They say it is better to be late than never. Maybe it is better to be ten years behind time than never to get there at all. Brother G. C. Brewer in a late issue of the Gospel Advocate pitches into Word and Work with at least one glove off and shakes Brother Boll with a vigor we deemed impossible for him. For years he has been notably sensitive over attacks on Brother Boll and kept his bristles up in his defense. But Word and Work, which in this case is Brother Boll, has finally gone too far even for our long-suffering Brother Brewer. It wrested and twisted that “Jerusalem Conference” and James’ speech therein until it thought it had a case made out for “pre-millennialism,” or at least had removed a serious obstacle that stood in its way, Brother Brewer in a three page article in the Gospel Advocate, brief for him, pushes the Word and Work around a bit roughly and sets the obstacle right back in its place. Stronger things have been written on the question, but then it is fairly good considering the fact that only a very few years ago, Brother Brewer had not given as much as an hour to the study of the question and besides according to his confession he cared nothing about it anyway. At least this was a common report along about that time. But times have changed and so have some men. “O, the fickleness of man.”

Says Brother Brewer:

“It is the conviction of this writer that the Word and Work has perverted the word of God this time, and in its repeated calling of the gospel work ‘new,’ ‘strange,’ ‘unheard of,’ and ‘perplexing’ it goes a long way toward justifying the charge that the ‘church is an accident,’ which charge this writer has denied for the Word and Work.”

For a good many years Brother Brewer has been denying what we and others have been both charging and proving. Even at this late date it is refreshing to see some fruit as a result of our labors although it yet appears to be a little green. Methinks I detect some blush of color in it.
Brother H. Leo Boles of the Gospel Advocate splatters a few scalding tears over the front page of that journal for the bitter persecutions the conscientious objectors are suffering in these troubled times.

"The conscientious objector to war has always been persecuted," he puts down in ink mingled with tears. His citations for this country in this war are not cases of hunger, strikes and imprisonment. He does not charge our government with standing the faithful in front of firing squads for Christ's sake. He charges their suffering to those "who claim to be their brethren." He is not surprised but just baptized in sorrow.

"We are not surprised at the persecution that is now heaped upon the conscientious objectors in this war. They are even persecuted by those who claim to be their brethren; they are called 'cowards,' 'yellow,' 'hypocrites,' 'traitors,' 'unpatriotic,' and 'poltroons.' Why should one who lives true to his convictions be persecuted?"

So that is the measure of the persecution the poor conscientious objectors are suffering! That being the case, I too have been persecuted and did not even know it until Brother Boles reminded me of it. Since this fracas came up I have been called all the persecuting names our sorrowful brother puts in quotation marks and a few more to boot. Most of them can be found in those letters Brother Dorris wrote me which the editor of the Gospel Advocate says are going to be published. Brother Dorris is a conscientious objector and at last account was hand in glove with Brother Boles. Was Brother Dorris trying to persecute me? The editor of the Gospel Advocate himself has editorially treated us to about as much personal roughness as Brother Boles charges some of the brethren with dealing out to conscientious objectors. Was he trying to persecute us? It was a conscientious objector and one of Brother Boles' "boys" who wrote a letter to Brother R. L. Whiteside and called him "a wily old devil." I have had letters from others of these "boys" and their near relatives who "cussed" me in such terms as Brother Boles puts in quotation marks. Were they trying to persecute us? It appears that the persecuted are turned persecutors. Or maybe Brother Boles has a persecution complex. It isn't the first time we have tangled up with somebody over some matter of doctrine and had him break into tears and sob over his persecutions. Since I am by nature a tender-hearted man it is quite distressing to me. If poking fun at silly youngsters and dotty oldsters because they complain about the sisters selling grease to the government for bullets; and scold the brethren for buying bonds and working in plane factories; if poking fun at them for this be persecution, make the most of it, and let the tears fall where they may. I'll use mine on whiterower causes. It was a conscientious objector who charged me with offering my sons to the "god of war" because they are overseas serving their country; and threatened me with the terrors of the judgment because I did not make conscientious objectors of them when they were too young to know any better.

Am I crying persecution and wailing for sympathy? I'm not that big a cry-baby! It has not even occurred to me that I am being persecuted. I do not even consider it a major annoyance. As Brother Whiteside once expressed it: "I sometimes feel like asking somebody to lend me a fly-swatter." But should I sweat a conscientious objector with it, he would cry "persecution" and suffer more agony than a real soldier does from a bayonet wound. They are sensitive souls. Are these persecuted ones? Some of them are so self-centered, they do not even feel grateful to the government for provisions for them to stay out of the army. They do not even appear to be rejoicing over the "persecution" they are suffering. It appears to me that they ought to be getting all the blessings they can out of it, instead of spoiling it all by complaining so much.

Anent The Banner Special
Fort Worth, 6, Texas, Oct. 19, 1944.

Your letter of the 17th is before me. I appreciate all you say. Your explanation is germane and heartily endorsed by me. I did not mean to censure you for publishing the matter you did-the letters I referred to-but to censure the need of having to stoop to handle such matters at times. It is unfortunate that the Cause has to be impeded by such. In your case, since you were after the truth from every angle, it was necessary for you to bring to light those hidden feelings of friends for Norris from within the Body of Christ. I am happy that you did that. Still, I deeply regret that it had to be done.

The Vindicator locked its forms, practically, to-day for the November issue. Your letter of permission came too late for me to insert some quotations from your estimable paper, but I hope to attend to this in the following issue. I'm sure you are aware of what the Polytechnic Church did a few weeks ago-distributing some 700 copies of your paper around the First Baptist Church while Norris was preaching. If you did not hear the roar of the beast over the radio that night, as soon as Norris became aware of what Polytechnic had done, you missed a treat. He exploded outright. "The hit dog yelped. (Not calling Norris a dog, you understand.) Losing his temper over the radio was a complete admission that he had been hard hit-and hit when he was least expecting it. I am happy, also, that you have found it necessary to issue additional thousands. I can use 25 more here on the Hill. I have mailed some out to distant States. I want every Baptist in Fort Worth to have a copy. It is unfortunate that the Cause has to be impeded by such matters at times. Norris has been gradually "slipping" in the Body of Christ as a debate would be. Norris gave one side; you have given both-and have proved him a liar in no uncertain terms. Norris has been gradually "slipping" in Fort Worth for some time. The "push" you have given him writes finis to his career in this section, is my prediction. You have done a fine work. The Lord reward you accordingly. Yours in Christ Jesus-E. C. Fuqua, Ft. Worth, Texas.

* * * * *

I received a copy of the Banner yesterday, and read most of it last night. To those who are really interested, it will be appreciated fully. The former debate with Norris has been so long that many people will think it too old to elicited much interest. All preachers especially should know the facts as you have so well presented them....There is now fewer than seventy-five friends have. I am enclosing our check and suggest that you add to the fifty that are on the way, twenty-five more. I will see that every one has a copy and will make proper comment respecting the same. I believe that all young men should know the history of every important matter connected with the church. I am thoroughly set for a defense of the "old paths." I hope you may be able to carry on in a most successful manner.-N. B. Harderman, President, Freed-Hardeman College, Henderson, Tenn.

Note: The answer to how much interest has been elicited is found in the demand for approximately 60,060 copies of the Special.-F. E. W. Jr.
IS G. C. BREWER WIDENING THE BREACH NOW?

(F. E. W., Jr.)

For many years it has been a matter of common knowledge that G. C. Brewer has sympathized with, apologized for, and whenever occasions presented the opportunity to has openly defended R. H. Boll and the personnel of his party. In the doing of this he has also repeatedly belittled the premillennial issue and often with acrimony has attacked those of us who have debated these issues and otherwise upheld the truth upon the important questions involved. He has called the issues non-essential, unimportant and inconsequential, along with a lot of other belittling names, and has referred to us personally in far more uncomplimentary terms than such as that. In addition to what he has said in minimizing the issues, he has also accused us of replying to Boll’s positions in order to become “leaders” of groups in the church and to “distinguish” ourselves in debate on these popular questions. Now comes G. C. Brewer himself, in a recent issue of the Gospel Advocate, in a long reply to something Boll has written on the Jerusalem Conference, and under far less provocation than existed ten years ago. He now sounds a note of warning against Brother Boll’s teaching, as though such a danger is just beginning to appear! In order than the readers may see how such a thing as this looks at a distance, and to enable them to more fully appreciate the front page article by Cled Wallace, we are here reproducing the editorial replies that were made in the Gospel Advocate back in 1932-34. These articles represent a series of editorials written by me while I was editor of the Gospel Advocate and are some of the editorials to which Brother Brewer so stoutly objected at the time and which, through his influence, created a rift in Gospel Advocate relations. Let the reader look these matters over and consider G. C. Brewer’s course and conduct in these matters through the years. We shall let the readers draw their own conclusions as to whether Brother Brewer would now attempt to “distinguish” himself, as he accused others of doing, or if he is simply deserting what he now knows is a failing cause and abandoning his premillennial friends to a sinking ship.

BROTHER G. C. BREWER’S ABILENE LECTURE

(In Gospel Advocate, March 1934)

In an editorial report of the Abilene Christian College Lectureship, the Firm Foundation gives a brief resume of a speech made by Brother G. C. Brewer on “Things Which Cause Division in the Church.”

Brother Showalter describes the speech in part, as follows:

“I heard but one of the speeches. I reached the auditorium just in time to hear the forenoon address on Thursday. It was scheduled to be delivered by Brother Foy E. Wallace, editor of the Gospel Advocate, of Nashville, Tennessee, but as Brother Wallace could not arrange his plans to be on hand the speech was made by Brother G. C. Brewer of Memphis, Tennessee, a staff writer for the Gospel Advocate. Brother Brewer has prepared a great deal in Texas where he has many friends and admirers many of them in the large audience assembled at that time and he made a very fine address. The subject was “Things That Cause Division in the Church.” The speaker stated candidly that the speech he was about to make in lieu of the one that should have been made by Brother Wallace would not be as Wallace would have made it— that he and Wallace differed widely on some things among them so-called “Bollism” that he did not regard that issue as of sufficient significance to justify the division it had occasioned—Boll and others with pronounced peculiar views on the “Millennium” were, nevertheless, pureminded men, with strong faith and deep reverence for the word of God—particularly Brother R. H. Boll had entered his own life at a crucial period and he believed had been the actual means of his salvation that he tried to keep Brother Wallace from having the debate with Brother Neal and thought the debate had not helped a division already existing, but on the contrary had widened the breach. He thought debates were sometimes a good thing, but many times not so often preachers get up debates to distinguish themselves though unintentionally and that the least attention to many things that are non-essential and inconsequential, the better for the cause of Christ and all parties concerned. Brewer said many fine things that ought to be considered and remembered by all—especially preachers. In regard to differences of judgment and of opinion as mentioned above, Brother Brewer added emphatically that he and Brother Wallace, though they differed widely in judgment on those matters, were, nevertheless, on very cordial terms, and that they loved each other as brethren should. This is just fine as Busby would say. Some one remarked that the Gospel Advocate was exceedingly well represented on the program—more than half of the speeches as the program was originally to be delivered were by an editor or staff writer of that journal. Even so the intention was undoubtedly good. Possibly it will kindle with that periodical a better interest in a great educational institution.”

Since it is understood that Brother Brewer was pinch hitting for me, I feel compelled to state that I had nothing to do with his selection, and certainly nothing to do with his speech. I feel an inexpressible regret that my absence should have been the occasion of such a speech. Any failure that I may have made in meeting the expectancy in the demands of such, a vital subject could not approximate to the harm Brother Brewer’s speech will do. The injury to the cause of truth could not have been greater.
had R. H. Boll appeared on the program in person instead of being represented in Brother Brewer.

We loathe the necessity of giving this matter editorial treatment but, as in all previous cases, the issue is thrust upon us. This time the fact that Brother Brewer is on the Gospel Advocate staff makes his course all the more deserving of rebuke. There is no alternative for the Gospel Advocate in the premises.

1. It is said that the theories taught by Brother Boll, and apologized for by Brother Brewer, are not of “sufficient significance to occasion division.” So they say—and then divide the churches! In the letter Brother Brewer wrote me, in which “he tried to keep” me “from having the debate with Neal,” he stated that he had never studied the millennium question as much as one hour in his life. How, then, could he know what significance there is in the subject? His indifferent attitude and admitted ignorance of the issue disqualifies him to pass judgment on those of us who have studied the question. If his recommendations should be adopted and all opposition to the Boll teaching suspended, the church, having no defense, would become the prey of these false teachers, and henceforth exposed to all of the lurking errors of premillennialism.

2. It is further said that “Boll and others with pronouncedly peculiar views on the ‘millenium,’ were, nevertheless, pure-minded men, with strong faith and deep reverence for the word of God.” As much can be said for the advocates of Adventism and Russellism. All sectarian teachers have it in an emphasized and deluded form. That is about all they do have. It is precisely what all sectarian and the digressives say when their false doctrines are attacked. Personally, I seriously doubt any man’s genuine reverence for God and his word who love theories and opinions better than the unity of Christ’s church. There is an art of concealing venom in petty balls. But a show of reverence, whether superficial or real, cannot mitigate the offense of teaching false doctrine, nor can it justify the man who teaches it. It is, indeed, a poor apology.

Worse still is the effort to shield a man whose views are “pronouncedly peculiar” for the personal reason that “he had entered his own life at a crucial period.” Brother Boll entered the life of the church at “a crucial period” -with his peculiar theories—and divided it. Gratitude to men is to be commended except when it is at the expense of the truth. I admire the spirit of the late T. W. Phillips, who did not spare his own son, 0. E. Phillips, when he knew the son had become an unsafe teacher.

3. It is averred that “he thought debates were sometimes a good thing, but many times not so—often preachers get up debates to distinguish themselves—though unwittingly.”

How could a man get up a debate to distinguish himself unwittingly, if such be his purpose? Is that the reason Brother Brewer debated with Judge Ben Lindsey in Memphis and J. J. Walker in Columbia—to distinguish himself? Or did he do it “unwittingly”? There was opposition among the brethren to the Columbia debate—but Brother Brewer debated, anyway. Since debates are “sometimes good,” may we not inquire when, where and whose?

4. If the thing is so “nonessential and inconsequential,” he should not have lectured on it at all. He is debating against having debates—and on a subject too inconsequential to talk about except in an Abilene lecture!

5. The Abilene speech is an attack on all the faithful preachers who are opposing this new party in the church, It comforts the enemy—all the speculators, non-debaters, and non-advocates among us. It is the most unfortunate, ill-timed deliverance that has been made by an influential gospel preacher in a decade. It can be construed only as an effort to break the influence of the Gospel Advocate’s opposition to this new party. It means that Brother Brewer cannot be relied on to protect the church from speculation and opinionism.

The purity of doctrine is at stake. Premillennialism threatens to do for churches of Christ what it has already done for Baptist churches. It will disrupt every church it strikes.

It is true that Brother Brewer and I have “loved each other as brethren should.” I consider him in some outstanding respects among the greatest preachers in the church. But he has made a serious mistake. He ought to correct it. President Cox, of Abilene Christian College, ought to repudiate the speech and bar it from the printed book. If Abilene Christian College endorses the speech, all the faithful brethren who oppose such teaching should know it.

It is Brother Brewer himself who has now “widened the breach.” His speech, as it stands, represents a challenge of the Gospel Advocate’s policy. The Gospel Advocate can do nothing less than to meet it. We are set for the defense of the truth.

