In the discussion about the land promise made to Abraham, one plain statement seems to have been overlooked. But, first, let us get before us an argument that some make on that promise. It is argued that the promise was made direct to Abraham and was meant to be fulfilled to him in person, and yet Stephen informs us that God “gave him none inheritance in it, no, not so much as to set his foot on.” (Acts 7:5) Assuming that the promise to Abraham meant that he would have title and right to the land in his own person, it is therefore argued that he must yet have it in his possession. It is therefore argued that the Jews must yet return to Palestine, so that the promise to Abraham may be fulfilled. But in thus making Abraham and the nation of Israel joint-owners of the land at the same time—they overlook the promise as Stephen stated it: “and he promised that he would give it to him in possession, and to his seed after him.” Notice that word after-first to Abraham, then to “his seed after him.” Notice again this word after in Gen. 17:8: “I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan.” Abraham first, then his seed after him. I wonder how long these future kingdom folks think Abraham is to possess the land before it comes into the possession of his seed after him! The emphasis the future kingdom folks place on their idea that the land was to be given to Abraham in person will not allow them to concede the truth that the promise was made to him as the head or father of a nation to be possessed by the nation of whom he was the father. The head or father of a nation is sometimes put for the nation—is sometimes spoken of as a nation. Before Jacob and Esau were born Jehovah said to Rebecca, “Two nations are in thy womb, and two peoples shall be separated from thy bowels: and the one people shall be stronger than the other people; and the elder shall serve the younger.” (Gen. 25:23) These statements or promises concerning these unborn sons were to be fulfilled centuries after they were born-fulfilled in their descendants. To rebellious King Saul, Samuel said, “Jehovah hath rent the kingdom of Israel from thee this day, and hath given it to a neighbor of thine, that is better than thou.” (I Sam. 15:28) Yet that threat was never visited upon Saul in person, for he continued to be king so long as he lived. Now, that threat to Saul was as personal as was the land promise to Abraham. Why does not some wild scribe argue that Saul must be raised again and put on the throne of Israel, so that God can fulfill his threat?! The threat was fulfilled in the family of Saul just as the land promise to Abraham was fulfilled to his descendants. And that is exactly the way the land promise to Abraham was fulfilled. After Stephen spoke of this land promise, he said, “But as the time of the promise drew nigh which God vouchsafed unto Abraham, the people grew and multiplied in Egypt.” (Acts 7:17) “The time of the promise” can mean nothing else than the time for the fulfillment of the promise. That time had drawn nigh, and things began to shape up for the fulfillment of that promise. Those who claim that the promise has not yet been fulfilled have a quarrel with Stephen.

At the proper time Moses was sent to lead Israel out of Egypt. In giving instructions concerning the Passover, Moses said, “And it shall come to pass, when ye are come to the land which Jehovah will give you, according as he hath promised, ye shall keep this service.” (Ex. 12:25) Hence when they should come into their possessions in Canaan, that was exactly what God had promised. Again Moses refers to Canaan as the land which Jehovah “sware unto thy fathers to give thee.” (Ex. 13:5) This same promise is referred to many times in Deuteronomy. A few of the many passages: (6:3, 10, 18, 23; 8:1, 31:20) These passages teach plainly that the possessions of the land of Canaan by Israel would be the fulfillment of the land promise made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. Joshua so understood it; for when the tribes of Israel came into possession of the territories allotted them, he said, “And, behold, this day I am going the way of all the earth: and ye know in all your hearts and in all your souls, that not one thing hath failed of all the good things which Jehovah your God spake concerning you: all are come to pass unto you, not one thing hath failed thereof. And it shall come to pass, that as all the good things are come upon you of which Jehovah your God spake unto you, so will Jehovah bring upon you all the evil things, until he have destroyed you from off this good land which Jehovah your God hath given you.” (Josh. 23: 1 4, 15)
MODERN MILLENNIAL THEORIES EXPOSED

By FOY E. WALLACE JR.

A series of ten gospel sermons delivered in Houston, Texas, during the recent Music Hall Meeting-January 21-28, 1945, supported by twenty churches of Christ in Houston.

1. The Infallible Book-Is the Bible Verbally Inspired? Is It Scientifically and Historically true?
2. The Infallible Faith-Is The New Testament Complete, Or Do We Need Later Revelations?
3. God's Prophetic Word-Are The Prophecies Of The Old Testament "Unfulfilled Prophecy" or Have They Been Fulfilled?
4. The Hope Of Israel-Will National Israel Be Restored? Will Jerusalem Become The Capital Of a World Kingdom of Christ on Earth?
5. The Church Age-Was the Kingdom of Dan. 2:44 Established on Pentecost, or Was It Postponed Until Christ Returns?
6. The Throne Of David-Is Jesus Christ Now King On David's Throne?
7. The Second Coming Of Christ-Is It Premillennial And Imminent? Is Jesus Coming Soon? Will Christ Reign On Earth One Thousand Years?
8. Anglo-Israelism-Does The Bible Support The Claim That the Anglo-Saxons Are Israelites And That They Are God's Modern Covenant People?
10. The Consequences Of Millennialism- Are These Millennial Theories Vital To Christianity? Are These Theories Destructive Of The Gospel System? Are Those Who Teach These Theories "Fundamentalists"?

THESE SERMONS WERE STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED—
by the best reporter obtainable and all the accumulated material on the issues of Premillennialism presented in these addresses has thus been preserved and are to be published.

BROTHER WALLACE HAS MET THE OUTSTANDING PREMILLENNIALISTS—
of this generation in debate on these issues and through several years of intensive study and research has accumulated arguments and material on these themes which represent the most complete preparation obtainable against these false doctrines.

THESE ADDRESSES WERE ILLUSTRATED—
by the use of charts prepared for use in these debates and all these charts will be in the book. An invaluable collection of material will be thus made available to this generation and those to come.

YOU WILL WANT A COPY OF THIS BOOK—
and perhaps more than one copy to distribute among your friends. Nothing like it is available anywhere.

THE PRE-PUBLICATION PRICE IS—
$1.50 Per Copy-After publication, $2.50 per copy.

ORDER ONLY FROM THE PUBLISHER—
whose name and address is listed below.

Note: Do not send orders to the editor of the Bible Banner, nor to the Bible Banner, as it does not have facilities for handling the orders.

SEND YOUR ORDER TO
HOUSTON, TEXAS
ROY E. COGDILL, PUBLISHER
701 LEGRENE ST.
It has been about six months since an issue of the Bible Banner has appeared. This temporary lapse in publication has been due almost altogether to the enormous issue of the Special Edition on the Norris-Wallace Debate. The task of bringing out that Special Edition was a huge one, and, in addition to the vast expense, it exhausted reserves in stock for several issues of regular size. The two issues of the Banner that followed the Special carried matter that had been previously put into type and was being held for regular issues. After these issues were printed, we deemed it expedient and practical to “pause” in our “offensive” to let “supplies” catch up and to “consolidate” the lines. This we have done.

Concerning the Special Edition, testimonies of the great good that it has done all over the world have come to us in a constant stream and flow of praise and appreciation—far too many to pass on in print even in a cross-section percentage. It has not been possible to acknowledge letters, cards, messages, and even telegrams, from friends of Christ and his Cause in the four corners of the earth, but it has impressed us all with the fact that our labors have not been in vain.

The attitude of our subscribers toward the unavoidable suspension in publication has also been superb. Concerned not for a dollar invested in a subscription, but rather for the welfare of the Bible Banner, many inquiries have come, all of which were withheld until the inquirer felt that he just simply had to know and when another Bible Banner would appear on the scene of things. To answer these inquiries a card was mailed to subscribers advising them of plans in the making for a series of special numbers to be issued on a change of frequency in publication. During this time we have kept in touch with our local postal authorities and have had their generous and courteous cooperation.

In view of these developments, however, and in consideration of the fact that there are many thousands who are now reading the Bible Banner who were not in on the start of the Bible Banner, hence somewhat if not altogether uninformed of the past with reference to it, it appears entirely proper and appropriate to dwell on the past, present and future of this very unusual, and with becoming modesty, extraordinary Bible Banner! Whether it has been liked or disliked, no one has ever-denied that it is an unusual and extraordinary publication. I know that it is— and I will take all of the consequences for saying so. For the information of some, and to serve as a reminder to others, the following chronicle is submitted.

I. THE PAST

The history of the Bible Banner links with the Gospel Guardian. After the debates with Neal at Winchester, Kentucky, and Norris at Fort Worth, Texas, it appeared to be imperative that we should have a medium of expression to meet the enemies of truth and right, if need be on their own ground, to repel their attacks, stop their campaigns of falsehood and calumny, and having done that— to launch an offensive for the truth against error. The papers that were being published did not offer such a medium, could not afford it, and would not attempt such a task. There was no alternative but to start one that could and would take up the fight against Premillennialism with all of its dormant divers doctrines and latent errors and evils. To meet this need the Gospel Guardian was first published. The following initial statement appearing in its first issue will serve to set forth the policies and principles of that ideal publication.

THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN

Through the substantial support of some loyal friends, I am able to offer this magazine to the religious public. The magazine is my own. There is no company or corporation back of it. The only backing it has received or will receive above the volume of subscriptions we hope to accumulate is the backing of individuals who are friends, not of the editor only but of the cause the magazine has espoused. We merely want the readers to understand this point, but with it one more i.e., the appearance of the Gospel Guardian does not mean the birth of another journalistic beggar. It will not beg its way. We hope to make it pay its way.

The name of the magazine suggests its mission and policy. It is controversial-doctrinal to the core. Paul said to his young protege, “0, Timothy, guard that which is committed unto thee.” The gospel needs guarding. It is the state of current religious thought and the needs of the cause with which my own life and labors have been identified that have called forth this magazine and that is the sole cause for its existence. It has been more than one hundred years since Stone and Campbell and their co-adjudors brought their plea for the complete return to the New Testament to this continent. During this time, though the triumphs of this plea have been signal, there have been many defections from it and its steady progress and highest success have been periodically retarded. But for the fact that the eminent men connected with this plea kept the church of the past generation or two thoroughly indoctrinated, and that by controversy, the plea would have become absorbed in the constant drift of things and lost from view.
We are overlooking the fact that the present generation has not had the advantages of the thorough indoctrination the former generation had under the "giants of those days." The whole array of the restoration blea needs repeatedly told.

Under the present trend it is not impossible that the church may be a lost institution among the denominations of the world.

Schools have been tempted to abandon their original purpose to vie with the standards of worldly schools. To a certain extent such standards may be maintained but not to the point of sacrificing or even of compromising the original aims of the Christian school. Loyal to these aims they may be a great factor in the dissemination of truth; unfaithful to these aims through their influence they may sweep the church into another wholesale digression.

The full and free discussion of the great fundamentals of the gospel is peculiarly timely now, when so many errors and isms are so rife. There has been a generation of younger Christians since these issues were made the common theme of every gospel pulpit. Now the canned sermons of Chappell and other denominational pulpiteers are more common from some of our own pulpits than the gospel of Paul.

While the range of subjects to be treated in this magazine will embrace the entire field of faith, doctrine, worship, work and growth of the church, yet special attention will be given to some particular errors, such as Premillennialism. To be specific we desire the publishers of the Word and Work, at Louisville, Ky., to know that we are set for the defense of the truth against the errors that periodical propagates. We shall meet them on the issues drawn and isms are so rife. There has been a generation of young Christians since these issues were made the common theme of every gospel pulpit. Now the canned sermons of Chappell and other denominational pulpiteers are more common from some of our own pulpits than the gospel of Paul.

While the range of subjects to be treated in this magazine will embrace the entire field of faith, doctrine, worship, work and growth of the church, yet special attention will be given to some particular errors, such as Premillennialism. To be specific we desire the publishers of the Word and Work, at Louisville, Ky., to know that we are set for the defense of the truth against the errors that periodical propagates. We shall meet them on the issues drawn and isms are so rife. There has been a generation of young Christians since these issues were made the common theme of every gospel pulpit. Now the canned sermons of Chappell and other denominational pulpiteers are more common from some of our own pulpits than the gospel of Paul.

My magazine has a field of its own. It was conceived and is now published in the conviction that its definite policy and purpose justifies its existence. I shall strive with all my strength to make it merit the confidence of those who have made it possible. That it may be further received with a generous welcome and a liberal support by all who are jealous and zealous of the doctrinal purity of the church and who believe the defection of the church is not great for me to overcome, handicapped as I was with no resources — and I could not go on alone. To have done so would have required all of my personal income, which, aside from being needed for the existence of my family, would have been too limited for the task I had undertaken. At that time even interested brethren had not been fully aroused to the need, nor convinced of the condition of the cause on the issues involved, as they later were convinced and aroused — therefore, being unable to carry on, the Gospel Guardian, after nine numbers, was discontinued.

The jubilee that was held in some circles upon the demise of the Gospel Guardian was not for long. The impetus that was given to Premillennialism and other insidious and seductive influences among us only served to convince some good brethren that such a medium was in reality essential to the "defense of the church against all errors and innovations." It was out of this realization some two years later that the Bible Banner was born. It was in reality the Gospel Guardian brought again into being — the spirit of the Guardian...
imbibe the spirit of that apostle who enjoins us all to love the truth and speak it.

"The Spirit of Christ"

"Other stock expressions of apologists for the soft-pedal cadences of sweet preaching 'are that we should manifest the spirit of Christ, and do things in the Christian way. The word “manifest” means to make clear and plain, apparent. Then to manifest the spirit of Christ means to make clear and plain what Christ thinks of the errors and shams of religion. This can be done by showing what He said and did regarding the teachers and institutions of error in His day. He said they were human plants and would be rooted up, and He called them all by name. A follower of Christ should always manifest the spirit of Christ; and a Christian should always do everything in the Christian way. There is no man whose soul senses a deeper desire for these Christlike traits than my own, unless he has a deeper soul. But how may we know the spirit of Christ save as He exemplifies it? Follow Him through Nazareth to Calvary and hear him release His spirit in reiterated exhortation of religious blind guides and their blind alleys. To the divinity doctors and phylacterised Pharisees He had a bad spirit-the spirit of Beelzebub! If the very spirit of the divinity doctors and phylacterised Pharisees He had a deeper soul. But how may we know the spirit of Christ save as He exemplifies it? Follow Him through Nazareth to Calvary and hear him release His spirit in reiterated exhortation of religious blind guides and their blind alleys. To the divinity doctors and phylacterised Pharisees He had a bad spirit-the spirit of Beelzebub! If the very spirit of the divinity doctors and phylacterised Pharisees He had a deeper soul.

The Lord's way of preaching is on record. He said those religious leaders did things ‘for a pretense’ and should receive ‘the greater damnation;’ He said their proselytes (converts) were ‘twofold more the child of hell’ than themselves; He said, ‘Ye fools and blind . . . ye blind guides, which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel’ (the Lord even had a sense of humor and resorted to the ludicrous in exposing their shams); He said, ‘Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell,’ and ‘upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.’"

Such was the preaching of Jesus. Do those who talk so much about “the spirit of Christ” preach that way on anything, ever? Rather do they seem to think that “the spirit of Christ” and “Speaking the truth in love” means to be so gentle and love everybody so dearly as to let them die and go to hell before we would nettle their feelings by telling them the truth!

There are religious Pharisees with us yet whose sins and shams demand castigation “in the spirit of Christ.” Preachers today can choose between two courses: the course of the least resistance in preaching only that portion of the truth in a mild and affirmative manner which meets no opposition, or like Jesus and Paul, preach the will of God in all of its condemning as well as saving power, without thought of man’s fear or favor. But the praise and popularity that accrue from compromise and neutrality are empty, indeed. “He makes no friends who never made a foe.”

"Institutional Influence"

"Back of much of this doctrinal softness is the influence of some of the colleges among us. They have harbored teachers of error; they have promoted a spirit of worldliness; they have manifested an air of superiority; they have conducted campaigns among the churches to affiliate church and school which will eventually, if continued, result in college domination and control in the church. The college domination danger is not imaginary . . . . When it is said that “the church that does not put the college in its budget does not have the right preacher”—that is college domination. It means college control of preachers, with a threat. When the ban of boycott is placed on gospel preachers who do not “cooperate” with the college, or who criticize anything the college does, and who oppose the church-budget scheme of linking the church and college together—that is college domination with vengeance. When the president of the college can sit in his office and dictate letters to young people in various churches who belong to “The Ex-Student’s Association” and through them influence the policies of a congregation on certain issues, even to the point of who shall or shall not preach in certain places—that is college domination. When these young people in the church, whether preachers or not, feel that they are obligated to the institution that graduated them, and they become virtually an auxiliary of that college in the church where they are—that is college domination . . . . There are those who measure a man’s loyalty to Jesus Christ by his loyalty to the college. This attitude is tested by the fact that he may criticize the church and bring no censure from college devotees, but if he criticize the college, let him be anathema! These are some of the dangers in this form of institutionalism growing up among us, the gravity of which cannot be denied.

“Lines of Cleavage”

“Other signs of doctrinal weakness settling down upon the churches are seen in such issues as that type of congregational anarchy existing in majority rule government in the church. This was back of all the dividing wedges of division driven by the digressives fifty years ago. By majority rule they confiscated property that belong to loyal brethren through the elders, who without restrictions named in the deeds to property, were helpless in courts that considered the property rights were vested in the majority or held that a civil court had no jurisdiction. The majority rule issue has taken definite form and looms as an issue in the near offing. The lines of cleavage exist in localities. Elders who are concerned for the church will do well to check and double check the preacher’s record on this question before he is called to their service. Once a majority rule preacher has done his work, the elders have been disarmed and a rebellion is in full charge, led by an ambitious preacher. The sequel to all such cases is simply and other church gone wrong.

“There are many important issues before use. They are not imaginary; they are real. We have been taking too much for granted. The present generation has not enjoyed the thorough indoctrination accorded former generations under the giants of early restoration days. There must now be a general return to militant preaching, the old type of preaching—and the old type of journalism—plain first principle preaching and teaching and writing that defends the truth against all errors, teachers of error and institutions of error by name, make, model and number. It is
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the only thing that will salvage the church from the calamity of another wholesale digression. It may be too late to redeem a large element in nearly every church who have been saturated with weak teaching and are virtually out of sympathy with the original primitive plea. There will be a certain sloughing off as a result of this weak element—but many can be retrieved, and the church can be saved for sound doctrine if elders and preachers will awake from their lethargy and arm themselves for battle. This has been the history of God’s people and the church in all ages.”—F. E. W. Jr., Bible Banner, July 1938.

As a proof of the immediate effectiveness of the Bible Banner, its announced policy to expose certain subversive men and movements among us, who and which were an ominous threat to the doctrinal purity and integrity of the church, drew from them threats of intimidation against us all the way from personal destruction to libel suits—they would “sue the sox” right off our feet! Clinton Davidson, an arch-innovator, premillennialist and digressive, who had been hibernating with a modern Christian Church in New York for years, and who referred to the church as “the alleged Church of Christ,” became the leader of the compromise movement in the church. His threatening letters were received by numerous brethren who were the tentative incorporators of the Bible Banner. Brother Leon B. McQuiddy, who was taking the lead in the permanent organization of the Bible Banner, took the Davidson threat seriously, and withdrew from the publication plan after only a few issues had been published. I was again left with a publication on my hands, to sink or swim, live or die.

The calumniators then seized this opportunity to attack our integrity in a series of anonymous letters, among which was one which attempted to convict me of fraudulent claims as to the incorporation of the Bible Banner, and which compared me to a criminal character who would fraudulently “organize” a Harry Somebody’s Oil Company which did not exist but sold fraudulent stock—assuming that we had thus deceived people into subscribing for an incorpored Bible Banner! This particular anonymous letter was circulated under the heading of “Just The Facts” and it became necessary after a time for the Bible Banner to issue a statement of facts clarifying the matter, which was done under the same heading adapted by the anonymous document. The relevant sections of that statement are here inserted.

“JUST THE FACTS”

It becomes our present duty, in keeping with the promise made in the last Bible Banner, to state “just the facts” regarding the announcements appearing in the Gospel Advocate and the Bible Banner just prior to the introduction of this magazine to the reading public. It was announced that the Bible Banner would be launched “Under Safe Management” and that it would be incorporated by J. W. Akin, J. E. Williams, George W. Birchfield, Cled E. Wallace, Austin Taylor, and Fo’ E. Wallace, Jr. It was also stated that the company would be capitalized and made financially safe. These promises were all made in good faith. The brethren mentioned had all agreed to such an arrangement and consented to the use of their names as they appeared.

A short time before this announcement, my long time friend, Leon B. McQuiddy, of the Gospel Advocate, proposed to finance a paper in the west, and to back me in the publication of it. It was his intention to incorporate the paper and capitalize it for a sufficient amount of money to secure its future as a permanent magazine. All statements which appeared in the papers were printed under Brother McQuiddy’s personal name, and the issues of the Bible Banner containing these announcements were printed on his presses. At this time Brother McQuiddy believed that he could promote this paper in the west to both his advantage and that of the Cause generally, though he said that he expected to lose considerable money on the venture for at least two years; after that he felt that it might become a financial success.

Various laundry matters delayed the business details, and then, finally, incorporation of the Bible Banner was abandoned by Brother McQuiddy, with his request of me that he be released from the agreement and permitted to withdraw from the management of the paper entirely and have me launch it out again on my own. In consideration of this request Brother McQuiddy offered some further financial assistance as a contributor to the paper until it could become stabilized. While this was a great disavowment to me, and to others involved. I have never wanted any man to do anything that he did not want to do. I had not made any propositions to Brother McQuiddy when the paper was starting it is a paper I believe that Brother McQuiddy would rather work for nothing and be true to his personal convictions than to receive as much per day as was offered him. However, I accented them; and when he later desired to be released, there was no alternative but to release him. I do not blame McQuiddy to come to this decision, as nothing exists in connection with my own affairs now that did not exist before, all of which Brother McQuiddy knew unless he knows something that I did not know. Be all of this as it may, Brother McQuiddy abandoned the original plans, which is the reason why the Bible Banner was not incorporated as announced by himself in the Gospel Advocate and the Bible Banner.

It was about this time that one Clinton Davidson wrote the men whose names had been announced as incorporators of the Bible Banner that his “eminent legal counsel” had advised them of their proper course of action and that they had written to me per month. Therefore, without reflecting on any man’s motives in the matter, but in what I considered duty’s de-
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"Thou has given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of truth"—and by the help of our God and those who love his Cause, we aim to keep the Bible Banner waving—F. E. W. Jr., Bible Banner, May 1939.

When men are bent upon mischief, especially when it involves well-laid plans for the personal destruction of one who stands in the way of their unrighteous cause, there is no limit to the ends by which they will attempt to accomplish their means. In an attempt to accomplish such ends Clinton (Copyright) Davidson, of the State of New Jersey, sought to capitalize on the mis-use of the name of my friend and benefactor, J. W. Akin. His shameful act brought forth the following very plain statement from Brother Akin, which was published in the Bible Banner.

CONCERNING THE BIBLE BANNER COMPANY

Some months ago when Brother Leon B. McQuiddy proposed to back Brother Foy E. Wallace Jr., in the publication of the Bible Banner, I agreed to serve as an incorporator of the paper along with other brethren whose names were mentioned in that connection. But when the plans were changed, and the corporation was not formed, my connection as above indicated was not established. Later, in answer to an inquiry from Clinton Davidson, of New Jersey, I briefly stated the fact that I had no connection with the paper. Since, however, a photostatic copy has been made of my letter and circulated with the apparent intent to injure the reputation of Foy E. Wallace Jr. I wish to say that the use of my name was according to the understanding at the time, and further that I regard the photographing and circulating of my letter a misuse of the same.

—J. W. Akin.

The name of Austin Taylor, known to all of the churches in the west as the greatest gospel singer of this generation, was involved in these proceedings due to the fact that he was to have been one of the incorporators of the Bible Banner. Brother Taylor spoke out on the matter as follows:

AUSTIN TAYLOR SPEAKS

Dear Brother McQuiddy:

There has been, as you know, considerable criticism of Brother Wallace because of the failure of the plans to incorporate the Bible Banner, and it has also been an embarrassment to those of us who have been backing him. I feel that you should make a brief statement assuming the blame for not forming the corporation as announced in the Gospel Advocate, and thus save time, trouble and embarrassment, as something will have to be done to clear this matter up if you do not make a statement assuming the blame. Sincerely yours, Austin Taylor.

Incidentally, Brother Taylor still has that Davidson letter which contained the threat of legal action against him for his connection with the Bible Banner! But Davidson does not know Texas men—he did not know them, he does now. It would take more than one man from New York or New Jersey to scare Texas Taylor, and other rugged Texans like J. E. Williams, G. W. Birchfield and J. W. Akin. Besides being men of high character in the world and in the church—they are just not the kind that can be scared. As for me, from the very start, I offered to provide a reception committee in Oklahoma City to meet the New Yorker, any time he wished to set the date, to greet him legally or otherwise.

Meanwhile, during all of this siege of personalities, forced on us by the pious element among us, we carried on with the Bible Banner until other men filled the breach. The following statement was inserted in The Bible Banner when an interested group of brethren who appraised the situation accurately and believed that the Banner deserved to survive, agreed between themselves, to see it through.

THE FUTURE OF THE BIBLE BANNER

Because the original plans for incorporating and financing the Bible Banner were not consummated, an effort has been made to discredit our publication and its publisher, and to create doubt in the public mind as to its continuance and performance. That our many friends, who have felt a concern for the Bible Banner may feel fully reassured, we are glad to announce that a group of Christian business men, who believe in the principles for which the Bible Banner is fighting, have entered into an agreement with the editor to contribute monthly to the cost of printing the magazine for a two-year period—the agreement subject to renewal at the expiration of that period. The amounts subscribed represent a donation from these men to the Bible Banner. One clause in the agreement reads:

"It is understood that this is a gift to the Bible Banner and I (the donors) will have no part whatever in its ownership, management or otherwise."

The editor of the Bible Banner will therefore be solely responsible for what appears in these pages, for the information of the legally minded brother and his "eminent legal counsel" who recently wrote ominous letters to certain brethren who (he thought) were involved in the ownership of the yaver. As it is, the name was with Mr. Clarence Saunders, of Piggly Wiggly fame, who was the "sole owner of his name," so it is with me and the Bible Banner, unincorporated.

The effect of this announcement, we believe, will be far-reaching. Friends will be gratified; readers will be satisfied; enemies who sought to capitalize on rumors of reverses, will be mortified—but most of all, we trust that the Lord may be glorified, his true people edified, and in all the Cause of the New Testament church magnified.

So with genuine gratitude to all who are helping in this fight for the truth, with malice toward none, and due in humility of heart, we take courage and press on—F. E. W. Jr., Bible Banner, May 1939.

So, much to the chagrin of some sweet spirits among us, the Bible Banner lived—it did not die. But its way has never been easy. The fight has been hard, all of the way, but it is worth it, for the church has been saved not only from the blight of Bollism, but from a movement which was far more bold, vigorous and challenging, and no less insidious—The Davidson Movement. The triple threat of Bollism, Premillennialism and Davidsonism was met at every turn, their approaches blocked and their attacks repelled.

There are many who know what relation the Bible Banner has sustained to this long and difficult fight, and who concede that it has been the deciding factor in stemming the tide of modern errors—but there are yet too many who do not even now sense what the actual dangers were and yet are in these surging issues. Many who did not understand the situation, stood by and criticised—and felt unmindful that when personalities were involved the editor of the Bible Banner was on the defensive. We took the offensive only when the truth of the gospel was at stake. We have never felt either an inward or an outward desire to make
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personal attacks on men, and it is only when men have been so involved with their own insidious systems of errors and isms that we have permitted ourselves to be compelled to deal in such. We had far rather defend principles than denounce men. Sometimes, however, the faithful performance of the former demands the latter. With this apology for the past, we offer some considerations for the present.

II. THE PRESENT

On occasion some have been heard to object to the Bible Banner because forsooth it could not be handed to an outside friend or non-member of the church. That in itself does not constitute an objection for the simple reason that the Bible Banner has been published primarily for the “inside” instead of the outside. But outsiders have been known to receive a lot of good from it, and have said so. Many members of the church are entirely too timid about what they would have friends to see, hear and know. I have heard members remark that they did not want their outside friends to hear certain plain gospel sermons which exposed their errors. So what some weak members of the church think cannot be handed out to a sectarian friend does not furnish a just ground of criticism of a sermon, an article or a periodical. But regardless of that, it is a well known fact that the members of the church need the Bible Banner and it has served to inform them on important issues, converted hundreds from errors which they had already embraced and save thousands from falling into such errors. Therein is its existence thrice over justified.

In the continuation of the Bible Banner our highest aspiration is to clearly and unmistakably set forth the principles of the gospel, with an unrelenting attack on every-thing opposed to New Testament teaching. The character of the fight for truth and right is twofold-defensive and offensive. Defensive because the truth cannot be merely stated-it must be defended also. Offensive because battles are not won on the defensive merely. Herein lies the Bible Banner’s greatest distinction.

