation to affirm some things, yet logically you are in the affirmative as you can see.

My reference to the wife being "in subjection" to her husband "in all things" was made for the specific purpose of illustrating the sense in which the Christian is to be "in subjection to the powers that be." You admit that if a civil power demands at the hands of a Christian that which contravenes God's will then he is not to be in subjection. Now if you could have found a verse which says, "be in subjection to the powers that be in all things," I feel that you would have used it to establish your claim that sword bearing is a Christian's duty. Now will you say, as one brother with whom I have discussed this question, that sword bearing is not a Christian's duty but his duty as a citizen of the government? If so, then why try to prove what is right for a Christian to do as respects his duty to civil government by Rom. 13:1-7? Are not Christian duties taught there?

Do you concur with the belief that it is right for a Christian to fight for "the four freedoms" one of which is religion? If you say that it is wrong for a Christian to defend the religion of Christ with the carnal sword, then how could you conscientiously meet the government's demand in the present conflict to do that? If you say that you would not meet that demand then you are, to say the least, one fourth "conscientious objector." Again, if the first three freedoms should be fought for and religious freedom should not be fought for, then it is inferior to them. Do you agree?

As I told you before, I emphatically deny that sword bearing is a Christian assignment. I deny that "the rulers" of Rom. 13 were Christians. True, the Christians were citizens of it but not "the ministers" of it. Paul is here (Rom. 13) merely setting forth their relationship to it as that of the governed and protected and not as the "ministers" of said government. Of course, if you or any one else could possibly show by either precept, example, or even necessary inference, that the Christians helped to bear the sword, then your claim would be established. You only assume that they did it simply because they were under the power. Those who exercised the function of sword bearing "attended upon this very thing continually," being "ministers" of God for that purpose. Never mind about it being right for the man of the world to bear the sword and wrong for the Christian to do it. While God appoints "rulers" to execute wrath upon "evil doers" by means of force, he ap-

points his people to use the "sword of the Spirit" on them. These two swords accomplish God's will in overcoming evil in the earth. Because God appoints one group of individuals to accomplish his will in a certain way does not prove that all groups have that right.

I called for precept and example in the establishment of your position. You reply, "such is not always possible nor necessary." Then why do we have the precepts and examples of Christians, in the Bible? Suppose some one should ask you to prove that it is right for a Christian to pay tax? Would you not go to the precept found in Rom. 13 and the example set by Jesus? Again, when you debate the instrumental music question with a digressive do you not call for the precept and example. Are we trying to do what is right by what the Bible says or by what it doesn't say? If a Christian should refuse to bear the sword would you say he sins? And how could you prove that he sins if you could not produce the proof that such service is authorized?

Your effort to prove by the jailer and Cornelius that it is right for a Christian to bear the sword is beside the point. These men, at the time they functioned as government agents, were not Christians. But you want me to prove that they "resigned" after they became Christians. That's not my obligation. You are the one who declares that they "continued" to bear the sword after they became Christians. This you can't prove, hence your "examples" here fail you.

As to Peter failing to tell Cornelius what to do to be saved, if he failed to tell him to quit his army post if such is wrong. Now I know that you know that we only have a brief account of what Peter told the Jews on Pentecost to do, for "with many other words did he testify and exhort them." Those things are not recorded. Did he tell them, in answer to their question, "What shall we do?" that they would have to leave off the practices of Judaism? If not, then according to your reasoning, he didn't tell the people on Pentecost what to do to be saved! I believe that you know that there is a difference in telling an unsaved man what to do to be saved and in telling him what his duties are as a Christian. The things that are wrong in the life and conduct of a person who becomes a Christian are often times pointed out to him after he 'becomes such. Hence, new converts are referred to as "babes," hence the need of teaching and discipline. Thus Paul taught the Roman Christians: "Resist not him that is evil, but rather give cute wrath upon "evil doers" by means of force, he ap-
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the kingdom of Babylon was plucked up for the same reason the kingdom of Israel was. I doubt not that God's hand has, through human agency, removed every kingdom since time began because of wickedness. It could be that the present world conflict is for the purpose of removing the "dictator powers" and securing the right for democracy to live in the earth. Again it might be God's will that democracy bow to dictatorship. Since we do not know God's plans for the future we cannot know just when we should fight for the preservation or destruction of any power. If we fight we fight in the dark. There is too much evil in all "the powers" of earth for me to say just which one will be taken and the other left. "Righteousness exalts a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." "Our way of living" now may not be our living tomorrow; but one thing we know, "all things work together for the good of them who love God."