In reference to these matters there have always been some who are more or less uninformed on various angles of the premillennial questions who have thought to dismiss the whole thing as a sort of a personal feud. In this they have gravely erred. While it is true that there have been numerous personal insults hurled at us, such as the Brewer Abilene Speech ivas, yet I have never held any such grievances, nor do I harbor any such offenses now. My sole interest has been in the forthright defense of the truth of Christ and the integrity of the gospel. In this connection the articles from the pen of the late and lamented F. B. Srygley, which appeared in the Gospel Advocate at the time of the Abilene incident, will furnish very readable and interesting comments. It is reprinted in full, as follows.

**BROTHER BREWER’S CRITICISM**

(F. B. Srygley, In Gospel Advocate, March, 1934)

If Brother Brewer said the things reported in the Firm Foundation, it was poor taste to take a brother’s place to make a speech and criticize him in his absence. In this the Brother runs true to form. These brethren who admit that Boll and his party are wrong, and yet try to defend them, usually do so by criticizing those who stand for the truth and defending those who are wrong on the kingdom come doctrine. He thinks Wallace did wrong in debating with Neal; but if Neal did wrong in debating with Wallace, it strikes.
the brother did not condemn him, though Neal sent out the challenge, printed copies of it, and wrote the brother to whom he sent them, that if he used all of them in trying to get some one to deny his proposition, to send back and get more. This was, at least, a suggestion that no one would, or could, deny his foolish proposition.

Brother Brewer said candidly that Wallace was wrong. Sure, those who are trying to apologize for these errorists can always see where the brother who is right is wrong to defend the right; but if they can see that those who are wrong should stop preaching their foolish theories that contradict the word of God, they do not make it very public.

There was no danger of Brother Wallace causing division in Winchester, as Neal and his copartners in their foolish theory had already done it, and were continually harping on it to keep the division up. Brother Wallace debated with Brother Neal twice, and before Neal was through with his part of the last debate he quit and announced that he would never debate with Wallace again.

If Brother Brewer is right in his position that Wallace should not have debated with Neal, Wallace will not have it to do any more. According to Brother Brewer’s logic, Wallace in doing wrong did right, for he stopped that thing which Brother Brewer says should not be done. How long would it take Brother Brewer, in his apologies for these brethren, to do as much? The brother said that often preachers get up debates to distinguish themselves though unwittingly. I do not think that Brother Brewer said this to insinuate that Brother Wallace had such an idea. I believe that Brother Brewer could come as near doing things unwittingly to distinguish himself as Brother Wallace. This was an unfortunate thing to say in that connection, but Brother Brewer can say about as many unfounded things in print as most of us.

How can Brother Brewer know it is an inconsequential thing for any to hold to a theory that contradicts Peter and the oath of God? This they do when they say that Christ will not occupy David’s throne until he returns. God swore that he would raise up Christ to sit on David’s throne, and Peter said that he spoke it concerning the resurrection of Christ, and added: “Therefore being at the right hand of God exalted.” “Therefore” connects this conclusion with the oath of God. Still, it is an inconsequential thing! Who said so? Neither Peter nor God did.

If it is wrong to debate with Boll and Neal, Wallace has taken the right course to stop it. Neal has quit for good. and Boll has a good chance to try it, but he will not do so. Brewer can give Boll the credit for saving him; why can he not give Wallace the credit for stopping those debates which he says ought never to have been? He tried to keep Wallace from debating with Neal. I wonder how much effort he put forth to keep Neal from debating with Wallace? He was the aggressor in this thing. But Brother Wallace must be criticized for defending the truth. This is the price that many have paid to defend the word of God. Brother Wallace seemed willing to pay the price, and I, for one, honor him for doing it.

The foregoing article was typical of the support and encouragement I received from Brother Srygley, while Brewer, Hall and others were criticizing and opposing our stand against Boll and the premillennial party.

In the lecture at Abilene Christian College, Brother Brewer criticized the debates that had been held on ‘these issues and censured the Gospel Advocate for its policy of opposition’ to that system of prophetic misinterpretation called Premillennialism. Brother G. H. P. Showalter, editor of the Firm Foundation, heard the address and reported it editorially. It will be observed that he quoted Brother Brewer as saying that he “differed widely” with the editor of the Gospel Advocate at that time on ‘so-called Bollism,” that he thought the issue unimportant and nonessential; that the whole thing was too inconsequential to discuss; that issues were often debated merely because the debaters desired to distinguish themselves, etc., etc.–G. C. Brewer fashion. In response to this report, with liberal compliments to Brother Showalter for the “fair summary” of his speech, Brother Brewer said: “It will add incalculable force to my speech... to have you endorse my effort is gratifying, indeed.” A report of a speech is not an indorsement, but Brother Brewer called it that, and thanked the editor for “indorsing” his effort. And what was his effort? It was to prove that the issue of premillennialism was “unimportant.” His own words are in the record, as follows: “I did not regard the proposition of sufficient importance to merit so much attention.

That the readers may see articles to which brethren Brewer and Hall took exceptions we insert the following replies to R. H. Boll which appeared in the Gospel Advocate ten years ago. I still have in my files exchanges of letters between them, revealing their private appointments and conferences in protest to my editorials against Boll. Their opposition to me dates from these editorials and the Neal debate.

BROTHER BOLL’S PROPOSITION

( Editorial in Gospel Advocate Replying to Boll’s “Here’s, My Hand” and “A Doctrinal Manifesto,” 1932)

In a recent issue of the Word and Work, Brother R. H. Boll extends his hand to us on a proposition regarding the teaching of certain prophetic theories which have been sponsored by that magazine. His proposition sets forth exactly the principles for which the Gospel Advocate has contended all the time, and we stand ready to complete the gesture toward unity so far as the editorial responsibility of the Gospel Advocate extends.

“Here’s My Hand.”

Under this heading Brother Boll delivers his proposition to us as follows:

“If any are sincerely troubled with fears lest any false doctrines, theories, speculations, etc., may rise up to disturb the unity of the church, I would like for my part to go on record on my own behalf, and so far as my responsibility for the Word and Work extends, that nothing shall be taught on any prophetic theme except what can be read from the Bible. On the question of the kingdom, for instance, the Word and Work is willing to set forth and emphasize any and every statement found in God’s book, in its own fair light and context. Without addition, theories on the subject. On the Coming of Christ, on the Thousand Years, on the Throne of David, on all disputed and prophetic themes, in short, I am willing to let God alone speak. In all discussions and expositions of prec-
sages bearing on these matters I propose to regard carefully, even scrupulously, what the passage in question actually says; to draw no unwarranted conclusions or unnecessary inferences to build up or defend no human theories, to avoid mere philosophical and syllogistic argumentation on Bible themes. I feel sure that all the friends and writers of the Word and Work will indorse such attitude. If the brethren who have pressed the other side of the controverted matters will bind themselves in like manner, harmony ought to be complete.”

If Brother Boll will live up to this proposition, harmony will be complete. And if he had never pursued any other course than the one he now proposes, there never would have been anything except harmony on these questions. He proposes “that nothing shall be taught on any prophetic theme except what can be read from the Bible.” This proposition bars all “interpretations” and “views” of prophecy beyond what the Bible “actually says.” We accept it. It is exactly what “the brethren who have pressed the other side of the controverted matters” believe. Brother Boll has, in fact, conceded that position to us by the admission that we have “pressed the other side of the controverted matters.” Since his side has been, by his own admissions, dealing with interpretations of prophecy which destroy harmony, “the other side,” by his admission, has been against these interpretations, and stands, therefore, upon the exact proposition on which Brother Boll offers his hand.

In view of this proposal, Brother Boll’s references, in the same issue of his paper, to what the pioneers taught on these questions is untimely. He is not proposing to do or teach as they did, but to teach only what the Bible “actually says.” Nearly every man who has ever had a peculiar position to defend has claimed “the pioneers” on his side. If we were at present devoted to the task of defending the teaching of the pioneers on the issues involved, it could be successfully done, at least, to the extent of proving that they did not hold the views advocated by Brother Boll. But that is not the proposition. Brother Boll has offered his hand on an agreement to teach only what the Bible “actually says” and only “what can be read from the Bible.” Without addition, subtraction, or alteration, and without regard to any theories on the subject.” While this will require that Brother Boll repudiate some of his own books and withdraw them from the market, we hope that he will not recede from his proposition. “A Doctrinal Manifesto.”

While waiting for us to accept or refuse his proposition Brother Boll issued another number of the Word and Work containing “A Doctrinal Manifesto.” Concerning this number he says: “Of all the issues [of his paper], our preaching brethren must have this one; we sent it to them all.” He further states that this is not the first time all the preachers have been treated to a free edition of his magazine. “Once before, for four consecutive months,” he says, “we ventured by faith to send the Word and Work to an extra list of two thousand preachers.” And between these “specials” we all know that he has been diligent in the propagation of his peculiar theories. Still, we have been supinely told that they have not pressed these theories and that we should not have opposed them. But even after extending us his hand on a proposition for unity our brother editor felt called upon for some reason to issue a “speculation special” in an effort to proselyte all the preachers. And worse still, in this issue he refers freely to those who differ from his views as “creedists,” “creed-bound,” “a self-constituted ecclesiasticism,” and “a human sect which they call ‘church of Christ.’”

Aside from being extremely untimely, with his proposition pending acceptance or rejection, the language is hardly consistent with our brother’s professions of piety and reverence, if not entirely incompatible with his own standard of integrity. Really, his proposition ought to be amended to include a retraction of these charges and an apology for his hard sayings; but if he will stand by the proposition on which he extends his hand, we will not require it of him.

But while we are waiting for his proposition to be confirmed, some strictures on our brother’s “manifesto” are in order.

1. Our brother editor says:

“In view of recent utterances of some religious journals, some editorial, some otherwise, the editor of Word and Work feels impelled to state again and anew his doctrinal position and church relationship.”

This declaration is hardly true to the facts in the case. Brother Boll would leave the impression that “recent utterances” of others impel him to make a declaration of his doctrine. But all informed brethren know that he has been at it all the time. His own unyielding attitude toward the propagation of his objectionable doctrines has called forth all the opposition. The suspension of the discussion of these questions in the Gospel Advocate over a period of time was, it seems, construed as a surrender of the issues involved, and the effort to advance their theories was given impetus. Thus an undue advantage was taken of a gesture for unity. It was this attitude of the editor of Word and Work, with his increasing propaganda, that called forth the “recent utterances” in the Gospel Advocate.

2. Our brother editor states further:

“Some editor and some writers who are not wholly decided as to whether they should any longer continue in fellowship with some of the rest of us who do not share their views on prophecy.”

This statement is a cunning but very ignoble effort to shift the responsibility of division and disfellowship. Brother Boll plays ventriloquist and makes it sound as if the voice of “views on prophecy” were coming from some other than his own direction. But his speculations are too notorious for this device to work. His name is virtually a synonym for theorizing. Any attempt to absolve his own guilt by adroit references to other prophetic views, as though it were just a matter of choosing between views held by others and his own, can only be classified as a shrewd maneuver. It is the editor of Word and Work, not “some editor and some other writers,” who has been imposing “views of prophecy” upon the brethren. Who does not know that the church was not bothered with these questions until he himself formulated his system of prophetic teaching and attempted to foist it bodily upon the churches? Brother Boll admits this himself when he speaks of “the good old days” when there was no “trouble” over these issues. Let him be as the brethren were in those days and there will be no
Our brother editor further deposes after this fashion:

"The word and work have repeatedly and with much care and detail shown that the charges of teaching 'Russellism' and 'Adventism,' which have been brought against its editors and some other brethren, are wholly untrue: that the Word and Work and all its friends stand opposed to both these false cults and against every distinctive doctrine of both Russellism and Adventism."

Here Brother Boll finds himself drawing the line of fellowship "over and above" the fundamental statement of faith he avows. On what ground does he draw the line on the Russellites, Adventists, and Fundamentalist Baptists who hold views so similar to his own on prophetic subjects? They will all subscribe to his statement of faith. Yet he indignantly disclaims any part or lot with such "false cults" and "stands opposed to" and is "against every distinctive doctrine" of these people. We would like for him to itemize the difference between his "views of prophecy" and theirs, so we can see no other chance. They will just have to put us out."

Who does Brother Boll think can disfellowship him? The Gospel Advocate claims no such prerogative. Our understanding of what the New Testament teaches is that only the local church with the divine arrangement of elders and deacons can withdraw fellowship. We believe and teach this autonomy of the local church, and could not be so inconsistent as to contradict it, by disfellowshipping Brother Boll or anybody else. The purpose of the Gospel Advocate is to advocate the gospel, not disfellowship people.

But what does all this mean, appearing in the next issue after an extended hand on a proposition for unity? Does it mean that he withdraws his proposition before it is accepted? Does he now mean to say, "Fellowship me, fellowship my theories?" Then who draws the line of fellowship? In his proposition Brother Boll proposes to "regard carefully, even scrupulously, what the passage in question actually says; to draw no unwarranted conclusions or unnecessary interferences, to build up or defend no human theories," etc. Now he says he will "regretfully permit" somebody to "draw their line" on him before he will "promise to keep silent on the subject." We are unable to interpret these "recent utterances" of his in the light of the proposition be made in the preceding issue of his paper.

4. Regarding creeds, Brother Boll says that no line of fellowship should be drawn.

"Over and above the fundamental statement of faith that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and the acceptance of the Scriptures as the word of God and only authority in faith and practice." (He further avers): "I am standing absolutely and foursquare upon the word of God, all of it and not any creed or theory of any man, either my own or any other, and that by that word and with it I am content to stand or fail and that I am declaring the fundamental principle of the church of Christ."

His statement of the Scriptural creed is correct, and we promptly accept and avow it. But that he is "standing absolutely and foursquare" upon it we positively deny. He is standing absolutely on his own opinions and theories, all of them "over and above the fundamental statement of faith" which he has laid down as his creed. Brother Boll himself does not practice what he preaches concerning "drawing the line of fellowship" on this statement and nothing more. Hear him:

"The Word and Work has repeatedly and with much care and detail shown that the charges of teaching 'Russellism' and 'Adventism,' which have been brought against its editors and some other brethren, are wholly untrue: that the Word and Work and all its friends stand opposed to both these false cults and against every distinctive doctrine of both Russellism and Adventism."

All the talk about an unwritten creed is for effect. It is not even new. It is an old, tattered scarecrow. Every innovation has sought justification in this creed-bound cry. Thus came instrumental music and all the talk about "the creed in the deed" when loyal brethren resorted to legal protection of property rights against the innovators. It is precisely this same spirit crying in these brethren, "Creed! Creed!" when they encounter opposition to their efforts to foist a new system of prophetic doctrines upon churches of Christ. We shall not be weakened in our opposition to this or any other form of error by any such feint. "Where the Case Must Rest."

5. Here is the final deposition of Brother Boll's manifesto:

"Here I must rest my case. I should be sorry to see a contingent in the professing church of Christ forget their principles and degenerate into a creed-bound sect. But for no fear or favor, nor for the sake of any specious pleg for unity, can I subscribe to anybody's creed or join their sect. So make up your minds, brethren, how it shall be."