Under such a policy our duty is to speak without restraint upon any issue that affects the purity of the church and the integrity of the gospel, yet without the appearance of that bigotry which papers too often assume in their role of attempting to control the preachers. If our churches have been endangered by “college domination” our preachers have been no less threatened by “paper control.” Conversely, some men and movements among us have sought to make a tool of the papers and have too often attempted to use an editor to say and do things which they would not themselves do or say. In actual experiences, I have been pushed out in the front by “friends” to be shot at on some issues only to find that “he” or “they” had vanished when the firing began! I have had my fingers burned when in all sincerity I had been used in doing something that turned out to be pulling chestnuts out of the fire for some who had an axe to grind. Experience is the best teacher, and it invariably teaches a safe rule—namely, when there is a suspicion that somebody is trying to use you for “a cat’s paw,” don’t let them do it. For the truth and for the church I should be willing to give myself and sacrifice my all, but to be used by any man or any group to promote their selfish interests—No!

There are others, too. First, those who either try to “fix” us, or who think we can be “fixed,” in certain courses of action or lack of action. Personally, I wouldn’t give a fig for somebody’s “information” or “advice” who even suspicions that we can be “fixed” on any question, nor shall we be threatened or cajoled into any action which is not in our own conviction and conscience right to do and true to teach. Second, those who try to make “personal-ities” out of every fight that has been made for the truth. They brand it as “a personal grievance.” This furnishes an excuse for side-stepping an issue—an alibi for not taking part in the fight. Thus premeditated efforts have been made to turn important issues into personalities so that certain parties to false doctrine could hide in the smoke which they themselves create. And in some notable instances a man has sulked in his tent over so-called “personal grievances” while we were making a major fight on some important issue. But when the smoke of the battle cleared away, and victory on the issue was evident, out of his sulk-tent he dashed for a ride on the band-wagon! The old story of how “we killed a bear” would be a fitting recitation for him.

We have no personal grievances, they are not worth having; and, if we be not deceived in heart, we have not engaged in personalities except when someone has stood in the way of the truth. In that case there is no alternative-personalities or no personalities, the way must be cleared that the truth in free course may prevail. This has been the past policy of the Bible Banner and is a commitment on our conception of its present obligations. So help us God.

III. THE FUTURE

As repeatedly stated, the original purpose of this magazine was to deal with special issues, covering the field of controversies, keeping the issues before the church clear and drawing the lines tight. As long as controversies continue, so long as issues exist and lines are loose, that long the Bible Banner shall proceed in its course of clearing issues, covering controversies, and tightening the loose lines. In so doing we have the assurance of the support of thousands of loyal and truth-loving members of the Lord’s church all over the land.

With reference to the immediate future — there will be a change in the frequency of publication. With this issue the Bible Banner becomes a Quarterly instead of a Monthly. In making this change in cooperation with and by the consent of the United States Post Office Department, we believe that we are taking a step forward. There are numerous weeklies and monthlies being published, perhaps too numerous — but the field is open for the type of Quarterly published many years ago by a few of the pioneers of the church. The periodical published by Moses E. Lard, under the title of Lard’s Quarterly, is an example. There then were others such as The Christian Quarterly, edited by W. T. Moore, and later The New Christian Quarterly, edited by J. H. Garrison. Many of the greatest preachers and writers in the church in the early day contributed specially prepared essays to these periodicals. Such a publication has the advantage of offering space for a full, lengthy and complete treatise of an important subject, which a weekly publication cannot offer. As a general medium, a weekly cannot afford space for essays of sufficient length to do
justice to many themes. Regard for variety compels brev-
ity, and important subjects must be treated seri¬
ally and partially, usually to their detriment. In changing the fre¬
cuency of the Bible Banner to a Quarterly our aim is to make every issue a special issue and to fill it so full that it will take the average reader the full quarter to digest it and get ready for the next issue. The size of the magazine will be three times larger. The subscription price remains the same-one dollar per year-and we shall strive to make every issue of it worth that dollar.

In a final word-without business organization or com¬pany, the Bible Banner has grown into a circulation that will compare with any paper published. among us, including

THE GOSPEL ADVOCATE AND THE GOOSE-STEP
CLED E. WALLACE

The editor of the Gospel Advocate points this one at us:

"It is worthy of note that most of the quotations are from churches not opposed to war. Of course, in time of peace, the greater portion of them have gone on record as opposed to war; but, in time of war, they change. They remind us of some 'among us' who, in time of peace, condemn war in severest terms; but, in time of war, they can goose-step like a German corporal."

"The quotations" the editor refers to are from denominational sources opposing, or viewing with alarm, the prospect of "peace-time military conscription" in this country of ours. I shall not here express any opinions as to the rightness or wrongness of any such program, but raise the question of this particular editor's right to raise a hullabaloo about the matter. He has not "goose-stepped" a step in praise of the government during the critical years which have meant so much to all of us; why then should he presume to quarrel at the government for what it proposes to do after the victory against aggression has been won? It would be gracious for him to be quiet. He cannot even vote. He considers it a sin for a Christian to hold office.

Participation in the affairs of government is an act of rebellion against God, so he believes. Our government, mine at least, if it isn't his, is owned and controlled by the devil and was even conceived and born in sin. If he is right in his fundamental contention what business is it of his, what the government does or does not do? It is his duty to "be in subjection" not set himself up as an adviser. If the question he is so upset about were submitted directly to the people, he would not vote one way or the other. Why should he, then, campaign in his paper one way or the other on a matter of government policy?

This editor, who never changes, is "opposed to war" in time of peace and in time of war. At all times and under all circumstances he is opposed to war. Anybody who thinks otherwise under any circumstances is so much "like a German corporal" you can tell him by his "goose-step." Why should he swing his pen in opposition to "peacetime" military preparation? He is opposed to war. He is opposed to the army in time of war. Had our nation declined to fight Germany and Japan, which the editor thinks it should have done, for he is opposed to war, he probably thinks he would have written editorials against their brutality in tak-

ing over this country—but he wouldn't! If he is not opposed to a police force, I think I can promise him space in the Bible Banner to tell us why, if he is too squeamish to tell us in the Gospel Advocate. I shall not consume space in pointing out the utter absence of discrimination the gentleman displays in his appraisal of sword-bearers in ignoring the important factor of motive. I think the brethren can do that without any help from me.

But who are these 'some among us' who. . . can goose-step like a German corporal? Of course the readers of the Advocate have already thought of the Bible Banner and its thousands of supporters. But I shall start my roll call in the Gospel Advocate. Its publisher, Leon B. McQuiddy is one of them. Let the editor publish his known views. He can put them on the back page if he prefers in type as small as his presses can make it. They will be read. W. E. Brightwell, editor of "News and Notes" is one of them. So is C. R. Nichol who is seen regularly in the Advocate. R. L. Whiteside, for many years a staff writer and editor of the Annual Commentary is one of them. Who is "opposed to war"? B. C. Goodpasture and H. Leo Boles! They cannot even pray for victory over the goose-stepping German corporal! If they wish it, they have not said so out loud, although they have been invited to do so. The readers of the Gospel Advocate know that they have not answered the contention that has been made in the Bible Banner regarding a Christian's relation to his government in times of both peace and war. Brethren who support the government in its titanic struggle against goose-stepping aggression with their lives, their sons, their toil and their money will think Brother Goodpasture has insulted both them and their government in comparing them to a goose-stepping German corporal. Out of deference to his publisher and the members of his own staff he might at least have made them sergeants or lieutenants. And they may wonder, too, why the war-opposing editor doesn't come right out and fight his good fight of faith with more vigor. Is he afraid of the government, more afraid of the devil than he is of God? There is neither argument nor reason in his ill-mannered growl at "some among us." It is discouraging to have him repeat so often that he never changes. A change would do him good. If there is no prospect at all of it taking place, it looks from here like a change of editors would do the Advocate good,
AN APOLOGY FOR DIGRESSION

(G. E. W.)

The following article by Earnest Beam was sent to the Bible Banner by Mrs. C. E. Shepherd of Pueblo, Colo., with request for publication. It is being inserted in full as received.

"GOD CAN DO MORE THAN WE CAN PLAN"
By Ernest Beam

1. Members of the Church of Christ, (conservative) would do well to remember the old College fight in our ranks. George Pepperdine, of Los Angeles, called these warring groups together in May of 1921. There was much sincerity and much petty talk too. Seemingly no progress was made. But there was the "will to believe" and God was busy as a result of that faith. Some of us began to fellowship "irrespective of the college question." We took a good "smacking down," from such veterans as Daniel Sommer and A. M. Morris (both of blessed memory despite their faults-grand soldiers of the cross). Both had religious journals and they wrote us up and down, but both were in fellowship with the college folk "before they died and both were interested in unity in all the "disciple" brotherhood.

2. Our brethren (conservative)-for want of a better designation-should accord to our brethren of the Christian Church a sincerity that there is just nothing at all to disfellowship over in the use of the organ akin to ours toward the "no class" minority among us. They can have classes or not-we "don't care"-but they should not disfellowship a minority of us. That is exactly the way most of our Christian Church brethren feel about the organ. To see ourselves as others see us will help to get together.

3. We should acknowledge the very evident truth that there are areas of silence in the scriptures where we have no more right to impose our judgment on the order observed in sister congregations than they have right to impose their judgment on our order. Whether the organ comes in this class-within this realm of silence and expediency-is not now being considered. The area of silence is there. Scores of us have never acknowledged this very evident truth and these minority groups. Among us who divide over colleges, cups, classes, and so on, are our children.

If in discussing the organ and organization's we refuse to acknowledge there is a wide field in which God and His church are stationed as it is one of where we are headed. We can break ourselves by getting in the ditch on each side of the road. How full of the love and wisdom of the Spirit is this: "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted." (Read it three times slowly and thoughtfully. I did just now.) There are "spiritual" brethren and there are others that are not that far alone. Often the greatest antagonists to getting brethren together are those who are not spiritual. They do not come to mind when that word is used and its counterparts in life are called up. They are not meek. There is some good, Scriptural ground here to get up a division! If all brethren were disfellowshiped who interferes with unity because of a lack of spiritual-ity and meekness we would have to shut the good in and the bad out than the organ fence is.

5. There is ever danger of having, "not another gospel" but a perverted gospel. Has it ever troubled you that you can fellowship and help to warm to spiritual life those who are not known for their faith, their hope or their charity but you cannot fellowship some sincere man possessed of all these? Grant that he is wrong in that detail, are we not still refusing to fellowship where we are at one in the greater matters of the law outside "our" ranks but willing to fellowship with forms and customs as a basic inside "our" ranks? Is this not the "mote" as a basis for disfellowshipping our brother but the "beam" that the opposers of this unscriptural worship have in their own eye. The people who have corrupted the worship by these unauthorized practices are in fact better and more spiritual, as well as more numerous than we are. Their innovations constitute a mere "detail," a foible we might say, in a sound program administered by an otherwise noble and loyal body of people. The logical conclusion to be drawn, whether the brother sees it, or avows it, or not, is that these innovations are so insignificant.
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significant that they should be no bar to fellowship. They should be ignored or treated with the same charity some dear old sister would be who is trying to praise God with a cracked voice and a total lack of ability to carry a tune. The labor-ed effort, backed by an ample supply of wishful thinking is shockingly weak and unconvincing. How are we going to reconcile all this with Brother Beam’s admission that he considers the “Christian Church” an “apostate” body? Brother Nichol has very effectively given him a deserved going over on that point. His inconsistency is apparent to any thoughtful person.

The approach to this matter of fellowship with an “apostate” church, even though they have no intention of surrendering their corruptions in worship, has followed the same pattern since the apostasy from a scriptural worship began. Many preachers back there considered “unity” so precious they argued that it could be bought with compromise. The organ was a matter for independent congregations to decide for themselves. They could worship either with or without it. They could preach where it was or was not being used. It was not basic or fundamental anyway. They were “peacemakers” and “fellowship” advocates. They prattled about weaknesses on both sides. When they could not have their compromising way, they all went digressive. They had no settled convictions to turn them from that course. Where is Brother Beam going? It is admitted that for the present he would prefer to remain with “our brethren (conservative),” whatever that may mean, and become a Beam in “our” eye to obscure the fact that the organ in worship is an effective bar to scriptural fellowship. The loyalty and good sense of the brethren are likely to remove that Beam unless he beats them to it and betakes himself off to some “apostate” church, whose fellowship he so inordinately craves and whose qualities “in the generality” he so hugely admires. It is quite evident that even now he thinks the organ is a mighty little thing compared with the saturated virtues of those who use it. It is a decided step in the direction of digression. In fact it is usually the first step taken by all who go that way.

The favorite method the brother employs to further his program of fellowship with an “apostate church” is a studied and detailed effort to confuse the brethren. He drags some red herrings across the trail and depends on distraction to herd them along the path he has marked out for them. It just won’t work. Whatever beams “our brethren (conservative)” have in our eyes will not blind us to that obvious trick. Daniel Sommer opposed Bible colleges, others oppose Bible classes and more than one cup in the communion service, some among us are not as spiritual as we ought to be, and still others use poor judgment in their selection of the songs they sing. These and sundry other things are the “beams” “we” have in “our” eyes, while the “apostate church” only has “a mote” in its eye. If it has even one “beam” the brother failed to make note of the fact. “In the generality they are not a whit behind the generality of us.” Since Brother Beam has a choice between a beam and a mote, I am wondering why he doesn’t go ahead and fellowship the mote. Possibly he is considering the matter. Personally, I do not fellowship anybody, anywhere in any notion or practice I believe to be wrong. Brother Beam’s admission that “Our ‘Christian Church’ Brethren” are “an apostate church” upsets all his ramb-

ling aberrations unless he means to contend that “our brethren. (conservative)” are also “an apostate church” and the pot has no right to call the kettle black.

It is not a new thing for apologists for error to pick out and magnify the faults of the brethren. The method is as old as apostasy. One brother attended a Catholic mass and told me it was the most spiritual service he ever witnessed. He was almost overcome with solemnity. We are being deluged with the spirituality and virtues of Catholics and Jews in a campaign for the unity of all religions. Of course, Brother Beam hasn’t gone that far yet, but in view of his remarks, why should mothes like sprinkling for baptism, and other little things like that, be a bar of fellowship against a people who “in the generality... are not a whit behind the generality of us”? The naked truth is that Brother Beam does not consider digressive innovations as much a corruption of worship as Methodist faith and practice are a corruption of doctrine. Logically, the drift of, his present plea for unity demands that he defend the organ. He will not? Then he will not get very far with his program of fellowship. Whatever progress he does make will be compromise and weaken the contention against instrumental music in worship. Every victory he wins will be a digressive victory. Let it be understood here that Brother Beam is not straining himself toward correction of the sins he finds, or thinks he finds, among “our brethren (conservative).” He finds in them a convenient pretext for making goo-goo eyes at “our Christian church” brethren who are “like us,” in fact “they are the same stock.” He reminds me of the fellow who went out in search of a church that would suit him. As the story goes, he finally dropped into one of “ours.” An old brother was called on to pray. Among other things he said: “O, Lord, we do so many things we ought not to do, and leave undone so many things we ought to do.” The stranger exclaimed: “This is it. I believe I’ll feel at home among this bunch of sinners.” If Brother Beam thinks that fellowship with “an apostate church” is what he wants and needs, he can hop to it, but please just leave me out of it.

---

Concerning Broadcasting

R. L. Whiteside

Since the latter part of June I have been able to da practically nothing; the greater part of this time I have been on my bed. During this time I have listened to the radio more than I ever did in a like period of time; but by far the greater percent of the programs are too silly for any sensible person to listen to. These I can easily avoid.

Most of the religious programs are worse than worthless. Even if the preaching is not worthless, there are frequently too much poor singing, too many announcements, and too much begging. One learns more about broadcasting by listening than by broadcasting. If a program begins with a lot of rather poor singing, announcing, and begging, I shut off or turn to something else. If you must have a lot of singing and announcing, do your preaching first. A radio audience is different from an audience in a meeting house. If some of the audience in a meeting house do not care for your preliminaries, they are not likely to walk out on you, but your radio audience is different. If your radio listener is really interested in you and your pro-

---
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Is The Church Of Christ A Denomination?
A. B. KEENAN

Don't turn in impatience from another consideration of this question, dear reader, because you consider it unutterably trite. We wish it were “trite” and answered negatively forever. But certain trends among immersed believers in Christ have brought the subject to the fore again, and if you can “hear us of your clemency a few words,” you will find, we are confident, that you have not been bored by a twice-told tale.

Whether or not the church of Christ is a denomination among denominations depends altogether upon circumstances.

It is a denomination if it is characterized by one or all of the following attributes:
1. A date for its founding previous to or later than Pentecost, A. D. 30.
3. Terms of admission which do not coincide with faith, repentance, confession, and immersion.
4. Innovations in worship (they may range from paganity and incense burning to the use of mechanical musical instruments).
5. Unscriptural methods of spreading the gospel.
6. Preachers who affiliate themselves with undeniable and undenying denominationalists in “ministerial alliances” and “union meetings.”
7. Preachers who by word or deed, or both, imply, if they do not overtly assert, that the church has been too extreme and needs to get closer to the “middle of the board.” Surely they have been thinking of the church largely in terms of its being a sect which needs to get along with other sects amicably. If this has not been their thought, then they have been unfair in encouraging out-and-out denominationalists to believe that we are ready to concede that our position is not all that the scriptures would have it.
8. Preachers who leave that which is clearly revealed for that which can be understood only with the aid of their own ex cathedra utterances, the denial of the legality of which leads them to brand the rest of us as “rejectors of the whole counsel of God.”

The church of Christ is not a denomination if
1. Its history can be traced back through secular and sacred history to, but not beyond, Pentecost in the year of our Lord 30.
2. Its members are called “Christian” without any kind of sectarian prefix or suffix.
3. Its name honors Christ and helps that giving of preeminence to him which Paul enjoins.
4. Its members are immersed believers in him.
5. They follow a “thus saith the Lord” for everything they do in worship or work.
6. They respect the silence of the Word both with respect to this worship and work and to God’s handling of the future.
7. They cherish and hand down to their children the things which have been revealed, and leave to God’s interpretation in his own good time the things which are obscure.
8. They demand that the only “getting together” with Professors of religion of any kind or degree be strictly on the basis of the New Testament Scriptures.
9. They do not stultify themselves by hobnobbing, fraternityizing, handshaking, backslapping, stomach stuffing, tip-toeing, tap dancing, teeter-tottering, or wire walking.

L.L. Freeman And The Salem Church

It has been my pleasure to assist Brother L.L. Freeman and the congregation with which he labors in Salem, Oregon, in two gospel meetings. I can sincerely say that during my personal experiences covering a period of thirty years of preaching, I have never found a more earnest, faithful, self-sacrificing group of Christians than these. I have never known a group so small to do so much. In these two meetings, I was associated constantly with Brother Freeman and his family. I found them completely devoted to the cause of Christ, loyal to the truth to the very core of their being, and willing to do everything within their human power to promote the principles of the New Testament Church. I verily believe that Brother Freeman would give everything he has or could honorably get to the church, and he has imparted that spirit to his whole family. I have observed him doing just such a thing. It is true that Brother Freeman has been opposed in Salem by some brethren there, and a few elsewhere; but I am convinced that the opposition to him has been due to his uncompromising stand against error and worldliness in the church. The opposition to him appears to have stemmed from a weak and compromising attitude toward the truth and Christian living in general, on the part of those who have apparently sought and are now seeking his personal destruction. Brother Freeman is a faithful gospel preacher, a man of Christian character, and I believe him to be worthy of the confidence, fellowship, and support of the faithful brethren and loyal churches everywhere. I have assisted him and the faithful group with which he labors in two meetings, as stated above, and it is my purpose to help them again. I know that they are striving to uphold the truth of the gospel and it is a pleasure to me to make this statement on their behalf.

Foy E. Wallace, Jr.
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A noted scholar once remarked that the book of Romans was the profoundest production in all literature. Shallow minds and superficial treatment certainly cannot do justice to such an amazing and enduring discussion of redemption from sin as Paul has written in this famous epistle.

R. L. Whiteside is superbly qualified to write a commentary on the book of Romans. He has a rich background of age and experience. He was born in Tennessee, December 27th, 1869, where he attended the public schools, West Tennessee Christian College and the Nashville Bible School. He developed an ambition early in life to know and to teach the word of God. By nature he is modest and rather retiring, but his thirst for knowledge made him a close student and his loyalty to the truth made him an independent thinker. As a student under David Lipscomb, he admired the stalwart character and humble bearing of that great man. However, on more than one occasion he took issue with the expressed views of Brother Lipscomb. Brother Lipscomb has been known to listen to him attentively on some point of difference and remark: “You may be right, I will study the question further”; and at the next recitation period of the class announce: “I am convinced that Brother Whiteside is correct in the view he expressed.”

Brother Whiteside has been a close student of the Bible all of his life. His critical mind and power of reasoning have afforded him an insight into the teaching of the Bible as a whole that few men have. His implicit faith in God has led him to seek to know only what the will of God is, that he might comply with it and teach it without faltering. The degree of his success has left him a store of knowledge covering a wide field and eminently fitted him for producing an outstanding commentary on the book of Romans.

He successfully served as president of Abilene Christian College for two years. He has ministered to some of the strongest congregations as a preacher, spending five successive years with the church in Denton, Texas where he has lived for many years. He has engaged in a number of oral and written debates, was always confident and at-ease and the cause of Christ prospered as a result of each discussion. His deportment has always been that of a gentleman in debate as on all other occasions. For a number of years he wrote the Annual Commentary on the Bible School lessons published by the Gospel Advocate and was otherwise a regular contributor to that paper. He is a veteran writer and widely recognized as a very able one.

The commentary on the book of Romans is decidedly not just another book. It is not a plagiaristic rehash of other books that have been written. It is not the green product of a big hurry to write a book or dictate it to a stenographer. The book is a natural. It is a maturity that has been in the process of growth for a long, long time. The author’s years of study of and inspiring essays on the apostolic masterpiece have created a wide spread demand for the book, a book that in a way just had to be. It is here. It is a distinct contribution to Christian literature which will be recognized, not only by the church of which he is a member, but by others also. It, will find its place into the libraries of Bible students and teachers throughout the land. In some remarkable instances the author has broken new ground which will bring much satisfaction to the student and open up a field of new thoughts. The literary style of the work is highly gratifying. The reader does not have to dig through a lot of superfluous verbiage to get at the thought. It is pointed right at your heart in a straight line. Here is a book you will want, get, and cherish.

—C. R. Nichol, Cled E. Wallace, Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

The Gospel Advocate Trust Fund

G. K. WALLACE

Brother Goodpasture, under date of November 2, 1944, had this to say about a statement I wrote in the Bible Banner:

“AGENCIES AND TRUST FUNDS”

“Writing under this heading in the Bible Banner of September, 1944, G. K. Wallace says:

In our debates with the Christian Church we defended the work of the Gospel Advocate and other papers on the ground of simply forwarding the money. Now it turns out to be 'a trust fund.' If the brother means that the Gospel Advocate is a 'trust fund,' he is mistaken. The Advocate is not a trust fund, nor does it have 'a trust fund' for brotherhood activities. Moreover, it is not a ‘collecting agency’ nor a ‘forwarding agency.’ On the other hand, it insists that brethren send money directly to those for whose use it has been collected.”

In this connection I would like for Brother Goodpasture to harmonize his statements with the following editorial written by the lamented J. T. Hinds and published in the Gospel Advocate, under date of June 21, 1934.

“A MISSION FUND”

“The directors of the Gospel Advocate Company have a trust fund on hand at this time for mission work that is sufficient to hold three meetings in the true sense of that term.”

Those in charge of that fund will be glad to hear from three places that are real mission points, and a preacher will be sent to them. The Gospel Advocate will be glad to see at least one hundred congregations join in this kind of mission work. The trustees of this fund will be glad to turn any extra calls for such work over to any congregations that want to do some work of that kind.”

Now we have it. The Gospel Advocate does have (or did have) a "Trust Fund" with which to do mission work. Those in charge of this fund will be glad to "send" a preacher. Who is sending this preacher? Is the preacher being sent by the church? No, the preacher is (or was) being sent by the Gospel Advocate. However, the Advocate does say that it will be glad to have at least one hundred congregations "join" it in doing such work. It does not ask for some congregation to do the work but to join it in doing it.

Now, will Brother Goodpasture please tell us the size of the Gospel Advocate trust fund? Do you still have it? What became of it? This will make interesting reading to the subscribers of the Gospel Advocate. Please note that the "Gospel Advocate will be glad to turn any extra calls for such work over to any congregations that wants to do some work of that kind." The Advocate will turn over the "extra calls" to congregations. They will keep the "trust fund" and let you have the calls.
THE BIG PRESIDENT OF A-LITTLE COLLEGE

CLED E. WALLACE
(Reprinted In Consideration Of Many Requests)

I have read with more than passing interest and a wide variety of reactions an article in the Saturday Evening Post of June 3rd. In it Philip S. Rose draws a sensational picture of Dr. George S. Benson, president of Harding College, as the “Arkansas Crusader.” Now there are some things about both Dr. Benson and Harding College that I frankly do not like, but I do not believe that this dislike is violent enough to make me abnormally caustic in my personal appraisal of an unusual situation among us. Indeed, I would have to veer far to the left in the way of criticism to balance the Post’s excursion to the right in the way of praise. It is understood that there are some things involved in this situation that interest some of us immensely; things the Post knows nothing about, and cares nothing about, since “The Churches of Christ” are just a vague movement “more frequently called the Campbellites.” This is not a criticism of the Post on my part but an explanation that the Post is looking at Dr. Benson and Harding College from one angle and I am shooting at them from another. The Post bombards them with bouquets; I’ll probably hurl a brickbat or so before I finish. Really, the Post has done such a swell job of praising our “Arkansas Crusader” that I feel no impulse whatever to add anything to it, but on the other hand feel perfectly justified in damping the fire with a bit of cold water. I think it is burning too fiercely for either Dr. Benson’s good or that of the little college he is the big president of.

First, it may be well to take a look at the picture of Dr. Benson drawn by the enthusiastic Mr. Rose.

“George Stuart Benson came back from China to put a small country college on the map—and found there was a bigger job that needed doing first.”

It was the “doing” of this “bigger job” that won the big president of “a small country college” his nation-wide notoriety. It was not the conversion of sinners or the extension of the borders of the kingdom of heaven; it was arousing America to the danger of paralysis that was threatening “democracy and human liberty.” The difficulties that beset the college were only “local.” He could not do much with them until he administered treatment to the whole nation first. “He vowed to himself that he would do what he could to help arouse America.” He did not keep his vows to himself for long. He first stunned the “House Ways and Means Committee” and all the reporters present with his wisdom. They were almost speechless, asking only a very few questions, but let loose a torrent of publicity for Dr. Benson and his suggestions as soon as they could contact their- Various papers. It “turned out to be something of a triumph” for Dr. Benson. This tidbit of publicity gave the doctor a voracious appetite, for more. It really tasted good.

“One success, no matter how spectacular, Dr. Benson well knew, did not constitute a campaign. . . .

Dr. Benson had demonstrated that he is no amateur in the highly competitive field of publicity.

But welcome as this first, year of publicity had been, Benson realized that it was only the frosting on the cake. It was not sufficient to impress his ideas upon a nation of 130,000,000 people. To accomplish that result would require a well-organized, continuous campaign he had in mind must include newspapers, radio and public addresses.

So the crusading wonder of the State of Arkansas took to the country newspapers and various radio stations and finally crashed the Saturday Evening Post. And there are new worlds looming in view to conquer in the crusade to save “democracy and human liberty.”

“Benson’s enormous popularity with people in many walks of life-farmers, business and professional men and factory workers—has not escaped the attention of the political slate makers in his state. He could probably be elected to any state office he might choose, a circumstance which the politicians recognized by offering him the best they had, the governorship. They suggested also that he might aspire to the high office of United States Senator.

We are told that this “tempting opportunity” was blushingly turned down by the modest president of the little college. He obviously prefers to be a big frog in a little pond, at least for the time being. Of course if the pressure is persistent, our Arkansas Caesar may finally succumb to having the crown placed on his able brow. Then what in the world will Harding College do? Possibly they can find a crumb of comfort in the thought that what Harding has lost, Arkansas and the nation have gained! However, Harding’s patriotism has a few yellow spots on it, as we shall note a little later on in this essay.

“Let us see if we can find something in Dr. Benson’s background to account for his uncanny insight into the nation’s needs, socially, politically and economically. He left this country for China in the year of our Lord 1925, when we had a Republican president and the nation “sound,” its people independent and employed and “democracy and human liberty” sitting high in the saddle and riding fast. He was then twenty-seven years old, with a wisdom no doubt far beyond his years. He was not in this country when the great depression hit us. More’s the pity, for had he been here it likely wouldn’t have happened! But he got back about 1936 and got the shock of his life over the paralysis that had settled upon our nation after he left. So it was up to him to correct it. So he “vowed to himself that he would do what he could to help arouse America.” The upshot of it is that they are about to make an Arkansas governor or United States senator out of him and rob Harding College of its great president. And even then it is likely that he could not swing the nation entirely from the path of its peril. He might have to have just a wee bit of scotching from Senator O’Daniel of Texas. It looks as though Senator O’Daniel is also going to have some trouble keeping out of the draft for President or something bigger than he is. He also knows the value of publicity. I’m not much of a politician but from my seat in the bleachers, I’m not expecting either George Benson or W. Lee O’Daniel to knock a home run as a national saviour. As it looks from here Lee has a slight edge on George “in the highly competitive field of publicity.” He has him a hill-billy band and can write poetry. But give George a little more time. He hasn’t been out of China long, you know, and even in so short a time has
“demonstrated that he is no amateur in the highly competitive field of publicity.” He is not apt to overlook any possibilities in the “field of publicity.”