I would suggest that if the Banner editor agrees to publish a discussion between us that we first of all have some understanding about a proposition which expresses the issue between us. Our correspondence so far it seems has been to understand the positions of each other. What do you say?

Sincerely,
John W. Hedge.

Dear Brother Hedge:

I was glad to receive your letter dated April 29, and I have read carefully what you have said. You may be assured that our differences on this question will not in the least affect the high regard I have for you as a Christian, and an able gospel preacher, I think I know you are both. I believe that I might be of some help to you in the way of a better understanding of a Christian's relationship to the civil government.

You say we seem to have boiled the question down to an issue, which you state as follows: "Sword bearing is equally binding upon a Christian as much as tax paying, or meeting other governmental obligations consistent with the Christians profession." You want to earnestly deny this, and say I am logically in the affirmative. I am inclined to think that the things upon which we agree are of greater importance, and really settle the question which you propose to debate if we will only let them speak for us.

We agree that the carnal sword belongs to the civil government, given to it by the Lord, and the duty to bear the sword belongs to the citizens of such governments, along with taxes, and other governmental obligations required of such citizens. We also agree, I think, that a failure to meet the duties required of citizens places them in opposition to their government, and since it is God's will that such duties exist, it places them in opposition to the will of God, and therefore makes them resist the ordinance of God.

We further agree that Christians retain their citizenship as long as they live, and are as much obliged to meet them as any other citizen of the government, and a failure to do so places them in opposition both to the government and to the Christian religion, which requires them to discharge such duties. You agree fully with this, except on the single duty of bearing arms. There you claim to find an exemption of some sort which frees the Christian from this duty. Then this seems to be the point of differences between us. I deny that such exemption exists, and call upon you to produce Scripture to prove it.

Searching for a proposition which sets out what I believe and teach on this subject, I will be glad to affirm that Christians are required by the New Testament to obey the commands of their civil government in all things which the Lord delegated to them as such government. This, of course, would include sword bearing as we have agreed that the Lord delegated the sword to the civil government, but only for the purpose for which the Lord ordained it.

We agree that if a civil government requires a Christian to perform some act that contravenes the will of God, that he should refuse to comply, even at the cost of liberty, or life. But is sword bearing, for proper purposes, under governmental instructions, contrary to the will of God? Did God ordain that which is wicked and sinful? You are wrong when you say I need a passage that says a Christian must be in subjection to the civil powers in all things. I only need a passage which commands him to be in subjection in those things which rightly belong to the civil government, and I have it in the words of the Master. Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesars, and unto God the things which belong to God. Now it is merely a question of whether the sword belongs to Caesar, or God. If God gave it to the civil government, and you say He did, then it is your job to prove that He has taken from it, where Christians are concerned.

Do I believe that sword bearing is a Christian duty? Your question, Brother Hedge, does not do credit to your educated, logical mind. Answer it yourself in the following question. Do you believe that tax paying is a Christian duty? They are duties that belong in Caesars government, and a failure to render unto Caesar the things which belong to him disobeys the Master.

It is a Christian's duty to obey the laws of his country, and to meet its duties and obligations, and sword bearing is one of them. God ordained the sword as the power by which such governments are upheld. God's kingdom was not of this world, and is upheld by a different kind of power, but Christians are citizens in both kingdoms and have duties in each. But there is conflict in these two sets of duties only when man's ignorance makes them conflict. This can be done by the Christian being forced by the civil powers, or required, to use the sword for purposes different to the ones the Lord ordained, to kill, and rob, and murder, for conquest and aggression, as the Japs and Germans are doing in this war. On the other hand it might be caused by a Christian resisting the civil powers in the things which the Lord delegated to them like the proper use of the sword, tax paying, and other civil duties. Such conflict can only come from a failure to understand the proper relations between the two sets of duties on the part of one or the other.

Should a Christian fight for the four freedoms? Certainly not unless it becomes necessary for him to do so in the discharge of his duties as a citizen of the state. Neither should other citizens, even the government should not go to war over them unless it is made the subject of unlawful attack from some wicked power out for conquest, as our government has been in the present war. Our government...
not go to war for the four freedoms. We always knew they were right and proper for all men, but had no idea of forcing others to accept them through war, or from the use of any other form or force, or coercion, economic, or political. To force them upon others by the sword would destroy their nature, and instead of them being the four freedoms they would be four forms of democratic oppression, and not a whit better for the world than the powers sought by the dictators in this war. It was Hitler and the Japs who went to war, they took up a sword against them, and when they did so they were making an unlawful use of the sword. Satan alone inspires the unlawful use of the sword, and that is the evil God gave us the sword to resist, and when we do so we fulfill the ordinance of the Lord.