Does this mean that Brother Boll has made up his mind not to stand by his proposition? There seems to be quite a contrast between the statement of the previous issue, "Here's my hand," and the closing statement of the current issue, "Here I rest my case." He has not made a con-
sistent witness in his case. He failed to talk the same way under cross-examination. In one he made a proposition for unity; in the other he calls on the brethren to make up their minds to fellowship his theories or disfellowship him on his own proposition, and all but dares them to do the latter. Verily, Ephraim is joined to his idol! This “manifesto” is about to become a declaration of stubbornness and self-will. Indeed, it is a pitiful begging of the question, a bid for sympathy, and a mighty poor apology for the injury he has done the church of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Where does the case rest? Just here—on the proposition Brother Boll made upon which he extended his hand. We accept it. Will he stand by it? It is within his power to restore the unity in which he so ardently professes to believe. Think, for instance, what the difference would have been if he had followed up his first proposition with an issue of his paper dedicated to common ground, accompanied by his assurances that he would cease to advocate his divisive doctrines. Will he yet do this on his own proposition? If he will, “here’s my hand”; if he will not, the responsibility for division and alienation must rest solely upon himself:

BROTHER BOLL WITHDRAWS HIS HAND
(Editors of Gospel Advocate Replying to The Final Statement of R. H. Boll Withdrawing His Offer of Harmony. January, 1933.)

There have been three novel issues of the Word and Work since October. In the October number Brother R. H. Boll said “Here’s My Hand” on the proposition “that nothing shall be taught on any prophetic theme except what can be read from the Bible” and “to regard carefully, even scrupulously, what the passage in question actually says.” But immediately succeeding this offer came the November Word and Work with a triple “Doctrinal Manifesto” published in special edition and sent free to all the preachers. With strictures on these manifestoes, the Gospel Advocate without reservation accepted Brother Boll’s proposition. Brother Boll said: “If the brethren who have pressed the other side of the controverted matters will bind themselves in like manner, harmony ought to be complete.” If by “the other side” another theory is meant, the Gospel Advocate is left out, for we advocate no theory. But assuming that Brother Boll meant those who oppose his theory, and therefore included us, we accepted his proposition. Believing that he was sincere in making such an offer, we expected favorable results. Instead, the December Word and Work brings us the following statement, given in full as it appeared in that paper:

“When a fair and brotherly proposition like that presented in the October Word and Work (“Here’s My Hand”) is made an occasion of further denunciation and misrepresentation, it is evident that the trouble lies deeper than mere disagreement on prophetic teaching. Harmony can never be complete,’ even with the extremist adherence to the letter of Scripture, unless there be a disposition to deal kindly and uprightly with brethren. When a group of men set up their own wryehetic views as a standard of sound doctrine, and on the penalty of ostracism demand submission to the same—that is making a creed; and that—not mere difference and controversy, or brotherly correction of what they believe to be error—is ‘the insidious peril that is threatening the churches.’ ”

If our October proposal might yet be accepted in that fraternal spirit in which it was offered, and as intended to apply, not to one side only, but to all parties involved, there would still be hope that something good would come of it. Meanwhile we assure our readers that the Word and Work shall not be drawn into unpleasant and unprofitable controversy. Beginning with the New Year, the Word and Work intends to make no further reference to adverse utterances in the papers. With malice toward none and charity toward all, we shall try simply, and to the best of our ability, to teach the word of God, and by the manifestation of the truth commend ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God.”

The foregoing “utterance” is rather a tame sequel to the virulent outbursts that have appeared in the Word and Work lately. In order that the issue be kept clear and the record straight before the brethren, a few final observations seem necessary.

First: It was immediately after this “fair and brotherly” proposition like that presented in the October Word and Work” that Brother Boll featured his triple “Doctrinal Manifesto” in a special edition of his magazine which he sent free to all the preachers.

Second: In this special edition, sending forth three editorial encyclicals, harsh and denunciatory terms, even to the point of redundancy, were hurled at the brethren who oppose Brother Boll’s positions on prophetic subjects. We pointed out a list of seventy-five words in one issue of the Word and Work the use of which was more severe than anything that has appeared in the Gospel Advocate. In fact, Brother Boll’s doctrinal manifesto could quite appropriately have been named “A Doctrinal Denuncio.” His talk about dealing “kindly” and “uprightly” with brethren would be received with better grace, as would also his protestations of charity, if he would remember that “charity begins at home.”

Third: It is evident that Brother Boll insists on making a personal matter of these differences. But it is not a personal matter. We are interested only in the issue. There are thousands of brethren, the writer included, who could not make it personal if they wished, for there are no personal differences or partisan feelings involved. Why should Brother Boll withhold unity from the brethren on such grounds and thereby try to force personalities upon them when they are interested in nothing except the issue of truth and unity upon it? It is hard to harmonize Brother Boll’s valediction of “malice toward none” with his action in withdrawing his hand on his own proposition. The inevitable impression on the minds of many brethren just as sincere will be that his action in this matter is a betrayal of his own heart—that in his soul is the smouldering fire of malice toward brethren who have opposed him, deeper, indeed, than his love for unity.

Fourth: It is further evident that Brother Boll did not expect us to accept his proposition; but we did, unreservedly. But since he followed his offer of unity with three editorials virtually daring brethren to disfellowship him, it became necessary for some strictures to be offered on his bold declarations. Brother Boll now makes this the ground of withdrawing his hand. If that be the ground,
then he furnished it himself. On the same ground, could we not have refused just as consistently his offer? If not, why not? It is a poor rule that will not work both ways.

Fifth: Brother Boll says his proposition was not accepted in that fraternal spirit in which it was offered. But when did our brother become a discerner of spirits? His Proposition was offered along with a three-header doctrinal manifesto, and it was accepted with our editorial respects and logical strictures. But here is the issue: Brother Boll made us the proposition “that nothing shall be taught on any prophetic theme except what can be read from the Bible;... to regard carefully, even scrupulously, what the passage in question actually says,” etc. And now, because he thinks the proposition was not accepted in the right spirit, he will not do that—he will continue to teach and preach more than he can “read from the Bible” and will not “regard carefully and scrupulously what the passage in question actually says!” Before he will do that, some one must accept his proposition in the right spirit! This is a tacit admission that his theories are beyond what the Bible actually says, and he has inadvertently conceded the point. If Brother Boll’s proposition is a righteous one, why should he not stand by it, regardless of the spirit in others? In so doing, if there be those who do not have the right spirit, will he not have disarmed them in their opposition to him?

Sixth: Our brother editor now assures his readers that the Word and Work will not be drawn into an unpleasant and unprofitable controversy. A belated decision, indeed!—after five special editions of his paper carrying his doctrinal manifestoes to all the preachers. He fires the cannon, forms the line of battle, and ignobly retreats, casting aspersions on others. The controversy has manifestly been unprofitable to his failing cause, for brethren are getting their eyes opened to see that his system of heresy is not as harmless nor its advocates as innocent as they have appeared to be.

Seventh: Finally, Brother Boll makes a New Year’s resolution—he will “make no further reference to adverse utterances in other papers.” His doctrinal manifesto was issued just in time, for now he could not publish it without breaking his resolution. Therefore, if his manifesto was right, his resolution is wrong; and if his resolution is right, his manifesto is wrong. We think both of them are rather oblique.

If Brother Boll had published a New Year’s resolution to cease the agitation of his peculiar and heretical notions, it would have been much the better part of valor, far more honorable, and would have received the universal applause of the brethren. Instead, he issues an obstinate resolve to continue his course. So the case is resting with Brother Boll’s refusal to accept our hand on his own proposition. It is well that the brethren know henceforth where to place the responsibility for alienation and disfellowship, It rests upon Brother Boll himself. But if he will yet come to his own terms in that fraternal spirit he has ex-tolled, but failed to practice, our hand is yet extended: for upon the proposition to teach only what we can “read from the Bible” and “to regard carefully, even scrupu-

lously, what the passage actually says,” we shall stand whether he does or not.

Since Brewer had charged in his Abilene speech that the debate with Neal and the editorials in the Gospel Advocate, had “widened the breach,” the following editorial, which appeared in the Gospel Advocate soon after the Brewer Abilene speech, will be of interest here.

THE WIDENED BREACH
(In the Gospel Advocate, 1934)

Effort to shift responsibility for division is the invariable rule of innovationists in the church. The innovators themselves never cause the division—it is always the opposition. It is an old story. The innovators of instrumental music never caused the division—it was the opposition to it!

Thus also would the sponsors of the speculations now disturbing the peace of the church escape their just condemnation. But they shall not pass!

Unopposed, no doctrine or ism, from sprinkling to speculation, would ever cause division. The cause is the teaching: opposition, the effect; division, the result. Acquies-cence to error is neither the price nor the basis of Christian unity. The doctrinal purity of the church lies in the defense of the truth.

The stock argument of all innovators has always been that their teaching or practice should not be made the ground of disfellowship. Digressives have worn this alibi out trying to justify instrumental music. Too inconsequential to divide over! Yet they hold to the teaching and let the church divide; and, of course, when division occurs, disfellowship is automatic.

Now, this piece of propaganda has been revived by the adherents and apologists of the Boll movement. But they either do not preach what they believe or do not believe what they preach—else they would discontinue their agitation; for there is division and disfellowship existing on the very thing they say is nonessential, inconsistent, and insufficient cause for division. And it is significant to note that these apologists for formulated opinionism, who have catego- rized millennium theories as “nonessential and inconse-quential,” when put on the spot, will all with one accord avow that they do not even know what the “Boll theory” is! Perhaps some information might serve to disillusion them. A reflection on the theory, its consequences, and the methods being employed to disseminate it will, at least, enlighten the victims of their sophistical attitude.

1. The Theory. Study the following high points of pre-millennial doctrine and decide if it is an inconsequential thing:

1. The kingdom of Dan. 2: 44—the kingdom of God—has not yet come into existence.
2. This kingdom, though announced by John and Jesus as at hand, “has never yet appeared.” (R. H. Boll.) It was postponed because national Israel rejected Jesus.
3. In consequence of his rejection by the Jews, Jesus pigeonholed the divine plan, introduced the “church age”—meaning the present dispensation—and went back to heaven to stay until the Jews get into a notion of letting him set up a kingdom on their territory.
4. While he is waiting for the Jews to decide what they will do about it, Jesus is sitting in an attitude of expectancy at God’s right hand, not being King in either “act or fact” -only expecting to be King when the Jews allow him!

5. During this period of waiting, politics must play its part. According to Daniel, the kingdom of God must be established “in the days of these kings”-the Roman kings. But Rome is gone-ended in 476 A. D. Hence, old pagan Rome is to come back into existence to play her part in the fulfillment of Dan. 2: 45. Watch Mussolini!

6. Before this happens, however, the Jews must be nationally restored to Palestine, and converted to Christ, so he can return as a real King “in act and fact,” instead of being a mere figurehead, sitting by his Father in heaven, holding his hands!

7. It calls for another reconstruction of the temple of Solomon, the complete national restoration of Israel, and the entire reinstitution of the Jewish system. Watch Hitler! Is he not about to chase all the Jews out of Germany? What will they do, and where will they go, if they do not go back to Palestine and start something of their own again? Plain as prophecy! But if you cannot see it, strike a match and find it in Neal’s “Light in a Dark Place”! or feel your way along without light, perusing Brother Boll’s books on the subject, and you will find it all!

8. With national Israel restored, and the Solomonic temple rebuilt, the next thing in order is the reoccupation of David’s literal throne in Jerusalem. The Lord, leaving the throne of his majesty on high, descends upon Jerusalem and sits down upon an old, dilapidated, dusty, Jewish throne, without even a new cushion on it—to be a King on the earth.

9. That is the beginning of the thousand years’ reign of Christ—the real millennium. Of course, it is all liable to happen overnight, for the second coming of Christ is imminent-impending. The event of his momentary appearance thus requires a series of miraculous interventions that completely upset the gospel order of things. It would necessitate a spontaneous regeneration of the Jewish nation that makes the theory of direct operation of the Holy Spirit in the conversion of sinners a mere side issue; a phenomenal transportation of Israel to Palestine that would make the crossing of the Red Sea look like stepping over a puddle; and a rebuilding of the old temple in less time than it took to grow Jonah’s gourd. All this, though a direct part of the theory as a contingency, is nothing—just “leave it to God”; he will take care of all the difficulties.

Now, if you cannot see all of this, you are not spiritually minded. What you need is “a deep reverence for God’s word” and a little more piety. But if you cannot cultivate that, then at least maintain a silent neutrality—a passive, peaceful attitude; for if you oppose this bedlam of materialism, you will widen the breach!

If Brethren Neal and Boll, or any of their group, deny that they have taught these things, we have as evidence their own books and writings.

11. The Consequences. Study now by item some of the inherent consequences of this ponderous system:

1. The postponement of the kingdom theory makes God false to his promise. Jesus and John preached: “The kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye and believe the gospel.” Multitudes repented in good faith, but did not get the kingdom—the Jews postponed it!

2. The theory makes the church a mere accident, the result of a prophetic default, for the “church age” was introduced in lieu of a kingdom that did not arrive.

3. The theory of the future reign virtually denies that Christ is reigning now. It puts the “reign of the Son of God” at the end of this dispensation—in the millennium.

4. It nullifies the Great Commission in that it denies that Christ is exercising “all authority in heaven and in earth.” It denies that he is King “in act or fact” now, thus stripping him of his kingly power and rule.

5. It antagonizes every passage of Scripture that speaks of this dispensation as “the last days.” If there is another dispensation of time to follow this, differing from the present dispensation, then the present dispensation is not the last days. But the Bible says it is.

6. It brings Christ down from the throne of his majesty and puts him on the earth, his footstool—an inglorious demotion.

7. It denies that Christ is on David’s throne in heaven now; therefore, bars the Gentiles from the blessings of the gospel. James said in Acts 15 that the prophecy of Amos regarding the rebuilding of the tabernacle or throne of David had been fulfilled, that the Gentiles might seek after God. This was his argument to justify the work that Paul and Barnabas had done at Antioch among the Gentiles. If the Christ is not now seated on David’s throne in the heavens, the work of Paul among the Gentiles was premature and the argument of James a fallacy; and, worse still, we, being Gentiles, cannot seek after God today. Believe it or not, this consequence exists. A simple parsing of the sentence in Acts 15: 17, containing the above adverbial clause of purpose, is sufficient to anybody who knows grammar. The conclusion cannot be escaped, and it alone condemns the future throne of David theory.

8. The theory alternates type and antitype-Judaism and Christianity. It revives in the millennium ceremonies and ordinances of the law which Jesus nailed to the cross and buried in his tomb. What a loathsome work!

9. It is the same mistake the Jews made when they expected a king like Caesar, and in their disappointment rejected Christ, our King. The present effort to dethrone him is but little short of the Jews’ rejection of him.

10. The system is rank materialism. It teaches that saints now living will in the millennium occupy “positions” of authority in which they will exercise temporal power under Christ, and thus “judge the world.” It is a complete let-down. It is a flareback to “the weak and beggarly elements.” It is not conducive in any of its phases to true spirituality.

While the saints are in the flesh, they are taught to be spiritually minded, to set their affections on things above, to lay up treasures in heaven, to seek a better country, and to have their citizenship in heaven. After all of this training, what would a redeemed saint want with a position in an earthly kingdom after death? Christ rebuked his disciples for seeking honor and position in his kingdom, because it was spiritual. He told them that his kingdom was not of the world, and that Jerusalem was no longer the place
for men to worship God. After all of this, we are told that he will put his kingdom right down here on earth, with the seat of worship in deodorized earthly Jerusalem. It is the most demoralizing theory to real spirituality ever known. It is the most degrading anticlimax ever proposed in the name of Jesus Christ.