In the midst of this dizzy publicity, we can be pardoned if we ask some questions and do a little speculating. This vast amount of publicity for the big president, with a modest amount thrown in for the little college, may be due to demonstrated genius on his part but if it is I have overlooked something. Some of us just can’t see it. I confess that I am a bit puzzled just here. I and some others are wondering. Can it be that the notorious promoter from New Jersey who has become something of “a financial angel” for Harding college is connected in some way with this publicity crusade? There are some suspicious angles to the case. This same promoter once invaded Texas while he was pursuing a grandiose scheme to get control of the papers published among “The Churches of Christ-more frequently called the Campbellites.” When that scheme collapsed he suddenly began to hover like a guardian angel over Harding College. It may be just a coincidence. I wonder and I wonder again.

Some of Dr. Benson’s social and economic “philosophy” has a universal appeal but we get a peculiar flavor now and then which suggests the possibility that some interested and organized groups from the East are finding him a convenient Charlie McCarthy for propaganda purposes. It would be pretty slick on their part to pick an innocent looking president of a little college down in Arkansas and properly publicize him as a mouth-piece, and does he enjoy the publicity! Sure, he would scornfully deny such a suggestion. He in all likelihood doesn’t know it.

He stayed a long time in China, you know, and hasn’t been back very long, not long enough to know as much about the nation’s ills and their cures as he claims he does. Besides, his credulity is rather well known. Some of us have not forgotten about how he “saw” some demons cast out of some of the Chinese by sectarian missionaries and miracle workers. He has “changed” now but at one time in the not too remote past he was a pre-millennialist. Of course, the Saturday Evening Post is not particularly interested in this angle but we have one or two connected with the Harding College administration it may be interested in, or ought to be.

“Despite the long hours of sweaty work which have gone into his crusade for bed-rock Americanism, President Benson has not neglected Harding College. The school and what it stands for are close to his heart.”

As the great physician for a sick America, “No one was better qualified than Doctor Benson to evaluate and diagnose these symptoms.” It appears that he had two patients on his hands at the same time, both in a rather bad way. Harding College was sick nigh unto death when the Lord run it. Brother Benson “obviously” saw that whoever was running it, he needed a man of his calibre to help him, for it was a job “to tax the abilities of any executive.” Brother Armstrong was inclined to feel that if the Lord was with him, it was sufficient with “no endowment, no financial angel and no certain source of income.” It appears that Dr. Benson has more respect for endowments, financial angels and certain sources of income. At least he has gone in strong for reorganization and publicity. He has “demonstrated ability as a financial manager.” But with all his salary is “only $1,800 a year” and “Harding faculty people with Ph. D. degrees are willing to spend their lives back in the country teaching for thirty-five dollars a week.” It seems to me that with all his financial and executive ability he ought to manage somehow to pay his teachers better than that. We are not asking him to tell us who his “financial angel” is or who they are, but everybody knows that he is not carrying on this crusade to save America, with its expensive advertising, on a salary of “only $1,800 a year.” Somebody is paying for it. Even if “Benson seems uninterested in money for its own sake,” pretense is not palatable unless it is very skillfully camouflaged.

Some years ago I heard a president of a school describe the sacrifices he and his teachers were making. He said that he had been president for lo, these many years, had received no salary at all and in addition had contributed some thousands of dollars of his own money to the work. In my simplicity I asked him how he managed to do it. His reply was that “The Lord has been good to me.” I explained it to a fellow-soldier in the army of the Lord and got a blunt rejoinder: “He is just a big liar.” Of course, I wouldn’t know. Maybe the Lord was good to him. But when men publish their ability and unselfishness, they should be careful not leave the wrong impression on simple people like me and a lot of others.

We learn some interesting things from the Post article which brings up something else besides:

“Within three years, Benson had cleared the college of debt, reorganized the Institution, paving the way for the far-flung crusade of America&m in which he and the college are now involved.”

“We teach the sanctity of life, the dignity of labor, the importance of decency and good citizenship.”

The thought that Harding college is in a crusade for Americanism and good citizenship is intriguing to me. My impression is that it is a hotbed of Conscientious Objector sentiment. Sure, Dr. Benson told the Ways and Means Committee that “This country must prepare to de-
fend itself against any aggressor nation,” and some Harding College students turned down money from the government that “might better be used for military purposes.” Others invested some money they had made in War Bonds and presented them “to the college treasurer.” This looks good and no doubt is good. At least it makes good publicity! But if Harding College is not shot through and through with the sentiment that Christians should take no active part in government affairs, and cannot bear arms under any circumstances, then I am sadly misinformed.

In a late issue of the Firm Foundation there is an advertisement of Harding College. It stresses endowment, new buildings and a “strengthening of faculty.” Two “outstanding men” are to be added to the faculty. Both are conscientious objectors, and I am wondering what they think of Dr. Benson’s publicity stunts in behalf of “bedrock Americanism.” And I wonder what he thinks of one of them.

“Theodore D. Bales, who is now completing requirements for his Ph. D. in the University of California, is expected to join the faculty in December of this year.

James D. Bales has recently published a book setting forth and endorsing the position of the conscientious objector. He insists that a Christian should not bear arms, or become a part of the armed forces, even as a so-called “noncombatant;” that he must not put on a uniform or drill; that he must not contribute directly or indirectly to any war effort by anybody for any purpose. If necessary he should go to jail or die if that is the alternative.

“Bedrock Americanism,” indeed! The sources of the Post’s information about Dr. Benson and Harding College did not reveal this. Bales is, according to rumor, in line for the head of the Bible Department in Harding College.

The Post and some others might be shocked to find out just how much of this sort of sentiment there is in Harding College. It just doesn’t jibe with crusading for “bedrock Americanism,” and buying bonds and suggesting to the government to use its funds for “military purposes,” and exhorting the government to “prepare to defend itself against any aggressor.” Are Christians citizens? Can they evade some of the righteous demands of citizenship?

Finally, Dr. Benson

“Wants America to rededicate itself to human freedom, to divest itself of all foreign ideologies and resume its march forward. This is his platform. Win, lose or draw, he is in the fight to the end.”

What some of us want to know is this: when the doctor gets America aroused, rededicated, divested and resumed, will it still be the devil’s government which Christians cannot afford to defend or promote? Dr. James D. Bales who is to “strengthen” the Harding faculty right away will doubtless teach Harding students the contents of his late book. If Dr. Benson starts a fight in the school, he stands a chance to “lose or draw” right in his own faculty. Some of his own faculty members could not vote for or against him should he run for governor or senator for they do not believe a Christian has a right to vote. I really do not think this is the Saturday Evening Post’s idea of good citizenship.

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

“And a third situation that may arise at the Judgment will be this. A Jap will be condemned to Hell. He will ‘point his finger at some preacher and say, ‘I never heard the Gospel either. I was killed with a bomb that your War Bonds paid for. And it contained the iron sold from your backyard. And the powder was made from old grease which your wife saved in her kitchen and sold to the government to make a bomb with. And members of your congregation were working in the aircraft plant that made the plane that dropped the bomb which took me out of the world without one chance to hear the Gospel,’ ”

“Some brethren take the position, that a Christian cannot kill but he can help others do it, load their guns and carry them drinking water while they do it. Now is that in harmony with the scriptures?”

The idea seems to be to let the Japs wreak their vengeance on this country and take all they want and it will increase their chances for heaven! This idiotic drivel and unpatriotic rot with a lot more like it may be ordered from the “A. C. C. Bookstore, Abilene, Texas.” The Abilene Christian College Press prints a lot of stuff like that, written by long-faced crackpots.

Of course it is embarrassing to the school. The president, a swell fellow and personal friend of mine, does not believe what is dripping ‘from the dwarfed minds of these youths of the military age, who enjoy exemption as “ministers of the gospel,”’ and take advantage of it to attack the war effort. The Board of Trustees, I understand, are on record in full support of the government. It doesn’t do a school any good to be so compromised by the attitude of extremists and their unreasonable and unscriptural antics, that its patriotism becomes a question for debate or investigation by anybody. It is generally known that militant youngsters who carry on a war of words, both shrieked and written against buying war bonds and putting on a uniform are either in or came from “our” schools. One of them is to “strengthen” the faculty of Harding College next year. With the great President Benson crusading for “bedrock Americanism” and Jim Bales coaching the students in “good citizenship,” Harding College ought to be a big college one of these days. Maybe they will make a big contribution toward ushering in the “millenium” which Brother Armstrong thinks may last two thousand years instead of just one.

Large numbers of American boys, Christians too, have gone directly from “our” schools into the armed forces of the country. They are neither hedging nor pussyfooting. They are not getting the “hand” they deserve from administrative forces who admire them too timidly and too secretly, I am inclined to think. They seem to be a little bit afraid of the noisy boys who make use of college presses and book stores to shout their opposition. It is paying too big and too costly a compliment to an undeserving minority..
One college president writes to a local board, which seemed to be more or less “unacquainted with the policy of the Church of Christ” whatever that is.

“This college is not a unit on the matter objection. Like the church it is an individual affair and some of the faculty would no doubt be objectors, while others of us feel otherwise.”

“This college” is not Abilene Christian College. “Others of us feel otherwise” includes the president himself. If our government, generals and soldiers were as timid and careful as some of our college administrations, the swastika would be waving over Washington and the Rising Sun over San Francisco. Then how would “others of us feel” and where would “our colleges” be? These silly boys who write that housewives should not sell grease to the government to make bombs with, nor give a drink of water to a soldier, must be, coddled and handled very gingerly! They must be accorded the full monopoly among us on “agitating,” except of course what “some of the faculty” feel inclined to do in the class room! Ugh!!

**From An Elder In The Church**

Little Rock, Ark. December 20, 1944.

Dear Brother Wallace:

Brother Wallace, I am an old man, as some would call me, having lived here in this world almost 74 years. I have been an elder here, at 4th and State, over 30 years and I have seen the church in its growth for over a half century. I have been a member of the church for 50 years and longer. I have seen the fight with Digression in this state and have been a regular reader of the papers and know of the struggle in the church for the past 60 years. I am the same man, except I am much nearer the end. I agree that we tried to work out here in Arkansas between the truth as defended by the church here under the leadership of Brother Harper, and Harding College under the leadership of Brother Benson. They had confidence in me then and they were willing to accept my word. Well I am the same man except I am much nearer the end. I am about as old as Brother Armstrong was and have watched him in Arkansas for over 20 years, and his school, and I know the trouble they have made. I am therefore writing you this asking that you publish it when you have time.

Brother E. R. Harper has been with us for 11 years and he has made the outstanding fight in Arkansas of this generation in defense of the truth and in opposition to error. I feel this is qualified to write about this situation as but few men are and I am sending this to you. Please publish it. If it is too much for one issue will you please publish part of it now and the rest in your next issue of the paper. I want to say that I appreciate your fight for the truth against this Boll, Davidson, Harding influence that has tried to take the church. Had it not been for a few of you who had the courage to fight it out in the open the fight that we older men have made in the past 50 years would have died. Thank God for the younger men who still love the truth. Too many preachers have sat on the side lines and let a few of you fight the battle, carry all the blame, make all the enemies, and be hurt in your work, while they could carry on with both sides and not be worried because they were, losing some of their best friends. Let that group of preachers who have been saying nothing but who have been running with both sides, criticising you, but never offering any criticism of those guilty of the error, let them come out of their hiding and show us how this thing can be won for the truth. Brother Wallace just rest assured of the fact that when they try it, that will stop their criticism and their shouting from the tree tops that they are doing the manner in which it is being carried on, and that it should be done in the spirit of this and that.” When they get the job done they will then know what it is to fight sin to its death in any form. You can’t stop it, Brother Wallace, without bringing upon you the wrath of those who are guilty and the preachers who cry “persecution,” for the group in error., and try to ruin the influence of you men who are fighting for the truth, when they step in to show us how to do it and then “do it,” you will see them getting the same abuse that you and Brother Harper are getting. But do not grow “weary in well doing” for at the judgment your efforts will be crowned.

Most Kindly Yours,

James H. Brewer,
(Elder Church of Christ, Fourth and State Sts., Little Rock, Ark.)

**THE ARTICLE**

First, I wish to answer briefly Brother Showalter’s article in which he came to the open defense of Clinton Davidson and referred to Brother Harper as having committed such a sinful act in suggesting that Brother Davidson is an “innovationist.” Brother Showalter has defended the late Brother J. N. Armstrong, and the school that he has headed all these years, and has given them space to deny the accusations. made by Brother Harper but he has refused to publish that which we have in our files here at the church which will prove that Brother Armstrong was a premillennialist. We know in Arkansas that he was.

I have this to say to Brethren Showalter, Otey, and T. B. Thompson, all of whom came to the defense of Brother Armstrong concerning his premillennial views, and also Brother Beeson, of Little Rock, who is defending the soundness of Brother Armstrong, if you brethren will meet us in person, we have the material that proves it. We have his statements in which he says “Christ will be the sole ruler of the earth” after all earthly governments are destroyed from the earth, not even a “vestige of civil government, human government, or any other kind of government save the reign of Christ and his saints,” that Christ will then have “re-established the divine rule over all the earth” and this, he says will be after his second coming. In addition to this he brought to the college for almost twenty years such men as Janes, Jorgenson, Blansett, Mullins, Earl Smith, Covey, Merrit, et. al., and tried for years with the young students trying to help them in their work and gave as proof of this that a “Holiness preacher in China cast 7 devils out of a Chinese,” and he signed a statement that he, George S. Benson, believed that “the Devil...
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Note: This report was due to be published before the
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use such men and their deaths, to destroy the men who
have told the truth. If it becomes necessary we shall pub-
lish in book form the entire matter, as Brother Harper had
started to do but stopped at the death of Brother Armstrong.
This book can be finished if it becomes necessary.

-J. H. Brewer

June 1945
A great, many Christian duties are to be performed by individual Christians. The only cooperative organization divinely” authorized is the local congregation. There are some duties that may be performed by a congregation or by individuals. After we have done our full duty as congregations or individuals there may still remain much to be done but our responsibility is coextensive with our ability. We have a responsibility to feed the hungry but when we have reached the limit of our ability in that respect we are not held responsible for the millions who may be just as hungry and just as deserving. In a like manner there is a limit to the ability of a local congregation and beyond this the Lord does not expect us to go.

**Pooling Resources**

I have no right to assume more than I can do and demand of my brother ‘that he help me, for he has a right to assume his own duties. Just suppose that every Christian should decide to assume more than he can do. Do local congregations have a right to assume more than they can do? Do they have a right to assume burdens for other congregations? If the Lord had intended that work be done on a bigger scale than can be handled by a local congregation would he not have designed a bigger organization? Should congregations or (Christians who have done all they can as congregations or as individuals worry or have an uneasy conscience because much remains to be done?

There is not the necessity for pooling the resources of congregations as is sometimes thought. It is usually because congregations have ‘no conception of their abilities and responsibilities. They are seeking to make things too easy for themselves. It is usually admitted that a Christian has responsibilities at least equal to that of a Jew. Having a better covenant and better promises it seems to me that if there is any difference, a Christian’s responsibility would be greater. Every Jew was required to give a tenth for the support of the priests. A tenth was not all they gave. What they gave for the poor and for their many offerings seem to have been in addition to the tenth. Nine Jewish families according to the divine plan could support a priest and his family. Eighteen families could support two. Forty-five families could support five priests and their families. If we do no more, forty-five Christian families could support five preachers of the gospel. We no doubt have many congregations containing ninety families which could support ten preachers and their families. We no get-together meetings, no interlocking committees nor any other machinery trying ‘the congregations together.

Last year-twenty-five thousand people applied for orphans for adoption in the United States and seventeen thousand failed to get them. This shows that there is now only one orphan for every three persons who would be glad to provide a home. A childless home needs children just as badly as an orphan needs a home. I know of one congregation where this was emphasized to some extent and as a result eight or nine children were adopted. There were no orphans available in that particular locality and practically all the children had to be secured in another state. One lady traveled over several states before securing a child. The number of homes needing children probably about equals the number of children needing homes ‘and the reason for the dearth of children is probably the practice among religious institutions of maintaining orphan homes. These homes then have an excellent pretext for securing the country for funds. These funds are collected by ‘people who have never been heard of before by the congregations. Regardless of the misgivings a Christian may have with reference to the scripturalness of the institution or of the management of it, he usually is loathe to voice them for fear of damaging the innocent children. It is parallel to the bank robber who carries away with him the young lady bookkeeper. He knows that everyone will hesitate to shoot for fear of hitting the young lady.

**A Nominal Eldership**

Since the brethren have begun to follow the nations around us in establishing institutions of this character, they have vacillated between two plans of operation. One plan has a board of regents residing at different points. The other plan ‘is to put it nominally under the eldership of some congregation. Neither plan is satisfactory. If there had been any need for either plan surely the Scripture would give us some hint of it.

The first mentioned plan creates an organization which does not even profess to be a congregation through which to do work which should be done either as individuals. or as congregations... It is “taxation without representation.” This board decides to spend several hundred thousand dollars for buildings. The congregations that are expected to support this have no voice in the matter. The local congregation is no more than a filling station for this unauthorized organization. If a congregation should fail to be ready when they drive up, it would be considered lacking in spirituality. The longer such institutions are borne with the more demanding they will become.

When these homes have been operated nominally by the eldership of some congregation, it looked more like an ‘arrangement made for the purpose of avoiding criticism than anything else. The management under either plan in reality is about the same. The superintendent receives and disburses the money. He receives and disposes of the thousands of dollars worth of supplies. It is possible for things to be mismanaged with the result that the elders of the congregation who are dumb enough to be rubber stamps for this sort of thing are liable to wake up and find themselves ruined financially and the brotherhood disgraced ‘in the eyes of the world.

**Interlocking Machinery**

When New Testament churches contributed to the support of Paul or to the relief of the distressed they did so as individual congregations. They had no get-together meet-
I. CONCERNING NAMES

Editor Ben M. Bogard, in Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, Dec. 27, 1944, delivers himself of some foolishness concerning names. He writes under the heading, "Campbellite Name Foolishness," and endeavors to set aside what the Bible says and build up his Baptist theology. He is very much concerned about the Baptist name: he wants to find some way to give it divine sanction; so he makes a desperate effort in his article to find divine authority for it. At the same time he wishes to set aside the name "Christian" and nullify the designation, "the Church of Christ." In his effort to do all of this he reaches the heights of folly, and I wish to call attention to some of his foolish blunders. So let us take a look at some of his foolishness.

**The Name Christian**

He endeavors to reply to the argument, as shown in Acts 11:26; Acts 26:28 and 1 Pet. 4: 16, that the name Christian was not given by the enemies of Jesus but by divine authority. Concerning this he says:

"Granting everything that this statement claims (but I do not grant it to be true) it would prove that the 'Christian Church' is right in calling their church, THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH. If would also prove that the Gospel Advocate sort of Campbellites are wrong in calling their church 'The Church of Christ.'"

If Bogard's conclusion in this were true, it would still give him no consolation for the name Baptist Church, unless he could be consoled by the fact that some other churches are not in the Bible any more than is the Baptist Church. He is welcome to whatever consolation this may give him in his contention for an unscriptural institution. But his conclusion about this is not true, for why would this prove that the Christian Church (of which the Bible says nothing) is right and that we are wrong in using the term, "The Church of Christ," which the Bible does indorse? In so many words the Bible refers to the "churches of Christ." Rom. 16: 16. But nowhere does it say one word about either "the Baptist Church" or "the Christian Church," nor of the plural "Baptist Churches" or "Christian Churches." The name Christian was never given as the name of the church which Jesus established. It was given as an individual name. Individuals were called 'Christians'; the church was never called the Christian Church: but individuals were never called Baptists nor the church the Baptist Church. So Bogard's "sort of Religionists" are not even mentioned, either individually or collectively, in all the book of God. Bogard knew, of course, that we do not claim the name Christian as a church name but as an individual name, but he had to have something to make an argument out of, and so he used it. That he did know this to be true is shown by his next statement which follows:

"If it is contended that the word 'Christian' should apply to individuals and not to the church as a whole, then our 'Church of Christ' people have nothing on any of us because that is exactly what all of us do, call ourselves Christians. Baptists tenaciously claim to be 'Christians,' each individual a Christian, that is an imitator of Christ. Why quote Acts 11:26 where it says, The disciples were first called Christians at Antioch if that applies to individuals only and not to the church as a body, while they are trying to prove that the church should be called 'The Church of Christ'"

I have never known of any one quoting Acts 11:26 to try to prove that the church should be called "the Church of Christ." I am sure that Bogard has never known of it either. That passage is never used for that purpose. If we want to prove the church should be called "the church of Christ," we use Rom. 16:16, which says: "The churches of Christ salute you." But when we want to prove the name for the individual followers of Jesus we use Acts 11:26 and similar passages. Bogard's claim that this is used to prove the name of the church is just another one of his foolish blunders which he makes for effect. He hopes to impress his brethren with an unanswerable argument. But why did he not deal with Rom. 16:16? And I am wondering what passage the Baptists will quote to prove that "the disciples were called Baptists" somewhere as individuals and what passage speaks of "the Baptist Church." I wish Bogard, or some other Baptist preacher, would give it to us. They would if they could. There is nothing that would give them as much satisfaction as would the two passages - "The disciples were called Baptists in Jerusalem" and "The Baptist churches salute you." Every Baptist preacher in the land would give the last shirt off his back for either of these passages. But they are just not in the book. And so they will have to go along without them. But what comfort would they bring to Bogard and his people if they could be found?

But "the Church of Christ people" do "have something" on the rest of religious people, Baptists and others, for we not only claim to be Christians, we claim to be "Christians only." We put no denominational handles to it. Yes, Bogard and his people claim to be Christians but they claim to be Baptists first-Baptist Christians. They must have that denominational handle. And so with a great host of other denominations. Yes, we "have something" on them there. We wear no unauthorized name, and they do. The
disciples were called Christians in the days of the apostles. We claim to be the same. But the disciples were never called “Baptist Christians.” It would be just as easy for Bogard to find where the disciples were called Baptists as to find where they were called “Baptist Christians.” He is at sea in either case. I am sorry for him, but facts are facts, and there is no way around them. A little later in his article he quotes from Isaiah: “In that day seven women shall take hold of one man, saying, We will eat our own bread, and wear our own apparel: only let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach.” (Isa. 4:1.)

Concerning this prophecy Bogard says:

“All Bible scholars agree that ‘woman’ is used as a figure of the church, a good woman of a good church and a bad woman of a bad church. Here are seven women not really joined to the man, but wanting to wear his name. The Holy Spirit evidently had the Campbellite church in mind when he inspired this prophecy.”

Prophecies often have a two-fold application. This prophecy points out the scarcity of men as a result of war, but if it also has a more remote spiritual application, it refers to denominationalism, including the Baptist Church. In this case “women” would represent churches. “Seven” being a complete number would represent all of them. They want to “eat their own bread and wear their own apparel” -they will feast upon their own doctrines and follow their own ways—but when they get in a tight they will say: “Let us be called by thy name, to take away our reproach.” That is exactly what Bogard and his brethren do. They will call themselves Baptists, feed on Baptist doctrine, clothe themselves with Baptist practice, but when they get cornered about the whole affair they will say as Bogard does: “Baptists tenaciously claim to be ‘CHRISTIANS.’” Oh, yes, “Let us be called by thy name to take away our reproach.” You never hear much about that claim when things are going well, but if it looks like they may lose favor with the people because they are following devised plans, then they will send up the howl: “We claim to be Christians.” At all other times they are satisfied to be known as Baptists. Why, then, claim so tenaciously to be Christians when they cannot a church now be a true New Testament church without becoming “Missionary Baptist”? This is handing Bogard’s reasoning right back to him on the same platter and with the same trimmings that were connected with it as he handed it out. If it works in one case, it works in the other. And yet Bogard would not recognize any church as a New Testament church that is not called “Baptist” today. If it is not a “Baptist Church,” it is not a New Testament church, according to Bogard.

Furthermore, Bogard, in his article, delivers himself in the following fashion:

“Anyone authorized to baptize is a Baptist. That is the way God fixed it. When Jesus organized his church he sent it on a mission. (Mat. 28:19, 20) When he sent the church out as a missionary he authorized, yes, commanded that missionary church to baptize. Therefore it was in fact a Missionary Baptist Church.”

This is really interesting. It tells us when the church became a “Missionary Baptist Church.” It became “missionary” when Jesus sent it on a mission according to Mat. 28:19, and it became “Baptist” when Jesus in Mat. 28:19 authorized it to baptize. Hence, it became “in fact,” according to Bogard, a “Missionary Baptist Church” when Jesus gave the commission of Mat. 28: 19. But that commission was given after Jesus arose from the dead. Bogard claims the church was set up at the beginning of the Lord’s ministry before his death, and that it was in operation “three long years” before he died. Well, since it did not become a “Missionary Baptist Church” till after Jesus arose, I am curious to know what kind of church it was during the three years or so of the Lord’s personal ministry. I wonder if Bogard will tell us. And further using his reasoning I ask: “If the church of the Lord continued three long years without becoming ‘Missionary Baptist,’ why cannot a church now be a true New Testament church without becoming ‘Missionary Baptist?’” I am willing to listen at him clear this matter up. I wonder if he will undertake it. If he clears it up, I shall be glad to pass his explanation on to my readers:

A Lesson In Seventh Grade Grammar

And now Bogard makes me smile, almost audibly, I
...By the way, Campbellites need to take a course in seventh grade grammar. When they do they will learn that names are never in the possessive case, but always in the nominative case. The expression, "The Church of Christ," is in the possessive case and denotes ownership and is not a name at all.

I have seen this argument in print a number of times from Bogard's pen. Other little Baptist preachers over the country think it is a wonderful argument. So they have "laid hold" on it and are keeping it going. I have heard them make it as they have been taught it by Bogard. But I have never yet seen the man who can make as many blunders as Bogard can while claiming to know as much as he claims to know. Perhaps his assumption of knowledge has his brethren so "flabbergasted" that they never think to investigate his claims to see if his statements are true. They just assume that Bogard could not be mistaken about it. So they accept his arguments at face value and begin to shoot them from their guns. However, I want to take a little time out just here and give Board and his brethren "a course in seventh grade grammar." And, incidentally, I would like to know what "seventh grade grammar" he got his information from. Now look at his statement again: "Names are never in the possessive case, but always in the nominative case." I have never yet seen a seventh grade grammar that gives any such statement. If Bogard knows of one, I wish he would pass the information on to me. Who is the author of it? And where can I obtain a copy?

And I wonder if Bogard ever looked into a seventh grade grammar to see what is the meaning of case anyway. Grammars which I have looked into tell me that "Case is that modification of a noun or pronoun which denotes its office in the sentence." Case, therefore, concerns only two parts of speech nouns and pronouns. But what are nouns and pronouns? The grammars which I have, studied always told me that "a noun is the name of anything." And they said that "a pronoun is a word used for a noun." I wonder if this agrees with Bogard's seventh grade grammar. Since "a noun is the name of anything" then "the name of anything is a noun." In other words, all names are nouns, and all nouns are names. Hence, a "name" is used just as a "noun" is used. To say that "a name is always in the nominative case" is to say that "a noun is always in the nominative case." And as a "pronoun" is a word used for a "noun" we would have to say that "a pronoun is always in the nominative case." How does this begin to look? And how does it make Bogard look as a grammarian? If "a name is always in the nominative case," what is used in other cases? It can't be a noun, for a noun is a name. It can't be a pronoun, for a pronoun is used for a noun. In fact, if Bogard's statement is true, there can be only one case-the nominative. But my grammars have always told me there are three cases in English-the nominative, the possessive and the objective.

What parts of speech are dealt with in the possessive and the objective case? It can't be a noun, for that is a name, and Bogard says "names are never used in the possessive case, but always in the nominative case." Nor can it be a pronoun, for a pronoun is used just as a noun is used.

So I suppose Board's "seventh grade grammar" puts adverbs and verbs in the possessive case and adjectives in the objective case. It must be something of this kind, for according to him, it cannot be a noun or a pronoun. It must be something else, and if not adjectives, verbs and adverbs, I would like for him to tell me what part of speech is used in the possessive case and the objective case. Anybody, of course, who has ever studied "seventh grade grammar" learned that nouns (or names) are used in all three cases. In fact "case" has nothing to do with anything except names and words used for names-nouns and pronouns.

Now, to give him a concrete example, that he might be able to grasp this, let us take the name "John." This was the name of the forerunner of Christ-the man called John the Baptist. Bogard claims a close relationship to him; so this example should prove interesting. How can we use the name John? Bogard says "only in the nominative case." But, according to my grammars, it can be used in all the cases. Let us give it a try. 1. John reproved Herod. In this sentence "John" is in the nominative case for it is the subject of the sentence. And grammars say: "the Nominative case of a noun or pronoun denotes its office as subject or attribute complement (called by some predicate nominative)." But is this its only use? Bogard says it is. But take the next sentence. 2. Herod beheaded John. "John" is still a "name," but it is not used in the nominative case. It is the object complement of the verb "beheaded." Hence, it is in the objective case, for "the objective case denotes its office as object complement or as principal word in a prepositional phrase." 3. John's head was brought in on a platter. This time the name "John" is in the possessive case for it serves as a "possessive modifier." So the name "John" has been used in all three cases, and Bogard has been shown to need much instruction in seventh grade grammar.