You “emphatically deny that sword bearing is a Christian assignment.” Why the emphatics, my brother? No one ever said it was. We have mutually agreed that it is a civil duty, therefore a civil assignment. Fortunately, or Unfortunately, we are all citizens of some civil government, even Christians, and we have civil duties and obligations just as binding upon us as our church duties. Tax paying and arms bearing are among them.

You “deny that the rulers of Romans thirteen were Christians.” How do you know so much about that which is not written? Paul did not say so. You must admit that some of them might have been, unless you mean to assume the extreme position that no ruler can be a Christian. God ordained the rulers when he ordained civil government, did He ordain something that is a bar to salvation? Do you hold with those who admit that God ordained rulers, but ordained for the devil to furnish all of them? Must the Lord depend entirely upon Satan to furnish rulers for the governments which He ordained? A government is not entirely made up of rulers, the common citizen is an important part in every government.

You warn me not to mind “about it being right for the man of the world to bear arms, and wrong for the Christian to do it.” Just why should I not mind this point? It is the meat in the coconut, and I like meat. Why is it right for the non-Christian to bear arms? Because he is a citizen, and a partaker of the protection and benefits his government is able to give him, and his government has a right to require it of him. But the Christian is also a citizen, and a partaker of the protection and benefits of his government, and owes it the same obligations. If not, why not? This is for you to tell, if you can.

They attend upon these things continually, you remind me. Yes, just as many of them as are needed. It is only in time of war, like the one an evil power has forced upon us, that any great number of common citizens are called to arms. Just a few citizens ordinarily actively bear arms, and the only way the common citizen is involved is in the way of moral support. In that sense the entire citizenship is behind the sword of the government.

Precept or example, I will accept either or both where they have a bearing on the point in dispute. I think I have given both in support of my position. But you say the Jailer and Cornelius, are beside the point because they were not Christians when the apostles preached to them. You seem to think Peter and Paul did require them to resign their offices, but not until after Baptism, and they already had them in the church. Now was that not taking an unfair advantage over them? Maybe if the apostles had told them what it was going to cost them they “might have asked for time to consider.”

But why should they ask them to resign? You admit that the Lord ordained for some one to perform those duties, and it was according to God’s will, that the sword should be used for this purpose. It seems to me that a Christian would be the very kind of man the Lord would want in their position. A non-who would enforce the law righteously. Don’t you believe that rulers should be good men, and where will you find better men than among Christians? What kind-of government can the Lord expect in the world if Christians are barred from ruling, and only wicked men can be rulers, men furnished by the devil?

You asked for an example of some Christian who actually bore arms and I gave you Cornelius, and the Jailer. Your sole reply is to assume that they were required to resign their offices, but offered no proof whatever. I also showed you that Jesus said if His kingdom had been of this world His disciples would have fought for Him, and you pass it up.

God plucked up the wicked kingdom of Israel, and he used the sword of Babylon, a pagan kingdom to do it. The wickedness of Israel was against more light, and was more wicked in the eyes of the Lord than the sins of Babylon, and for that reason. God plucked up Israel. I do not question the Lord’s judgment in plucking them up. He had sent prophets to warn them and they had cast them in prison, and even stoned them, but refused to repent of their evils. Then God said, “if they will not obey I will utterly pluck them up, and destroy that nation” (Jer. 12-17) and they merely reaped what they had sown.

I would not go so far as to say that God directly plucks up evil nations in every instance, I think He interferes very little personally in the affairs in this world, especially in a direct way. I am not strong for the direct operation theory in any of the works of the Lord. His eternal laws take care of them, and human agency has a large part in the operation of God’s laws among the nations.” Whosoever a man soweth that shall he also reap,” is one of those laws. Nations, like men, individually reap the fruits of their own sowing. “He that taketh the sword shall also perish by the sword” is another way of stating the same eternal law, and this applies to every sort of evil nations can sow.