III. The Methods. Consider the workings of this movement which is growing up in our midst. It is developing into a sinister system. Their methods are cowardly. Millennial propaganda is disguised in the sale of literature featuring divers and uncanny approaches to the various phases of premillennialism. So-called "analytical Bibles," such as the Scofield Bible, are but handbooks on premillennialism. The Dickson Bible, though in some respects a good work, features in its index, references and outlines the premillennial viewpoint. These books are not Bibles at all-they are works of men bearing the Bible title. They are rank with sectarianism and are not to be recommended. Christians who want the Bible should procure a copy of the King James, or American Revised, translation of the Scriptures. Get the Bible, not some man's analytical versions of it.

This movement also seems to be working as a sort of secret operative system. There is an ambitious program somewhat under cover to gain influence and representation in the churches. It works through individuals, preachers, teachers, and laymen who are not avowed "Boll followers," but who are sympathizers and supporters. They hold positions in our schools, write in our papers, and are leaders in our churches.

When a preacher or a teacher says he is neutral on the question of instrumental music in the church everybody knows that he is in favor of it and would have it under favorable circumstances. The same is true of the neuter genders among us on this question.

Since the advocates of premillennialism will not relent, the indications point to war on these issues, comparable to the battles that have been staged on the instrumental music and society questions. It is folly to allow advantages. There is too much at stake. A purging is needed of teachers on the faculties of the schools, leaders in churches, and in journalism. Schools are especially conducted by the Baptists as "the gospel," is not the seed by which men are begotten as children of God.

These were the articles that brought the wrath of Brewer and Hall upon my head-not only then but during the decade that has elapsed. What now? Brewer all at once becomes excited over an article from Boll and "hastens" to answer it as though it is a recent and late thing for R. H. Boll to write such things. The recent Boll article not only contains nothing new or unusual but is mild in comparison with utterances of the past. Why the dramatics now? Has G. C. Brewer decided to "widen the breach"? If so-what will his Axis partner S. H. Hall say-since they both criticised others of doing what Brewer now attempts to do?

All of this makes the remarks of Cled E. Wallace, on the front page, all the more effective. If his article was not read first, read it now. If so-read it again.

A Proposed Broadside
(E. C. FUQUA, In Vindicator)

Texas Baptists have announced a slogan for 1944: "One Million Souls For Christ." They may proselytize that number, but not one will they lead to Christ, for the Baptist church exists and functions for the exclusive purpose of keeping souls from reaching Christ. That statement is true as certainly as the New Testament is the Word of God. I can prove it in 30 minutes, if challenged and granted an audience of honest people who believe the New Testament to be inspired of God.

The 36 "Points of Agreement," drawn up by Brother J. L. Hines, and jointly signed by Dr. J. Frank Norris, are wholly misleading because calculated to minimize if not to wholly destroy the actual difference between the Baptist church and the New Testament; leaving the impression that the New Testament endorses most everything taught by Baptists. That is just the reverse of the actual fact. Examine Baptist doctrine in the light of New Testament teaching, and see for yourself. The following items are just a sample of what can be shown.

1. The Gospel. Baptist doctrine limits the Gospel to the facts named in 1 Cor. 15: 1-9. They call the dissemination of those facts "preaching the Gospel," and limit it to those facts. The New Testament, using those facts as a basis, makes the Gospel a system of commandments to be obeyed in order to justification or salvation. That is indisputable from many passages, which are all epitomized in 2 Thess. 1: 8: "[Christ will come again] taking vengeance on them that know not God, and who obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ." Thus the saving value of the Gospel lies in man's obedience to it, since the disobedient are to be eternally destroyed. The Baptist doctrine of justification by faith alone-by "faith plus nothing, minus nothing," as Dr. Norris expresses it-is not the Gospel on that subject; it is "another gospel," a gospel unknown to the New Testament and the reverse of the true Gospel of Christ. Moreover, the "gospel" preached by the Baptists is not offered by them as "the power of God unto salvation" (Rom. 1:16), but a "dead letter," without some accompanying power distinct from the Gospel. What is preached by the Baptists as "the gospel," is not the seed by which men are begotten as children of God. (1 Cor. 4: 15; 1 Peter 1: 23; Luke 8: 11.) It is therefore not the Gospel of Christ; but "another gospel," to preach which brings men under the curse of God. (Gal. 1: 8, 9, 11)

2. Faith. The "faith" taught by Baptists is dead. James says that "faith without works is dead"-just as dead as the human body without the spirit is dead. (James 2: 20, 24, 26.) "Faith without works" is the only "faith" preached by Baptists, who tell us that it is a live, justifying "faith." There is therefore no faith found in Baptist doctrine but dead "faith." All Baptists are the lifeless products of the gospel. Where is there a Baptist who will not affirm that "faith without works is alive"? As there is no power in anything that is dead; just so is there no spiritual life in the Baptist church, because it rests solely upon a dead "faith." "Faith plus nothing, minus nothing," is faith only, and faith only "is dead," says the Word of God. Baptist doctrine, therefore, is a religion without faith; and we
are told that “whatsoever is not of faith is sin.” (Rom. 14: 23.) Consequently, every person sins in becoming a Baptist. So teaches the Word of God.

3. Repentance. Baptist “repentance” is sorrow for sin. That is the only ground for the old “mourners’ bench” (now revived by J. Frank Norris). But sorrow for sin is not repentance. Repentance is from the Greek word metanoia, and means “a change of mind,” not grief or sorrow of heart, although often involving this. Paul says: “Godly sorrow worketh [leads toward] repentance” (2 Cor. 7: 10), but is not repentance. There is no repentance without a change of mind; and the mind is changed by sober teaching and clear reasoning. This cannot be done under the excitement of the “mourners’ bench” and other forms of religious frenzy so essential to a Baptist revival. Baptists, therefore, do not repent in “conversion.” they are victims of the emotional excitement under which they yield to Baptist persuasion instead of the Truth of the Gospel. If Baptist doctrine contained repentance, the act of repentance would be followed by baptism in Jesus’ name “unto the remission of sins,” and that, by “the gift of the Holy Spirit.” That was the way it occurred on the day of Pentecost. (Acts 2: 38-42.) But Baptist “repentance” is followed by “faith,” not by baptism; and occurring before faith, it is without faith; therefore not acceptable to God; for “without faith it is impossible to please God.” (Heb. 11: 6.) Therefore God does not accept the “repentance” taught in Baptist doctrine: it most certainly is not the repentance which God demands, and that fact places the Baptist church out of Christianity-and in the world of impenitent men. Amen.

4. Baptism. The Baptist church totally rejects the baptism commanded by Christ and substitutes one that bears no resemblance to it, save in the act of immersing. Those immersed according to Baptist doctrine are not baptized in obedience to anything commanded by Christ, but are merely inducted into a human party by a human rite that makes Baptists of people who would become Christians if baptized with true baptism. They immerse only those who have not truly repented; those only who profess a “faith” that God rejects because it is dead, and because it can be expressed only by stating belief in a falsehood: namely, that “God for Christ’s sake has pardoned my sins;” those only who demand baptism without confessing their sins, which no person to be baptized even by John the Baptist would have attempted (see Matt. 3:6; Mark 1:5); those only who deny that baptism is “unto the remission of sins” (hence those only who deny the Word of God); those only who deny the Headship of Christ by disdaining to be “baptized into Christ,” “in Whom” alone salvation can be obtained (Rom. 6: 3; Gal. 3: 27; 2 Tim. 2: 10; Eph. 1: 3, 7); those only who repudiate the Name of the Godhead by making “non-essential” of the only rite by which that Name can be appropriated by men (“baptizing them into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit” (Matt. 28: 19); those only who claim salvation out of the Name of Christ by professing to be saved without being “baptized into” that Name; those only who make Christ a liar, by affirming that he “that believeth and is NOT baptized shall be saved,” when Christ said, “He that believeth and IS baptized shall be saved” (Mark 16: 16).

5. Justification. Baptists offer justification to men at faith-the moment they believe-before obedience. Christ says the believer is under God’s wrath until he obeys: “He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life; but he that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.” (John 3: 36.) That kills the theory that sinners are justified or saved the moment they believe. Christ teaches that believers on Him are under God’s wrath until they obey the Son-if they wait 50 years before obeying! And why? because Christ “became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him.” (Heb. 5: 9.) Baptists do not believe in the justification taught in the Word of God, but preach and practice a “justification” all their own-which leaves their convert still in his sins.

6. The Church. There is no similarity between the Baptist church and the churches of Christ revealed in the New Testament. The Baptist church is a body of Baptist people; the New Testament church is the body of Christ, consisting of all Christians. The latter is essential; the former (even according to the Baptists) is “non-essential.” Christ’s blood purchased His church (Acts 20: 28; Eph. 5: 25); the Baptist church, because un-purchased by Christ, belongs to Satan. Christ is Head of His blood-purchased church (Eph. 1: 22, 23); Satan is Head of the un-purchased Baptist church. To the body or church of Christ, God adds all members by the process of the New Birth; to the Baptist church each member adds himself by the process of “joining.” God takes no hand in it. That essentially makes the Baptist church a human organization, for it consists of its members, and each member adds himself to it. It is therefore a creation of men’s hands exclusively. Baptist polity and Baptist doctrine make Baptists. Christ has nothing to do with it. In all the labors of Christ and His Apostles not one person was ever added to the “Baptist church” or even called “a Baptist.” That church, therefore, is in every essential a “Sect of Perdition.” (2 Peter 2: 1.) It is an effusion of the Great Apostasy, a Daughter of the Mother of Harlots.

Any man who can discover one “Point of Agreement” between New Testament teaching and essential Baptist doctrine, let alone 36 such Points, is not posted on Baptist doctrine. “What agreement hath a temple of God with idols?” (2 Cor. 6: 16.) And he who thinks that the Baptist church is any part of the temple of God is disqualified for debating with Baptists. If the Baptist church is not the temple of God, it indisputably is a temple of idols, for but the two temples exist.

What we need to-day as a debater is a man who will not waste time by flirting with the Baptists, but who will, in the love of lost souls, mercilessly expose the deception, “hewing Agag in pieces before the Lord.” (1 Sam. 15: 33.) Anything short of that is short of love. The exposure of Baptist deception proves one’s love for the deceived Baptist people. That is why the Vindicator is the best friend the Baptists have.
A “block-buster” bomb falling into a Berlin street will detonate like a gigantic clap of thunder with a shattering, devastating force which levels everything in a hundred yards of it. When the blast has spent its force, all the surrounding air will come rushing back into the vacuum thus created with the speed of a hurricane. The secondary effect of the blast is often even more destructive than the first. For the initial explosion serves to weaken many structures but does not knock them down; then the air rushing back into the vacuum around the bomb-center will flatten these brick walls and buildings thus weakened with almost irresistible force.

Society has experienced the first explosion of the bomb; the war which draws toward its close represents a shock to civilization beyond anything ever known within such a short period at any time in the past. But the aftermath, the inevitable sequel that follows every war, may be compared to the tornado like blast of air rushing back into the vacuum left by the initial explosion. All the institutions of society which have been left standing by the war, together with the traditions and conventional customs of living, will face an even harder and more dangerous trial in the days to come. They must try, somehow, to survive the upheaval that is sure to come.

The Church Will Be Affected

The church is one of the institutions which has been very close to the bomb-center. It has felt the full force of the blast. But by the grace of God it has come through the experience relatively unscathed. In some respects she is even stronger than she was before the war.

Now, however, comes the aftermath. There will be a decline in national income, a staggering national debt, (which seems more and more to be coming under the control of radical and communist leaders), along with unprecedented problems of social unrest. There will be a world-wide feeling of mental and moral depression. Social and religious revolution will be in the air, as well as political and military revolution.

In the midst of all this chaos, it will be inevitable that sooner or later somebody, somewhere, will begin to want to introduce some revolutionary ideas into the church. There will probably be no frontal assault (as of a few years back) in which it is sought to take over the church lock, stock, and barrel; but in a subtler and more dangerous approach the attempt will be made. Little by little, in this church or in that, new and subversive ideas will be introduced.

The Insurance Against Apostasy

There is one insurance, and only one, we believe against the growing danger of apostasy. In every age it has been found that the only way to keep the church sound in the faith is to keep it busy for the faith. A militant, aggressive, unceasing educational emphasis, coupled with a fervent evangelism is the surest safe-guard to be found against the corroding inroads of modernism, cynicism, and all their attendant evils.

This aggressiveness of the church must manifest itself unmistakably in the Bible school. Teaching is the very life-blood of the church. That church which is careless and indifferent in its teaching emphasis is headed toward sure oblivion (witness our “anti-Sunday School” brethren). The early churches had no misgivings as to the value and necessity of their teaching. Within a century after the apostolic age, Celsius, powerful opponent of the church, was complaining bitterly that, “Christians extend their numbers and propagate their views by getting hold of children privately, in homes and in schools, and influencing them by their conversations with them, without the knowledge of their parents or teachers, and thus leading them away from the religion of their parents.” To which Origen replied by admitting that that was exactly what they did.

Church historians are agreed that the thing that stopped the Protestant Reformation cold in its tracks, and saved Catholicism from almost certain extinction, was the work of the Society of Jesus, organized by Ignatius Loyola. These Jesuits, realizing the importance of teaching, organized parochial schools throughout all the Catholic dioceses. By their teaching they saved the Catholic religion. And their schools have made Catholicism one of the strongest forces in all the world today.

Among churches of Christ there must be a constant emphasis on the teaching of the Bible. Our Bible Schools in all the churches must aim their lessons toward an indoctrination of the students-frankly, purposefully, and resolutely. We are not engaged in this business merely to pass the time; we are in deadly earnestness. The future of the churches will depend in no small measure on the kind of teaching done in the Bible schools.

Along with this work there should be a constant emphasis on evangelism-the sort of evangelism the New Testament sets forth, a militant, uncompromising, forthright fight against all the errors and falsehoods of modern sectarianism and modern irreligion. Our aim is to win people from error; not to make them at ease in error. This aim can best be served by helping people to realize that they are lost, that the religions of men are wasted efforts, that no human church can promise one single thing beyond the grave.

We believe this two-fold emphasis (on indoctrinating the children and evangelizing the world) is the safest and only real assurance the church can have for continued growth and soundness. We believe this is the only path toward a realistic solution of the avalanche of problems which will descend on the church when the last-gun of this war has been fired. To fail during these next few years will be to endanger, if not to destroy, the whole progress of the church in our generation.
By the word evolution I mean to express the manner in which civil government began in a small way and developed into the civil governments we have in world today. It was small in the beginning because there was only a single family in the world. All government was centered in the family, civil and religious, the father being the head over the family. He made what civil laws were needed and executed them as he saw fit, offered sacrifices for his family, received revelations from the Creator for them, and conducted their devotions.

We call this the patriarchal age for this reason, the father age, and the family unit was all the government they had. Authority in civil rule was vested in man by this arrangement, but it was also vested in him from the dominion God had given him over all living things, and in the command to multiply, replenish, and subdue the earth. What progress man made in civil government before the flood we do not know, but suppose that he had made a mess of it. He finally became so corrupt that God destroyed him from the face of the earth, saving only the family of Noah with the family of his three sons to repopulate the earth.

The story of civil government then must begin with the family of Noah and the new world, in which Noah was prophet, priest, and king, during his lifetime. He lived three hundred and fifty years after the flood, ruled his descendants, offered their sacrifices, and received revelations from God for them. In this capacity he divided up the world between his three sons, Ham, Shem, and Japheth, and each of them would become prophet, priest, and king, when their father died.