But I want to take the example Bogard uses-"The Church of Christ." He says this is no name at all, for it is in the possessive case, whereas names are "always in the nominative case." Let us get the sentence from the New Testament-"The churches of Christ salute you." (Rom. 16:16.) The word "churches" is a name: In this sentence it is used as the subject and is therefore in the nominative case. "Christ" is also a name. It is the principal word of a prepositional phrase, the object of the preposition, and is in the objective case. So neither "churches" nor "Christ" in this sentence is in the possessive case. And Bogard is wrong again. While such expressions often denote ownership their "case construction" is not possessive. The fact that ownership is involved does not eliminate the "name" element from the sentence. If I say, "The sons of Smith went to town," would you decide that you cannot tell anything about the name from this sentence?. Then why decide that "churches of Christ" is "no name at all"?

Following A Common Sense Rule

It is certainly true that the name of a thing is only one point of identification. I might start a search for John Smith. Ks name would help me to identify him, but I would not be dependent entirely on his name. He has other characteristics, and, along with his name, I must also keep them in mind. I might walk into a group of men and say: "I am looking for John Smith." A dozen men might stand up, for often we find men wearing this name: By knowing
other characteristics of the man I am looking for. I would be able to determine if he is in this group, but I would certainly not expect to find him among those who were not named John Smith. Likewise a number of churches might wear the Scriptural name, but merely wearing the name would not be sufficient. By a knowledge of the characteristics of the New Testament church I can determine if it is among said group of churches. But surely I would not expect to find it among churches that do not wear the Scriptural name. The Missionary Baptist Church has neither the name nor the characteristics, and I am certain it is not the New Testament Church.

Concerning matters of this nature Bogard says:

"Would calling a buzzard an eagle take the stink out of him? If you call a polecat a rabbit will that stop the polecat from stinking? If you call a vicious tiger a lamb would that take his ferocious nature out of him? If you call a Campbellite congregation the Church of Christ will that make it so? Things should be called what they are and when you adopt that rule, a common sense rule, it will follow that the New Testament church was a Missionary Baptist Church."

No, it would not make a buzzard an eagle just by calling it that, and a polecat would not become a rabbit by merely calling it that. However, if you were walking through a zoo looking for an "eagle," you would not expect to find it in a cage labeled "buzzards." Or if you were looking for a "rabbit," you would not expect to find it in the cage labeled "skunks." Likewise, if you were looking for the Church of Christ, you should not expect to find it behind the label, "Missionary Baptist Church." Thanks, Mr. Bogard, for the illustration. It does a fine job in showing up the false claim of Baptist preachers.

But Bogard tells us that "things should be called what they are." I fully agree with him in this. This, as he says, is "a common sense rule." But he concludes that the New Testament church is in reality the "Missionary Baptist Church" and should be called that. If it was the "Missionary Baptist Church," I agree that "it should have been called that." But it never was. Neither Christ nor his apostles ever referred to it by that name. In all the history of the New Testament church no reference to the "Missionary Baptist Church" can be found. One of two conclusions must follow. Either the New Testament church was not the "Missionary Baptist Church" or inspired writers failed to follow the "common sense rule" of calling things what they were. Do you think they failed to follow this "common sense rule?" I am certain that they called the church, what it was, and since they did not call it the Missionary Baptist Church, I am sure it was not that. But they did refer to congregations of the New Testament church as the "churches of Christ." (Rom. 16:16). They called them what they were. That was the "common sense" thing to do.

**Why John Was Called "The Baptist."**

Bogard says:

"The personal name of John the Baptist was simply 'John.' (Luke 1:59-63) That was what his father called him. His religious name was Baptist for that was what God called him. (Mat, 3:1) John was not the Baptist because he baptized. It was the other way around; he was a Baptist before he ever baptized anyone."

When Jesus was referred to as "the carpenter" I suppose he was not a carpenter because he constructed buildings. And Barabbas was said to be "a robber." That, however, would not mean that he was a robber because he robbed some one but was a robber before he ever robbed anyone. Do you suppose this is so? The word "Baptist" comes from the Greek word "Baptistes" and means, according to Thayer, "a baptizer; one who administers the rite of baptism." So John the Baptist simply means John the baptizer. And if John had never baptized any one, I wonder if he would have been called the "Baptist." When Bogard says "his religious name was Baptist," he says what he could not prove if his life depended upon it. This would indicate that he was an adherent of the "Baptist religion," and there was no such thing. If this was "his religious name," there must have been some organization, or institution, or church wearing that name. But there was none. Did John belong to the "Baptist Church"? He would have to if his religious name was Baptist, and this would require the existence of the church during John's ministry. A long time ago Baptist preachers claimed that the church was founded by John on the banks of the Jordan, but they were so often whipped on this point that they gave it up, and now you can scarcely find one who is willing to take that position. Yet Bogard must return to it to sustain the idea that Baptist was the religious name of John. In fact, he will have to go farther back than that. He claims that John had this "religious name" before he ever baptized anyone. Then there would have to be a Baptist Church and a Baptist religion before John ever begin his work. Is Bogard ready for this position? And furthermore, if His "religious name was Baptist," will Bogard or some of his brethren be so kind as to give us the name of some other person mentioned in the New Testament that wore this "religious name"? And if John could wear "Baptist" as his "religious name," before he ever baptized anyone and without ever being baptized himself, why does Bogard now require people to be baptized before they can wear that name? All this simply shows this is another foolish blunder of Bogard's.

**II. DEPENDING ON SPURIOUS SCRIPTURE**

The following quotation is taken from the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight of May 25, 1943. It was written by Ben M. Bogard, editor of that paper.

"Campbellites make much of the good confession which reads: 'I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. That verse is not in the original Greek and was properly left out by the revisers and when they did it the Campbellite sugar-teat was taken from them.'

"In this connection we will mention another fact. The Campbellite sugar-teat found in Mark 16:15, 16, is not found in the oldest Greek manuscripts. It was added by some one many years after the Bible was completed and put in to bolster up a false doctrine. All scholars agree that the part of Mark 16 from verse 9 on down to the end of the chapter is an addition to the word of God. It is found in our translations but in the Revised Version a foot note explains that it is not in the original Greek. So the Campbellites depend on two passages more than any others for their doctrines and neither one of them is found in the original Greek. When it becomes necessary for Baptists to depend on spurious interpolations instead of the very word of God for their doctrine, right, then we will take out."
A number of statements in this quotation deserve consideration. And I want you to remember that last statement of Bogard’s: “When it becomes necessary for Baptists to depend on spurious interpolations instead of the very word of God for their doctrine; right then will we take out.” I shall have some interesting use for this statement before the close of this article. But first let us look at it.

The Good Confession

Bogard thinks there is no scriptural authority for it, and Baptist preachers often make fun of “the good confession.” In Acts 8:37 we have recorded the passage to which Bogard refers. It concerns the conversion of the eunuch. Philip preached Jesus to him as they traveled along the way. They came unto a certain water and the eunuch said: “See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?” (v. 36). Then follows the statement of verse 37: “And Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.” Bogard tells us that this “verse is not in the original Greek and was properly left out by the revisers.” He refers, of course, to the Revised Version. And because the revisers left it out he thinks the “Campbellites” have lost proof for a doctrine which they preach.

In the first place, if this portion of the record is left out, we have a break in the story that cannot be bridged. Philip asked what hindered him from being baptized, and if this verse is left out, we have no answer given by Philip to the eunuch’s question. He was never told what hindered him or what he must do to become a proper subject of baptism. Thus the baptizing took place with no answer being given to the eunuch’s question. This makes a serious break in the story. And besides, the very king contained in that confession is what the Lord requires of one before he can be baptized. Even Bogard will admit that a man cannot properly be baptized until he believes in Jesus as the Son of God. The very faith that is necessary to qualify one for baptism is the faith that is expressed in “the good confession.” Why, then, be so determined to get rid of it?

But Bogard says: “That verse is not in the original Greek.” What does he mean to imply by this statement? He leaves the impression on his reader, and I have no doubt that he intended to do so, that the original copy of Luke’s record is available, and that this verse is lacking from his record. But any one who is at all informed about the matter knows that the “original Greek” of Luke’s record is not available. We do not have that “original Greek.” We have a number of manuscript copies but we do not have the original. But Bogard might protest that he meant it was not in the Greek manuscripts which we do have. But neither would this be the truth. It is true that it is not in many of the manuscript copies, but it is in some of them. Authorities say that it is found in Manuscript E and “several others of minor importance,” and it is found also “in the Vulgate and Arabic.” Manuscript E has the record in “original Greek,” if by that expression we simply mean the original language in which the record was made, So it is in some of the “original Greek” manuscript copies.

But the translators of the Revised Version left it out, so Bogard tells us, and it is therefore not Scripture at all. I know that the verse has been rejected by many critics, and I know that the translators of the Revised Version left it out of the text. But they did put it in a foot note. Their statement reads as follows: “Some ancient authorities insert, wholly or in part, verse 37: And Philip said, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.” I wonder if Bogard could not find that in his copy of the Revised Version? He could easily find the foot note at Acts 8:37. I wonder why he mentioned one and failed, to mention the other. The reason is obvious. The foot note at Acts 8:37 did not suit him. Bogard claims that ancient authorities do not contain this part of the record—“it is not in the original Greek.” But the translators say that “some ancient authorities” insert it. So it has more in its favor than Bogard claims for it.

But suppose I just admit that this verse is not a part of the Bible. Would that take away from us the teaching of the good confession? Must we “depend” upon this verse to sustain that doctrine? Absolutely not. A number of other passages that have never been questioned teach the good confession. Take Paul’s statement in Rom. 10:9, 10. He says: “That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.” I wonder if this is “the very word of God.” This enjoins a confession upon men as a condition of salvation. Paul said: “If thou shalt confess, **thou shalt be saved.” Also that this “confession is made unto salvation.” But what confession is it? The same confession recorded in Acts 8:37. “If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus.” To confess “the Lord Jesus” is the same as to confess “that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.” And we do not have to depend on Acts 8:37 at all for “the good confession.” Then Paul wrote Timothy after this fashion: “Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art also called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses.” (1 Tim. 6:12.) The Revised Version reads (in case Bogard should like to take a peek at it): “Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on the life eternal, whereunto thou was called, and didst confess the good confession in the sight of many witnesses.” Timothy, therefore, made “the good confession” unto eternal life. This agrees with the statement in Rom. 10:10 that men must “confess the Lord Jesus-unto salvation.” A number of Scriptures thus authorize the good confession, and the truthfulness of our teaching does not depend on the authenticity of Acts 8:37.

The Baptist Confession

But what about the confession made by Baptists? What confession do they require of their candidates for baptism? Here it is: “Do you believe that God for Christ’s sake has pardoned your sins?” Now, just where can this confession be found in the word of the Lord? No inspired man ever asked any one to make this confession. And no example of this confession’s being made can be found in all the book of God. Neither did inspired men ever teach that such a confession is to be made by any one. But this is the confession that Baptists require. It cannot be found anywhere in “the very word of God.” Neither can it be found in any
What About Mark 16:16?

In this passage Jesus said: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." This puts salvation after both believe and baptism and makes both necessary to salvation. But Bogard teaches that men are saved before they are baptized. Something, therefore, must be done about this passage. Bogard cannot answer it—so he just denies that it is the word of God. He calls it a "spurious interpolation" and says it is not in the "original Greek." He says: "All scholars are agreed that the part of Mark 16 from verse 9 on down to the end of the chapter is an addition to the word of God." But this is absolutely not true. Scholars are not agreed on any such thing. The authenticity of the passage is not questioned; some question its genuineness. In other words, it is not denied that it is of divine authority, but some doubt that Mark wrote it. So it is a question of whether Mark wrote it and not a question of its inspiration. But Bogard says: "In the Revised Version a foot note explains that it is not in the original Greek." And again this is not so. It is one of Bogard's tricks to make people think the passage is not the word of the Lord. The translators of the Revised Version say no such thing as this which Bogard attributes to them. Why did not Bogard tell what they said in their own words instead of misrepresenting them? They do not say that it is "not in the original Greek." After all, the "original" of Mark is not available—we have MSS copies of it. The Greek is the language in which it was "originally" written, and there are MSS in the "original language" that contain this passage.

Let us see what the translators of the Revised Version actually said in the foot note. Here it is in their own words: "The two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities, omit from verse 9 to the end. Some other authorities have a different ending to the Gospel." This is vastly different from saying that it is "not in the original Greek." And don't forget that the 101 translators of the Revised Version left these verses in the text. If they were convinced that they are not in the "original Greek," why did they leave them in? They did not even put them in a foot note. But they say the two oldest Greek Manuscripts do not contain this passage. Even that does not mean the passage is spurious, or that it is not the "very word of God." Note the following facts about this passage:

1. The 47 translators of the King James Version left it in the text of the New Testament. These men were Greek scholars. They were not "agreed that it is an addition to the word of God."

2. The 101 translators of the Revised Version left it in the text. They did not agree that it is an addition to the word of the Lord; yet they were Greek scholars.

3. It is found in three of the four great uncial Manuscripts (A. C. and D.). See Smith's New Testament History, page 704. These three manuscripts are in the "original Greek." But Bogard says the passage is not in the "original Greek."

4. It is not found in two of the great manuscripts—the Vaticans and the Sinaiticus. These are the "two oldest Greek manuscripts" to which the translators of the Revised Version refer in their foot note. But they were not written earlier than the fourth century. In the Greek New Testament, by Wescott & Hort, page 564, we have the statement that these two manuscripts "appear to belong to the middle of the fourth century." So "the two oldest Greek manuscripts" in which the passage is not found date only to the fourth century.

5. The passage existed in manuscripts older than these, for it was quoted by Irenaeus in the second century. Note the following:

"Irenaeus cites both the opening and closing words: an important testimony in any case, but doubly so from the doubt that has been cast on the closing verses. The passage is rejected by the majority of modern critics, on the testimony of MSS, and of old writers, and on the internal evidence of the diction. Though it is probable that this section is, from a different hand, and was annexed to the Gospel soon after the time of the Apostles, it must be remembered that it is found in three of the four great uncial MSS. (A. C. D.), besides being, quoted without any question by Irenaeus. With the exception of these few verses, the genuineness of the Gospel is placed above the reach of reasonable doubt." Smith's New Testament History, p. 704.

It will be seen from this quotation that "the doubt that has been cast on the closing verses" by "the majority of modern critics" has to do with "the genuineness of the Gospel" and not its' authenticity. The question is whether Mark wrote it, not whether it is inspired. And note the fact that Irenaeus quoted the passage without any question in the second century. We, therefore, know that it was in some Greek manuscript approximately two hundred years older than the ones we now have that leave it out, for if it had not been in such copies of the gospel, Irenaeus could not have quoted it.

6. One of "the two oldest Greek manuscripts" that leaves it out—Ms. B, or the Vaticans manuscript, also leaves out a part of the book of Hebrews, all of the Pastoral Epistles, the book of Philemon, and the entire book of Revelation. The following quotation is taken from Wescott & Hort's Greek New Testament, page 564:

"B. Codex Vaticanus, at Rome, containing the whole New Testament except the later chapters of Hebrews, the Pastoral Epistles, Philémon, and the Apocalypse."

For Bogard to be consistent he must say that the later chapters of Hebrews, the Pastoral Epistles, the book of Philemon and the entire book of Revelation (the Apocalypse) are "spurious interpolations" and are not "the very word of God." He declares such to be true of Mark 16:16 because it is not in the "original Greek" of this manuscript. These other portions of the word of God are not in it either, but he does not think to denounce them as spurious interpolations.
He wants to get rid of Mark 16:16, however, and the only way to do so is to deny that it is "the very word of God." But until he is willing to reject the entire book of Revelation and other portions mentioned, we shall not let him get by with his denial. And if he decides to deny them all, we will just let him take his stand with the infidels.

7. Even Bogard regards this passage as "the very word of God" when he is not fighting baptism. In debates on baptism he claims it is a "spurious interpolation," but in other matters he thinks it is good. He has changed back and forth in his various written works. But here is proof that the passage is not considered as an addition to the word of God when Bogard uses it for other purposes. In chapter 8, page 41, of Baptist Way-Book, writing under the title of "The Way of Mission Work in History," Bogard says: "The Apostolic Baptists were Missionary Baptists. This is abundantly proved by the Master's commanding the church to 'go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.'" Here he quotes Mark 16:15 as "abundant proof" for Missionary Baptists, and yet that verse is a part of the passage that Bogard says is a "spurious interpolation" and no part of "the very word of God." But maybe Bogard has changed his idea of the passage since he wrote the Way-Book. Well, he often changes, as is shown by his various debates and books in print. In his debate with N. B. Hardeman he said on page 273: "I have never yet said that Mark 16:16 was a part of the word of God." Well, in his Way-Book he said that verse 15 contained the "Master's commandment" to the church, and if verse 15 is the Master's commandment, so is verse 16, for it is a part of the same passage that Bogard says is not in the "original Greek." It was in 1938 that he made this statement in debate with N. B. Hardeman, and that was since he wrote the Way-Book. But let us look at a statement made since the Hardeman-Bogard Debate. In the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight, Nov. 10, 1943, we have another statement by him. This was about five years since his debate with Hardeman. It was about six months later than the issue of his paper from which the quotation was made at the beginning of this article. What does he say at this date? Well, he publishes a sermon that he preached over the radio on the subject: "Put Christ First In All Things." He asks the question: "What was the work that Jesus told his followers to do?" In answering the question he gives a number of things that Jesus did not tell them. After that he comes to this question again: "What, then, does Jesus want his people to do?" And here is his answer: "The work of the church is to 'go into all the world and preach the gospel.'" So he quotes from Mark 16:15 again, and he says this is what "Jesus told" his people to do. Well, if this is what Jesus said, it must be "the very word of God" and not a "spurious interpolation." If it is a spurious interpolation, Bogard is "depending on a spurious interpolation" to prove what Jesus wants the church to do. And since he has promised to "take out" when he does a thing of that kind, he would just as well unhitch himself, for he is certainly depending on what he says is not in the original Greek. Did someone say that "the legs of the lame are unequal?"

But I want to leave this final question with "Dr." Bogard. Since he has said "when it becomes necessary for Baptists to depend on spurious interpolations instead of the very word of God for their doctrine, right then we will take out," I want to know what he depends on for the name Baptist Church. It is nowhere found in all the word of God. And there is no "spurious interpolation" in the Bible that even remotely hints at it. He is, therefore, unable to sustain his doctrine and practice along this line by the word of God nor by "spurious interpolations." He must go completely out of the realm of the Bible to find it. And I might tell him that when I cannot sustain my doctrine and practice by even a "spurious interpolation," to say nothing of the word of God, right then I'll take out. And if he can find even some "spurious Scripture" for the "Baptist Church," I would like to see it. Maybe he will print it for us in an early issue of the Orthodox Baptist Searchlight.

III. WHAT PREACHERS TELL US

We can't always depend on what preachers tell us. Sometimes they tell us the truth; sometimes it is otherwise. But we are usually willing to accept what they say if they do not contradict the word of the Lord. And a great many people will accept them even if they do contradict what God says. The following story is told by a Baptist preacher, E. P. Alldredge, writing in the American Baptist of Sept. 11, 1944. As far as I know the story is true, and in the main, his comments upon the story are true. But I am convinced that he was not the preacher to tell us about it and make the comments. It is a story that concerns

Confessing To The Wrong Person

Mr. Alldredge gets his information from a journal published by the Episcopalians. In fact, he gives a quotation from said journal. From it we learn that a Roman Catholic girl, while in New York, went looking for a Catholic Church that she might confess to a Catholic priest. She found what seemed to be a good Catholic Church, made her confession, obtained her forgiveness; and then the following Sunday she discovered somehow that she had confessed to a Protestant Episcopal minister instead of to a Catholic priest. Her father was somewhat upset and wanted something done about it. Whether anything was done, I do not know, but Mr. Alldredge says:

"In such a delicate and distressful situation, we wonder if a Baptist might offer two helpful suggestions."

It is all right, I suppose, for any one to offer "helpful suggestions" when any situation presents itself that is "delicate and distressful." And yet if the suggestions put the one who offers them into the same "delicate and distressful situation," it would likely be better for him to keep still. For that reason I am sure this Baptist preacher talked out of turn. Let us take a look at his first "helpful suggestion." Here it is:

"1. Why go to a confessional at all? Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Episcopalian, or Lutheran? There is not even a hint in the New Testament Scriptures that any one of the apostles established a confessional, or made a confession to any one of his fellow ministers, or advised or suggested that any Christian should go to a confessional."

What boldness a Baptist preacher must have to offer a suggestion like that! It is certainly true that there "is not even a hint in the New Testament" that any inspired man
“established a confessional.” And there is no Scriptural authority for any man to “go to a confessional-Roman Catholic, Greek Catholic, Episcopalian, or Lutheran.” But I wonder how it happened not to occur to this Baptist preacher that “there is not even a hint in the New Testament” that “any of the apostles,” or the Lord himself, ever established a Baptist Church. Neither is there “a hint in the New Testament” that any inspired man ever “advised or suggested that any Christian” or any one else should join a Baptist Church or even “go to a Baptist Church.” It looks to me like this Baptist preacher is in the same “delicate and distressful situation” that the Catholic priest is in and needs someone to offer some helpful suggestions to him. The Catholic priest or the Episcopal minister could offer to this Baptist preacher the same suggestion he offered them, and with as much propriety and good sense, for it is evident to all who know the facts of the case-and no one knows them better than this Baptist—that the same verse in the New Testament that mentions the Baptist Church tells also of the Catholic confessional. It mentions neither, of course, but the Catholic has just as much divine authority for his confessional as the Baptist has for his Baptist Church. I am not sure that he could not come nearer proving divine authority for his confessional than any man can for the Baptist Church. James said: “Confess your faults one to another, and pray one for another.” (Jas.5:16) While this does not sanction the Catholic confessional, it does give authority for one man to confess to another and for one to pray for another. If any Baptist preacher could find a passage in the New Testament that mentioned anything that sounded as much like a Baptist Church as this does a confessional, he would make the discovery of the century as far as Baptists are concerned, and his name would be heralded to the ends of the earth. What Baptist preacher would not be willing to give the last shirt off his back for just such a passage? They have been searching diligently for it for years, but no man has ever found it. I would suggest that Baptist preachers keep quiet when anything is said about what is hinted at or mentioned in the New Testament. They might save themselves from a “delicate and distressful situation.”

No Salvation Outside Of Baptist Church

Baptist preachers have long raised a howl about the idea of salvation in the church. When gospel preachers contend that there is no salvation for responsible people in this age outside of the church of the New Testament Baptist preachers have tried to create prejudice against us and sympathy for them by saying that will damn all good Methodists, Presbyterians, Luthernans and all others who are not members of “the so-called church of Christ.” So it may sound a little strange for a Baptist preacher to tell us that salvation is possible only in the Baptist Church. And yet one preacher recently did that. I don’t think he intended to do it, and likely was not aware at the time that he was doing it. But he did it anyway. The preacher is C. R. Meadows, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Jacksonville, Texas, and recently connected with Jacksonville Baptist College. He sent a report of a meeting to American Baptist, of which D. N. Jackson is editor. The report concerned a meeting conducted in Jacksonville and was published in the issue of May 26, 1944. After telling the results of the meeting Mr. Meadows said:

“Now, Bro. Jackson, we are already looking forward to having you with us again in the fall. It seems to me that we need to be busy in revivals all over the country. The people need the simple, plain gospel which is the power of God unto salvation, as only Baptist people can preach it.”

I suppose D. N. Jackson indorsed this statement. At least he registered no objection to it, and he headed the report like this: “Good Report Concerning Texas Church And College.” If what Meadows told us was not true, or if Jackson did not think it was true, he said nothing about it. It is very unusual, of course, for a Baptist preacher to tell us that “the simple, plain gospel” is “the power of God unto salvation.” I know that Paul said that in Rom. 1:16, but Paul was not a Baptist preacher. He lived and died hundreds of years before a Baptist Church was ever heard of. Generally, Baptist preachers do not agree with Paul—they are not willing to say that the gospel is “the power” of God unto salvation. D. N. Jackson himself has denied this in debate with me, claiming that the gospel is only a small part of the power to save—that there must be a power distinct from the gospel and in addition to it exerted upon the sinner before it is possible for him to be saved. In case such is true, then the gospel is not “the power of God unto salvation.” But C. R. Meadows says it is. So some of them must be learning. But he not only said “the gospel is the power of God unto salvation” but declared “only Baptist people can preach it.”

This means, of course, that Methodist preachers cannot preach it. Neither can Presbyterian preachers, Lutheran preachers, Pentecostal preachers, or any other kind except Baptists, for “only Baptist people can preach it.” So all the tears Baptist preachers have shed about the Methodists going to hell if our preaching is true have been wasted, because they will now have to go to hell if Meadows’ “Good Report” is true. How were Methodists converted anyway? They were converted under the preaching of Methodist preachers. But Methodist preachers cannot preach “the simple, plain gospel which is the power of God unto salvation”—“only Baptist people can preach it.” So if Methodists were saved by the preaching of Methodist preachers, they were saved without hearing the gospel “which is the power of God” to save. They must hear Baptists preach in order to hear that gospel. If they were saved under Methodist preaching, they were saved independent of the power of God. In fact, according to Mr. Meadows, no one will be saved except those who have been converted under the preaching of Baptists. This consigns every body to hell but the Baptists, for those who are converted under Baptist preaching become Baptists, and nobody else ever obeys the gospel, because their preachers can’t preach it.

Mr. Meadows is the man, if you remember, that I mentioned in a former article, who rebaptized a Baptist preacher at Jacksonville sometime ago after he had been preaching to and baptizing people for several years. The question was raised then as to what was the status of all those this preacher baptized before his rebaptism. And now it appears that none of them could possibly be saved. Prior to his
rebaptism *that* preacher *was* not a Baptist, *as* he had, *not* received Baptist baptism according to their "age old position," and during that time he could not preach the gospel that is God's power to save, for "only Baptist people can" do, that. Whoever accepted his *preaching* during those years were not saved, unless men can be saved without hearing "the gospel which is the power of God unto salvation, as only Baptist people can preach it." It is, time now for Baptist preachers to start shedding tears for them.

**IV. REPORT OF MABELVALE DEBATE**

From March 12 to March 16 inclusive I met W. Eugene Davis, Missionary Baptist, in a debate at Mabelvale, near Little Rock, Arkansas. Elder Davis is editor and owner of The Oklahoma Missionary Baptist. On the editorial page of March 20, 1945, and with editorial indorsement, the following report of the debate appeared. It was written by Elder Jack Dean, moderator for Elder Davis. Before commenting on the report I want you to read it as follows:

The debate is now history. To say that Brother Davis defended and presented Baptist doctrine is to state it mildly. He is much the master of any situation where a defense of "the faith once for all delivered unto the saints" is involved. His arguments from the scriptures are unanswerable. The only recourse left the Campbellites is ridicule and misrepresentation, which they are capable of doing.

It is doubted that the Campbellites in this section of the country will want any more debates very soon. If you are bothered with these folks in your community, it will do your soul good to get Brother Davis in there for a defense of Baptist Doctrine. The church here, of which I am pastor, was well pleased with the debate, in fact all Baptists who attended said that it was the most complete victory for Bible truth witnessed in a long time.

Mr. Porter, who represented the Campbellites, is given up to be a very good debater, but he was made to look like a beginner. In fact the defeat was so crushing to the Campbellites that they all started to talking, and that while Brother Davis was on the floor. They even went so far as to object to his using the scriptures. If you need a good debater, do not fail to call on Brother Davis.

**ELDER JACK DEAN,**

Mabelvale, Arkansas.

I have learned a good while ago that it does not seem to hurt the 'consciences of Baptist preachers to lie. I thought that Jack Dean, young Baptist preacher who moderated for Davis' might be able to state things more accurately than many of them, as he is yet a young preacher and has not had so much experience in preaching Baptist doctrine as some of them. But after reading the above report by him, I shall have to admit that he "sounds like a veteran" among Baptist preachers. It was really amusing to me to read the statement that Davis "is much the master of any situation." It will no doubt cause you to get a good laugh if you were among those who attended the discussion. Davis is a likable sort of fellow. I had never met him before until we met for this discussion. He has a *characteristic* smile that helps you to like his personality. That smile remained for the first two sessions of the debate. Whether he was presenting his arguments or being prodded by his opponent, he could look at you with a smile that made you think he might be enjoying the discussion. But after the second session he began to break, the smile began to diminish and agony began to register in its place. During the last session of the debate, as I made my two speeches, the smile was entirely gone. Davis sat, as all the audience knows, with his head down, his eyes staring at the floor by way of his nose, his lips trembling and quivering, and though I pressed him constantly I could not even get him to open his eyes and look at me. Whenever my opponent drives me to a condition like that I shall never give editorial indorsement to a report that says I was "master of any situation." I know when men suffer. I have seen them suffer before. And if any man's agony was ever written upon his brow, it was so with Davis before the debate was over. The statement that Davis made Porter "look like a beginner" is about the biggest joke I have heard since the war started. Along with it may be classed the statement: "It is doubted that the Campbellites in this section of the country will want any more debates very soon." Let them call for one and see how quickly they are accommodated. But I predict that Elder Davis will not be running over anybody to get into it.