I do not agree that we cannot know God’s plans as respects the principles of right and wrong. Stay on the side of right and justice and you will be on the Lord’s side in every case. Neither is there any mystery to me as to what side the Lord is on in this war, and I am not in the dark in the least. You say He might even want the dictators to win, and want the democracies to bow to them, but I do not believe you are that much in the dark as to the issues in this war. At least, we did not attack them, they took up the sword, and it was a sword of conquest, and aggression, a use the Lord never ordained for it. Since war is always an evil, and, they made the war, God gave us a sword with which to resist such aggression, and avenge this evil, and we are His ministers when we so use it. This is the only kind of ministers the Lord ever uses against that kind of evil.
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As for you and I debating the question, I was under the impression that we are debating it, and in about the only way Christians can debate such questions. So far as I can judge from our two exchanges the point of difference is very clear, and both of us have been devoting ourselves to the point at issue. There seems to be no difference as to the place occupied by the civil government, God gave it the sword to use for this agreed purpose, stated plainly in Romans thirteen, and He has never taken that sword away from them.

Now, if some one wants to affirm that God gave Japhan and Germany a sword to use for the purposes they are using it for, I will gladly deny it. That is an unauthorized use of the sword so far as the Lord is concerned, a sinful use of it, and only Satan authorized, and inspired them, to so use it. That is the use of it that all of the anathemas of God are directed against-murder, which is unlawful killing, which the Lord has always condemned as evil. That is why our country is justified in using the sword God gave it to punish their evil deeds.

Our entire difference then settles down to the part a Christian may have in helping to use the sword God gave his country. You claim his profession exempts him from this civilian duty, but admit that it does not exempt him from others, such as paying taxes, and otherwise supporting his government. If a Christian is exempted, by his profession, or by specific direction from the Lord, it is a matter to be proved by the Scriptures, and it is an affirmative matter. A negative might be proved by the silence of the Scriptures, but not an affirmative.

My affirmative position, as I understand you, has already been agreed upon between us, and we have no cause to argue over it. My position is that the Lord gave the sword to the civil government for this specific purpose, and the Christian is an essential part of the civil government as long as he lives in the world, and therefore obligated to perform the duties of citizenship fixed by the Lord. This is my affirmative, and it covers the whole ground. You claim some kind of exemption for the Christian, and that is the only difference I can see between us. You admit the Christian is a citizen, but with reservations, and your reservation destroys the very power by which civil government is able to function and exist. And it is a power which God gave to it, and when so used it fulfills God's will. I will be glad to hear from you again, and assure you of my best wishes for your success in the gospel.

Your brother,

T. B. Wilkinson.

Dear Brother Wilkinson:

I have your letter of recent date concerning our difference over the Christian's relation to civil government and thank you for same. Due to the fact that I am very busy now I will not have the time to go further into the discussion of our difference. Your last article did not, in my judgment, bring to light any new argument, I do not say this to throw off on you. You continue to give your opinion that bearing arms is the same thing in principle as paying tax or meeting any other governmental obligation consistent with the Christian profession. I say they are not the same-so that puts the laboring oar in your hand. You are the one to prove things-not me. You say Cornelius and
but that does not mean that the sword when so used is an evil if it accomplishes the purpose God ordained, ...

Why shall I be obliged to prove that Cornelius and the Jailer continued in their natural occupations after their conversion? Their occupations were important ones, and God had provided them by ordaining them, and now what made them sinful the very moment they are converted. Does repentance demand that a man forgo a lawful occupation just because he has repented? If their occupation had been a sinful one, like gambling, or selling liquor, conversion would bring an end to them, but their occupation was one God ordained. It was a necessary job before they are converted, but now they must reign or be damned. Who ever said so but you? Paul never mentioned anything like that, and they were sent to tell them words whereby they could be saved, both him and Peter. But you say we do not have a record of all they preached unto them. You assume that they might have required them to resign in some things they preached to them, but Luke did not record it, and you try to prove your point by the silence of the Scriptures. You should revise the rule, where the Bible is silent we are silent, and make it say, where the Bible is silent we speak, and we supply what they left off.

Your little byplay on the Jews and instrumental music in the worship is a poor answer to this argument. The Jew left his religion behind when he obeyed the gospel, and accepted the new, or he did not obey the gospel. They could bring their occupations along with them, but their religion was the very thing involved in their conversion, the very thing they had to surrender in order to become a Christian.

You say the very spirit of Christianity would forbid a Christian to take the life of any man. How do you know what the spirit of Christianity would forbid unless the Bible tells you? You might badly misunderstand the spirit of Christianity, and we know many people do. No Christian, or other normal man, would want to take human life, and would not do so except in the line of duty. No hangman delights in the execution of the most hardened criminal, but the laws of God, and the laws of civil government, demand it for the good of society. If this duty devolves upon a Christian he would perform it as agent of the state, and not as a Christian, and the principles of Christianity would require him to perform his duty as a citizen of the state.