By this time there must have been something like a million souls in the world, and we suppose they should have separated, each going to that part of the earth Noah had allotted to them. Had they done this the Tower of Babel might never have been built, and the story of the world might have been different.

The facts indicate that they chose to remain together for two hundred and fifty years longer, and then migrated in a body to the Plains of Shinar where they built a city, and began the erection of a Tower which they said should reach into heaven itself. The language may be partly figurative, it is not probable that they were so simple as to think they could build a way into heaven out of brick and mortar. At least God would know better, and it is hard for us to understand why he used such extreme means to stop a work which he knew would soon fail of itself. Why not let them build until they were satisfied the effort was foolish?

This fact, with other considerations, leads me to believe that there is a deeper meaning underlying this effort than appears on the surface, and we can find it from the few facts Moses was able to give us. That they built a tower there can be no doubt, but the purpose of that tower is what we want to find. The population at this time would reach into the millions, and we cannot see how so many people could remain together in peace without some recognized leader who ruled over all of them. This would be an opportunity that some ambitious Nimrod would not overlook to build himself an empire to rule over. The three patriarchs, if still living, would be very old, and little able to resist his ambitions, and if the people continued to live together a united central government would be inevitable.

We know that they had not separated up to this time, Moses said the people were all one, and had one language, and this seems to be what displeased the Lord, and caused him to prevent the building of the tower. If it was intended as a monument to some great leader like Nimrod who must have lived about this time, and was meant to honor his name, and hold the people together, this would defeat the purpose of God in the decree he had issued through Noah. God came down and confounded their language, and forced them to disperse according to the decree, and it is said they left off to build, and were scattered from the plains of Shinar.

Before this miracle they were all one, and all had one language, but after the miracle they had many languages, and were no longer one. It does not seem that merely confounding their language would have been sufficient to have prevented them from continuing the work, they could have found ways to surmount this difficulty, and it must be that the many races were created by the same miracle. We know from monuments and inscriptions which have come down to us that the races have existed in the world from about that very date substantially as we find them today. And we know that before that date they were all one, Moses tells us they were, and Paul tells us that God made out of one blood all nations of the earth to dwell upon all the face of the earth. The creation of the races, with racial differences, not only of color, but in many other ways, would have accomplished what the Lord wanted.
After the miracle they were dispersed from Shinar. Family groups of the same color and language would migrate together, and settle together, probably in the very parts of the earth allotted to them by Noah. This would put an end to the universal empire for the time being, and restore the patriarchal form of government, and set them back on the course the Lord ordained. The habitable parts of the earth were great as compared to population, and natural resources were abundant, and rich, and the lessons learned at the Tower of Babel would be remembered. This also would produce many small independent kingdoms, each with their own patriarchal ruling over them, and we know from what Moses has told us that God continued to deal with them, and reveal himself to them when it was for the common good.

But we know very little about the world after this until we reach the time God called Abraham out of Ur into a land which he would show him. Just a touch here, and one there, to show that God did not forget man, and revealed himself to those who proved worthy in his sight. Some did not care to retain God in their knowledge, and he gave them over to a reprobate mind to work that which is unseemly.

But we are told enough to know that such petty kingdoms did exist in various parts of the world, and some of them would become comparatively large as men lived to be very old in those days. Therefore some of these kingdoms would become large and prosperous under their natural head and ruler, and not all of them would be good men, and retain God in their knowledge. Jethro seems to have been one who did continue to commune with the true God, and it was to him that Moses fled, and to the protection of his kingdom, when he displeased the king of Egypt. He lived there forty years, tended Jethro's flocks, and married his daughter. Balaam was another prophet of the old order, and there must have been many more whom Moses does not mention for the reason they did not come into the story. he was telling.

As the populations increased there came a time when known habitable parts of the earth became crowded, and men fought for space. Rivalries arose like the one between the servants of Abraham and Lot, over grazing lands and water supplies, and petty wars would arise between rival families. For mutual protection families would unite into tribes, and then it was but a short step to the nations, like the one we find in Egypt in the days of Joseph. This union of families required them to surrender some of their family rights for the common good, and the substitution of other rules, and laws, to take their place as wisdom suggested, and this is how civil government as we know it was born, and grew into what we now have. This uniting of family groups once begun would grow rapidly, not only in size but also in importance, and a time came when civil law, and civil government, became the important thing in human existence.

Properly speaking civil government has to do with the relations between men as individuals in a society in which their interests are mutual. The rules and regulations, commonly called civil laws, are most just when arranged by consultation, and mutual consent. That is how the Lord meant for it to come, like the agreement between Abraham and Lot, and from its nature it is a living, growing thing. Many people look upon civil government as something inherited from the past, something blocked out, and made ready for use, instead of a present, living, growing, something, which began in a small way when man's needs were small, and grew as man's needs multiplied.

There can be no straight jacket for civil government. What would have been just what they needed in Abraham's day would be inadequate now, and the peace of the world could not be kept under it. Since civil government was left to man's wisdom under the dominion God gave him to regulate his own personal affairs, God, left man free to work it out in his own blundering way: Suffering for his mistakes when he made them, and receiving blessings when he did well, man has struggled forward.

The mistakes and blunders of one generation would become warnings to the next, and it is possible that we profit more from our blunders than we do from any wisdom that man himself possesses. It has been a stumbling course that man has pursued in civil government, but to argue that it has not been an upward course is to deny the lessons of all history, The Lord meant for man to learn it in his own way, for from its 'very nature it is something that cannot be cut to pattern, or bound to any single formulated plan. The form of government best for man now will not suffice for men of the future, any more than those of the dim past are the best for us. We cannot stay the hand of human progress in government any more than we can in other things, it is driven on a relentless course by human needs, and in the end those needs will triumph.

We think our own democratic form of government is the best one ever yet devised by man, but he that is not blind can see it changing right under our eyes. Men shout about returning to the government of the fathers, of Jefferson, Lincoln, or some other great reformer. That is the cheap talk of the politicians, and it is made to catch the votes of the uninformed. It is true that principles never change, they are eternal, but human problems do change, and they become more complex daily. The makers of our own Constitution knew that nations could not continue to grow in a straight jacket, and -they provided for the Constitution to grow as the needs of man demanded. Our Constitution does plug the holes against the mistakes of the past, but provides no obstruction against the needs that will arise in the future.

Great changes are now taking place in civil governments all over the world, some of them from the lessons learned in this war. But still greater changes can be seen in the offing which will effect the whole world, and a world government in which all nations will have a part is within the possibilities of the near future. What it will be does not yet appear, but the need for it to prevent devastating wars in the future is too great to be ignored. And need is the father of all good things, when we see the need we begin to search for the remedy. Broad minded statesmen saw the need for it at the close of the last war, and planned to do something about it, but the reactionaries were too strong at that time. They
always fight every forward looking move in government, but step by step, it moves forward in every nation. The house of cards the reactionaries built at the close of the last war has tumbled in upon them, and has proved their arguments false in every case. Their mistakes will be milestones for us to follow when this war is over, and stepping stones to high ground.

But we are told that governments make wars, and that proves they are bad things. Yes, governments make wars, some of them, and they are bad when they do, but governments also unmake wars, just as our government is now unmaking this one. They can make wars they can prevent wars, which is one point the pestilence gives. Civil government has a sword given to it by the Lord, and it can make war, and can prevent war, with the same sword God gave it. God did not give it a sword to make war. Satan has taught it to make war with the sword, and Satan only. God gave civil government the sword to punish evil doers, and preserve peace for the righteous, and any other use of it is evil and comes from the devil the author of all evil.

One by one through the ages civil government has placed checks upon evil doers who are inspired by the devil to commit crimes great and small. In every country we find men under the influence of Satan committing crimes, and misusing the sword God gave to man. Individuals and nations alike misuse it, crimes against individual of the state, and crimes against nations like the one we are now witnessing. We have civil laws to deal with individual criminals, prison houses to confine them to protect law abiding citizens, and the electric chair for extreme criminals! and it is only where we have civil laws, and the sword to execute them, that life and property are safe.

The same kind of checks that civil government places upon individuals will have to be placed upon nations if wars are to be prevented. There must be laws to control nations just as we have laws to control individuals, and there must be a sword strong enough to execute the laws, and compel obedience, if criminal minded nations are to respect and obey them.

II

"GOD RULES IN THE KINGDOMS OF MEN"

The prophet tells us that God rules in the kingdoms of men, and sets over them whomsoever he wills. This does not mean that God directly appoints every ruler in the world, but that he has power to do so, and exercises that power when it is necessary to His purpose. In the creation God gave man all his faculties of body and mind, and they are directly responsible for whatever man has been able to accomplish in the world. Satan has not given man anything, he has no creative power. All he can do is corrupt what God gave to man, and lead him to misuse them. God gave Hitler all the powers of mind and body that made him ruler of Germany, and they made Hitler ruler. Satan corrupted Hitler, and made him misuse his power.

On special occasions the Lord has elevated men to ruling power by direct intervention, and supernatural aid. Joseph down in Egypt is a good example of this, and Daniel in the courts of Babylon, Mordecai and others. But the Lord has also elevated wicked men to power, and used them for his purpose. He brought Pharaoh to the throne of Egypt to demonstrate His power over human kings. King Nebuchadnezzar was also made ruler of the world for the same purpose.

Civil government is one of the elemental needs of man, and next to the church it is man's best friend in the world. And it is Satan's worst enemy, second only to the church. This in spite of the fact that Satan has been able to corrupt them, and use them for an evil purpose, he has done the same thing with the church.

Civil government began in a small way in the garden of Eden, and grew as the population increased, and new needs arose for it. The family form of government was the best possible for man in the beginning when the population was limited to a few families. After the flood it was continued and served the needs of man for centuries, but the need for larger units of civil government began to be evident. The first effort to form a centralized government was thwarted by the intervention of the Lord at the Tower of Babel, the Lord forced man to disperse to their appointed parts of the earth which he had set apart for the sons of Noah.

But from the time of Abraham we have evidence that the nations were forming each with their own peculiar form of civil government. God knew that they would form in time, and it was according to His purpose that they should. Paul indicates this where he says God made out of one blood all the nations of men to dwell on all the face of the earth. It is further proved by the fact that the Lord recognized them, dealt with them, elevated chosen men to rule in them, and often used his own saints to rule in them, and teach them of his ways for the good of man.

These nations of course began in a small way, families in a given locality would unite for mutual protection against some aggressive kings from other parts of the world who would send armies to plunder and kill. At first they would form what we call tribes, but tribes called for some recognized leader, and required some laws and regulations that would include the whole tribe. In the beginning these laws and rules came by mutual agreement between the families concerned, like the agreement between Lot and Abraham when their herdsmen began to strive over the range and water, and this is what we call government by the consent of the governed. That is the kind we have in this country, and the only kind compatible with man's nature.

That such little kingdoms were numerous in the world in Abraham's day is shown by the battle of the kings Moses told about. Lot had moved down to Sodom, and had become a citizen down there, and as the battle went against the five kings of the cities of the plain, Lot lost all of his family, and property to the victors. However Abraham heard about this battle and armed his servants and pursued after the four kings and in a sharp battle defeated them and retook all of the spoils. On his return from the slaughter of the kings he met Melchizedec, another king, and priest of God, and gave him a tenth of the spoils he had taken. I call attention to these things because they give us an insight into the
conditions that prevailed at that time in so far as civil governments are concerned, and to show how they came into being.

If this seems like a departure from the patriarchal form of government we insist that it was a natural one, and a necessary one to meet the growing needs of the people as the world population increased. We do not find any indication of anger, or displeasure, on the part of the Lord over this development, but we do see him dealing with them, and in the case of Jacob keeping his sons together until they grew into a great nation, and settled them in Canaan.

The call of Abraham marks a turning point in world history, and a change in the Lord’s method of dealing with man. Up to this time he had dealt with man through angels, and had revealed his will to him through dreams and visions, but it seems that these methods were not succeeding very well. God could not make revelations to wicked men, or send angels to talk with them, and most men had forgotten God by this time, and gone off to worship false gods. In Abraham and his seed the Lord was preparing to abolish this old system, and use men as his servants instead of angels, and make man help to enlighten the world.

Abraham and his seed were to be the light of the world, and through them all nations were to be blessed. The church now is the light of the world, but ever since the choosing of Abraham God’s people have been the light of the world, to carry to the nations the knowledge of the true God, and the Lord began right then to unfold what he meant to be a permanent revelation for mankind, and which we have preserved for us in our Bible. But before this permanent revelation could be made a nation must be established and prepared to receive it, and preserve it for future generations, and that is why none of the books of our Bible were written until after the Jews were brought out of Egypt and molded into a nation. Some think the book of Job might be an exception, but I seriously doubt it. The evidence seems to favor the idea that Job was written later than the five books of Moses, either by Moses, or by someone of the old prophets of Israel.

After Abraham and his seed were chosen as a light for the nations of the world, there was a season of preparation during the lifetimes of both Abraham and Isaac and part of the lifetime of Jacob, but all the time the Lord was making revelations to them which were ultimately to bless every nation: It is in this respect that the revelations made to them differed from those given such men as Melchizedek, Jethro, Balaam, and other priests and prophets of the old order. The revelations to the latter kind of prophets were temporary in nature, and concerned only the families of the prophet to whom they were made, and little would have been gained by preserving them. But the things revealed to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were for all nations, and for all time to come, and would need to be preserved.

It was when ‘Joseph was sold into Egypt and was finally elevated by the Lord to the second place in the kingdom that we can really see’ the purposes of the Lord begin to unfold. Egypt was the proper place to begin such a mission as the Lord had laid upon Abraham and his seed, it was the greatest kingdom in the world, and at this time had reached almost universal proportions. It had become very corrupt, and was almost entirely given over to idol worship, and what Egypt thought and did would effect every other nation of the world. As Egypt went the rest of the world would follow. Such has been the history of every great civil government the world has ever known, they form the moral code for the smaller nations who copy after them.

Mohamedanism swept over three fifths of the world where Christianity was born, and left not a vestige of it because Mohamedanism took over the civil rule, and used it for religious purposes. Just as long as the pope could keep civil rule under his control he ruled the world, and it was only after the civil power was taken from him that the reformation made any real progress. Reform in religion and in civil government have marched forward, hand in hand, and little progress has ever been made in either while the other lagged behind. If Lot lived near Sodom and kept his integrity it was because of his long association with Abraham, and the short time he had lived in the wicked city. Even at that he seems to have lost his entire family except the two youngest daughters. It is very hard to row against the current.

Joseph was sent down into Egypt, not to give the people bread alone, but as a witness and light for God. Jacob and his family followed for the same reason, and they remained there over four hundred years, and they took their religion with them, and their God, and reintroduced him to the people in Egypt who had forgotten Him. We never can know how much effect the sojourn of these people of God had upon the people of Egypt, but it must have been great. And whatever effect it had, upon Egypt, they in turn would effect other nations. We know it was bad when the Lord sent Moses to lead His people out of bondage, but it could have been much worse. It could have been so corrupt that the Lord would have destroyed the whole nation like he did the world in the flood of water, or as he did Sodom and Gomorrah.

The Lord was preparing the world for his son, a world into which Jesus could come, and give it a gospel that would save men’s souls. As the civil governments went the people went, and to lift up the people to a higher plane he must use the civil governments which molded their moral conduct. Like government, like people, even in an absolute monarchy, and it is more true in a democracy. That was why the Lord elevated his people to places of trust and responsibility in the civil government, and kept them there, like Joseph in Egypt, Daniel and others in Babylon, and Mordecai and Queen Esther, at a later period.