Another statement that is characteristic of Baptist preachers in their lack of veracity is this: "The defeat was so crushing to the Campbellites that they all started to talking, and that while Brother Davis was on the floor." This is as far from the truth as the east is from the west. I resent being called Campbellites, of course, but I know whom he means by the slanderous use he makes of the term. Often during the discussion, while Davis was on the floor, he would direct his talk to some of our gospel preachers in the audience, whom he called school boys, and often he got a response from them. But to say "they all began talking" while Davis was on the floor has not a speck of truth involved. And, except for Baptist doctrine, I could not understand how any man who claims to be a child of God could say: "They even went so far as to object to his using the scriptures." Nothing of this kind ever occurred at any time during the entire discussion. I wonder if Jack Dean thinks that people who heard the debate will be willing to swallow such falsehoods. Once during the discussion Davis began to introduce new arguments in his final negative of the proposition, based on scriptures that had never been used in the debate, E. R. Harper, my moderator objected. He did not object to his using scriptures but he objected to his making new arguments in his final negative when I had no chance to reply. I suppose that is what Dean calls "objecting to his using the scriptures." That is about as close to the truth as you could well expect a Baptist preacher to get. But after we objected-nobody objected but my moderator and me-to his new arguments in his final negative, we let him proceed with his new arguments, for we realized he needed them badly. But we wanted the audience to be aware of the fact that he was introducing new arguments when he knew I had no chance to reply.

I said, "except for Baptist doctrine," I could not understand how a man claiming to be a child of God could make such statements. But I fully understand it in connection with Baptist doctrine. It is but practicing what they preach—that a child of God can commit any sin beneath heaven, die in the very act and go to heaven any way. During our discussion of the possibility of apostasy I asked Elder Davis two written questions. He wrote
his answers to the questions. The questions with his answers are as follows:

1. Is it possible for a Baptist child of God to get drunk and commit murder?

   Answer: Yes.

2. If he should die while drunk and in the act of murder, would he go to heaven?

   Answer: Yes.

   These are Davis' own answers to these questions, and while some Baptists might have admitted that such is Baptist doctrine, it is so. This is what they teach. Every act of the alien, they claim, is a sin in the sight of God; but the child of God may do anything and it will not be held against him. Before conversion the man may refuse to drink, but it is a sin and he will die and go to hell; but after conversion he may become a drunken sot, die in the gutter while intoxicated, and still go to heaven. Before conversion he may refuse to have any trouble with his neighbor, but such is a sin, and he will die and go to hell; but after conversion he may take his razor and cut his neighbor's throat from ear to ear, die in the very act, and go to heaven. Before conversion he may control the lusts of the flesh, but it is a sin, and he will die and go to hell; but after conversion he may ravish your wife and daughter, get killed in the very act, but he will go to heaven anyway. Before conversion if he tells the truth, it is a sin, and he will be sent to hell for it; but after conversion he may lie to every man he meets, and he may die with lies upon his lips, but he will go to heaven anyway. So I suppose that explains why Baptist preachers can say such things in their report of a debate. It doesn't hurt them to lie, according to their doctrine, for they will go to heaven in spite of it all. I suppose we should not, therefore, be greatly surprised at the report on the editorial page of Davis' paper.

   But to show you how well he was "master of every situation" I shall mention a few situations. While discussing the question of Christ's sitting on David's literal throne in Jerusalem when he returns, I introduced the statement in Jer. 22:30 concerning Coniah, also called Jeconiah and Jeconias. God, through the prophet, said: "Write this man childless, a man that shall not prosper in his days: for no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting 'upon the throne of David, and ruling any more in Judah." It was shown from this statement that no man of the seed of Coniah could ever rule any more "in Judah" on the throne of David. But Matthew, in his genealogy of Jesus, traces his descent directly through Coniah; therefore, Jesus is "the seed of Coniah," and can never rule on David's throne "in Judah." But that very kind of reign Davis and Jeconias begat Salathial." So I wanted to know how this could be true if he had no children. Jeremiah does not say that Coniah was childless. He was not childless. Seven sons of Coniah are listed in 1 Chron. 3: 17, 18. But God said, "Write him childless." In other words, as far as any son of his ever ruling on the throne of David "in Judah" was concerned, he was to be reckoned childless. No son of his, no descendant of his, was ever thus to rule. So that eliminates any such rule on the earth by Jesus when he comes the second time. This shows how well Davis was "master of every situation."

   Then, too, while discussing baptism as essential to salvation, I introduced John 3:5 in which Jesus said: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." I contended that this included baptism as a condition of salvation. He made the usual Bogard run by substituting the word baptize for born throughout the passage, claiming that we claim that born means baptize. But no one ever made that claim, and he based his argument upon a misrepresentation. We have never said that the word "born" means "baptize." But we claim that "born of water" has reference to baptism, and we are perfectly willing for the word baptize to be substituted for such expressions. But not for the word born. I endeavored to get him to tell me what "born of water" meant that I might substitute his definition for the word "born" throughout the passage. He saw the handwriting on the wall, the situation looked bad, and he refused to say. Under constant and continued pressure he said: "Born of water means what it says." Then I asked what the word "water" in the passage means. He replied: "It means what it says." "Well, does it mean 'water'?" I questioned. He again replied that it means what it says. So I asked: "Does it say 'water'?" He replied that it does. So it says "water," and it means what it says; therefore it means water. But usually Baptist preachers claim it means "Spirit." Davis, however, says it means water just as it says. I believe that too. Since then Davis admits that "water" means "water" I want him to note the fact that Jesus put water between a man and the kingdom of God, and I insisted that he tell us where and what the water is that is between a man and the kingdom of God. The "situation" was never "mastered" by Davis.
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Many other such situations could be given if space permitted. To those who heard the discussion such a report as occurred in the Oklahoma Missionary Baptist will really be amusing.

In closing I give herewith the following report of the debate which appeared in The Tennessee Valley Christian, edited by Franklin T. Puckett, minister of the Poplar Street church in Florence, Alabama. Along with many other gospel preachers he heard the debate. But here is his report: “Several preachers of the Tri-Cities area recently returned from a trip to Mabelvale, Arkansas, where Bro. W. Curtis Porter engaged Mr. W. Eugene Davis in a religious discussion concerning certain points of difference between the two. The debate lasted five nights (March 12-16) and included discussions of the following topics: premillennialism, the plan of salvation, apostasy, and the return of the Jews to Palestine.

Mr. Davis, a reputable Baptist minister, and editor of the Oklahoma Missionary Baptist, while laboring strenuously to present convincing arguments in defense of his positions, was woefully put to shame by Bro. Porter’s masterful exposition of the truth of God’s word. Bro. Porter’s power lay in his irrefutable arguments, his driving logic, and his genial personality, all of which gave him complete mastery of his audience. The general sentiment prevailing among preachers of the church of Christ who were present was that Bro. Curtis Porter ranks at the very top in his ability to expose the erroneous doctrines of denominationalism. ‘May God grant him a long, healthy, and prosperous life in the Master’s vineyard. The faith of the gospel will never suffer at the hands of men of his calibre.’

V. A NEW HERESY

There were heresies in the church in the days of the apostles. False teachers came from Jerusalem to Antioch and taught that Gentiles must be circumcised and keep the law of Moses in order to be saved. With these teachers of heresy Paul and Barnabas had a big debate. The trouble was not settled by compromise nor by ignoring it. Some in Corinth taught a “no resurrection” heresy. And others taught that “the resurrection is past already” and overthrew the faith of some. It is no new thing for a heretic to appear in the church with some system of false doctrine.

In the nineteenth century teachers in the church began to advocate the instrumental music heresy. Later came the premillennial heresy with all its varied theories. And now a new heresy has appeared in this part of the country. For several years Thos. L. Conner, now of Leachville, Arkansas, has been preaching that there will be no judgment after death—that all judgment for man takes place during his lifetime. Recently he has begun a persistent and constant agitation of this theory. Wherever he goes, he advocates, both publicly and privately, this theory. He has caused much disturbance among brethren. And, according to the information which I have received, this and another hobby of his have resulted in the division of congregations. He has been challenging far and wide any one to meet him in debate on this issue. And the news has been spread around that every preacher is afraid to meet him. Some people have been made to believe this and have been convinced that he must have the truth, or preachers would not be afraid of him. Recently his challenge was made in such a way as to include me. I accepted his challenge and propositions have been signed for a discussion. The propositions to be debated are as follows:

1. The Scriptures teach that there will be a judgment for man after death and at the second coming of Christ.
2. The Scriptures teach that the intermediate state of the dead was destroyed when Jesus arose and all judgment for man takes place during his lifetime in the Christian age.

I am to affirm the first proposition; Conner, the second. The discussion will be held at the Boynton church, north of Leachville, Ark., where Conner is serving as preacher. The date has not yet been set but will be just as soon as my blood count is reduced far enough toward normal to make it safe for me to engage in a discussion. I am fully convinced that circumstances justify this debate. Some may think the whole thing should be ignored, but ignoring Conner and his theory will not stop the theory. Not that Conner is such an outstanding preacher, for he is not, but he has had a number of debates and has great confidence in his debating ability. And he is fully determined to revolutionize the church with this theory. He has a broadcast on a station that covers seven or eight states and has preached his theory extensively in his broadcast work. Furthermore, he has a number of preachers under his training. His son, Marshall Conner, is destined to be a preacher of no small ability. Already he is constantly advocating his theory. Two other young preachers-Cecil Cagle and Lowell Blasingame—are under his tutorship. And I understand that they have accepted the theory. Whether they are already preaching it or not I have not learned. But the theory has opportunity to become a major trouble in the church. I am convinced that the quickest way to kill it is to debate it at every opportunity. This I have resolved to do. The folly of ignoring heresies has been fully shown in connection with the theory of premillennialism. Had it been fought constantly from the time it first appeared among us it would have never reached the magnitude that it did. If I live, and if the Lord wills, this new heresy shall not go unchallenged for twenty years. I feel that brethren should know that when you call these men who are advocating this theory you are inviting trouble. Just recently Eugene S. Smith, of Dallas, Texas, added impetus to this theory and encouragement to the heretic when he appeared on Conner’s broadcast. He was conducting a meeting for the church at Black Oak, Ark., and was invited by Conner to speak over the radio. His sermon was given to the advocating of the first part of Conner’s theory—the destruction of the intermediate state. Whether Bro. Smith also accepts Bro. Conner’s theory of the judgment was not stated. But at least he added his influence to the theory by preaching a portion of the very things Conner has been so persistently agitating. But the thing will soon be tested in public discussion. If I know in time when the discussion will be I shall make announcement of the date in our papers.
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In all human experience, the way by which an individual’s reliability and veracity are established is well defined. Over a period of years, every statement made by the man is found to be true; no statement made by him is ever found to be false. His trustworthiness is further enhanced when (1) statements which appear incredible are later found to be true, and (2) statements which are to his own detriment and disadvantage are shown to be exact statements of fact. If a man speaks the truth in every area where later tests and investigations confirm what he has said, then it can be safely assumed that he has spoken the truth even in those areas where no investigation has been made, or even where none can be made.

The reliability and trustworthiness of the Bible have been established in precisely the same way. In every area where men have ever put it to the test of hard and scientific investigation, it has been demonstrated to speak the absolute truth. This has been the case even when the thing stated in the Bible may have appeared to the whole world as (1) utterly fantastic and incredible, and (2) to the detriment and disadvantage of the very thing the Bible seeks to establish and teach. No test of man’s devising has yet uncovered one single important error as to a statement of fact in all the pages of inspired literature. If the Book has demonstrated its veracity in the areas where testing has been made, and can be, shall it not be presumed to speak truth also in those areas where testing is impossible?

Archaeological Evidence

No more fascinating study has ever engaged the abilities of the scientist than the study of archeology. Through long and patient research, men have reconstructed for us the civilizations and customs of nations and races long since extinct. Cities have been uncovered; palaces and public buildings have been resurrected out of the accumulated debris of the centuries; a long dead people have been brought to life, and their very language and thoughts made real and vivid to us by the records of the stones. In the field of archaeology, no particular branch has been more fruitful than that of Biblical archaeology. And every single fact uncovered by the archaeologist which has had any bearing at all on the record of the scripture has fitted perfectly into the picture as presented by the inspired writers. Palestine is in every particular the matrix of the Book; the Bible fits into the contours of the land as a hand into a glove, or a precious gem into the matrix of the stone in which it was embedded, and from which it has been cut.

Through many years of scientific research, the archaeologists have come to accept as absolutely trustworthy every statement the Bible makes as to the topography and geography of Palestine. Also the relations between peoples and nations in times of antiquity, wherever these matters are touched upon by Biblical authors, and where modern discoveries have thrown light on the same questions, have been found to be exactly and accurately portrayed. The monuments of the past are an unanswerable argument for the veracity and dependability of those men who wrote in ancient times.

In Genesis 19 is recorded the story of the destruction by the judgment of God of the cities of Sodom and Gomorrah. These cities were located in the region around the lower end of the Dead Sea. And, according to the International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, “recent researches at the lower end of the Dead Sea by the expedition of Xenia Seminary and American School of Oriental Research have made further discussion of the location of the Cities of the Plain superfluous.” (Page 660)

“The Canaanite civilization represented in the story of Abraham and Lot as being upon the Plain was actually there. The Great High Place of the Plain, its greatness indicated by the great fortress protecting it, was found. Beside the temple was a camping place where people gathered from time to time, as at Gilgal, to worship. At the end of the Dead Sea. There has been some discussion in side of this camping place was a cemetery. From the graves came the unmistakable pottery of the Early Bronze Age, the time of Abraham and Lot. A careful search of the plain for 20 miles revealed the fact that for 2500 years from this time, there was no civilization of any kind on the Plain. In accord with this is the silence of the Scriptures concerning any history of the Plain onward to the end of the Biblical record.” (Bibliotheca Sacra, July 1924).

“As pointed out above, the pottery from Bab-ed-Dra is all older than the 18th century B. C. at the latest, since none of the characteristic Middle Bronze, or Hyksos, types appear, and everything is “first Semitic.” The date we have fixed for the catastrophe of Sodom and Gomorrah, about the early part of the 18th Century B. C. seems exceedingly probable.” (Albright, Annual of American School of Oriental Research VI).

The significance of these facts is further heightened when we consider what geologists have to say about the earth formations still to be seen in this region. “A stratum of salt 150 feet thick underlies the ground surface. Over it is a stratum of marl mingled with free sulphur. This is now a burned out region of oil and asphalt. Moreover, a great rupture in the strata completes the story. At some time, somehow, God kindled the gases which always collect where there is oil; a great explosion took place and the salt and the sulphur were carried up into the heavens red hot, so that it literally rained fire and brimstone over the whole Plain.” (I. S. B. E.-page 661)

The conclusions are unmistakable and decisive:

(1) There was a fairly high state of civilization existing in these regions for many hundreds of years prior to the time of Abraham.

(2) This civilization came to an abrupt end at the time of Abraham, and the places were not reinhabited for approximately 2,500 years.

(3) At some unknown time in the past, there was a tremendous explosion in the geologic formations here which resulted in a veritable “rain” of fire and brimstone over the whole Plain.

These are facts which are obvious to all-both atheist and believer alike. Thus in one clear-cut and definite narrative the Bible is found to be recording cold and literal facts—not the dreamy fiction of imaginative visionaries and enthusiasts. When the test was made on what the unbe
liever undoubtedly would have described as a lurid and impossible melodrama, it reveals that the event was undoubtedly lurid, and it was the most tragic sort of drama, but far from being impossible, it actually happened.

Bricks Without Straw

For many years the unbelievers and those who considered themselves authorities in the field of Egyptology looked with considerable skepticism, if not derision, on the Biblical accounts of the enslavement of Israel in Egypt. The whole record of Moses was dismissed contemptuously by them as being the folklore of a nomadic desert tribe, with absolutely no foundation in fact. But during the last century, the excavations in Egypt have produced such overwhelming testimony as to the historicity of Israel’s bondage that it is highly unlikely even one dissenting voice could be found in all the realm of scholarship to that assertion. Moses relates (Exodus 1) in detail the oppressive measures which the “new king over Egypt, who knew not Joseph” launched against the captive Israelites. And further along, (chapter 5) he recites in fullest particulars how the Israelites were compelled to gather stubble for straw, and finally were compelled to make bricks without any straw whatsoever.

The ruins of Pithom (Exodus 1:11) were excavated in 1883 by Naville of the University of Geneva. “On the great gateway was the inscription by Ramses the Great: ‘I built Pithom at the mouth of the East.’” In his book (Moses and the Monuments) Professor Kyle describes these ruins of Pithom as he saw them: “The bricks were laid in mortar, contrary to the usual Egyptian custom, and contrary to the observations of explorers in Egypt previous to the time of Naville’s discovery at Pithom. The lower courses in at least some of the store chamber work are laid with brick filled with good chock straw; the upper courses are made of brick having no binding material whatever; and the middle courses are made of brick filled with stubble pulled up by the roots. The impress of the roots is as plainly marked in the bricks as though cut by an engraver’s tools.” (Christian Faith and the Spirit of the Age-C. E. McCartney, page 39)

From the excavations of the archaeologists, therefore, we record these indubitable facts:

1. Ramses the Great who lived at the time ordinarily accepted as the time of Israelitish bondage in Egypt declared that he built the city of Pithom.

2. The first bricks laid in the store chambers of this city were made with good chock straw; the next bricks laid were made with stubble and roots instead of straw; the top layers of bricks were made with no binding material whatever.

Compare this with the Biblical account which records that:

1. The captive Israelites built for Pharaoh the store cities of Pithom and Raamses (Exodus 1:11)

2. At a certain period in their enforced labor the Israelites were suddenly denied the use of straw with which to make bricks, but were compelled to make as many bricks as they had previously. (Exodus 5:7-8)

3. The captives were compelled to go out through all the land of Egypt gathering stubble for straw (5:11).

4. They were finally forced to make their allotted number of bricks, regardless of whether they could find straw or stubble to put in them or not. (5:18). They complained that they had no straw.

We believe it to be impossible for an unbiased mind to compare these two records (the archaeological record and the Biblical record) without being fully convinced that they refer to identical happenings. The Biblical record has been known for thousands of years; during some of those years, at least, it has been scorned and rejected by some as being unhistorical and fantastic. The archaeological record has only recently come to light. But it now shows in undeniable demonstration that the Biblical record is absolutely trustworthy and reliable. Again, in an area where testing has been made possible, the Book has met the test. Turning through its pages and picking somewhat at random from the thousands of events, incidents, customs, and historical happenings recorded there, we test first this one then that one, and then another, and another-giving the most searching analysis possible to every bit of evidence which the expanding archaeological discoveries make available to us. Without a single exception, in every instance where testing is possible, it has been found that the words of the Bible are sober truth. These men who wrote this Book dealt in facts, not fiction.

The “Higher Critics”

The higher critics for many years tried to reconstruct the whole Biblical picture of Palestine and its history. They sought to show that the patriarchs were not individuals but personifications; that Moses was comparatively unimportant; that many of the heroes of the Old Testament were purely legendary and had no actual existence except in folklore and fairy tales; that Israel’s religion was a very gradual development from purely naturalistic origins, etc., etc. It is of the deepest significance that increasingly the archaeological discoveries are forcing a complete revision of schools of theology today are having to re-examine and modify the concepts which they have been so vehement in trumpeting forth for a generation as “the assured results of competent scholarship.” The archaeological findings are compelling a return to the accepted and traditional view of the historical accuracy of the Biblical record. “Of the current reconstructive theories of criticism—the patriarchs not individuals but personifications; the rude nomadic, semibarbarous condition of Palestine in the patriarchal age; the desert; Egypt; the comparative unimportance of Moses as a law-giver; the gradual invasion of Palestine; the naturalistic origin of Israel’s religion from astral myths; the late authorship of the Pentateuch—no one is being sustained. In fact, however much archaeological evidence there may be that is negative in character or that is not definitely against the reconstructive theories of criticism, no one can point to a single definite particular of archaeological evidence whereby any one of these theories is positively sustained and corroborated.” (I. S. B. E.-page 233)

It would be impossible in any one treatise to consider all the archaeological evidence which has a bearing on the scriptural record. Many volumes would be necessary even to list, much less discuss, the thousands of instances where a monument, a piece of pottery, a ruined stone wall, a debris covered altar, the charred remains of a palace, or some other bit of archaeological testimony has fitted perfectly into the Biblical narrative. And not one instance
has been found where any single iota of archaeological evidence has demonstrated the falsity or inaccuracy of a statement of the Bible.

In view of this overwhelming confirmation of the reliability of the inspired record, considering the multiplied thousands of points at which it has been tested, we confidently affirm that no competent student can study the evidence and retain any doubt whatsoever as to the accuracy and dependability of the statements of these men. Their veracity has been established, their truthfulness vindicated.

Concerning then, those men who still try to cling to the outmoded and fantastic theories of the “higher critics,” we bluntly charge that they are either incompetent or dishonest. If they are unacquainted with the vast accumulation of archaeological discoveries bearing on the Biblical record, they are incompetent; if they are unable to recognize how completely this evidence shatters the modernistic interpretations, they are intellectually unqualified to speak. If they have seen the evidence, and have correctly evaluated it, and still cling to their theories, they are dishonest. There is no other explanation. In past years, there have been a few sophomoric minds among gospel preachers who have been bedazzled by the aura of “scholarship” which the modernists tried to arrogate to themselves. In their naive simplicity, they have thought they could be “intellectual” simply by accepting the vacuous vaporescence of these self-styled “scholars.” Fortunately (for the church) such men have either gone completely into agnosticism, or else have come to their senses and returned to the proclamation of the fundamental truth of the gospel. The church of Christ has not been cursed, as have been sectarian churches, by the presence in her pulpits of doubtful or skeptical voices. If gospel preachers will take the trouble to acquaint themselves with the evidence from the field of archaeology, we anticipate the church will never be in danger of the bitter controversy over modernism which has so emasculated the power of denominational organizations. Since we are living in a scientific age, let us be truly scientific! The record of the rocks is pure science—its voice is thunderous, and unmistakable.

**That Tract**

CHAS. M. CAMPBELL

It is of that leaflet, that tract, “Why Not Be Just A Christian?” by R. H. Boll, of Louisville, Ky., and premillennial “fame” that I write. Yes, to the surprise of some and the chagrin of others, let it be known once and for always, that, R. H. Boll is the author of that anonymous tract.

Those who may be surprised are those, who, in credulity have accepted it because of its title and regardless of its anonymity without Investigation, and who do not subscribe to the Judaizing views of R. H. Boll and his pet theory borrowed from the Adventists and “Jehovah’s Witnesses.” And, those who will be chagrined by this exposure of the strategy and subterfuge of a premillennial propaganda campaign in which that tract has been imposed upon the unsuspecting, are those who have become collaborators for the Word and Work and World Vision, the organs of R. H. Boll, and B. D. Morehead, respectively.

The tract, the very title of which is a base misrepresentation, for R. H. Boll wants one to be more or less than a Christian, has been publicized constantly in World Vision, but always without revealing the name of the author. So, it served a two fold purpose, namely to impose itself upon those not in sympathy with Boll’s theory, and to conceal the identity of World Vision.

Certainly it was not accidental nor incidental, that, the tract was publicized anonymously, for, all other tracts advertised, carried the names of the authors.

The same paper carried perpetual publicity for Jorgenson’s song books. Still the editor, Chas. R. Brewer, a David Lipscomb teacher, declared in a recent issue of the paper that his opposition to premillennialism was well known. When I wrote to him and requested that he reconcile his statement with the facts, he very obligingly did not answer. Surely he did not lack words, being a teacher of speech, but then he is reported to have said that he could not pronounce the word, premillennialism. Well, for his benefit, and that of some others, I think I shall reveal my thoughts. It reminds me of a school yell, p r e m i 1 l _ e n n i a l _ i s m. “Here’s the way you spell it, and here’s the way you yell it,” premillennialism! Yes, “yell it.” Truly of those who distribute Boll’s tracts whether they are on the subject of premillennialism or not, for, after all, that is his hobby and what all of his efforts lead to, eventually.

0, yes, concerning the distributing of Boll’s tract, Brother H. Leo Boles told me that Robert Neil has been scattering them zealously down in Alabama. Still, some brethren who, deny sympathy for Boll, persist in using Robert for a song leader, and one of whom I know, actually had two elders removed from office for opposing Robert being brought into the congregation. At least, that was the beginning of his difficulty with them.

Finally, when Harris J. Dark, a capable and uncompromising gospel preacher, wrote a tract, at Morehead’s request, on the subject: “Why Not Be Just A Christian?” Barney told another; “We are continuing to use Brother Boll’s, for it is better.” Well, Barney, like Boll’s theory, that could be a matter of opinion. And, it is the opinion of Chapel Avenue congregation where Brother Dark preaches, and which is one of the largest and one of the best congregations in the brotherhood, that, Harris’s tract is far superior, for they have had it printed in large quantities for free distribution, and, for some reason, they were not in the least afraid nor ashamed to reveal the identity of the author.

**Why Not Be Just A Christian?**—and I leave Boll and his satellites and sympathizers to find “comfort” among the rest of the sects, who, are not satisfied to be just Christians? And that will take care of his tracts.
E. G. COUCH AND MANHATTAN DIGRESSION

Brother Couch one time evidenced a love for the defense of the truth; but now the evidence shows that he has left his first love, and that his second love is not for the truth nor its defense but for the digressives and compromise.

Brother Couch evinced that he loved the truth back in the late 30s, when Doctors Benson and Sears were unsuccessfully trying to remove the "stigma of premillennialism" from Harding College without removing the "premillennialism." The college sent forth a flood of enigmatic bulletins beclouding the issue and denying the taint of the millennial heresy. In 1938 Brother E. G. Couch secured and made public an unequivocal statement from the late Brother Armstrong, which avowed Armstrong's belief in premillennialism and belied the bulletins of Benson and Sears. Brother Couch thus did the cause of truth a great service and we counted him a fellow-worker in the defense of the gospel.

But now it is apparent, from the denied report which follows, that he has left his first love and is wasting his affections on the digressives. My plea to Brother Couch is that he remember and return to his first love, by renouncing compromise and unity with the digressives.

In the early part of this year, one of our boys (parents are members of the church in Del Rio) in the armed forces was stationed in the East: he was baptized and began worshipping with the Manhattan church, which made known to us, through him, their need of some money to furnish bed rooms for service men when they had to be in New York City over night in order to be there for worship. We sent the money ($85) to furnish one room.

The Witty-Murch publication "Christian Unity Quarterly" issue of April, May, June, 1944, page 22, contained the following item about the Manhattan church, quote:

"Recently E. G. Couch, pastor of the Manhattan Church of Christ, arranged a four-day conference at his church on East 80th Street, Manhattan, -New York City. One of the sessions was a discussion of Christian Unity; confining the discussion to those of the 'restoration' point of view. Prof. Sanders, of David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tenn., who had taken a leading part in the four-day session, spoke for the church of Christ group. M. S. Kitchen, pastor of the Grove Street Church in East Orange, was asked to express the point of view of the 'Disciples' who do not support the missionary interests, which are directed by the United Christian Missionary Society. Hugh D. Darsie was asked to express the point of view of the liberal groups of the 'Disciples.' It was an interesting afternoon. 'Christian Church' pastors who were present, besides Mr. Kitchen and Mr. Darsie, included Glenn Rockwell, new pastor of the Second Church in the Bronx, and J. Lindale Lewis, pastor of the Greenpoint Church in Brooklyn. We do not have a complete list of the 'Church of Christ' ministers present.

Under date of Oct. 6 I addressed a letter to Brother Couch and requested that 'Since you graciously accepted our gift, fairness demands that you just as graciously explain your activity and state your position on this vital matter.' When the contribution was sent I received a prompt and gracious reply, but I have heard nothing since the questions about the Unity Meeting were submitted-I guess contributions and questions are horses of different colors, at least the response is different. Since I received no correction or denial of the published report of the Manhattan Unity Meeting, I and the public must accept that report as substantially correct.

Note then, what is said in this unverified report, "Recently E. G. Couch, pastor of the Manhattan Church of Christ, arranged a four-day conference at his church on 80th Street, Manhattan, New York City." This Unity Movement, of which the New York conference was a part, is a few years old and has notoriously received censure and repudiation from sound brethren by the score. The arguments showing the error of the Unity Movement, which would be more truly designated "Compromise Movement," are too well-known to need restatement in this article-in the Bible Banner and other publications of the brotherhood they have been presented repeatedly. Typical of the statements is one by C. A. Norred, quote, "In all humility I must say that it is my conviction that anyone encouraging and abetting the Murch-Witty enterprise advertises his unsafeness as a religious teacher and leader." So Brother Couch put himself in a pretty bad light when he "arranged" the Unity Conference in New York City.