You say God uses the sword against evil doers, but He won't use His own people for the purpose, He borrows executioners from Satan. It is right for the Lord to execute the criminal, but it is too wicked for a Christian to perform the execution. If He did use a Christian to perform this wicked act which the Lord wants performed, it would defeat the very ends of Christianity; but if the Lord uses one of the devil's children to perform it, it will serve the ends of Christianity, a very logical conclusion, I don't think! You make no distinction between Christian acts and civil acts. As a Christian, no man has authority from God to use a sword, even on the worst criminal, unless in self defense, the authority resides in the civil government, and the executioner only carries out its decree.

"Christians bear the sword which brings peace, and it is more powerful than any carnal sword, or all of them combined." I agree if you mean for the purpose for which this sword was given, but your comparison only confuses the issue for the two swords belong in two different kinds of kingdoms. A carnal sword will cut off a man's head, but may not save his soul. The other sword will save his soul but will not cut off his head, it has no power of that kind. A criminal may laugh at your sermon, but he won't laugh at the carnal sword. God gave different kinds of power for different things. There is a power in bread to feed the body, but the gospel cannot satisfy the demands of the body. Would it not be foolish to say there is more power in the gospel than in all the bread and meat in the world? They are different powers, and for different purposes.

The carnal sword was also given by the Lord to keep the peace of the world, and He must have thought it was necessary or He never would have given it. For what purpose do you think the Lord ordained the carnal sword, to bring war to mankind, or to keep the peace? Satan has used it to make war, but Satan has used other things God gave us for evil purposes, even the gospel. ....

"Would I lay down the sword of the Spirit for the carnal sword?" That all depends on what I want to accomplish. If I want to convert a sinner I will use the gospel sword, but if my purpose is to punish criminals I will need the carnal sword. I used such a sword only two nights ago. As a magistrate entrusted with the enforcement of law, I was called upon to assess punishment on a man who had violated the law of the State. I did not whack off his head at one full sweep, but I assessed such punishment as I thought his offense demanded, what I thought necessary to make him respect the law, and to protect peaceful citizens whose peace might be endangered by such law violations. I used this sword the Lord had placed in my hands as I think a Christian should use it, a minimum fine for this offense, and told the man to go forth and sin no more against the law.

Of course, I did not cut off his head, my jurisdiction does not extend that far, and this was not a capital offense. If it had been, however, I would have heard the cause just as cheerfully, and while I could not pronounce the sentence of death upon him, I could hold him over to a court which could. And if the evidence showed that he had committed a capital crime I would have held him with out bail to be tried for his life in a court of competent jurisdiction.

"Would Paul have laid down the gospel for a Carnal sword?" I am pretty sure that he would not. The Lord called him to be an apostle, and gave him a special commission, and special qualifications, and laid a woe upon him if he did not preach the gospel. I think Paul was a better preacher than he would have been as a soldier. I have heard that he had weak eyes, and a weak body, and such men would make poor soldiers at their best.

You say, "Never mind about others bearing the sword for his protection, that is in perfect accord with Romans 13:1-7. While the Christian bears the sword which brings peace, he is at the same time protected by the Lord through the rulers of the country." Yes, I am sure God uses the civil rulers to protect the preachers of the gospel, and the farmers, and the carpenters, and bankers, and all other peaceable citizens who are going about the business of the country which makes life possible in a great community like ours, and makes it possible for Christianity to grow,
and prosper. But who, besides you, has said that those civil rulers could not as well be Christians as of the devil? Who, besides you, has said the Lord can only man His civil government with wicked rulers, the Lord must borrow rulers from the devil to run His government? Why would a son of old Nick make a better ruler for the civil government the Lord ordained than a Christian? If an humble, God-fearing Christian will make a better ruler, and execute the laws more justly than a wicked man, why not let the Lord use him?

It would be wrong for a Christian to refuse to use the sword the Lord placed in his hands, if it was his duty as a citizen to use it. It would have been wrong for me to refuse to fine that man who merited a fine. I could have made it ten times higher, and added a jail sentence with it, but being a Christian I tempered justice with mercy, and gave him the minimum because I thought it was enough to make him respect the law, and would protect the interest of the state. Would I be condemned if I failed to use the sword? Well, I think the arresting officers who are trying to enforce the law would have condemned me, and the State’s attorney whose duty it is to see that the laws are enforced would have condemned me, and I think all loyal citizens who want the laws respected would have condemned me, and that is enough condemnation for refusing to assess a single fine.