After he took them out of Egypt he formed them into a nation that would be a shining light among the other nations of the world, and during the time that Israel remained faithful to the Lord no nation in all the world prospered as they did, and every nation on earth learned about the God of Israel. The effect that the kingdom
of Israel had upon the other nations of the earth during this time we know was great, and the name of Israel's God was made known to all nations. We have many incidents of record that prove this point, the Queen of Sheba, for one, and Naaman the Syrian Leper for another, and by the time Israel fell through her own sins men all over the whole world were thinking of God as a being of supreme power and goodness.

In their fall and dispersion among the nations of earth, the Lord was able to continue to use them as the light of the world. In fact that seems to have been the Lord's greatest opportunity. Had it been only man's doings, what happened to Israel would have been the end of that nation, as had happened to so many other nations since time began. But Israel has survived all her many captivities, and cruel persecutions such as no other people ever received. Why has Israel survived so long without a country and a king? Because wherever those Jews went they took their God with them, and their religion, because they were God's light in the world, and God chose to make that light shine through the civil governments of the world. That was why He would elevate chosen servants to high positions in the governments, they served as lessons that the people could not fail to see. This was God's way of blessing all nations through Abraham's seed for the time being, and until Christ could come, as the fulfillment of this promise, and make the blessing complete.

It would take pages on pages to recount, or even name, the many nations into which God sent the Jews during the time from the fall of their kingdom to the advent of Jesus into the world. Babylon, Medo-Persia, Assyria, and back into Egypt time after time, are just a few, and again I want to remind that where these Jews went their God went with them, and their religion. While wanderers and captives in most nations they did not remain in obscurity, God saw to that, for obscure men would make poor witnesses for the God of heaven. They would have been obscure men had it not been for their God, and the kings and rulers would have paid them no mind, instead of elevating them to high civil positions in government.

Luke gives us all the light we need on conditions at the time Jesus was crucified. He tells that on the day of Pentecost there were dwelling in Jerusalem Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven, who had come to Jerusalem to worship at the time of the great feast. They were not only Jews, but they were devout men, men who worshipped God, and they from every nation under heaven. And they were men of importance in the countries where they lived, we know this must be true, or they never would have been permitted to leave their posts and come to the city of Jerusalem to keep the feast to their God. And the people of their countries knew why they came, and therefore knew about their God.

These devout Jews were present on the day of Pentecost, and beheld the miracles the apostles worked, and Luke says they were astounded when they heard them speaking to them in their own tongues wherein they were born. Luke mentions seventeen different nationalities who heard them speak on that day, and they were devout Jews who worshipped God. How many of them were converted on that day and the days following we do not know, but there must have been many. And no doubt they would be among the first to whom the apostles would give the Holy Spirit, and some of those devout Jews were from Rome, the metropolis of the world.

It is supposed that it was some of these very Jews who carried the word to Rome and established the first church in that city, and if to Rome, then to other nations as well. Luke mentions by name one other notable character, the Ethiopian Eunuch, who was a man of authority under the Queen of that country. Up to this time all that the Lord had done through these advance agents of his was preparatory to what he was now doing through them in the name of His Son.

I have called attention to these facts to show how God has always used civil governments to help advance the cause of righteousness, even the most wicked of governments. God rules in them, but he rules through human agents, not in some dark mysterious way, but in ways we can understand. God performs all of his works in this world through human instrumentality, he even saves the souls of sinners through human agents, for only men can preach the gospel by which men are saved. Civil government cannot save a soul, but it can prepare a soil in which gospel seed can be sown which can save. The Ethiopian Eunuch was the very kind of man the Lord needed to carry the gospel back to his home country, not only because of his sincerity of mind, and-honesty, but also because of the confidence his Queen had in him. Men of his type are not easily swayed by every wind of doctrine, and the people would know it, and they would listen to what he had to say, and believe it.

III

"GOD, MAN, SATAN, AND CIVIL GOVERNMENT"

In the Garden of Eden, Satan interposed himself between God and man whom God had created, and brought about the first sin. When man was driven out of the garden Satan followed him, and he has overlooked no opportunity to meddle in the relations between man and his Creator. God gave man dominion in civil affairs, and Satan was quick to take advantage of this fact. Civil government has to do with man's relationship with other men, and the material things of life. Spiritual government has to do with man's relationship to God, and Satan was just as active in his efforts to meddle in spiritual affairs, and just as successful.

In the beginning all government was very simple, and consisted in the regulations of family affairs, civil, and spiritual. But as families multiplied on the earth new needs began to arise to regulate the relationship between the various families, Rules and regulations had to be formulated regulating the rights of different families in order to keep peace between them, and for the good of all. They could come only through mutual agreement, or by war between them, in which case the strongest family would force its will upon the weaker.
In the case of war the weaker family would have to submit and serve the other, or move out to new quarters surrendering the range and other profits to the enemy.

It is not my purpose in this article to trace the development of civil government through the ages until we reach the Christian era. It is sufficient only to mention this gradual development, and point out the fact that the Lord kept in close touch with man through all of them, and his hand can be seen guiding man, and working with him in all ages. The hand of Satan can also be seen working among them, opposing all the Lord was doing for mans good, and hindering a proper development of civil government in every manner possible. He also corrupted the worship when possible, and he corrupted civil government because it effected mans moral nature. Satan has been very active in civil government in all ages, but he has done so only because through it he could effect mans relationship to the Creator.

Both were essential to man's good in the world, and were designed to make man remember God, and be submissive to his will. That is the reason Satan has so bitterly fought them, and tried to corrupt them through his ability to deceive and mislead man. Man is a free moral agent which is what makes him a moral character, and responsible to the creator for his acts. God has never coerced man, or forced him to obey his commands. He made known his will where man was willing to hear it, and then left him free to accept it, or follow Satan if he so desired.

Man is the essential element in civil government just as he is in spiritual government, he has the deciding voice as between God and Satan of making either what God wants it, or what Satan wants. When man follows the Lord he is always blessed, but when he follows Satan he ultimately reaches disaster, but Satan is so cunning in hiding the source of the evil that man is slow to realize the cause of his troubles, or find the proper remedy.

Some men argue that civil government belongs to Satan that he gave it to man, and that if there is any good in it man must thank the devil for such good. A young preacher wrote me a scathing letter saying I did not believe the Bible when I denied that all civil governments belong to Satan. He cited me to the passage where the devil claimed them, Luke 4:9 where Satan said, These are all mine, and I will give them unto you, and the glory thereof, for I give them unto whomsoever I will. See also Matt. 4: 8-9. I knew before the young preacher told me that the devil claimed them, and claimed all of this power, but the devil is an awful liar, and I do not have to believe a thing just because he said it.

I believe what the Bible says, but the Bible ascribes this bold statement to Satan the father of liars, and that is enough to make me doubt it. This young preacher only had Satan's word for what he is preaching all over the land, and printing in books and tracts, and newspapers where they will let him. I had read in my Bible that the Lord ruleth in the kingdoms of men, and setteth over them whom he will, and I prefer to believe what the Lord said. But Satan is cunning and sometimes there may be a mite of truth in what he claims.

I admit that civil governments can belong to Satan just as some men can belong to him, but not by right of creation. Satan cannot create, all he can do is corrupt, pervert, and attempt to steal that which God created by fraud and deceit. Some civil governments are almost entirely perverted to the service of the devil, and in this sense he can truthfully claim they are his, but none of them are his by right. Jesus proved this in his reply to Satan, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve," was his reply. His servant ye are to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, said Paul, and civil governments can belong to Satan just to the extent that they obey him.

And they can belong to God in the same way, besides they all belong to Him by right, since he is the creator of all things. They are obligated to serve God, and are responsible to Him whether they do or not. When they obey Him He blesses them, and prospers them, and when they follow Satan they soon perish in the evils he leads them into just as we see Japan and Germany perishing today, and as all wicked nations have perished since time began.

Most of that which men recognize as the church in the world belongs to Satan in the same sense that any civil government ever belonged to him. Yet that is no argument against the church the Lord did ordain, or any reason why men should shun it as an unclean thing. Both civil government and the church came from God, and both have a place to fill in the lives of men. It is folly to confuse them, or try to make one fill the place of the other. It is equally foolish to talk of men living on the earth without civil government, and living in peace. Thousands of years before the church could be set up in the world civil government was given, and the Lord worked through it to prepare the world for the church. That is why Satan has fought civil government, and worked so hard to corrupt it.

All that the Lord has been doing for man from the beginning of time Satan has fought, taking advantage of man's weakness, and his disposition to listen to Satan's lies, and follow his delusions. Yes, I admit the Lord has met with some defeats temporarily on account of man's weakness, but his purpose has moved steadily forward in spite of them, and in spite of all Satan could do. On man's part it has been a question of training, education, experience and progress has been slow and painful, but none but an ignoramus would deny that there has been progress.

It is only when we view the picture from the standpoint of centuries that we can see how great that progress has been. From Egypt in the days of Moses to Babylon in the days of Daniel, there had been some progress. From Babylon to the Rome that Jesus knew there had been progress but from Rome to the civil governments we know in our own country, and others like it, there has been great progress. But even yet I believe civil
government is really in its infancy, and man has more to learn on how to regulate civil affairs than he has already learned. This progress as remarked has suffered serious set-backs at the hands of Satan, but the Lord has been able to use them as lights to lead man on to a better world.

One of the greatest defeats ever suffered at Satan's hands is what we call the great apostacy. It involved both the church and civil government, and for a time it looked as if both would perish from the earth. It brought the world into the dark ages to which the world still looks back only to shudder with horror. Civil governments went to pieces all over the world, and the church fled away into the wilderness. Men returned to the most primitive forms of existence, and governments fell away in feudal clans, and civilization almost perished from the earth. Then came the reformation, and civil governments and the church marched back, hand in hand, but no longer united as one, but each taking its own proper place in the lives of men.

Satan's scheme though so successful for a time proved a failure in the end, but he did not give up the fight. He has tried time and again to throw the world back in a new Dark Ages, but every effort has failed. In one effort Napoleon Bonaparte was his chosen agent, but the Lord over-ruled Satan's purpose, and used Napoleon to free the world from the civil power of the pope, take the sword out of his hand and put it back where it belonged, and open a door for his church to march forward in the reformation, as well as independent civil governments, the only kind the Lord ordained. The Kaiser's war was another effort similar to the one in Napoleon's day, and now Hitler's war, but the lessons the world will learn in these wars will help to guide it into a safer harbor for tomorrow. We are just now learning that civil government was ordained for man, not man for civil government. Scoffers will come, but let them scoff, true statesmen will read the lessons aright, and put them to use.

Civil government will never save the souls of its most perfect citizens, that is not its purpose. But it will prepare a soil in which gospel seed can be planted, and where it can spring up, and grow. It provides an environment where the church of the Lord can grow and prosper, and the gospel have free course. Churches in the absence of civil government are unknown, history is silent about such churches for the simple reason that they do not exist. And we have millions of people in the world yet where they have no organized civil government where these enthusiastic missionaries might go to plant their churches where they would not be bothered by the evil influences of civil government, if the missionaries wish to take the risk. But not many of them take the risk, they don't want to be made into a stew for some cannibal chief to feed to his tribe of savages.

One young brother who wrote a book on the evils of civil government admits that it is "God's second choice for keeping a semblance of order in the world." On another page he tells us "Civil government is a substitute for those who have not the gospel, and for those who do not have enough of it to keep them in the straight and narrow way." Again he informs us that those who have the gospel do not need civil government. But he does admit that the Lord ordained it, but only for those who have not the gospel, children of the devil, and God's children should touch not, taste not, handle not, the unclean thing, God ordained.

While this young preacher, who is able to print a book, and scatter it among the churches, is certain that civil government is only for those who have not the gospel, I am just as certain that the gospel is for those who have civil government, from the king on his throne to his most humble citizen. I am also sure that the more of the gospel civil rulers absorb, and practice, the better the civil government will be, and the more people will accept the gospel. Any theory that makes civil government the enemy of Christ and of the gospel is dangerous both to civil government and the church. Any theory that makes it a necessary rival of the church is dangerous, and helps to create a rivalry which should not exist.

The best way I know for such preachers to prove their theory is to go among those people who have no organized civil government and establish them a church, and prove their faith by their works. Why have they not done this? The reason is obvious, civilization does not exist where there is no civil government, and where civilization does not exist the gospel has no power. Uncivilized savages do not make good Christians, and some of them want to eat the missionary instead of worshipping his God, and missionaries object to being made into a pot roast for some cannibal chief.

If you want to save those savages you will first have to civilize them, and the first step toward civilization is recognized civil authority, and that means a civil government of some kind. When this has been accomplished even partially the missionary can begin his work in a small way, and then his gospel will further the work of civilization, but it will not destroy the civil government which made the civilization possible. This young preacher unconsciously endorses this point when he said civil government was ordained for those who have not the gospel, or who have not enough of it to keep them in the straight and narrow way. He also admits it when he said it was God's second choice to keep a semblance of order in the world, but I am sure he did not mean it that way, or understand what his statement implied. God used his second choice for four thousand years before he introduced the gospel, but this preacher would have us believe that if he had only given the world the gospel then, civil government would not have been needed.

IV

"THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST AND CIVIL GOVERNMENT."

Some who might agree with most I have said up to this point, argue that all of this was changed when the church or kingdom was set upon the day of Pentecost. They point me to Daniel's prophecy which foretold the time when the kingdom of God would be set up, and claim it will break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms. They quote that they shall be as chaff of the summer threshing floor, and the wind will carry them away.
These men understand little about what Daniel is fore-telling, and make the same mistake about God's kingdom that the Jews did. That it was ever intended for God's kingdom to take the place among men which civil government has always occupied is a serious blunder, and it was denied by the Lord before Pilate when he told him, My kingdom is not of this world. Daniel was not discussing civil government as such in his prophecy, but four universal empires which would rule the world, Babylon, Medo-Persia, Greece, and Rome, and the manner in which they were broken up, and became as chaff of the summer threshing floor. That is what created the innumerable civil governments which have developed from the chaff of those empires.

It is certain that Daniel does not mean that the kingdom of God would destroy those kingdoms in the same sense that Medo-Persia destroyed Babylon, or Greece destroyed Medo-Persia, and Rome destroyed Greece. The kingdoms which Daniel said would be destroyed by the kingdom of God were the ones the king saw in his vision, the great image, which Daniel interpreted for him. The head of gold, the breast of silver, the belly of brass, and the feet and legs of iron mixed with miry clay. These four empires of pagan origin ruled the entire world, and they represent a principle in government which the kingdom of God would destroy. We know how they fell, one destroying and succeeding the other, until the Roman Empire ruled the world. The Roman, or iron kingdom, was ruling the world when the kingdom of God was set up. It began at once the work of destroying the pagan idea upon which these universal empires existed, through the gospel, and it scattered them in due time like chaff before the wind, and there has never been another of the kind. When this chaff settled, we have many independent kingdoms, or civil governments, all over the world, and this is what the kingdom of God did for the pagan system of universal empire.

Daniel was not discussing civil government of the kind God had ordained for man, nor did he hint that God's kingdom would supplant them, or render them useless for man. It never has, and never can, perform any of the work the Lord assigned to civil government when he ordained them. The Jews thought it would, and even his disciples before Pentecost, and the Jews undertook to take Jesus by force and make him a king of that kind. When he refused such a kingdom they turned violently against him and betrayed him to Pilate. This was the basis of their charges before Pilate, that he and his disciples were plotting such a kingdom, and it was the charge which secured his conviction. Pilate had rejected all of the charges until they brought this one, and their charge. If thou let this man go thou art not Caesar's friend, decided him, and he told them to take him away and crucify him.