Noteworthy among the articles exposing the Unity Movement is one by W. O. Otey, in the Firm Foundation, Nov. 30, 1943, entitled, "The Tie That Binds." Among many other good things, Brother Otey said, "The real 'tie that binds' Witty and associates with Murch and associates .... that tie undoubtedly is the disturbing doctrine of premillennialism. It is my firm conviction after observing this Unity Movement from its beginning that everyone associated with Witty and usually counted with the church of Christ, is a full fledged Premillennialist." This shows that when Brother Couch "arranged" the Unity conference, he left his first love of defending the church against premillennialism, and got over on the other side of the fence and made love to the Premillennialists working under the banner of Unity Movement.

An article from Brother E. R. Harper of Little Rock, Ark., was published in the Firm Foundation in the early part of this year, in which innovations and their promoters were exposed. Copyright Davidson, of the Manhattan Church, was named and correctly marked. The article was followed shortly, by a statement from the Manhattan Church exonerating Davidson of the charge of heresy; and Brother Showalter disclaimed responsibility for and about half-repudiated the Harper article. Brother Showalter said, "I have not heard of his (Davidson's) bringing in, or trying to bring in, any innovation." Brother Showalter has been as powerful in exposing the Unity Movement as an innovation as anybody. So Brother Showalter, if you will just listen, you will hear of Davidson, Couch, and the Manhattan church taking up with the Unity Movement which you have exposed as an innovation.

Now in regard to Professor Sanders and his part in the Unity Conference. The undenied report says, "Professor Sanders, of David Lipscomb College, Nashville, Tenn., who had taken a leading part in the four-day conference, spoke for the church of Christ group." In time past the digressives compared the beloved David Lipscomb's opposition to their innovations to a "desperate old woman who tried to sweep back the tide of the ocean with a broom." Brother Lipscomb, to the digressives' discomfort, did a pretty good job...
with his sweeping. *From* the undenied report it appears that if Brother Lipscomb could come back to Nashville, he would have some innovation sweeping to do in the College that so proudly bears his name. We cannot keep confidence in schools whose professors show signs of compromise and court the favor of the digressives.

II. S. S. LAPPIN AND DIGRESSIVE FREEDOM

I read papers of various stripes and do not intend my subscription to a paper to be interpreted as sanction of its peculiar tenets; I take the Christian Standard and read some of what the digressives write. Their speech betrays them. Jesus said, “Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh,” (Mt. 12:34); again, “This people honoreth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me. But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men.” (Mt. 15:8-9) What the digressives say reveals their trouble to be in the heart, and is a lack of respect for the authority of the Lord.

S. S. Lappin, the digressive preacher, who in 1941 held the meeting in the premillennial church in Louisville for E. L. Jorgenson, writes an article in the Christian Standard of April 22, 1944 entitled “Full Freedom in Christ Jesus.” In this article he manifests a looseness and lack of conviction that is characteristic of digressives everywhere, a quality they have in common with the premillennialists among us—maybe that is the tie that binds and attracts them to each other.

Mr. Lappin has the wrong idea of freedom, he apparently thinks it is license to disregard what the Lord says and do as one pleases. He reminds me of the lady who thought when she was granted a driver’s license, she was thought to be the cloak for his broad tolerance and flagrant disregard of the will of the Lord on missionary agencies and instrumental music. He talks about “opinions” as though they were all we have to guide us in religious matters; but the standard of Christianity is not opinions but the New Testament, and religion is not a question of opinion but it is a question of “What saith the Lord?”

Mr. Lappin had a lot to say about denominations and he classified various kinds: “journalistic denominations,” “organ and nonorgan denominations,” “missionary denominations,” and “convention denominations.” He seemed to reach his point with this sentence, “Most of us have figured it out that it is not the reading of this or that paper that makes a denomination; not the use or non-use of instruments in worship; not the giving or withholding of offerings to missionary and benevolent enterprise; not attendance upon this or that gathering of convention folk-none of these, but the disposition to become intolerant of the opinions and practices of others, to disfellowship those of another way of thinking.” The Bible does not sustain Mr. Lappin’s definition. The word “denomination” does not appear in the Bible, but the words “sect” and “heresy” are used and are about equivalent to the word denomination. The scriptures fix the definition of a sect or denomination as something contrary to the doctrine and practice of the New Testament (2 Pet. 2:1; Tit. 3:10; 2 Jno. 9-11). Tolerance and intolerance is not the standard to determine whether a person or doctrine is denominational or not; the standard is the New Testament and anything not specifically authorized in it is denominational, sectarian, and heresy. Mr. Lappin’s instrumental music and missionary societies put him in this class.

Until he can find a New Testament scripture authorizing his innovations or until he repudiates them, he will be a denominationalist in heart and practice notwithstanding his denials. So in spite of his’ bold disclaimer, Mr. Lappin, according to the Bible, is the man that is sectarian and denominational because he tolerates, fellowships, and practices things not authorized in the New Testament.

Digressives go to the “wailing wall” over broken fellowship, but seldom do they love fellowship enough to give up their innovations that breached the fellowship and disturbed the peace. They have an inclination to want to fellowship everything; and they just about do. The idea to fellowship everything does not come from the Bible. The Bible commands fellowship, and it tells what and who to fellowship, and it forbids forming fellowship with some things. Note these scriptures: “For what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity” (2 Cor. 6:14); “Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them that are causing the divisions and occasions of stumbling, contrary to the doctrine which ye learned: and turn away from them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Christ, but their own belly; and by their smooth and fair speech they beguile the hearts of the innocent” (Rom. 16:17-18). So the kind of fellowship that Mr. Lappin practices and finds such joy in, is forbidden the Christian who wants to follow the Lord. One absolutely cannot please the Lord and fellowship innovations contrary to the doctrine of Christ. There is a danger pointed out in the Bible that many apparently have not seen, that is of getting one’s fellowship too broad. It behoves us to regulate our freedom by the law of Christ, let the New Testament be the standard of our religion, and to restrict our fellowship to those things that are approved of God.
The Christian Unity Quarterly, of July-August-September, 1944, has come to me. In it Brother Witty has an interesting essay under the above heading. He says some fine things in decrying the division that exists over the use (or is it non-use?) of instrumental music in worship. I take it that he would have us state the issue to include also the non-use of the instrument, as though not to use it is as much the cause of division as the use is. I do not understand the aims and spirit of the Quarterly if all of them connected with the movement do not so hold. It is very clear that the present users of mechanical music will be willing, for the sake of nominal unity, for the non-users to continue not to use the instrument, provided they cease all opposition to it. But I do not get the hint that any of them think that the use of the instrument should ever be finally discarded as a means of unity. It has been my conviction from the first that both sides were and are anxious to have unity among the two groups of churches. But on the part of the Christian Churches participating, it has never been the least entertained or dreamed that they would eventually give up entirely mechanical music—that unity will come only that way. If they know that it will not be brought about short of that, then they know more than Brother Witty knows, unless he expects the churches to reach the sort of general compromise Editor Murch says was the forced practice of Brother John F. Rowe for some time many years ago.

There are just three positions possible: The users of the instrument will have to cease it entirely, or the opposers will give up all opposition, or a general compromise will be agreed upon and instrumental folk will worship without the instrument if and when they happen to be where it is not used, and the present opposers will worship with it, without compunction of conscience, when they are where the instrument is used. Let the churches of Christ adopt the compromise ground, and it will be a matter of time till all churches will have gone to the ground of the Christian Churches. They know this to be the inevitable, and this is why they keep on working for what they call unity.

Brother Witty has been a gospel preacher for years. It is supposed that he has always stood against the use of instrumental music—that he has held it to be an entirely unacceptable practice. We suppose that he has held against it on greater grounds than mere policy—merely better not to use it. I suppose that he has regarded it in the past as a definite sin, one as clearly opposed to the spirit and letter of the law of Christ as animal sacrifice in Christian worship is. If this has been his position, when did he change? He surely does not hold this ground now. If he does, then some things he says are so far “off the beam” of common sense that a careful man will not say them without having yielded that former ground.

Dropping down into his editorial we find him sharply reproving “slackers” for not being interested in getting a settlement of the difference. Of course, there have always been the uniformed in the churches of Christ who could never give any reason for not using an instrument, and, therefore, did not really oppose it. These have no grounds for objections, call them “slackers” or anything else. But that is not what Brother Witty means. He thinks he is spanning the active preachers and other brethren who have not had any confidence in the possible outcome of the “Unity Movement,” except to get all who will to go to the grounds held by the Christian Churches, or at best (or worst) reach the compromise agreement. We have known from the first day of their “movement” that the users of the instrument have not the least thought of yielding it and coming to the New Testament grounds for unity. We have believed from the first that Brother Witty knew they would never yield one inch. Some few individuals might, and they are worth the efforts, but not a strong congregation will do so. At least we doubt that Brother Witty could now lead one to do so. This writer asked him some questions some eight years ago. One was about like this: When the last battle has been fought, the smoke has cleared away, and the Christian churches still hold to the instrument, just where will you stand? He did not bother to answer. Nor will he do so, we think.

Let me quote from his pen. “We have all been contented to let things go on just as we found them when we took over where our fathers left off.” This is a statement of things as they are not, under the claim of being as they are. Doubtless many of us have not been as aggressive in the fight for real unity as we should have been. Perhaps we have not always been as diplomatic as we should have been. But we have been much concerned. We have not been contented. We have lifted our voices in the pulpits, in the papers and on the air against every form of digression from the simple worship the Lord ordained. Some of us have stood ready to meet any advocate of instrumental music any day, either in open battle, if that seemed best, or in a heart to heart talk in effort to “reason together.” We have always stood ready and offering: Show us where the instrument is even permissible, within the scope of divine law under Christ, and we will adopt it.

Brother Witty continues: The time has come when—we must ask God to help us find a way out. And, mind you, God will do it.” As earnest as the editor evidently is in this appeal, honesty demands that we take issue with him. Yes, this writer takes a square issue on both his sentences.

The Jew would be as Scriptural, and far more consistent, if he should appeal to his brethren in the same words. If he should say, “The time has come when we must ask God to send us a Savior. And, mind you, God will do it,” he would be as nearly right as is Brother Witty. The Detroit sage writes as if God has left us in a predicament of division over a thing about which he has not legislated, either in fact or in principle. It is folly to ask God for “a way out” when he has given in the plainest of terms that very “way out.” It is also folly to say God will send a way out, as much so as to say he will send us a Savior. He has already sent both, if the New Testament is reliable!

Brother Witty implies that the difficulty is to be solved, the way out is to be found, by human wisdom, by arriving at the best solution for a division over things perfectly immaterial to God. If he says what he means, then he no longer holds the position that the only way to worship God acceptably is without the instrument. If that is the only worship God accepts, then God has sent us “the way out” when he revealed and described that worship, laying down...
the undying principles of “true worship.” Is the Hebrew looking for a Savior yet to come? He is. Therefore, he would be perfectly consistent to make the statements Brother Witty made. Is Brother Witty looking for a revelation from God, directly or by means of human wisdom, by which we may learn a new way to be united, even by adopting instrumental music? If not, then his statement is amiss the mark of a careful writer. Just a common, country, gospel preacher should know enough about the law of worship and unity not to say a thing like that.

Previous to this bit of information (?) he gave us, he tried to make a comparison between his and Murch’s efforts, and the slow progress made, with that of the Campbells and Scotts of the restoration days. Because those men would not give up in face of opposition and failures at first, therefore the present “Unity Movement” should continue, not expecting to win out for several years. But there is such a vast difference between the two movements and the principles upon which they work that it is amusing that a man should make the blunder of attempted comparison.

The men pleading for a restoration a century ago were in the same position that Brother Witty would be were he pleading for a return to a “thus saith the Lord.” Yes, the Lord has said a lot about unity and against division. But he gave us the exact ground upon which unity “in him” may be found, and it is folly to look for it, and it is anti-gospel to work for it on any other ground. The Campbells and Stones held a position as infallibly correct as is any scientific fact which has fully left the theory stage of investigation. Does Brother Witty mean to insinuate that the giants in that restoration plea were at work with denominational men trying to discover, or invent, a way of unity not definitely and clearly set forth in the New Testament? Does he mean that those men considered any compromise with the men of the denominations? Will he say that his plan for unity is not by our adopting instrumental music at times when unity cannot be had any other way? I do not believe that he will answer this question categorically. Will he say that the New Testament is indefinite as to the kind of worship which must be rendered the Lord? so that in cases we may adopt the practice of the Christian Churches? Will he say that unity is so important that the instrument can be used one time to gain it? Will he say that singing with an instrument is less a sin than to be separated from those who will not give it up? If he answers “yes” to this question, then he must work for adoption of the instrument in all places, for unity can he had over night by our going to the ground of the Christian Churches. If he says “no” to this question-if he says that to worship with the instrument is too serious a departure from the law of the Lord to do so for the sake of unity with those who will not quit it-then he must know that the two groups will never get together and that he is only playing into “the hands of those who have the edge on him in this work. Who for a moment thinks that he thinks that Murch has any intention of ever helping churches discard their practices which we know to be in direct violation to the will of the Lord?

Brother Witty would have the hearty hand of every informed gospel preacher, and all the papers standing opposed to his compromising attitude, if he were standing like Campbell and his co-workers stood. They adopted 1 Peter 4:11 with a human form of expression. They never thought of indicating that the pedobaptists, or any other sectarian, held any possible ground of unity. They did not dream that they could meet the denominations on half way ground, and then reversing the practice for the sake of unity, With them it was come not to us, but to the plainly revealed way of the Lord in the Scriptures. Is that your position in this “Unity” movement, Brother Witty? Has the Lord clearly given a way to worship God “in spirit and in truth?” How far will we have to go toward the Christian Churches’ idea of unity to meet them? How much of the divinely given way of worship will we have to surrender to fully adopt the plan of unity for which you are working?

It is either right or wrong to worship as do the Christian Churches. If it is right, for sake of unity let’s adopt it wholly. If it is wrong, then no word the Lord ever offered the world for unity even remotely suggests that ‘we yield. Will Brother Witty clearly commit himself on the question: Which is the greater sin, for all the churches to adapt the instrument and unite with those, who use it, or refuse to use it at all and keep separated from them? He might answer this question too: Is the use or nonuse of the instrument (all side issues not mentioned now) ‘the real separation from the New Testament standard of church worship? It is not a question as to which group in any given case may show the worse spirit, or which be the kinder and gentler. Suppose that opposers should be harsher in a given case, is it the use or refusal to use mechanical music which is the real departure from the Lord’s standard of acts of worship?

In the latter part of his article Brother Witty got down to rock bottom more nearly than his first pages or my criticisms indicate. He stated nine propositions in effort to cover all possible claims for authority of the instrument in the worship. Then he turned those propositions into questions. Both the propositions and questions indicate a stronger stand against the practice of the Christian Church than the rest of his article allows. If my criticisms misrepresent him in any way, may they serve to bring him out definitely for the only possible ground of unity, so we can know that he is not trying to lead us into acceptance of mechanical music. However strong he may be in determination not to adopt the instrument, he surely knows that Murch and his men are just as determined not to give it up. Then where is unity possible?

COMMENDATIONS

I want to commend you for the excellent piece of work you have done in the special edition of the Banner on J. Frank Norris. I know it must have cost you many hours of painstaking labor which we hope will be rewarded in a wide reading of it. I’m sure it will do much good. I’ll have another article in shortly. Brother Young told me he sent you a check for the extra copies. We will cover the surrounding territory with them.

Wishing you health, happiness, and continued success.

Allen E. Johnson, Roswell, N. M.

I have received your special edition concerning the Norris-Wallace Debate. The same has been read with deep interest. I have learned a number of things from it which I did not know. This issue should have wide circulation among the Fundamentalist Baptist as well as among our own brethren.

-Norman H. Beaman, Detroit, Mich.
CONCERNING CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND CARNAL WARFARE

T. B. WILKINSON

I. DOES H. LEO BOLES WANT A DEBATE?

I have been trying to arrange a debate with Brother H. Leo Boles on the war question. I had been informed by brethren who agree with his position that he wanted such a debate, and had a standing challenge to certain able brethren, and it was suggested that I might want to take it up. Also, in various papers I saw articles by certain brethren that Boles had backed the field down seemingly, and no one was willing to measure sword with him.

Then I received a challenge from a young preacher on his side, who challenged me to debate with him, or rather challenged me to take up the Boles challenge, and debate with him. Some able brethren on my side had expressed a desire to have me meet Boles on the question, and thought such a debate would do good. After I received the challenge, I wrote Brother Wallace about the matter and sent him some correspondence I had received. He replied that he would be interested in such a debate if I could manage to take Boles on, and in another letter said that I would be his choice—if he had a choice—to meet Boles in such a debate.

But Brother Wallace said Boles would not debate, that he had never meant to debate the question from the beginning. He said Boles had a hand-made proposition which he had written, and which he demanded that his opponent accept, or none. He said this hand-made proposition did not state the issue between us, and Boles knew it, and he wrote it that way on purpose to keep from debating, and refused to even consider a proposition which stated the issue between us.

I have known some would-be great debaters who seek a kind of cheap reputation in that very way, and it was hard for me to believe Boles would be that cheap, or needed that kind of reputation. It is a trick the sects often work, and is an evidence of weakness in a debater. No man ever seeks an advantage in the wording of a proposition unless he feels like he needs it, and lacks confidence in his own position. Such debaters are whipped before the debate begins, and I sometimes grant them some advantages, knowing I can force them to defend their true teaching or make them look small before their own followers. Whether Brother Boles knows what the real issue is, or not, his brethren do, and any effort on his part to evade defending it will betray a weakness that he cannot hide.

I sent Brother Boles a proposition which had been accepted by two men on his side of the question as properly stating the issue, and I have their signature to the proposition. I had already learned that Brother Boles would not affirm anything in the debate, and insisted on being in the negative all the way through. Of course, this is always an evidence of weakness in a debater, but I was willing to grant him that much advantage. In the proposition I sent him I agreed to affirm that the Christian on the call of his country is required to bear the sword for all God-ordained purposes. He replied that he could not accept this proposition for it would make him deny that a Christian should do what God ordained for him to do, and he then sent me his own hand-made proposition.

This was a mere quibble. He knows that he teaches the same as I, that there is a God-ordained use for the sword, and that Paul said so. He teaches that the Lord only uses children of the devil to use it, while I had agreed to prove that Christians are also required to use it. His brethren know that this is the issue between us, and I think he knows it, and my proposition stated the real issue. I was assuming the burden of proof all the way through, and giving him the unfair advantage of arguing from a negative standpoint. But I waived this point and sent him another, in which I embodied some of the pet phrases he included in his hand-made proposition, which he had written for his opponent.

In this proposition I agreed to affirm that the Bible teaches that a Christian on the call of his country must bear the sword to execute wrath upon evil doers, and protect the lives and property of the righteous; and when military necessity requires, to kill his country’s enemies, and destroy their property. These last two phrases I copied from his hand made proposition. Now, I thought he would not return a word and we could proceed with the debate.

I wrote him as nice a letter as I knew how, and even offered to discuss it with him without a formal proposition, each one of us setting out our views in an exchange of articles on the subject. This is what we do when we debate the general church question with the sects, and this leaves each opponent free to bring out any point in which he believes his opponent is unscriptural.

Finally I received the following reply which I quote in full. “Dear Brother Wilkinson: Your letter of Feb. 8 received. Do you believe that the Bible teaches that Christians should respond to the call of their country to destroy the property and kill the citizens of another country? If you do believe this why not affirm it? If you do not believe the above statement, then you should not affirm it, I have no disposition to ask a man to affirm that which he does not believe. Yours fraternally, H. Leo Boles.”

He has no disposition to ask any man to affirm what he does not believe, and yet that is what he is doing in
this very short letter. That is what he has been doing with a number of brethren for years, even insisting that they do believe it, like he has stated it, and are so teaching it.

If I will defend Christians fighting in armies engaged in a war of conquest and murder, like the armies of Japan and Germany in this war, then he will debate it with me. No Christians are fighting in the armies of either of those countries and murdering innocent women and children, as well as men, for Christians do not commit murder. If they do, they cease to be Christians and ought to be killed. But the Bible teaches that Christians should fight in the armies which execute wrath upon these murderers, and I am ready to prove it. Do you believe this statement? If not, then why will you not deny it? That is what I teach on this question, and it is what the Bible Banner teaches, and also what the Bible teaches. Are you afraid to discuss this issue, or was it a mistake when the impression got out that you wanted a debate? You know we are not teaching that Christians should fight to help murderers and robbers and will not affirm a proposition which forces us to do it. Our country is not engaged in murder and robbery in this war, but in defense of right and justice.

Brother Boles may not be able to see the difference between a war waged for murder, rape, and robbery, and one waged to put an end to this murder, rape, and robbery, but his brethren can. He may not be able to see any difference between the sword Satan has raised in the land, and the one the Lord ordained to put down this sword of Satan, but most brethren can. This is the sword we teach a Christian is required to use, and we are ready to prove it by the Bible. Brother Boles does not believe a Christian can use any kind of sword, in any kind of war, but refuses to affirm it, and even refuses to deny our proposition when we agree to affirm our teaching. Does he really want a debate?

I am publishing the proposition I have agreed to affirm, and some of the arguments by which I seek to prove it, for the benefit of Brother Boles, and some of his admirers, who say he wants to debate. This is what I teach in all of my writings on the subject, and what the Bible Banner teaches. It is also what Brother Boles has been fighting in his writings, what Lipscomb fought, and what all conscientious objectors are fighting. Will he debate it?

If he wants to reply to this article he can do so, and I think I promise him space in the Bible Banner for a reply of equal length, of course, on the condition that both my article and his reply are published in the Gospel Advocate. Then, if he wants to continue the debate to a reasonable length I am sure arrangements can easily be agreed upon between us. Shall we have the debate? The decision is up to him. If he believes the things I have argued in this article he ought to come out and say so for the sake of peace. If he does not believe them, he should be willing to give his reasons in a brotherly way, or quit talking about a debate, and plainly say that he does not want it. I may have more to say later about my efforts to arrange a proposition with Brother Boles, but that too will depend on what he has to say in the future.
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penalties the Lord required. Man's dominion allowed him the liberty of choosing to obey God's law, or if he preferred, disregard it, and choose a course contrary to it.

We know very little about the laws God gave to the people who lived before the flood. The law against murder must have been different to the one He gave Noah after the flood. We know he did not slay Cain for murdering his brother, and put a mark upon him to prevent others from slaying him. Moses account is very incomplete regarding the world before the flood, and the reason probably is because the Lord meant to make a new beginning with man in Noah's family, and under a new set of laws which would cure many of the evils which brought on the flood.

I agree with Alexander Campbell that all 'authority for war must come from God, and I would add that such authority must come through God's law, since He does not deal with man direct. Before the flood the world was filled with war. Moses called it violence, and this violence seems to have been the chief cause of the flood. This was a severe remedy, and as happens in all war the innocent suffered with the guilty, and all were destroyed.

Noah had lived for five hundred years in a world filled with violence and war, and raised his family in such a world. God wanted to prevent such wars from again corrupting the whole world so he gave man a law which would prevent it, if man would only regard God's law. It was a law which outlawed war and murder, and provided for himself to operate this law, and make it workable.

He delivered this law through Noah, the head of all living, and all government, and through him to his sons and their successors in government. From that date this has been God's law against murder, and against war, for war is murder on a mass scale. It reads as follows, "And surely your blood of your lives will I require. . . At the hands of every man, and at the hands of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso shall shed man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed. For in the image of God made he man." (Gen. 9:5-6.)

This is God's law to prevent murder, and therefore to prevent war, which is mass murder. It pronounced the sentence of death upon all murderers, and made man His minister to execute the sentence, saying, I will require it of man. This makes it man's duty to execute murderers, and he said at the hands of every man, and the hands of every man's brother he would require it. God made man his ministers in executing the sentence of death passed upon all murderers by the Lord. It makes no difference whether it was mass murder as in war, or the murder of a single person, the sentence of death was pronounced by the Lord, and it was made man's duty to execute it. To execute the sentence of the Lord upon murderers, does not make the executioners murderers also, it makes them God's ministers to execute justice in the land.

From Noah this decree passed to his sons, and through them to their successors in government, and this placed it in every government in the world. Thus from the flood civil government has had divine authority to execute murderers of all kinds, therefore a divine right to wage war upon nations engaged in mass murder. It is even stronger than nuptial authority, it is a duty which the Lord requires, and a failure to render it is rebellion against God. It is not a choice with man, God made the choice, and requires man to execute it, by man shall his blood be shed.

This divine decree is what Paul had in mind when he said the powers that be are God's ministers, ordained to execute wrath upon evil doers. The powers that be, said David Lipscomb, are the civil governments of the world. The first war of which we have any account after this decree was delivered was Abraham's war against the four wicked kings who had raised a war of aggression against the five kings among whom Lot lived. He pursued them when he learned what they had done, and slaughtered them. He was God's minister in this case to execute wrath upon them, and restore the captives to their homes.

He had no direct command from God to slaughter these kings, but the decree issued through Noah was all the authority he needed. God had said that by man should their blood be shed, and at every man's hands he would require it, and Abraham was the friend of God. They had shed innocent blood, and they had captured Lot, Abraham's nephew and had attacked three of Abraham's allies, and this seemed to make it all the more his duty to slaughter them. The only word that came from God on this war was after it was over and Abraham was returning home with the captives he had recovered, and stolen goods. Then he met Melchizedec, priest of the most high God, who blessed him, and thus placed the stamp of God's approval on his war.

This divine decree against murder and aggressive war has never been repealed, and the authority it gave man through civil government to execute murderers has never been taken from him. God still requires it of man, and what God requires is a duty which man can only shirk at his own peril. It had not been repealed when Paul wrote Romans thirteen, for he said they were still God's ministers to execute wrath upon evil doers. They were not Satan's ministers whom God had adopted because He had none, but Paul said they were God's ministers, and He ordained them.

During the time of National Israel when God ruled them in person He still left the execution of this sentence in the hands of man. Moses law did not repeal it, even to Israel, but provided procedure through which the civil rulers could make it operate. No covenant made with a single nation could repeal a universal covenant made with all the nations of the earth. Israel's laws against murder were under the same divine decree delivered through Noah, and bound them to a stricter enforcement of the decree than was found in most nations. They could serve as patterns for other nations, and quicken them to a better enforcement of the law. They could even use the same procedure prescribed in the law if they preferred it to any they had been able to, work out for themselves. Men still study the civil laws delivered through Moses, and the laws of many nations are patterned after them in some ways.

Jesus did not repeal this universal law when he came, or interfere in the ordinance of God whereby He had made civil government His ministers to execute wrath upon evil doers. He confirmed the decree to his disciples when
he told them, He that taketh the sword shall also perish by the sword. This is the same law spoken in different words. He taught his disciples, so far as civil govern-
ment is concerned, to render unto Caesar the things which are his.

If an opponent argues that while wars were permitted, and even commanded, in Old Testament times, they are forbidden now, I reply that wars were forbidden then in every sense that they are forbidden now. God forbade killing then in the very sense in which he forbids it now. The execution of murderers was not forbidden then, and it is not forbidden now. The same kind of wars that God approved then, he approves now. To argue different is to assume that God ordained things, and provided ministers to execute them, which he disapproves. Under God's law if there had never been a murderer there would have never been an avenger of blood. If there had never been an aggressive war there would never have been any war.

At this point I want to introduce a quotation from an address delivered by Alexander Campbell, at Wheeling, Virginia in 1848. I find many things in this address that should be preserved, and this is one of them. 'It is important to reiterate that God gave to Noah, and through him to his sons and successors in government, the right to take away in civil justice the life of a murderer. As the world of the ungodly antecedent to the flood during the first five hundred years of Noah's life was given to violence and outrage against each other it was expedient to prevent the same violence and blood shed after the flood, and for this purpose God gave to man, or the human race in Noah's family, the right to exact blood for blood from him who had deliberately, and maliciously taken the life of his fellow. Had not this been first ordained, no war, without a special divine commission from God, could have been sanctioned as lawful and right. Hence, as we say wars were first allowed against those who first waged war against his fellows, and hence were viewed by God as murderers.' This address was printed in the Congressional Record at Washington by special request, and can be found there.

One point I am trying to establish is that there are two different kinds of war that men wage in the world, one kind of war which God condemns, and calls those who wage them murderers, and has pronounced the sentence of death against them. The other kind which God approves, and which He authorized, are wars waged against these murderers, and those who wage them are God's ministers to execute the sentence of death at His command. This is the kind of war Abraham waged, and for which he received God's blessing from God's own high priest, Melchizedec. Naturally this is the only kind of war God's children can engage in, and the kind my proposition calls for in which Christians can fight by God's authority.

Mr. Campbell goes back to Noah as the proper person through which such a decree could be delivered for the whole human race. It had to come through Noah to be universal, and include every nation that would ever exist in the world, for Noah was the head of all living men. Its object was not to cause wars, or promote them, but to prevent them from occurring, or failing at that point, to provide a sword which would be able to pun
ish the guilty, and bring an end to their war. It was not to cause murder, but prevent murder by executing those guilty of it. Paul, in Romans thirteen, places this sword in civil government, and said they were God's ministers ordained for this very purpose, and warned Christians to not resist them.