You seem to only think of the sword in terms of blood, but that is only a small part of it, the extreme, and it is only applied as a last resort. As I said the threat of the sword, and the certainty of punishment, is perhaps its most potent power, and many potential thieves, robbers, and even murderers, are restrained by this fear, and refrain from committing crimes. Remove all law, and all fear of just punishment, and you will find we have more criminal-minded men than you think, and life and property would be in constant jeopardy from them. I have seen this tried out in oil boom towns, and I know whereof I speak.

You may feel that I have devoted more time to this effort than the importance of the case merited, but I assure you that I feel deeply the importance of it. I am sure that if you brethren could realize that what you are doing in this crisis plays into the hands of our country’s enemies, and civilization requires a strong civil government in which to live. Let us suppose for instance that you brethren could be one hundred per cent successful in keeping Christians, and their boys, from bearing arms, or in other ways helping out our country’s war effort—just what effect would that have in determining the course of the war?

Of course, you cannot be that successful, for which we all should be thankful, but you can succeed to some extent, and the extent to which you do succeed, to that very extent our country’s enemies are made stronger. Unconsciously you brethren, Brother Hedge, are doing a class of work which either Hitler, or Togo, would pay good money to have done if they could not get it done without it costing them any thing. And we never can know until the judgment day just how much they are responsible for stirring up this spirit of opposition to the war effort, not that I believe we have a preacher in our midst who could be influenced directly by anything Hitler or Togo might do. But they are too subtle to ever make a direct approach, and there propaganda will be so well disguised that no one will ever be able to trace it to its fountain head where all propaganda is born.

I have not spoken this directly to any of my other critics, and I admit I have a few others, most of them boys with hot-heads, and little understanding, and I am sure that my efforts will be wasted on them. Time will cure most of them, and a more mature understanding of the problems involved. But I know you, and know that I can speak my mind freely to you without injury to the mutual regard we have for each other in the Lord. I know you are sound, both in heart and mind, and your whole desire is to serve the Lord, and finish your course with joy.

I am sure that if you realized, or believed for one moment, that any word of yours has worked to the hurt of our country’s resistance to the unholy mob of murderers Satan has turned loose upon the world, and cost the sacrifice of a single life fighting our country’s desperate battles, you would not speak it, for if you did you would not be the John Hedge that I know. Of course, I understand from your letters to me that you have not advocated the extreme position of such hot-heads as Eugene Smith, W. L. Wilson, and several other young men, who even go so far as to say that if you carry drinking water to war plant workers you are a killer’s helper, and as guilty as the man who bears the sword that does the killing.

I am sure you can realize what effect such agitation as this is bound to have upon our country’s war efforts, and that its effects would be tremendous if it was only general among the preachers of the church of Christ alone. Of course, I have no argument with Jehovah Witnesses, Mennonites, Quakers, and men of that type, for their systems were born in a fanaticism that binds them, but I do want to reason with my brethren, and help to wake them up to what this thing really means to civilization, and Christianity. It is only in a civilized world that Christianity has any show to survive, and the Lord knows it, and that is why He gave our country this big sword, the biggest in all history, to preserve this civilization. Satan loosed the sword of Germany and Japan in order to destroy civilization, because he knew it was his only chance to perpetuate his rule in the world. Christianity will grow in an atmosphere of civilization, and no where else, and civilization requires a strong civil government in which to live.

This may be my last word to you, but if so I want you to know that I only wish you well in your work, and hold you as ever in the highest regard. When you can, if ever, I will be glad to hear from you again.

Your Brother in Christ,
T. B. Wilkinson.
“I indeed baptize you with water but he shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit and with fire.” This, we are told, proves that pouring is baptism because the Holy Spirit was poured out on the apostles. What John said he did with water, Jesus would do with the Holy Spirit. But Jesus poured out the Holy Spirit when he gave it to the apostles. Therefore, John poured out the water when he baptized the people with it. Therefore, pouring is baptism.

Did Jesus pour out the Holy Spirit like a liquid? Is that the idea which we have of the Holy Spirit? Jesus said, “I will send him unto you, and he shall abide with you forever.” Also we read of the Spirit, “He shall not speak of himself but whatsoever He heareth that shall He speak.” Joel prophesied that God would pour out of His Spirit upon all flesh, and Peter said on the day of Pentecost that it was the fulfillment of this prophecy. What happened on the day of Pentecost is called the baptism of the Holy Spirit, according to John and Jesus. But the Spirit was poured out upon them.