Pilate questioned him closely on this point, and while he refused to answer other charges he did answer this one. But he explained that His kingdom is not of this world. If His kingdom were of this world then his disciples would have fought that He should not be deliver-ed to them. Jesus did not mean that his kingdom was not for this world, nor that it was not in the world, but that it was not like them, a material kingdom having to do with the material affairs of life. He was denying the interpretation that the Jews placed upon the kingdom of God, that it was a rival kingdom to that of Rome; and that it filled a different need of mankind.

After his resurrection he told his disciples that all power and authority in heaven and on earth were given to him. This means all that the words imply, but does not mean that he would take the throne of Caesar. He had power to do so, or do whatever he thought best with all of those earthly kingdoms, for they were now his by reason of his conquest over all things, and if Satan ever had any just claim upon them, it was now gone. But God had given man dominion in them, and Jesus left that right where it was, with man.

But that dominion was subordinate dominion, man was responsible to God for the manner in which he exercised it from the beginning. Jesus now had the right of rule over them, and over man as an individual, and the power, but he has chosen to exercise that power through the gospel. And so far as we are able to know he has never exercised that power in any other way. Then while this left man in dominion in civil government, there was a higher power over him which he was responsible to for the way he exercised it, a King of kings, and Lord of lords, to whom all creatures in heaven and on earth were now responsible.

Under the patriarchal dispensation civil laws and spiritual laws were closely related, more so than during the law age. Under the law there was made a distinction between acts of worship and purely civil laws, but even then they were closely related. Under the gospel there is a clear distinction, and a place assigned to each. A man might be a most perfect citizen and yet not regard Gods spiritual laws. Tom Payne was such a citizen, He was a good citizen, but disregarded God, and wrote books trying to get other citizens to do the same.

On the other hand no Christian can defy the civil laws, or disregard the civil government. Jesus said, Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things which are God's. If man cannot do this, then the language of the Lord is meaningless, and was a fraud. The civil law was represented by Caesar in this passage, and it states that there are things which belong to it, and for Christians to render them. It was the question of tribute that he was discussing but he did not confine his language to taxes. Tribute is one thing which belongs to civil government, but we are told the sword also belongs to it. The sword belonged to Caesar and Jesus recognized his right to it when he submitted to trial and execution from Caesar's hands when he could have easily freed himself.

Paul also appealed to Caesar's sword when his life was endangered by a lawless mob because that is God's ordained way of resisting violence. He could have armed the disciples who adhered to his teaching and called 'on them for protection but that would be to meet law-
lessness with lawlessness, and would have been to ignore
civil government which God had ordained. Peter cut off
the ear of the servant of the high priest with a sword.
This was a lawless act, and defiance of the civil author-
ity which had a legal right to arrest Jesus when charges
had been filed against him, and hear the charges. The
Charges were false of course, but that did not alter the
fact that proper procedure demanded that he be appre-
hended and the charges heard by a legal tribunal.

Does the New Testament religion free the Christian
from obligation to meet the duties of citizens of the
civil government? It is not a question of obligation to
do all things any civil government might demand of a
Christian, but only to meet the duties properly belonging
to civil government. The right to control the conscience
of man, and direct his worship towards the Creator, has
never been committed to civil government. This belongs
to, God, not Caesar, and is a matter between man as an
individual, and the Creator. But there are things which
properly belongs to civil government, and both Jesus and
Paul taught the Christian to render them. That the
use of the sword to keep the peace, and execute wrath
upon evil doers, is one of these, there can be no doubt
by those who believe the Bible.

Peter, to whom the keys of the kingdom were given
shall be my first witness on this point. “Submit yourselves
to every ordinance of man for the Lord’s sake: whether
it be to the king as supreme; or unto governors, as unto
them who are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers,
and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the
will of God that with well doing ye may put to silence the
ignorance of foolish men.”

Paul, the great apostle for the Gentiles, is just as
clear on this point. I quote, “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. Whoso resisteth
the power resisteth the ordinance of God, and they that
resist shall receive to themselves damnation. .. 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. Do 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.)”

I do not see much that could be added to what these
two apostles have said to make it clear that the Chris-
tian owes obedience to the civil government. But as be-
fore remarked this can only apply to the things which be-
long to civil government, and would not apply when they
go beyond the scope of that authority, and undertake to
dictate in things which belongs to God. In private life, in
family life, and in spiritual life, there are things which
civil government cannot regulate, and to attempt to do so
would be an abuse of authority, and they would not be
Gods ministers in so doing, but Satan's ministers.

The only attempt I have ever seen to meet the points
set out by the apostles in these passages is a foolish play
on the word “powers.” They try to make Paul's language cover all powers, even the devil himself, but
the rules of common sense, and of proper interpretation,
will confine it to the powers he had in mind in the con-
nection, the powers which it is right for them to obey.
Citizens in this country owe obedience to its laws, and
they are not concerned about what laws the people of
Japan, or Germany, may have. We are under no more
obligations to obey them than we would be to obey the
laws of inhabitants of Mars, or Jupiter, if they have laws
on those planets.

Not all laws, even in our own country, are just laws,
but if we live here we should obey them while they re-
main on the statute books. We have ways of getting rid
of unjust laws, proper ways, and these would come under
the authority delegated to civil government by the Lord.
But to resist them, or refuse to obey them, it is not he
proper way to deal with them.

The powers Paul had in mind in writing to the church
in Rome was the Roman government under which they
lived. Peter also had direct reference to it, but their
language will apply to any government under which a
Christian might live, they are required to render unto
them the things which belongs to them. The devil is a
power, but he is not one of the powers God ordained. He
made himself a devil, and any power he has for evil is
stolen power, that is why he is, the devil. The same
point holds true for civil governments. What God or-
dained was good, and only for good, and when they de-
part from that which is for mans good they follow the
devil.

This is the lame point in the argument of those bre-
thren who say a Christian in Germany is just as much
bound to aid in her war of aggression and robbery as one
here is bound to aid in a war of defense against aggres-
sion. The difference lies in the fact that our country is
using the sword for the purpose God ordained, but Ger-
many is using it for the purpose God did not ordain.
Only a blind man can fail to see this difference, you can't
show a blind man anything. God ordained our use of the
sword and prospered it, Satan ordained Germany's use of
it, and God said it should be broken, and our sword is his
minister to break it.

Peter said this is the will of God that with well doing
ye might put to silence the ignorance of foolish men. Read 1st Pet.
-2:13-15, and Romans 13: 1, 12 and get out from among that class of foolish men whose ignorance
must be silenced, not for the good of the church only, but
of all men. While we are in the flesh we have to live
in the flesh, and observe fleshly rules and obligations.
The gospel of Christ will convert civil governments from
their evil, and make them rule righteousness. But it must,
work from the inside, not the outside only. The worst
civil government in the world is better than it would
have been without the effect the gospel has had upon it.
And the worst one we know now is probably better than
the best one would have been if the effects of the gos-
pel had not been felt in the world.

To argue that Paul means that Christians are to sub-
mit to every power there is in the world, which would
include the devil, is to reduce the passage to an absur-
dity, and render it meaningless. In my correspondence
with some preachers of the conscientious objector class
almost every one of them claims that he means just that.
They say we cannot resist the aggression, robbery, and murder, of Germany and Japan without resisting the powers that be in the sense Paul contemplated, and bringing upon ourselves damnation.

I am just as sure that the powers Paul had in mind were the powers he told them to obey, and to whom he told them to render custom, tribute, honor, and fear, and this could not include alien powers. The same powers that we are not to resist are the same ones to whom we are to render tribute, and we do not pay tribute to alien governments. These preachers inform us that if we resist the aggression of these alien powers we will be damned for it. But they argue that we must resist our own government if it asks us to bear arms to resist aggression, or we will be damned under another law which says thou shalt not kill. But if we do resist our own government we will be damned any way, and it is merely a choice of damnations.

Then I will leave it for them to decide which damnation they prefer. If they help their country resist the aggression of Germany and Japan they will be God's ministers to execute wrath upon evil doers, and we might have something left for our children to live for after it is over. We might even save the lives of our wives and mothers, as well as our children, at the sacrifice of our souls. But if you go the other way you will also lose your soul, and you will have nothing to show for it, and the Germans and Japs will also murder your mothers, wives, and children. And the savagery to which they will reduce the world if we fail to resist them will cause untold millions of souls to be damned in the centuries to come. If you doubt this picture all you need to do is visit some of the funeral pyres our American correspondents describe for us that they have witnessed with their own eyes, and talk to the hungry, ravaged, remnants they have left to repeople the occupied countries.

We are resisting the powers that be either way it goes, and we will be damned. We are resisting a power the devil inspired, but they are resisting their own country which God placed over them and commanded them to obey, and Paul says they will be damned for it. They say we will be damned too, but they do not speak by inspiration, and Paul did. Let them take their choice of damnations, for me I would prefer to be damned while resisting robbers and murderers than be damned for resisting a power that God commanded me to obey.

Then we are told in the Bible to resist the devil, and the war that Germany and Japan are waging is the devil's war. I challenge them to deny it. God never loosed those murderers and robbers on a peace loving world. I challenge them to say he did. Then, when we resist them we are resisting the devil. Will they deny this? Their war is the devil's war, and those who fight with them, or aid them, are ministers of the devil, and not ministers of God. We use the sword God gave us to execute wrath upon these evil doers, and Paul said we are ministers of God. Will they deny it? We are using the sword of God to resist the sword of Satan, and it is not sin to do what God has ordained for us to do. Will they affirm that it is?

Dear Brother Wallace:

When you so skilfully met in debate ten years ago the most artful schemer and trickster in unfairness and dishonesty of modern times, I heard every word of the battle.

At that time I was in position to hear it critically and to see about every failure that might have been yours, as you know. The kingdom-millennial issues were not so well known by me: but the power, clarity and absolute invulnerability of your every argument I could see and fully appreciate.

You let pass only one minor thing I thought unfair to truth. You stated the evident truth that no verse indicates that Christ will ever set foot on earth again. Norris made it appear that you said he would not return to earth. I thought you did not make the difference clear enough between coming to earth and setting foot on the earth. Maybe I slipped there.

When you had finished your argument on Mk. 16:16 I said to J. A. Douthitt, sitting by, "That is the most exhaustive and powerful, and the clearest. I never heard or read on Mk. 16:16." After ten years, I am not ready to change my statement. I wish we had in print your exact statement of that text under the inspiration of the hour. I doubt you could repeat the clarity and power of the argument, unless the equivalent of the occasion could appear.

You and others are right. Norris never did intend to meet you in another debate. His challenges were all bluff, and no man knows that were the dishonors I have always thought the world of Brother Hines, but I am astonished that he would allow himself to be pulled into a radio debate (?), if indeed he did not push himself into it instead. As it now appears I do not see how I could be interested enough to listen to the exchanges of such speeches as theirs must be, under the guise of an honorable debate.

The Special issue represents a great amount of work on your part-1 am sure it was mostly yours. You have done two things to perfection in it. You have exposed, as so long proved, the falsifications and ridiculous claims of Frank Norris that you would not meet him again. You have given us a fine collection of valued points on the issues, though condensed from their strength in the debate. Yes, you have done a third thing in this Special, of which I am especially proud, as well as every lover of just common human fairness and honesty must be.

You have exposed the charges made by many not otherwise akin to Norris that your financial dealings were dishonestly conducted. I have never believed, but have ever most firmly known that you were ever dishonest in any step of business nature. I did not have to know all the facts involved.

There are so many things to say about the great event of debate, and especially of the unfortunate turn of affairs which caused the truth to suffer so much by your part of it not getting to press. Norris has ever known that you and the rest of us would have been hasty to see the full debate published. But he also knew that that was one thing he did not intend to allow and could not face.

Good brethren think Norris should have been ignored entirely since the tricks he pulled over us all in that debate and months following. Some things, some maltreatments should be passed by. But when so much of truth is at stake, I do not see how common honor will allow such a power in Satan's kingdom to defy continually the church of our God.

Here is my hand and every good wish for a recovering of all ground lost by the tricks too low for any white man, or any MAN, to pull. It is still as true as when Solomon wrote it, "God will bring every work into judgment, with every secret thing, whether it be good or evil."

Faithfully yours, F. L. Paisley, Tyler, Texas.

October 1944

Page Twenty-three
Announcement was made in the October issue of the Bible Banner that the Special Issue dealing with the facts concerning the Fort Worth Debate would exceed forty thousand—forty thousand plus the avalanche of orders. In the first press run, forty-one thousand were printed. In the second press run fifteen thousand additional copies have been printed to take care of the orders that have been received from all over the nation. It appears that these will be completely exhausted. Fifty-six thousand Bible Banner Specials—which means approximately 500,000 readers of this amazing Special Number. Its seventy-six pages would make a 200-page book of average size. The post-publication price is twenty-five cents per copy, and orders will be filled at that price while they last. There has never been anything like it in the annals of religious publications. Order from the Bible Banner, Box 1804, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

You did a good job presenting the facts and good Will result.—James P. Miller, Evansville, Indiana.

I have read the special. It is a dirty job—well done.—John T. Smith, Waco, Texas.

Thanks for the early personal copy. It does the job.—Jack Meyer, Houston, Texas.

I hasten to send check for one hundred copies. I am so glad you got this issue out.—Cleveland Moore, Trenton, Fla.

I believe that you are doing great things for the Cause in bringing out this Special.—C. B. Thomas, Corpus Christi, Texas.

I enjoyed the Special Edition of the Bible Banner. It will surely get the desired results.—Preston Cutham, Edmond, Okla.

I rejoice with you over the fine reception of the Banner Special. It will do a lot of good.—Roy E. Cogdill, Houston, Texas.

The Bible Banner Special was red-hot. I really enjoyed it. It really shows Norris up in fine fashion.—Joel R. Chambers, Rhome, Texas.

We are with you in your fight. Send us five hundred copies of the special edition of the Banner. We are sending a check to cover cost.—Cleon Lyles, Paris, Texas.

Please send us 150 copies of the Special Issue of the Bible Banner. Hope and pray that you can get Norris into another debate.—Floyd J. Spivy, Haskell, Texas.

This church is poor but we want 100 copies of that Special Bible Banner @ seventy-six pages.—Chester A. Hunnicutt, Union, S. C.
I was at once impressed with the cover. That cover should be permanent—it catches the eye. People would pick it up first off a news stand. I have read several pages and believe it will do the job. I want a special sitting to read it all.—A. H. Maner, Buffalo, New York.

I think the Special Issue is what was needed for Norris and don't think he will be able to bring any more! It ought to settle the issue of Jake Hines and Gene Smith also. Will right thinking brethren?—? B. Wilkinson, Duncan, Okla.

When the bundle of the Bible Banner Special arrives I will place them where, in my judgment, they will best accomplish their purpose. You will trust my judgment as to the use I will make of them.—C. R. Nichol, George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, Calif.

The Special Issue of the Bible Banner was “super” special. It will huld Norris. You have done more for the salvation of the church than any man in our day. I thank God for your faithfulness. I believe the river has been more misrepresented than you have. Doubtless it is because you are exposing more error than any other one man. Men wax hot wheresoever their errors are exposed.—Otho D. Fikes, Edcouch, Texas.