The only way civil government can act as God's ministers is by the help of its citizens who are as much a part of the government as the rulers are. Had Abraham's servants refused the sword when he set out to arm them, and plead that their conscience would not permit them to slaughter these wicked kings his mission would have fail-
ed. If the citizens of our civil government refuse to use the sword on the same plea our government could not act as God's avenging ministers to execute wrath upon evil doers. His ministers would flunk, and his ordinance go up in smoke from the bombs of Hitler and Hirohito.

Christians as citizens of civil government owe it the duties of service which rightly belong to it. Jesus taught them to render those duties. Bearing the sword for these God-ordained purposes is one of those duties. Therefore, Jesus taught his disciples to bear the sword when demand-
ed to do so, for any purpose for which the sword was given to civil government.

Peter and Paul taught Christians to obey their rulers in all things which properly belonged to them. Paul said, "Render to all their dues, honor to whom honor is due, fear to whom fear, custom to whom custom." He had just told them that they were God's ministers to execute wrath upon evil doers, and ministers of good to those who do good. He said they were ordained of God for this purpose, and that to resist them is to resist the ordinance of God, and they will be damned for resisting. This was no idle threat, but divine truth which was as old as the human race, dating from the family of Noah. He said they were not a terror to good works, but to evil, and those who do good will have praise for them.

These powers that be, of Romans thirteen, are the civil governments of the world. So said David Lipscomb, and he was right. Paul wrote to Titus for all the churches and told him to tell them to "be subject to principalities and powers, to obey magistrates, and to be ready to all good works." (Titus 3:1) From Peter I quote, "Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake; whether it be to the king as supreme, or to governors as sent by him for the punishment of evil doers." This submission to rulers means much more than not violating criminal laws, it means rendering to them the duties citizens owe them.

Of course, we are to obey them only in the things which belong to them; the things which God gave them. Things which He did not give them, He reserved to Himself, and we must render them to God. But keeping the peace, and the use of the sword to punish evil doers, God did give to them, and both Peter and Paul so teach in these passages, God has never taken it from them, or assumed the duty Himself. Jesus did not take it from them, or assume it while he was here in the world. He never gave his church authority to assume it, override it, or attempt to take it unto itself. He left it right where God placed it after the flood, and this makes it responsible for the execu-
tion of this divine law against murder just as it ever has been from the beginning.

This means war when a sword of aggression and murder has been raised in the land. We know this can happen for it has happened to us right now, and we thank God that he has provided us a remedy, and authorized us to use it. Without this sword God provided for us we would have perished in this war, civilization would have perished, and only an act of God like the flood could have ended it. We know it is bad, but still we are glad that God rules his world through law, and shame ourselves because we did not respond to His law sooner than we did.

The right to exact blood for blood was one of the things which Jesus did not commit to his church, or kingdom. It belongs to civil government, given to it by the Lord, and Jesus left it there. He never questioned civil government’s right to it, not even when it unjustly required his blood. He did not place a carnal sword in his kingdom, but he did not take it out of the hands of civil government. To have done so would have rendered them helpless to keep law and order in the world. But since his disciples are citizens of civil government they have the same rights and duties in this respect that all citizens have.

Wars of conquest and aggression are the greatest evils that can beset man in this world. It is not only murder, but mass murder. The sword which God ordained for use against this mass murder is not an evil, but an avenger of evil. What God ordains is not evil, and man does not commit a sin when he obeys God’s commands. Samuel, the prophet of God, slew King Agag with a sword at God’s command, even when that command had been given to another, King Saul. What Samuel did pleased the Lord, and it was no sin. Saul failed to kill King Agag at God’s command, and that was sin, he lost the kingdom and his soul for not doing God’s command:

The Christian’s obligation to use the sword to execute wrath upon evil doers rests upon his duties as a citizen of civil government. It is not a matter of choice with the individual Christian as to whether he meets these duties. God made the choice when He gave the duties, and civil government is bound by God’s choice. Next to God, and between the citizen and God, civil government has the choice as to what citizens shall bear the sword in military service. Not every citizen can render the best service to his country in time of war in the military service. There are other duties to be rendered just as essential as armed service in the military branch, and the government alone is competent to judge such matters.

Paying tax is another duty, and a very essential one. But the individual citizen has no choice in the amount of tax he must pay, and no choice as to paying them. Like bearing the sword, it is one of the things which belong to Caesar, and Jesus said render it. Paul, too, said render to all their dues, and dues are duties, and a Christian has no choice in performing his duties. If the power to whom the duty is due is willing to forgive the duty, release the citizen from it, it has that power, but the one who owes the duty has no such power. If I owe you money, I cannot pay you, you can forgive me the debt, but I can’t release myself from the obligation.

As a citizen we must render those duties on demand, and we cannot plead our obligations to the Lord as an excuse, for the Lord said render them. This is the point around which the question revolves. Is the Christian a citizen of civil government? Does he owe it the same duties that other citizens do? Does conversion to Christ free him from the duties and obligations of citizenship? Does citizenship in the kingdom of Christ cancel citizenship in civil government? Is the Christian still required to render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s?

II

THE CHRISTIAN’S RELATION TO THE SWORD

The Scriptures teach that the carnal sword belongs to civil government, and Christians as citizens are required to use it for all God ordained purposes, including carnal war.

The Scriptures include the Old and New Testament. The scriptures teach by command, precept, example, or logical inference, in one or more than one of these ways. The “sword” does not mean a literal sword, necessarily, but any force that may be used to enforce law, or to execute punishment for the violation of law, including fines, imprisonment, or executions, under the law. Civil government means the governments of this world, the governments under the dominion of men as distinguished from the kingdom of Christ in the passage where He says, My kingdom is not of this world. It is government the Lord ordained for man, but gave man dominion in the same.

One is a citizen whether a born citizen or a naturalized citizen, who has a right to expect all the benefits of a citizen, and relies upon them. They are required to use the sword for all God ordained purposes, and this places the use of it under the supervision of the civil government. Not that all have the same functions in government, or all must act in the same capacity, but all are required to do so on the call of the government. Carnal war is the kind the Lord ordained and which the apostle defined as executing wrath upon evil doers, and which are for the good of the righteous. This would not include wars of aggression since the Lord does not ordain wars of that kind.

The sword does not belong to the individual citizen but to the state, therefore the citizen is authorized to use it only at the command of the civil government. It is the duty of, the state to enforce law and preserve the peace, and it can only do this through the help of its citizens. The citizen is as much a part of the state as the Governor, or any ruler, and it is their duty, ordained of God, to serve in whatever legal capacity they are called, and Christians who are citizens are subject to all duties legally belonging to the State.

A Christian citizen is required to use the sword for all God ordained purposes. He is required to use it in the same sense that he is required to pay taxes. This will not require him to volunteer for military service any more than he volunteers to pay his taxes. The taxes are assessed by the state, and they owe them to the state, and pay them as an obligation they owe to government. It is a citizenship obligation, and men do not pay them as a matter of choice, but of debt, or duty.

This will not require every man to bear arms in the
military sense, regardless of need, or fitness for that line of service. But it is not a matter to be determined by each individual citizen, it is a matter for the government to determine, and more so in great national crisis like the war we are now fighting. One might have scruples about paying taxes for war purposes, or taxes that might be used to buy arms for soldiers, and send them to fields of battle, or taxes that might be wasted by corrupt officials in riotous living. He objects to furnishing money for such evil purposes. If I were a conscientious objector I would refuse to pay taxes to be used by the government for war purposes, and would as willingly go to prison on that score as I would on that of bearing arms.

But we are told that Jesus said pay taxes. Jesus said nothing of the kind. He paid taxes to the Roman government, and told his disciples to render unto Caesar (civil government) the things which belong to it. The things which belong to civil government includes much more than taxes, they include the sword, which they all agree does belong to it. They agree that the sword belongs to civil government by God's ordinance, and if it does then these words of Jesus require the Christian to render it as well as to pay taxes.

Each citizen is a component part of the great body which makes up the state, and there are many lines of service necessary to its operation. No citizen is required to serve in all of them, but in the one where his service is most valuable. The armed service is just one line of service and comparatively few citizens are needed in armed forces except in time of war, and comparatively few then.

Government is divided into three branches, the legislative which makes the laws; the judicial, which judges them; and the executive, which executes them. One branch of government is just as responsible for the kind of laws we have, and the manner of their enforcement, as the other. The common citizen who has given no direct aid to either branch, but who accepts the benefits of them, and who aids them by moral support, by paying taxes to support them, by voting for them, or for men to enforce them, is equally responsible with those who execute them.

In a democracy the government is responsible to the people, and they can make it what they want their government to be. The government is not made up of officials only, but of the whole people, and the officials are merely the men the people have selected to carry out the things they want done. Some people look upon government as something over the people, something above them, but that is not true in the kind of government the Lord ordained. When we say God gave man dominion in civil government we do not mean just one man, but man in the generic, and that government comes closest to what God ordained which is closest to the will of the people, and in which the people as a whole have a voice.

The purpose of the sword as God gave it to civil government is to preserve the peace, and the punishment of evil doers is authorized only because it is necessary to that end. Orderly government is necessary to peace because it regulates the conduct of men towards each other by formulating rules of conduct which we call civil laws, and by providing penalties for those who violate them. Civilization is not possible in the absence of civil government. We know this is true from the fact that regardless of how many people live in a given place, where they have no government, they have no civilization, but are savages instead. In all human experience it has been found that the first essential step toward civilizing savages is to bring about the formation of some kind of civil government, and until this is done all efforts to teach them civilized ways are wasted, Even the gospel is taught them in vain, gospel seed is wasted when planted in such soil.

The carnal sword belongs to civil government. Perhaps no one disposed to deny this fact since it is so universally recognized, but I want to call attention to one or two passages any way. John 18:36: Jesus was before Pilate who had questioned him. He answered, “My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered unto the Jews. But now my kingdom is not from hence.”

Jesus’ kingdom is here contrasted with the kingdom of the world with reference to the carnal sword. If his kingdom had been an earthly one then his servants would have fought with the sword for their king. He recognizes that it would have been their duty to do so, and he said they would have done it. The carnal sword as I have defined it is the power by which earthly governments are upheld, and the Lord ordained the use to which it was assigned, to execute wrath upon evil doers, and for the good of the righteous by maintaining peace. The sword which God gave was not to create violence, nor to break the peace, but to restrain violence, and keep the peace, by punishing -those who break it.

Christians as citizens are a part of the civil government, and are commanded by the Lord, and by the apostles, to render unto it the duties which belong to it. Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, is enough to settle that point forever. But Paul speaking with direct reference to civil government said, Render therefore to all their dues, custom to whom custom is due, fear to whom fear, honor to whom honor. Likewise Peter said, “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 that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of those that do well. For so is the will of God that with well doing you may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.”

The ordinances of men are the laws of men, civil laws, or the laws of civil government. Peter said submit to them, and that this is the will of God that Christians submit to them, which means obey them, and that by so doing they will put to silence the ignorance of foolish men.

Relations between nations are regulated by international law, and many of them are what we call unwritten law. But they are well established, and well understood, and because they bind all nations equally, all are bound to obey them. Treaties between nations are laws as between the nations who are parties to the treaties and they also are international law. International law requires each nation to regulate its own affairs under such laws as their people want, collect taxes and revenues from their own subjects, and execute its own laws with its own sword as it pleases them, and this binds them to not meddle in the affairs of other nations, but to conduct their acts toward others in accord with international law.

For the peace of the world it is just as necessary for
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nations to obey international law as it is for citizens of each state to obey their own civil laws, and a violation of international law by one nation against another is considered a breach of the peace, and attack upon the sovereignty of the other nation, and when flagrant and unprovoked, is considered a cause for war. Peace loving nations always try to settle international disputes without resort to arms, and only resort to arms when all other means have failed. This is as it should be in all cases, national, or international, and only hardened criminals reject it.

But we have criminal nations which provoke wars, and make wars of aggression against peace loving nations. This is a use of the sword the Lord has always condemned, and it would certainly not be correct to say that the Lord ordained that use of the sword. Such wars then become an evil which makes them an object of the sword which the Lord did ordain. The Lord did give each nation a sword to use in cases of this kind, and this use of the sword is war, the only way it can be used. If the Lord ordained this sword he ordained men to use it, and the means to make that sword effect the purpose the Lord had in view, to execute wrath upon evil doers. A failure then to use the sword for this purpose will render the ordinance of God ineffective, and will be rebellion against the ordinance of God, and when man resists the ordinances of God, he is resisting God, and will receive condemnation.

The God-ordained use of the sword is its use under government supervision, and for the purposes God ordained. In the case of unprovoked attack like the one on Pearl Harbor, and the act of Germany in declaring war upon us, and by waging war against our people, and government, all other remedies have failed, and nothing is left our government but a resort to arms. This means the use of the sword God gave us, by the government, through its citizens, for the purpose God ordained when he gave us the sword.

The only way the government can use the sword God gave it is through its citizens. Therefore God ordained for the citizens of civil government to use the sword for all God-ordained purposes. The Christian is a citizen of civil government, and is required by the language of Jesus to render unto civil government the things which belongs to it. No doubt there have been many wars in which both sides in it were evil, and it was merely a matter of dog eat dog, or which side should gain the power, and property, of the other. No man can be justified in fighting in a war of that kind, Christian or otherwise, for no government has a God ordained right to wage a war of that kind. It is not the use of the sword God ordained when he gave it to civil government, therefore it is an unlawful use of it, and those who so use it are outlaws, and criminals. Therefore, it is evident that a Christian cannot fight in such wars, it would make them outlaws and criminals.

The gospel not only does not exempt Christians from civil duties which he owes to the state, but specifically commands him to render them, and to obey the rulers of his country from the king supreme down to the lowest magistrate. If the gospel intended to exempt the Christian from one civil duty, but not from others, then it would have to do so by special legislation, by specific command.

It has been argued that the command, Thou shalt not kill, is such a specific command, But this is not a specific command which applies to Christians only, it applies to all men, and is a general command which all men are required to obey.

It is the unlawful use of the sword that is prohibited in that command, the taking of human life unlawfully. That it does not apply to lawful executions under the law is proven by the fact that the Lord ordained such killings, and made it the duty of civil authorities to execute them. Under the law of Moses we find numbers of offenses for which the Lord provided the death sentence, and required his ministers to execute them. We know it is also true under the gospel, and Paul specifically informs us God ordained a sword for civil authorities, and the use of the sword implies executions.

In not a single instance can we find where Christians are held to be exempt from any duty which rightfully devolves upon citizens. On the other hand we find plenty of passages which require them to render those duties, and to obey them which have the rule, and to be subject to the powers that be. If the sword belongs to civil government as an ordinance of the Lord, and Christians are required to render unto them the things which belong to them, they are required to use the sword when it comes in the line of duty. Let him who can show wherein my conclusions are wrong.

III

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL ON CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND WAR

Alexander Campbell in his writing and speaking did not overlook the subject of a Christian's relations to civil government and war. I have in my possession a copy of an address he delivered at Wheeling, Va., in the year 1848, and which was printed in the Congressional Record in the year 1937 at the request of the Honorable Joseph Shannon, Congressman from Missouri.

I do not know just how much study the author had been able to give to his subject considering the many problems with which he had to deal in launching the great reformation. At the time of the address, questions like that of war, and the millennium, were not live issues like many others over which he was compelled to battle daily, and it is remarkable how he ever found time to devote to the study of so many different problems. On this occasion he spoke on the question, "Has one Christian nation a right to wage war on another Christian nation?"

Of course, there can be but one answer to the question, no Christian nation has a right to wage war on another Christian nation. No Christian nation will wage war on another Christian nation, or any other inoffensive nation for that matter. If they did by that act they would cease to be a Christian nation, and would become a pagan nation. But he did not address his remarks to what I consider to be the proper question for such a discussion. Had the question been, Does a Christian nation have the right to defend itself, and the lives and property of its citizens, against aggressive war from a pagan nation? the answer would have been different, and a different line of argument would have been involved.

He seems to proceed on the hypothesis that there can be no such war as a purely defensive one, that all wars are necessarily offensive wars, and both nations involved in it
are aggressor nations. Had he lived in our times I do not think arguments would be necessary to convince him on this point. I agree that there may be wars in which both sides are aggressors, but I think such wars have been few, and the present war is certainly not one of them.

He calls attention to the fact that Napoleon even claimed that all his wars were defensive wars, but he must have known that Napoleon lied. If not, then he must have been about the only man who did not know it. We could add the names of Hitler and Togo to his list of men who claim they are fighting defensive wars, but even their own people know they are lying.

He poses this question as a basis for argument, “Suppose England declares war against our country, or that our nation declares war against England: Have we the right as Christians to volunteer, or enlist, or if drafted, to fight against England? Ought our motto to be, ‘our country right or wrong?’ Or has our country a right to compel us to fight or take up arms?”

The question he proposes does not properly present the issue. If our country is wrong we cannot support it in the wrong without being a partaker of its sins. Two wrongs cannot make a right. But if our country is made the subject of an unlawful, aggressive attack from a foreign power, as we know happened at Pearl Harbor, that raises a very different question, and Brother Campbell ignores the possibility of this condition in his argument. In that case I would say that our country should use the sword God has given it to resist such aggression, execute wrath upon the evil doers, and restore peace to the world again. This would involve Christians as citizens, for it is only through its citizens our country can use the sword God gave it.

He correctly says that the Bible is the sole oracular authority on this question, and then asks, “What, then, says the Bible on the subject of war?” Then he answers, “It certainly commended and authorized war among the Jews. God had given to man ever since the flood the right of taking away the life of man for one specific cause. Hence murderers ever since the flood were put to death by express divine authority. He that sheds man’s blood by man shall his blood be shed. He gave authority, however, to one nation whose God and King He assumed to be. As soon as that nation was developed he placed it under His special direction and authority.”

Short as this paragraph is it seems to me that it presents a contradiction, and is somewhat confusing. At first he had the law against murder pronounced by Noah, and dating from the flood, and said from the flood murderers had been executed by express divine authority. Then he seems to teach that this authority was given only to one family, or nation, and that nation one which did not exist until hundreds of years after the flood. He does not bother to tell us how this law against murderers was executed during that long period between the flood and the establishment of Israel as a nation.

As the decree was delivered through, Noah the head of the whole human race it would seem that it was a universal law and applied to all nations. Israel when it became a nation would be under that universal law, but that would not deprive the other nations of the law which Noah gave to them as the head of the race. If he means to confine all divine authority to the laws enacted through Moses, and assumes that it abrogated all past laws to all other nations of the earth, he should have raised the point and offered some proof if such proof exists. That the law of Moses did supersede all other laws to the Jews there can be no doubt, but we have no evidence that it affected the relationship between God and the Gentiles in any sense, and we have plenty of evidence that it did not.

But if he uses the law of Moses as the basis for the authority the Jews had to execute murderers he will have to add some twenty other causes to what he calls one specific cause, that of murder. The law of Moses required the death penalty for many crimes, about twenty I believe, and God must have thought them necessary at that time to preserve the peace.

Without entering into long quotation from the address, I will here state briefly what I understand to be Brother Campbell’s position on war. On the period between the flood and the establishment of the Jewish theocracy his position is somewhat hazy, except the one statement that the law against murder authorized the execution of murderers from the time of the flood, and this implied to war.

Concerning the Jews he speaks very clearly, he says the Bible certainly commanded and authorized war, and God was their king, and their wars were therefore under His divine direction. He seems to trace their authority for wars back to the law given by Noah after the flood, but I cannot see why this would be necessary since God was their king, and the law of Moses had been given to them, and it provided very severe penalties against crime. Once he evidently refers to Abraham’s war against the kings who robbed and sacked the cities of the plains as a kind of war authorized by God, but does not tell how.

But during all of this long period of time in which wars were authorized by divine authority God was supreme king and ruler of the universe, and authorized wars for the punishment of evil doers in all nations, at least up to the time national Israel was established. After this time, so far as any thing we find in the address is concerned, God had dealings only with that single nation, and they only had a divine right to wage wars. But we have evidence sufficient in the Bible to know that this was not true, especially with reference to the kingdom of Babylon, Medo-Persia, and others.

But under the Christian dispensation, he states that the dominion of the universe came under the dominion of King Jesus, and all previous laws concerning war, and the punishment of evil doers, civil and national, came under his jurisdiction. All rule and authority now belongs to him and he has expressly forbidden the taking of life or resistance to evil in the way of carnal force. He does allow however that while the Christian must submit to any humiliation, punishment, or persecution, when offered against him as a Christian, without resistance, he can appeal to Caesar, and demand protection by his sword because he has paid taxes to Caesar, and is entitled to demand protection at his hands.

But he does not presume to inform us where Caesar got authority for his sword, or the power to extend this protection to which Christians are entitled who have paid their taxes. Since all authority now must come from Jesus,
as he affirmed, he must assume that Jesus gave him that authority and power or he arbitrarily assumed it himself. If Jesus did not delegate this authority to him, and he just assumed it, this would be insubordination, presumption, and rebellion, against authority which belonged only to Jesus. If civil government did not have divine authority for the power it? assumed to extend protection through its sword from persecution, and punishments of this kind, could a Christian appeal for it and accept it, without becoming partakers in rebellion against divine authority? Can a Christian accept protection from the devil, even appeal for it, and pay for it, in the way of tax money and other services?

I would be one of the last to question the authority of Jesus in the present dispensation. God has made him head over all things, and he has the right to take over absolute rule in every kingdom on this earth. But Jesus has no authority or right over the kingdoms of this world that God has not had from the beginning of time. But God gave man dominion in the affairs of this world, and Jesus has not taken that dominion from him. God could set up kings, or take them down, at His will, and could exercise any kind of powers over them which seemed good to Him, and Jesus can do the same today. But neither God or Jesus ever saw fit to take this away from man, and with few exceptions, ruled them only by the power put forth in His divine decrees, and laws. The gospel of Jesus was a big advance in the moral powers heaven has exercised over man, and it was all that Jesus added to what had always been God’s methods of ruling the kingdoms of the world.

That the reign of Jesus and his kingdom made one particle of difference between the relations existing between civil government and divine government this speaker did not attempt to show. The Jews charged that it would, but Jesus disavowed it before Pilate, and instructed his disciples to render unto Caesar the things which belonged to him, and unto God the things which belongs to Him. If these two duties enjoined by Jesus conflict they could not possibly obey both of them, and it would have been mockery to require them to do it.

I quote from the address as follows:

“The great law giver addresses his followers in two very distinct respects. First, in reference to their duties to him and ‘their profession, and then in reference to their civil rights, duties, and obligations.’

I have tried at different times to express this same truth, but I never was able to express it in such few words, and so clearly. This is the key to the entire controversy if we will only keep it in mind when reading Scripture, and apply each passage where it properly belongs. Every passage is perfectly clear and harmonious when considered in the light of this truth. The sermon on the Mount is the portion of Scripture which I find most universally misapplied in this respect, and other passages of a similar nature. There are things which belong to God, and there are things which belong in the line of duties, rights, and obligations, to civil government, and inspiration addresses us on both lines:

But again I quote from the address:

So far as any indignity was offered to them, or punishment inflicted upon them as his followers, or for his name, they were to in no way represent it. But in their civil rights he allows them the advantage of the protection of civil law, and for this cause enjoins upon them the payment of all civil dues, and to be subject to every ordinance of man of a purely civil nature not interfering with their duties to him. If a heathen man or a persecutor smite you on one cheek, turn to him the other, if he compels thee to go one mile, go two, if he sue thee at law and take away thy coat, give him thy mantle also, these, and whatever of evil they might receive as disciples of Christ, they must endure without resistance, or resentment.

“But if in their civil relation, or citizen character, they are defrauded, maltreated, or persecuted, they might, and did appeal to Caesar. They paid tribute to civil magistrates that they might protect them, and they therefore can claim this protection. In this view civil magistrates were God’s ministers to the Christian for good, and also as God’s ministers they are revengers to execute wrath upon evil doers. Therefore Christians are in duty bound to render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, and unto God the things which are God’s—to reverence, honor, and support civil magistrates, and when necessary claim their protection.”

In my fumbling way I have tried to express these same truths in most of the articles I have written on this subject, and I am glad to pass them on to the reader in the clear language of this great logician and scholar. But it does seem to me that he attempts to set it all aside in his very next paragraph, and render them meaningless. He says he cannot possibly see how a Christian, who is to live peaceably with all men as much as lieth in him, and who has the sword of the Spirit, could enlist to fight the battles of Caesar, Hannibal, or Napoleon. Neither can I. Of course, the reference to the names of Caesar, Hannibal, and Napoleon, can only have the effect of evading the proper question at issue. Neither of these men ever fought a war which a Christian, or any other good man, could fight without becoming a party to their aggression, and therefore a partaker of their crimes. They never fought a war that was not a war of conquest, murder of innocent victims, and robbery, and such wars are wholly of the devil. But what about their innocent victims? If a Christian should happen to be a citizen in one of the nations who were made the victim of this murder and aggression, and their country should require their aid in resisting this aggression, that would present a different kind of problem. They would be ministers of God, according to Brother Campbell, in resisting these murderers, and using a sword God had given them. The same God who ordained the sword of the Spirit also ordained the carnal sword, and if Brother Campbell will keep his rule in mind he can find a place for each in the world, appointed to it by divine authority. The Christian has duties which involves both swords, one line of duty belonging to Caesar, the other belonging to God, or the things of God, and Jesus instructed his disciples to render both services in their own proper fields.

What Alexander Campbell taught about civil government is not to be accepted as authority any more than what any other well informed Christian might have taught upon the subject. But Campbell was a well informed Christian scholar and what he taught upon any subject does have weight, but not the weight of authority. Only inspired men could speak with authority.

In the address delivered in 1848, he seemed to recognize some four different kinds of civil government, Pagan, Jewish, Mohamedan, and Christian. The Jewish government...
recognized as being under the rule of the God of heaven, but it no longer exists in the world. His address deals principally with what he calls Christian nations, and Pagan nations. I am sure all he means by Christian nations are those nations in which the Christian religion dominates the civilization, and in this sense I think he uses the expression correctly. This is borne out by his statement that in a proper sense no such thing as a Christian nation exists in the world. If every man and woman in a government were Christians it would still be a worldly government, and have to do only with the material things of life. Only the church, or kingdom of God, can properly be called a Christian nation, and that in a spiritual sense.

But it is with respect to the Christian’s relationship to civil government that we are now concerned, and how Campbell viewed it. We have many now who claim that a Christian is no longer a citizen in the worldly government, he left that back in the world of sin when he was converted. They claim citizenship in heaven cancels citizenship in the earthly government, and the Christian is forbidden to have any fellowship with it, except in the single exception of paying taxes. They claim Jesus made an exception in this respect, and taught his disciples to pay them.

From page 11 of his address on the subject of war I quote, “But as we are under neither a pagan government nor a Jewish government, but professionally under a Christian government, we ought to hear what the present King of the Universe has enacted upon this subject. The maxims of the Great Teacher, and Supreme Philantropist are, one would think, to be the final decision of the question. The Great Lawgiver addresses his followers in two very distinct respects; first, in reference to their duties to him, and their own profession, and then in reference to their civil rights, duties, and obligations.”

Then the Christian does have civil rights, duties, and obligations, and their Great Lawgiver addresses them in regard to these duties in a manner very distinct from the manner in which He addresses them in regard to their duties to Him, and their own Christian profession. Two distinct lines of teaching, and therefore two distinct lines of duties, are here set forth for the Christian. This is only to repeat in different words what Jesus taught his disciples, “Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, and unto God the things which are God’s.”

But he amplifies and explains this principle as follows, “So far as any indignity was offered to them or any punishment inflicted upon them as His followers, or for His name sake, they were in no way to resent it. But in their civil rights He allows them the advantages of protection of civil law, and for this cause enjoins upon them the payment of all of their political dues; and to be subject to every ordinance of man of a purely civil nature not interfering with their obligations to Him.”

He illustrates this principle further: “If a heathen man smite you on one cheek turn to him the other. If he compels you to go one mile go two. If he sue thee at law and take away thy coat, let him have thy mantle also etc. These and whatever else of evil treatment they might receive as disciples of Christ, they must for His sake endure without resistance or resentment. But if in their citizen relations, or character, they are defrauded, maltreated, or persecuted, they might, and they did appeal unto Caesar... In this view of the matter civil magistrates were God’s minister’s to the Christian for good. And also as God’s ministers they were revengers to execute wrath upon him those who do evil. Therefore Christians are in duty bound to render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar’s, and to God the things which are Gods-to reverence, honor, and support, the civil magistrates, and when necessary to claim his protection.”

From these brief paragraphs we learn a number of things which I think ‘settles the question of the Christians attitude toward civil government. There are certain things which belongs to civil government, or as he says to Caesar, and magistrates, who represent civil government. They are God’s ministers to the Christian for good because they can afford him protection from those who would malign, punish, persecute, and defraud, him. And they are God’s ministers as revengers to execute wrath upon evil doers, and as Paul said they do not bear the sword in vain.

Then the carnal sword belongs to civil government, and it is authorized as God’s minister to use it to protect the Christian in his citizen rights, and to execute wrath upon evil doers. But the Christian not only has citizen rights which he can claim, but he also has civil duties, and obligations, which he must render to civil government. These duties and obligations they must render to civil government to be entitled to these citizen rights, and protection. They are not only to pay all of their political dues, but to be subject to every ordinance of man a purely civil nature which does not interfere with their obligations to God.