But Joel did not say the Holy Spirit would be poured out, he said God would pour out of His Spirit upon all flesh. God poured out of His Spirit the power which came upon the apostles that day. The Spirit was the source of those powers that Joel said would be given to them on that day.

To baptize with water according to this argument is to do all with the water that Jesus did with the Holy Spirit. But Jesus filled them with the Spirit, therefore he must fill them with the water. A few drops will not do in this case, you must drench them with the water, and you must fill them as full of water as the Lord filled them with the Spirit.

One more argument I want to call attention to in this connection. That is the meaning of the word baptism in the Greek, the language in which the Lord spoke. Baptidzo is the word, and while it is admitted by all scholars it also means to wash, to dye, to color, and while these are known as secondary meanings they prove that it does not always mean to immerse, necessarily. It might take one of these secondary meanings.

But which one? Call on your Methodist friend to take his choice, which meaning he wants to apply to the word. Suppose we take the word, wash, does that imply something less than an immersion? The man who would say, yes, must know very little about washing clothes. I used to help my mother wash the clothes, and what she did to them in the water was much more than a mere immersion, or dipping. She immersed, and she dipped them, and she soaked them, and she chugged them, and then she soaped them, and scrubbed them on the old rub board. This is what the word wash means, and I know I would not want a Methodist preacher to baptize me by this mode.

But try the word, dye, or color. It takes more than a mere immersion to dye things, or color them. It takes a good soaking in every case, and even that is not enough, they must be kept in the water steaming hot, and boiled for many minutes, like boiling a soup bone. If they want that definition for their mode they can take it for me, but their converts won’t have any hide left when they come out of the water. A simple immersion is all I want.

The primary meaning is the one that always governs in the meaning of words, the secondary meanings must correspond to it. It can’t mean less, but it might possibly mean more. Thus while the word baptidzo means to dip, plunge, immerse, the words wash, color, dye, imply a continued immersion, and all the other things I mentioned. A simple dipping in the water will not wash clothes, nor dye them, or color them, it takes much more than a dip.

What a sprinkler ever expected to gain from making this argument has always been a mystery to me. A sprinkling copious enough to wash clothes, or dye them, would strangle their converts, and drown them, and that is the only kind of sprinkling that would get the job done. But no Lexicon can be found which gives sprinkling as a definition of the word, this is admitted by all scholars, even those who practice sprinkling and pouring instead of baptism.

I use the words, instead of baptism, advisedly, for sprinkling and pouring never could be baptism regardless of what you called them. They come from different words both in the Greek, and in the English, and apply to different kinds of acts. In baptism you baptize the man, the subject, but in pouring and sprinkling you act upon the element, you sprinkle and pour the water.

In the English we have dip, sprinkle, pour, while in the Greek they had, baptidzo, Rantidzo, and Ek Cheo, and the words are never used interchangeably. They refer to different, independent acts. You can’t sprinkle by dipping any more than you can dip by sprinkling or pouring. To sprinkle means to scatter in drops, and refers to the element sprinkled, the word pour means to cause to flow in a stream, and also refers to the element. To dip means to plunge under the water, and refers to the subject who is baptized, or dipped.

Thus while a Methodist preacher sprinkles or pours water, a gospel preacher baptizes men and women. The three words are not even akin, much less can they be applied to the same act, and no greater mockery was ever perpetrated on the earth than to sprinkle or pour a few drops of water on the head of man or woman and call it baptism. The authority for sprinkling and pouring came originally from the pope of Rome who claimed he had power to change the laws of God.

What the apostles and other inspired men thought on the subject is shown by what they practiced. To them baptism was a burial and a resurrection. In it the body was washed with pure water according to Paul. He probably got this idea from Ananias who first used the phrase, Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling-upon the name of the Lord. To the Lord it was a birth of water, and idea which probably came to Him when he came straightway out of the water after he was baptized of John in the river of Jordan. To Phillip it was going down into the water, baptism, and coming up out of the water. There is no need for me to remind you that none of these ideas are suggested by the words sprinkle or pour.
A TRIBUTE TO R. W. COMER