I am glad that you are exposing the misrepresentations of Norris. First, let it take the wind out of his sails. I am persuaded that no man of this generation has been more misrepresented than you have. Doubtless it is because you are exposing more error than any other one man. Men wax hot wheresoever their errors are exposed.—A. L. Colson, Lake Park, Ga.

I have just finished reading the Special Bible Banner, and must say that it is wonderful. My only regret is that you will not get to meet J. F. N. I was all set to be in Dallas or wherever you met him. . . May God give you many more successful years in his kingdom. My respect for you and your work grows with the years.—R. G. Embry, Louisville, Ky.

I am appreciative from the very bottom of my heart for your courage and efforts in exposing this confirmed enemy of the truth. You will never know just how many friends you have, not only among the brethren here, but also to those who are doing through the Bible Banner. It is my earnest conviction that the Bible Banner has done more to stay the church from digression than any publication of my time. I pray that God may bless you with a clear mind, a strong body, and a continuation of the will to stand for the faith once delivered unto the saints. Truly you have delivered a death blow to sectarianism of every form that has shown its ugly head among churches of Christ where the paper has gone. I shall ever be friendly to it as long as its aim is at present.—Glenn A. Parks, Fayetteville, Ark.

I believe they will fill a great need for those who are willing to press the battle against sectarian doctrine and misrepresentation of the truth. Norris has allied and schemed his way through life. I am personally acquainted with faithful members of the church who have known him from his youth and they say his present tactics are nothing new.—B. C. McCarley, Galveston, Texas.

I am enclosing you herewith a check to apply on the Special Issue of the Bible Banner. Doubtless this Special Issue has been a burden to you and in this connection I feel definitely certain that the churches will come to your aid as it is known, or at least they should do so. My warmest personal regards to yourself and family.—E. E. Young, Attorney, Roswell, N. M.

I think the Special is fine and the facts it gives will no doubt be news to many—for the simple reason that there are so many people who know but little about the real facts in the case. A lot of people believe, or at least pretend to believe, that the Norris-Boll crowd are fine, dependable, people and I think the Special will surely open the eyes of some.—J. F. Kurlees, Louisville, Ky.

I am partly through reading the Norris-Wallace Debate matter in the Bible Banner. Doctor Norris—what a man! I had no idea he was such a wolf in sheep’s clothing. A contrario the reading, he is a man that cannot be trusted either by word or actions. You have him fairly handcuffed. I am certainly glad you gave him enough rope. Anyone knows who won the debate.—J. Hunt, Detroit, Mich.

I have read the Special number of the Bible Banner and think it fills the purpose splendidly. I was talking to some of the members here and we have pledged ourselves to distribute this Special Number among the members of the Temple Baptist Church, if enough copies could be obtained. If you have any left, send as many as you wish to be used in this way, also the bill.—Willis W. McLain, Detroit, Mich.

I have your letter of September 19 and appreciate your thoughtfulness in sending the fifty copies of the special issue of the Bible Banner for our preacher boys. I shall be glad to see it when they arrive that they are distributed among our preacher students.

I hope that you will send to the ACC campus at every opportunity. Best personal wishes.—Don H. Norris, President, Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas.

The Special number of the Banner required two settings, one till early morning hours. All this is information to me. Too bad the debate was not taken down at Fort Worth. I wrote ordering a copy from some brother there and wondered why it was never available. Enclosed find check for subscription to your paper. I want to see what is happening and cannot learn much, save reports of protracted meetings from papers I am now getting.—W. W. Freeman, Commerce, Texas.

I have an uncle who lived at Ft. Worth, belonged to the 1st Christian church there, and who hates the church of Christ, yet said to me a few years ago, relative to your debate with Norris, that it ruined Norris at Ft. Worth, that he lost members and that he was his undoing! There is the testimony of an outsider, who should be impartial witness to the affair!—Murray M. Marshall, Groom, Tex.

While discussing the special issue of the Banner with two brethren, one of them lately from Dallas (Oak Cliff), remarked on “how the Norris issue gripped his interest.” I told him he ought to take it all the time and “have his interest gripped every month,” and to take out a buck. He said fine, and then I asked the other fellow if he was a subscriber. He said no. I said, Well get out a dollar and join up. He responded, I just mention this to show how things go and because it is of a little human interest. We all like to know that what we do is worthwhile.—Glen N. Green, Vernon, Texas.

You have done a wonderful job showing us the facts surrounding the subject of the Norris debate. Suppose his followers are being favored with a copy of this statement and proofs of facts. It is lamentable that a display of friction in the church should have been furnished him for ammunition but that very thing may be of benefit to the church by forcing some unwilling eyes to see the false issues offending the church and with whom the supposed “harmless” teaching and teachers stand. Best wishes and prayers for you and your work.—W. A. Phillips, elder, Central Church of Christ, Los Angeles, Calif.

Brother Carrard told me about your desire to place the Banner into the hand of a man, many people as possible. There is a Fundamental Baptist Church near the congregation here, and the elders of Garfield Heights asked me to order
two hundred copies of the Banner. Brother Gerrard also asked me to have you send him personally one hundred. Enclosed is the money to pay for them. Send them all to my address in Beech Grove.

I am glad that you are going to expose Norris, and I shall do all I can to help. —W. L. Totty, Indianapolis, Ind.

I was delighted to learn that you are sending 50 copies of the extra special issue of the Bible Banner containing 76 pages, giving a complete exposure of the Norris Fort Worth Debate. The copies came this afternoon, and I shall place them immediately into the hands of our young preachers. It is very thoughtful and kind of you to send them, and I want you to know that I appreciate it. I have received my copy and an additional one. I am glad that you have made a complete exposure of J. Frank Norris and those who sympathize with him.

I continue to appreciate the good work that you have done and are doing. —W. B. West, Jr., Head of Department of Religion, George Pepperdine College, Los Angeles, Calif.
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* * * *

Send me two hundred fifty of your Norris "cannon fodder." D. C. Boswell has read it and pronounced it fatal to the Dr. Norris, and his son, Lee Warren Boswell, offers to pay the bill if we will see that this number is distributed. I am glad to set my hand to this task for that good it can do. I haven't finished the reading of the matter as yet but have read enough to see that the job is a complete one. I fully appreciated the preceding issue and the annihilation that the information promised for Norris and his cause, and I regret the inoculation of the new spark of life that Erutherford Hines has given to that cause by his rash and extremely ill-advised action. Best wishes for the continued success of the Banner and of every effort of all of you connected therewith in the Cause of the Master.—Denton M. Neal, Lakeland, Fla.

* * * *

I am enclosing an old Five Dollar Bill which has been exchanged for a lot of different things, but never put to a better use than to pay for a bundle of papers. Send them to my home address.

I want you to know that I appreciate the fight you have made and are making. Personally, I am a sort of 'Casper Milquetoast.' I know quite well that I am not competent to deal with such matters as you are doing, and so I just leave that sort of work for those who are qualified to do it right.

I have noted the spirit of devotion to the plain truth as evinced in your most severe criticisms of others. I fully believe that the intention is to demolish the doctrine, and not to destroy the man. May God spare you and strengthen you for the battle against error.

I found the Bible Banner a day or so ago and have read every word of it. It is a complete expose of that bundle of inconsistency and contradiction known as J. Frank Norris. May it be blessed as it is read by the multitudes. Yours and His, Rue Porter, Neosho, Mo.

* * * *

The special Edition of the Bible Banner received, and certainly appreciate the information contained therein. Have always believed you to be above many of the things charged against you, but had no positive proof other than my confidence in you as a gospel preacher, and Christian gentleman. Now it seems to me that those who have been so liberal with their charges, if they are really honest, will gladly make apologies for the wrongs done you and the cause of Christ in general.

Even those who criticise you admit that you have done more to check and retard the growth and spread of pre-millennialism than any other force in the world, and this alone deserves the everlasting commendation and gratitude of the brotherhood. Even though you may have made mistakes in other things, who is it that—does not make mistakes? If you do get Norris to meet you again somebody can make room for one more from Florida. May His blessings be upon you and yours in your work. —W. Herren, Clearwater, Fla.

* * * *

I fell heir to the last issue of the Bible Banner through Bro. E. C. Fuqua. I can say that it was with intense interest that I read every word of it. I must say to you: "Well done thou good and faithful servant." I have had a favorable feeling toward you, and you have always been my favorite preacher in the church of Christ. I have been reading from your pen over a period of many years, and as you know, I have heard you preach through meetings, and at different times for almost thirty years. I heard you when you met J. Frank Norris. You did not leave a stone unturned. Norris was left without one thing to stand on, and no one knew that better than he. I said at the close of that debate, "Norris will never meet Foy E. Wallace, Jr. in another debate. My prediction has come true. I appreciate the fact that we have men to help safe guard the cause of our Lord .... There are some things, that grieve me to the heart, and that is to think that, in the church of Christ we have men, who claim to be Christians, that would line up with a man like Frank Norris, as some have done, just because of their dislike for you; and turn traitor to God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Bible, and all good men for no other reason save to destroy your influence, and that because you refuted false doctrines. I believe that your mind has been made up for many years to stand for that which is right, and at the same time, stand against that which is wrong, and that is the thing we all should do. I had just as soon be Judas when I go to the judgment as to be those whose names have been called in the Bible Banner, who take issue with you, and favored J. Frank Norris. As for myself, I shall never turn against you, nor speak evil of you, you are my brother in Christ, I have always loved you, I do now, and always shall. And may I say, as I bring this letter to its close, be careful, shun the evil, do good. God will be with you, and the fellowship of all good men will be yours to enjoy.—Jesse Powell, Ft. Worth, Texas.

ARE YOU INTERESTED IN SONG BOOKS?

"GOSPEL SONGS HYMNS," our new, 1944 hymnal, is having a wonderful reception. 9,000 sold in four months. The second edition is now on the press. In making this book I purchased song permits from The Rodeheaver Co., The Hope Pub. Co., The Lillenas Co., The Gospel Advocate Co., and others, securing the most popular church songs in America, investing $1,000.00, first cost. I have owned this book for fifteen years. My "dream" has at least come true. 288 pages, 300 of the finest songs and hymns ever published. Shape notes only. Price : Beautiful Deluxe-Cloth, 75c per copy; $8.00 per dozen; $32.00 per fifty; $66.00 per hundred, prepaid. Cordwain Tag, 40c per copy; $4.50 per dozen; $17.50 per fifty; $32.00 per hundred, prepaid.

We have other books. Returnable copies of our books will be sent for examination. Write for catalogue. Our books are not sold through Agents. Send all orders direct to

WILL W. SLATER, PUBLISHER, STATION A, FORT SMITH, ARKANSAS
Brother S. H. Hall brings up one of those ticklish problems and pitches it at us in the Gospel Advocate.

“But a preacher is in the pulpit, and out there in the audience is a mother with her little babe. She loves that babe, and how much, she loves the preacher and wants to hear him preach! He is her favorite preacher. But the baby cries, and he has a fit right there in the pulpit! Is he not ashamed of himself? He hurts her feelings and that of her many friends and destroys his influence as a preacher in that congregation. Is that not silly? Yes, it is worse than silly—it is mean! Do you not know that any soul, with half sense, knew that it was not the Christ that was in him that got angry? It was that mean self of his that never has been converted.”

Now let us dry our tears and turn this problem over and take a look at it. Let it be granted that there are some preachers who have fits and some mothers who do not know how to either keep their babies quiet or take them out. These are the known factors in the case. It is assumed that if the preacher can be cured of his fits the problem will be solved. But what about the mother and babe angle? That is really where the trouble started, you know. It does not solve the problem, but only aggravates the situation, to ignore the mother and turn the meeting over to the baby. He may decide to cry louder and longer than the preacher can preach, in which case the mother could not listen to the preacher regardless of how much she loved him; and besides there are some people who think that an audience has at least equal rights with a mother and a howling baby in a public assembly.

Preachers are not all alike, nor are mothers and babies all alike. There is the preacher for instance who can squat and squall, and as long as the baby does not make so much noise that he cannot hear himself, he is perfectly happy. If the mother happens to be of the kind who is unmoved by the “silly” situation, nobody suffers but the audience. Then there is the high strung preacher who is so anxious to get it over to the audience that he is make so much noise that he cannot hear himself, he is annoyed by a youngster who decided that it would add something to the meeting for him to run up and down the aisles and across the pulpit and vocally express his delight in the way that only such a child can. His father and mother did not seem to mind it at all. He was such a cute little fellow. All of them are, you know. As he raced on the stand. The child was pleased. To him my father said:

“I want to have a heart to heart talk with you babies who are sitting on your mothers’ laps. I am afraid to talk to your mothers for I might hurt their feelings. I know you do not like to hear me preach any more than I like to hear you cry. It may well be that there are people here who had rather hear you cry than hear me preach. But I do not want that kind of competition. If you feel the bawl coming on, just ask your sweet, thoughtful mothers to carry you out of hearing distance.”

Glory be, it worked and I was saved the disgrace of a “silly” fit. That very night when that little angel opened up with a blast that would make Gabriel’s horn sound like a squeak, his darlings mother scuffed up several pairs of shoes getting him out of there. And I was saved! I hope she still loves me.

A preacher needs to be both resourceful and artistic to handle situations. If he isn’t whatever he does, or if he does nothing, the results are likely to be embarrassing. It is not always the “little babe” but the larger one who uses both his voice and his legs. Then there are the sweet young things of feminine gender and the smart young bucks who are plagued with adolescence who demand some correction for the good of the meeting.

My father is quite adept in handling an audience and keeping them in a good humor. Once upon a time he was annoyed by a youngsters who decided that he would add something to the meeting for him to run up and down the aisles and across the pulpit and vocally express his delight in the way that only such a child can. His father and mother did not seem to mind it at all. He was such a cute little fellow. All of them are, you know. As he raced across the pulpit, my father snatched him up and set him on the stand. The child was pleased. To him my father said:

“Son, what is your name? You are an orphan child aren’t you? If you had a papa and a mama, they wouldn’t let you act this way would they?” About that time, the mother got him and out of the door she went with him. A ripple of laughter swept through the audience. The episode had a happy ending.

Once when I was getting up steam, I faced two very young couples who were old offenders considering their age. They laughed and talked and passed notes and had even been accused of making faces at preachers who showed any annoyance. They enjoyed the reputation. What could I do besides have a fit? I stopped and looked at
them. In return I got a saucy stare. It was time to do a bit of experimenting. They were really nice kids apart from what was ailing them. I put my hands in my pockets, walked slowly back and forth across the platform, walked just as slowly down the aisle until I was directly in front of them. With hands in pockets and feet apart I turned a broad grin on them until they got the unindivided attention of the audience. I said nothing but turned back to the platform and finished my sermon without further interruption. The youngsters took some good natured kidding which cured them as far as that meeting was concerned. If it had not worked I do not know what I could have done short of having a fit, or wringing their young necks.

I knew a very useful deacon in a certain church who was a sort of self-appointed sergeant-at-arms. He kept order in the assemblies. He did not carry the traditional cane with a rabbit’s foot on one end but he had a way of showing thoughtless or embarrassed mothers where to take their crying babies; and he could quell effervescent adolescents with a look or a tap in an unobtrusive way. He seemed to always be at the right place at the right time.

The preacher who reached up and pulled out a handful of his hair and shouted: “For Pete’s sake, sister, take that young’un out of here and spank the fire out of him,” probably got results, but I do not recommend that course except in very extreme and aggravating cases.

If Brother Hall can get even “half sense” out of this, he is welcome to it. We’ve got to have preachers, women and babies, even if we have to put up with occasional fits.
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