J. CLYDE SHACKLETT

During 1911, while he was one of the elders of the Russell Street Church, Brother R. W. Comer observed the need for a place of worship in the vicinity of Chapel Avenue. Realizing the fact that Russell Street church had a large membership, and capable eldership, he with a few others purchased from the Baptists the small meeting house, which Bro. T. Q. Martin referred to as the "cracker box," and began keeping house for the Lord. (In the near future we hope to give you a reproduction of one of the early bulletins of Chapel Ave. Church showing a picture of the "cracker box.") Having "put his hand to the plow," he has never looked back. Although the number was few at the beginning and many things discouraging, this group has never ceased to worship "upon the first day of the week" according to the divine pattern. The responsibility of this work rested almost wholly upon Bro. Comer for many years. From the beginning Bro. Comer stood upon the platform that the scriptures furnish a man completely unto every good work, and it has been his policy to do nothing as service and worship to God for which he could not find authority in the New Testament. There was no desire to make the services entertaining other than the simple preaching of the gospel, nor any effort to "soften" the gospel to make it more pleasing to men. Because of this solid foundation, Bro. Comer's determination to stand by it, and his refusal to make any compromise with the forces of evil, God has prospered him, both materially and spiritually. The Chapel Ave. Church has steadily grown in numbers and strength until it is now one of the outstanding congregations in Nashville.

Bro. Comer has always been a liberal contributor and his example has inspired others to be so. As God has promised him, he has increased his contributions proportionately. I am sure Bro. Comer understood God's formula for success. "Seek first the Kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things (material blessings) shall be added unto you." (Matt. 6:33)

Like Jacob, Bro. Comer made a vow that at least a certain per cent of his income should go to the Lord. He made it a rule, when not able to be at Chapel Avenue at the service, to send his contribution anyway to help carry on the work. Although Bro. Comer has been one of the most liberal in his giving to the church, to orphans and aged homes, to schools where the Bible is taught daily and to charity, he has never boasted nor in any way advertised his gift or sought any publicity whatsoever. What he did along these lines was done for the good that might be done in the name of Christ. But very few of us who are very close to Bro. Comer knew of the extent of his liberality. We did not know it because of his boasting or of his telling us about it, but because we were in position to know, being associated in a business way. I do not doubt that many "good Samaritan" deeds were done about which no one knew but God, Bro. Comer and the recipient.

Another outstanding characteristic of Bro. Comer, was his ability to move freely in all classes of society and at the same time to make everyone feel at ease. Even in his business relations, he had many employees, both white and colored but he never intimidated them or showed any spirit of superiority. The most humble colored employee felt at ease in his presence, and felt free to discuss any problems with him. He tried to influence all to obey the Lord, but never to persuade or force anyone to adopt his view or policy simply to please him. He wanted them to act from conviction only. In the church also, there were no classes or distinctions with him. The rich and the poor were all treated alike. So far as I know, he had no personal enemies. There were men who differed with him politically, religiously and otherwise, but they felt free to discuss their differences without becoming enemies.

There are scores of preachers who sought and received wise counsel from Bro. Comer. Many, are they who have received financial aid from him in going into new and destitute fields to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ. Brother Comer became acquainted with a man who had been a Methodist preacher for about twenty years with a salary of $250.00 per month and who, after hearing the gospel in its primitive purity, preferred to suffer persecution with the people of God than to enjoy the emoluments of the world for a season. When that man had lost his former friends and his salary, Brother Comer gave him employment, and as soon as he was able to begin preaching the pure gospel, Bro. Comer gave his personal indorsement and support, material, moral and spiritual. Such has been some of the work of R. W. Comer. His life has been full of events similar to these. God's promises being true, there is bound to be a rich reward for him "over there." When that white robed throng is gathered around the presence of Almighty God and Christ our King, (I am constrained to exclaim as was said of the beloved Charlotte Fanning about a century ago), if Brother Comer is not in that company, then Nashville and Davidson County will not be represented.

Finally Bro. Comer gave the best that he had to the Lord. He endeavored to do everything in word or in deed, in the name of Christ, thru the spiritual body of Christ, which is the church of Christ. We who are younger and who served with hi min many ways, were often admonished by him to always stand for that which is right. His final message sent to me by his son was to guard that which is committed unto thee. Perhaps he had in mind Paul's charge to Timothy as recorded in I Tim. 6:20-21.

I am sure he had the work at Chapel Avenue at heart. God forbid that we should ever deny our Lord, or betray the confidence Bro. Comer had in us. I know of no one left behind who is big enough to wear that great mantle which he wore, but I pray God that we may be true to that trust.

May God bless the memory of Bro. Comer.
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