But the use of the carnal sword for the protection of the righteous, and the execution of wrath upon evil doers, is one of these civil duties which the citizen must render to his government. And it does not interfere with man’s relations with God since God ordained it, and required this use of it. It is one of the things which belongs to Caesar’s kingdom, and without which his kingdom could not afford the protection here mentioned, or execute wrath upon evil doers. It is a duty which the citizen owes to the government, and must therefore render.

In each of these three paragraphs he clearly recognizes the Christian as a citizen of the civil government, not only entitled to claim its benefits, but as bound to render it the duties and obligations which rightly belong to it, and which do not interfere with his relationship to God. We learn also that their great law giver addresses them in two distinct senses, one with reference to their duties to him, and then with reference to their rights, duties, and obligations as citizens of the civil government.

Any evil inflicted upon them as His followers, and for his name’s sake, they are not to resist, or resent. But evils inflicted upon them as citizens, they were to resist, and can and did appeal unto the civil magistrates for protection, they were entitled to such protection as the law afforded them as citizens, and could, and did demand it. Thus we find that the same act of violence in the way of punishing, or persecuting a Christian might come under either head. It is only when it is offered against the Christian because of the name of Christ, or because they are His disciples, that they must submit to it without resentment.

But if it is offered as a violation of his citizen rights,
he is not to submit to it without resentment, or resistance, but could appeal to the state for redress, and protection, like any other citizen could. In the early ages of the church I am sure many Christians were persecuted for no other purpose or reason than the fact that they were Christians, they were persecuted for His name, and because they were His disciples. To such Peter said, If any suffer as a Christian let him not be ashamed, but let him glorify God in this name. They were not to fight back, or in any way resist, but submit meekly for His name's sake. When such submission will bring honor and glory to His name the Christian must submit to it.

The martyrdom of Stephen was such a case. No doubt it had a profound effect upon the Jews who constituted the mob who stoned him. But in another case, almost similar, Paul refused to submit to death at the hands of a Jewish mob, but appealed to the civil authorities for protection, and got it from them on the grounds of his Roman citizenship. He not only got protection from the mob who were bent on murdering him because of what he preached, but had his case removed from their hands, and carried to the courts of Caesar. In this case it seems that both of Brother Campbell's rules applied. He was being persecuted for the name of Christ, and his rights as a Roman citizen were being violated. If this is true, and I don't see how any one can deny it, then a Christian has a right to appeal to the civil authorities for protection against religious persecution where such is obtainable. At least, Paul did it, and he was an inspired apostle.

Down in Phillipi, too, Paul appealed to his Roman citizenship when the officials who beat and bound him and cast him into prison without a trial, and uncondemned. When they found he was a Roman citizen they were afraid, and wanted to smuggle him out of the prison privately. Not so, said Paul, they have beaten us openly and uncondemmed, being Romans, and now they would thrust us out privily. Let them come and bring us out. This was an appeal by Paul for his rights as a Roman citizen, to be brought out openly, and discharged by the magistrates in a legal manner, and they were glad to do it. Paul could have carried the matter further, and caused them no little trouble, and they were afraid he would.

Paul was a Roman citizen and plead his rights as such, even though a Christian, and an apostle of the Lord. Paul had his citizenship in heaven, but he also had a citizenship upon earth, and he had rights, duties, and obligations, which he owed to both, and could claim in both. Paul is our example, "Be ye followers of me, even as I am a follower of Christ." Paul was right in claiming his Roman citizenship, and the rights which it afforded him against persecution. We are right when we claim our American citizenship, and it does not conflict with our citizenship in heaven. **But to claim its benefits is to admit the duties and obligations which go with it, and Jesus has told us to render them.**

IV  
**DAVID LIPSCOMB AND CIVIL GOVERNMENT**

David Lipscomb was a great man, a great writer, and a great Christian, and did as much to build up the cause of Christ as many perhaps since the days of Campbell. Martin Luther was a great man. But the greatness of any man does not make any error that he taught less pernicious for evil, it makes it more powerful, and adds greater reason why it should be exposed. **Lipscomb taught error on the subject of civil government and I propose to prove it, and that his teaching on that question has done great harm to the cause.**

I do not propose a review of the entire book at this time, but it is a job that I think some man should do if the book remains in print, and his admirers continue to advertise it as the voice of the church. But if it can be shown that his entire theory of civil government is wrong, the entire book is discredited, and he is convicted of forcing an evil upon the church. He was a conscientious objector, but he was logical enough to know that if he belonged to a civil government he would owe it whatever duties and obligations that belonged to it, and as a citizen render them, even if it required him to bear arms.

From page 66 of his book I quote: "Christ recognized the kingdoms of the world as the kingdoms of the devil, and that they should all be rooted up, that all institutions of the world save the kingdom of heaven should be prevailed over by the gates of hell."

In this short paragraph there are three statements, and not one of them is true. First, Jesus did not admit that the kingdoms of the world belonged to the devil. There is no hint that Jesus admitted the devil's claim to them. That the devil did claim them there is no doubt. But the devil has claimed many things which did not belong to him. Once he claimed the body of Moses, and disputed with the angel Gabriel over it. Once he claimed Job, and disputed with the God of heaven over him. But he is such an awful liar that we should always be on guard when he says a thing. He lied when he said he owned all the kingdoms of this world and could give them to whomsoever he would, I know he lied. He is not greater than God, and God said he gave those kingdoms to whomsoever He would, and I believe it. Jesus knew he was lying and shows it in the answer he made to him in the very passage cited. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and Him shalt thou serve," is a denial of Satan's claim.

Second, Jesus did not say that all of the kingdoms of the world shall be rooted up. He did say that every plant which the heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted up, but that cannot refer to civil government for God planted it. He ordained it for man and if he ordained it, He planted it. God uses it, too, as His minister for good, and to execute wrath upon evil doers. There are many plants in the world which God did not plant, but civil government is not one of them. God planted civil government, and gave man dominion in it, and holds him to strict account for the way he exercises that dominion.

Third, it is no where said in the Bible that the gates of hell will prevail over civil government. Will the devil prevail over himself? If the civil governments all belong to the devil, and he rules them as he wills, why would he try to prevail over them? Later Brother Lipscomb says the kingdom of God came to the earth to destroy civil government, came as their enemy, and it will destroy them, he said. Now he says the gates of hell will prevail against them. Does he mean Jesus will fail in what he came to do and call on the devil to finish the job for him? Or does he mean the devil has been helping him all the
time? It seems to me that Brother Lipscomb has got his wires badly tangled on civil government.

Again he says: "Christ therefore was recognized from before his birth as coming to make war on human governments, and as their enemy; and rulers sought from his birth to kill him."

This is a strange mixture of truth and fiction, which makes it all the more dangerous, since truth will not mix with error. The error destroys the truth, poisons it, and makes it vicious. Satan has always been skillful in using half truth to deceive man, it is his most effective weapon. Some people did think he was coming as a rival to the kingdoms of this world, and therefore an enemy, but God never said he was. Jesus always denied it to the day of his death. My kingdom is not of this world, he told Pilate. Herod thought it was of this world and tried to kill him. The apostle never did fully understand the difference until Pentecost. The Jews expected a material kingdom also, and the premillennialists insist to this day that he came to set up such a kingdom, but the Jews refused to accept him.

That was the charge upon which the Jews secured his conviction. If thou let this man go thou art not Caesar's friends, they said. Then Pilate said take him away and crucify him. The apostles understood him on Pentecost, but Brother Lipscomb had not learned it, and the Jews and the premillennialist have not learned it yet. YOU cannot make the kingdom of Jesus a rival of the kingdoms of this world without making it material like them. Of the same kind, and with the same kind of work to do.

This is the fundamental error of premillennialism, and the rock upon which the theory goes to pieces. Had he wanted a material kingdom he could have set up one and all the powers of hell, and earth, could not have prevented it. But if he had done so he would have taken the dominion from man which God gave to him in the beginning, and relieved man of the responsibility. This would have made man a mere machine, and tool in the hands of his almighty king, and would have reversed God's method of dealing with man from the beginning. No wonder so much of Brother Lipscomb's writings encourages premillennialism. I have never considered him a premillennialist but on account of his peculiar teaching on civil government, his writings do encourage the theory, and lead weaker disciples into it.

Note another statement: "Here the human governments are placed among the powers of the wicked one, and their entire work is against the church; and the Christian must needs arm himself with the whole armor of God to withstand them as the enemies of God."

The passage of Scripture upon which he bases this statement reads as follows: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."

In this passage the apostle recognizes two kinds of powers, one we do wrestle against, and the other we do not. We do not wrestle against flesh and blood, material kingdoms, but we do wrestle against the other kind which are not flesh and blood. Brother Lipscomb says we wrestle against human kingdoms, but they are flesh and blood, or material. Paul said we do not wrestle against flesh and blood, and in another prominent passage he tells us to not resist the powers that be, for they are the ministers of God to us for good; and both Paul and Peter tells us to obey them, submit to them, and pay tribute to them. Jesus said the same thing, 'he said render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's.

Then we are told to not resist the civil governments, but we are told to resist the principalities and powers, the rulers of the darkness of this world. Then what are the powers against which we do wrestle? Paul explains it in few words in the passage itself, it is spiritual wickedness in high places. These are the things against which we wrestle, and for which fight we are armed with the armor of God. Spiritual wickedness in high places. Since Jesus and the apostles told us to not wrestle against civil government, but to obey it, and submit ourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, we know that Paul is not now telling us to wrestle against them, and fight them as an enemy. According to Brother Lipscomb we have the Christian armed to fight against civil government, and Jesus and two of his apostles forbidding us to use it. Paul even goes so far as to tell us we will be damned if we do use it. We must not resist the powers that be.

If all, Brother Lipscomb meant by the gates of hell prevailing over the kingdoms of this world is that they will end when time ends, then I would agree with him. But they will be here when time ends, and they will be gathered to the judgment, every nation under heaven will be in the judgment. But the reign of Christ ends at that time as well. He turns the kingdom back to the Father that God may be all in all. I hope he would not say that the gates of hell prevailed over the reign of Christ.

Paul was not announcing some new principle to the church in Ephesus in this passage. They had witnessed his mighty struggle against the principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places, for two eventful years in Ephesus. They had seen him use the armor against these powers of darkness which he recommends to them, and knew it had not been directed against the civil government one single time. One of those principalities and powers against which he had wrestled valiantly was Diana of the Ephesians, and we are told they had thirty thousand gods, all heads of powers of darkness which was spiritual wickedness in high places. Of course, the devil was at the head of all of them, the supreme head.

These principalities had fought Paul from the day of his entrance into Ephesus, and he had wrestled with them, but the civil government had not interfered, it had rather protected him from the mobs. He even appealed to it for protection against these followers of the powers of darkness, and got it. He said he had done nothing against Caesar, therefore he had not wrestled against his government, but had fought this spiritual wickedness in high places. Brother Lipscomb would have us believe in a mighty campaign to destroy the Roman government, Paul went into the city of Ephesus, and declared open warfare on it. Paul went into Ephesus under the protection the civil government afforded him to fight spiritual wickedness in high places, and he waged a mighty war against them. Without the protection afforded him by the civil government Paul would have perished in Ephesus, the powers of darkness would have destroyed him. This illustrates...
use God makes of civil government, and shows us his wisdom in ordaining them from the beginning.

That is the only protection gospel preachers have today and if it was taken away they would soon be driven from their pulpits. Mobs of fanatics would drive them out and hang them as criminals. They almost do it yet in spite of the protection guaranteed us by the civil government. These are the powers of darkness the Christian wrestles with, and against which God has provided armor, not the civil government God ordained for our good.

If the kingdoms of this world belonged to the devil there would be no wars between them if Jesus understood the devil, and told the truth. He said Satan is not divided against himself, therefore will not fight himself, and destroy his own kingdom. But if civil government belongs to man, and is a gift from God for man's good, then Satan would want to raise wars between them. He would not be fighting himself, but fighting against God, and man.

If this is true, and we know it must be, then we can understand why God gave civil government a carnal sword, the very kind Satan uses, to execute His wrath upon evil doers. Satan interferes in the civil governments God gave to man, deceives them, misleads them, and raises wars between them. God's sword is to put down these wars and restore peace and order between the nations. In a like manner it is to be used to preserve peace and order in the civil government. Without it we could have no peace and order for criminals would prevent it.

An inconsistency I see with many "conscientious objectors" lies in the fact that they raise no objections to the use of the sword to preserve peace within the civil government. They will even sit on juries which try murderers, bank robbers, rapers of women, and other vile criminals, and say they do not object to the death penalty for such criminals, or life imprisonment. But when it comes to criminals nations they draw the line. They must be allowed to continue to kill and murder, and they say let God stop them if he wants them stopped. One preacher has taunted me with lack of faith in the power of God to stop them because I say God uses human instrumentality in stopping them. The sects also taunt me in the same way because I argue God uses human instrumentality in saving souls. He said God would stop Germany and Japan when He is ready to stop them. I reply, yes, He will stop them when we are ready to use the sword he gave us to stop them. But if we cowardly lay down the sword He gave us He will not stop them. He gave us a sword for that purpose.

At this time I shall call attention to only one more statement in the book. I quote: "Every act of affiliation, partnership, friendship, or treaty, with them was regarded and punished as treason against God."

This statement and one accompanying it that it was regarded as spiritual adultery, is absolutely false. I wondered if he had overlooked Joseph on the throne of Egypt, brought to it by the help of God. Did God elevate Joseph to high rule in Egypt just to make a traitor of him? Did God make an adulterer of Joseph who refused to commit adultery with Potiphar's wife, and went to prison for it?

Then there was Daniel over in Babylon whom God made ruler in the kingdom of Nebuchadnezzar. The King set Daniel over all the province of Babylon, and God brought it about. Daniel also comes in for blame. He begged the King to set Meshach, Shadrach and Abednego, rulers in the province of Babylon and he did. Then there was Mordecai, and Nehemiah who wrote a book, all traitors to God, and God made them such, and made them spiritual adulterers! He preserved them in the den of lions, the fiery furnace, and from destruction by their enemies, just to save them for a much worse fate, eternal condemnation as traitors and adulterers, according to the Lipscomb book.

It seems to me that a great mind like David Lipscomb could have seen the contradiction in the two ends of his theory. He has the kingdom of God coming to the earth as the enemy of civil government, to fight against them, and destroy them, and then invites the devil in to do the job. The gates of hell, he said, won the final victory over them, not the kingdom of God. The gates of hell will prevail over all of the kingdoms of earth, but the kingdom of God, he said. But in the beginning, and in his basic premise, he has the gates of hell already prevailing over them. He said they all belonged to the devil, therefore the gates of hell had prevailed over them. And he has Satan fighting against himself, a thing Jesus said he would not do. He has Satan's kingdom divided against itself and destroying itself, in spite of the fact that he now says the kingdom of heaven came to the earth to wage that fight and win that victory, which he concludes that the devil won in the end.

V

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW FOR THE WORLD

Genesis 9:5-9, is constitutional law for the world. Given at the fountain head through Noah, it binds all civil governments great and small. Constitutional law does not usually prescribe procedure: it states the law in principle, and the procedure for its enforcement is left to the lesser powers, whose duty it is to carry out the law. Thus when God issued His divine decree—"And surely your blood of your lives will I require... at the hands of every man; at the hands of every man's brother will I require the life of man. Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of God created he man"—he was stating a principle, but not prescribing how it should be executed.

He took matters into his own hands with the murderers who lived before the flood. He destroyed them with a flood of water. This was the greatest execution of murderers this world has ever witnessed, even much greater than the one now being witnessed, as the sword of God closes in on the murderers from Germany and Japan, who started their wild career of mass murder in this war. The only hint we get from this constitutional law is that its decree shall be executed by man himself, and not by some direct act of God, like the flood. "By man shall his blood be shed." Man is made responsible for executing the law, under procedure he himself must work out.

In the beginning the procedure was very simple, and of a most direct kind. Some friend of the slain man, his next of kin, in most cases, would simply slay the murderer, and that would end it. For many centuries the procedure was very crude and imperfect, but as civilization grew, and men and nations multiplied in the world, each nation worked out a procedure of its own, and not all of them could be perfect, if any of them were..
Constitutional law is basic in nature, and laws of procedure must be in harmony with it. Our national constitution is the basic law of all of our many states which operate under it. What ever laws they enact must be in harmony with it, or they will be voided, and cast out. We have a supreme court which sits between our constitution and the statutory laws of procedure passed by the states, and it judges between them. Any law passed by a state is subject to review by this court, and the decisions of this court are final.

But in the case of this constitutional law for the world, the great lawmaker Himself occupies the position of Supreme Judge, and He alone is competent to pass upon the laws of nations enacted to carry out this divine decree. Each nation has worked out its own procedure, they are given that right in the words, “by man shall his blood be shed.” But their procedure must be in harmony with the constitutional law, and accomplish that, and only that, which the constitution authorized—the execution of murderers.

In the Bible we have many accounts of the procedure of various nations with respect to this law on killing, or taking human life; both of that which is unlawful-murder; and that which is lawful—the execution of murderers. We also have accounts of how God viewed this procedure in various cases, either to approve, or disapprove, the acts of men and nations. These may be considered as decision from the Supreme Court on procedure. What God approved in one nation we can be sure He would approve in another nation, under the same conditions, or as a court would say, under the same set of facts.

Let us take the case of Abraham in the slaughter of the kings as an example. It seems very certain that Abraham was operating solely on the authority of the divine decree which came to him through Noah. If he had any further authority from God the Bible is silent as the grave on it, but what more authority would he need? Four kings had come down with their armies and made aggressive war upon the five kings in the cities of the plain, murdered many of their citizens, and carried away their goods, and their people as captives. Among these were Lot who was Abraham’s kinsman, and three of his allies with whom he had confederacy, Aner, Escol, and Mamre, and some of these escaped and told Abraham about it.

Now, please observe that those wicked kings had not bothered Abraham, nor any of his property, and had made no personal attack upon him, as the Japanese did upon us at Pearl Harbor. But they had committed murder according to the decree of God given through Noah, and Abraham considered it his duty to intervene, to execute the sentence of God upon them. They had captured Lot, his nephew, and had carried him away captive, and they had attacked the people of Abraham’s allies, as well as the people of Sodom and Gomorrah, and committed murder in war.

Therefore, Abraham armed his servants, and some of the young men of his three allies, and pursued these kings, overtook them, and slaughtered them in war, and brought back the captives and the booty. What right had Abraham to intervene in this war which did not involve him personally? Many would say he had none, it was not his war. But what did God think about Abraham’s war on these murderers? We are fortunate in this case in, that we have a decision from the Supreme Judge of all the world on this very case, and it is one we cannot misunderstand. Melchizedec, priest of the most high God, rendered God’s decision. He met Abraham on his return, from the slaughter of the kings and blessed him in the name of God and said, “Blessed be the most high God Who hath given thine enemies into thy hands.” How were they Abraham’s enemies since they had not molested him? They were Abraham’s enemies because they were enemies of God, and Abraham was called, the friend of God. Any nation which raises the sword in aggressive war is God’s enemy, and the enemy of any nation who is a friend to God, and who wants peace and order on the earth.

In the law of Moses, we have a most complete set of decisions from God, Himself, regarding the procedure of nations in the execution of his constitutional law which requires blood for blood. The procedure which God prescribed for Israel is right because God prescribed it, and God is always right.

Israel, while a chosen people of the Lord for certain specific and high ends, was a civil government in the same sense that other nations were. Her laws were statutory laws, like the laws of our various states, and while they were different in many respects to the laws of any other nation, they corresponded to God’s constitutional law, which required blood for blood. While they were meant for no other nation except Israel, they do serve as examples to all nations in the things God enacted along the lines of moral law.

For the ordinary murderer we find an avenger of blood who as the next of kin, was allowed to slay the murderer at once. This was a law peculiar to Israel. There was always the possibility that the next of kin of a slain man would be prejudiced against the slayer, and would slay many who were not, really guilty of murder out of anger and in the heat of passion. These laws recognized that not all slayers of men were murderers, and the accused was entitled to have his case heard by the people, and judgment rendered thereon. To protect the slayer from the avenger of blood cities of refuge were appointed, three on each side of the Jordan, and the man could flee to any one of these cities and gain protection until his cause could be heard by the judges to find whether he really was a murderer. If he was judged guilty of murder after a fair hearing of his case he was then delivered up to the avenger and executed. This was statutory procedure enacted by the Lord, Himself, for one nation. Some other nations may have had a similar procedure in some respects, or one entirely different in all essential respects, but if it reached the same results, and only the guilty were punished, it was constitutional, and satisfied the law of God requiring blood for blood.

In the matter of war Israel can also be taken as examples for other nations under the divine decree of God. God certainly authorized wars among them for the purpose of vengeance in the name of the Lord. Their enemies were counted God’s enemies, God’s enemies were counted their enemies, and God commanded them to wage war on them; in some cases to exterminate them, man, wo-
man, and child. There were cases where this was necessary to meet the ends of justice, or we know the Lord would not have required it. King Saul was sent by the Lord to slay Amalek man, woman, child, and beast, but Saul did not see it that way. He saved King Agag alive, and the fattest of the cattle, and God rent the kingdom from him for his sin. Samuel told him why the Lord was angry with him and rent the kingdom from him, and he took a sword and slew King Agag before Saul’s eyes, and told him that to obey is better than sacrifice. Samuel said that King Agag had made mothers childless, and that now his mother must be made childless.

This will answer those who argue that all war is sinful because the innocent are made to suffer with the guilty. They say that we cannot punish the guilty if war without causing innocent women and children to suffer; it is much better, they argue, to let the guilty escape. The answer is that aggressive war is evil and God gave man a sword to put it down, and punish the aggressors with death, and he did it, though many innocent people had to suffer. Are they better than God, or will they place their puny wisdom above the wisdom of God? If there was never another murder, there would never be another avenger of blood. If Amalek had not lain in wait for the children of Israel and attacked them, God would never have sent King Saul to wage war on them, and there would have been no war on Amalek.

The avenger of blood who executes the wrath of God upon evil doers is a minister of justice, not a minister of evil. It is not evil to do what God commands, but it is evil when man refuses to do it. Therefore it is evil to refuse to bear the sword God ordained, and any excuse we render for refusing is no better than the one Saul gave. It is better to obey than to make excuses.

What did the four kings do to the cities of the plain that Germany and Japan have not done in their war of aggression? What have the United Nations done that Abraham and his allies did not do? They were God’s enemies and Abraham went out and slaughtered them under God’s divine decree. If Germany and Japan are not God’s enemies, what would they have to do to become his enemies? If they are God’s enemies, and our enemies, how can we be God’s enemies in fighting against them? If Abraham’s servants had pleaded their conscience, and refused the sword, and refused to fight, Abraham’s mission would have failed. God’s enemies would have escaped with their plunder, and their captives, and would soon have been out seeking other people to attack, Abraham the next time, or some other nation they could have overcome and plundered. If our citizens had refused the sword we never could have met the murderous attacks of Japan, and our own women and children would have been slaughtered.

Some nations did foolishly refuse to arm, and resist the murderers of Germany and Japan, and where are they now? Bad as conditions are in those countries, how much worse would they have been if all other nations had been as foolish as they were, and refused to fight?, Hitler and his allies would have destroyed what we have left of civilization, just as they did in the countries they overcame, and they would have reduced the world to barbarism and slavery.

If such men are not God’s enemies, I want some wise man to tell me what a nation would have to do to become God’s enemy. If they are God’s enemies, then why should we not go out and slaughter them as Abraham did? God gave man a sword to execute wrath upon just such criminals, and commanded them to use it for that purpose, and those who refuse to do it cannot please they are God’s friends. God’s friends are those who do what He commands, and their pleas of a weak conscience will please God no better than the excuse of old King Saul. He saved the cattle alive to offer a mighty sacrifice to God. It was an excuse to justify himself for not doing what God commanded. But excuses do not go far with God. He knows why He wants things done, and why they are good, and man’s part is to obey just like Abraham did, and leave the consequences with God. The man who always does this will be blessed as Abraham was.

IV

THE OLDEST LAW IN THE HISTORY OF MAN

Gen 9:5-9: “And surely the blood of your life will I require: at the hand of man, and at the hand of every man’s brother, will I require it. Whoso shall shed man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed, for in the image of God made he man. And behold I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you.” This was the first law given to man after the flood, hence it is the oldest law in the new world, short in the use of words, but tremendous in meaning.

It is a covenant law, as near a unilateral covenant as any the Lord ever made with man. It was delivered to Noah but it was for the entire human race, and for all time to come. “With you, and with your seed after you,” makes it a covenant meant to continue as long as Noah had seed in the world. Read the entire chapter in Genesis and see if you can find one thing mentioned that would ever be changed while man lives upon the earth.

There was a special reason back of the law which requires blood for blood. The world that ended with the flood was one filled with violence, and perpetual war, and bloodshed. Noah had lived five hundred years of his life in such a world, and his sons had grown to manhood, and married their wives, in such a world, and of course they had witnessed these unending wars. God wanted to prevent such violence from again corrupting the world, and this law was given as a preventative against the possibility. It was a law to prevent murder; therefore, a law to prevent war to the extent that they could be prevented. But strange as it may seem it was a law which authorized war, gave it divine sanction, and even required it at the hands of man, for the one specific purpose.

Does it seem strange to you that God would authorize war, while at the same time he condemns war; that he would authorize killing, in the same law in which He condemns killing? But this was God’s way of dealing with this most tremendous problem that ever faced the human race—how to prevent wasting, corrupting war, among the new race which he meant to create from Noah’s family. God knew men would commit murder, they had done so ever since Cain slew his brother Abel.
They had no divine right to do this; and it was wrong and immoral in nature. It would have been wrong if no law against killing had ever been issued. Moral laws are all that way. God enacted them because they were right within themselves, and such laws serve only as reminders to man. It is wrong to steal, lie, commit adultery, murder, and such like, and it was wrong before any law was given forbidding such crimes, and it will always be wrong to commit them.

Positive law is different, positive law is only right because the thing was commanded. Circumcision, animal sacrifices, burning incense, keeping the seventh-day sabbath—were right only because God commanded them. Baptism, the Lord's supper, and such like, are positive laws of this dispensation. It is right for men to do these things now because they are commanded, but the Jews under the Old Covenant had no such laws, therefore it was not wrong when they failed to do them. But, it would be wrong if we failed to do them, it would be sin.

This universal law against killing, which prohibits aggressive war, is a moral law. Therefore it is right, always was right, and always will be right. That it was wrong for the antedeluvian people to wage these wars is proved by the fact that God destroyed them from the face of the earth. What measures God took to prevent such violence before the flood we do not know, but we do know what measures he took to prevent it in the new world, he has told us. I want to briefly analyze this law in its different aspects, and find what it means to us.

"Whoso sheddeth mans blood." This is unlawful, felonious killing. This is the kind God forbids, and for the commission of which he pronounced the death sentence, direct from heaven. "Whoso sheddeth mans blood," includes murder of all kinds, private murder, in the still and darkness of night; murder, committed in anger; murder on the wholesale, on the field of battle. It forbids all murder, but not all killing, or taking of life. Not all killing is murder, under the laws of God and the laws of men. Killing may be accidental, or it may be in self defense, in which cases they would not be murder, and God's penalty would not apply.

"By man shall his blood be shed." This is the penalty of the law, fixed by God, Himself; against murderers. This is authorized killing, and God has 'decreed that man himself must execute the penalty. This killing is not murder because it is not done in malice, nor in anger, but as a matter of justice it is inflicted in the name of the Lord, and by His authority. This does not mean that every man must appoint himself the Lord's executioner, constitute himself judge and jury, try and condemn the guilty, and then proceed to execute him. The murderer must first be apprehended, then he must be heard in his defense, his guilt established by legal and competent testimony, and sentence pronounced in a legal way.

This implies government, and legal procedure. Therefore, the Lord gave the law to the heads of government, to Noah and his sons, and to their successors in government, and to their seed after them; but not to man as an individual. Civil government, and orderly, lawful procedure, is implied all the way through. This is implied also when the Lord added to the law, "For in the image of God was he created." This points to the dignity which man possesses over other created things, the dominion which God gave him over them. The word dominion "means" sovereignty, reigning power, rule, and man was, given this dominion because he is in the image of God.

It took a universal flood of water to put an end to the violence and perpetual war of the old world, and God did not want that to happen again. He told Noah, and covenanted with him, that it should not happen again. But what means did the Lord supply that would prevent the world from becoming as violent as the old world was? He provided this law which created a sword on the side of right and justice, and gave it authority to execute men who raised the sword in murder. This sword of the Lord will counter the sword of Satan which is always raised in murder, and prevent it from again corrupting the whole of mankind as it once did.

This law of God specifically authorizes the execution of murderers, and war against aggressors in any and all nations. This law has never been changed, and it has never been repealed, if you say it has been repealed point me to the passage in God's word which repealed it. It is a moral law, and moral law is eternal, and cannot change without changing the moral principle upon which it rests.

In addition to arguments heretofore advanced I want to add some thoughts on the same lines from that prince of scholars and thinkers, Alexander Campbell. From the same address from which I formerly quoted we have the following:

"It is important, however, to reiterate that God gave to Noah, and through him to his sons, and their successors in government, a divine right to take away in civil justice the life of a murderer. ... And for this cause God gave to man, or the whole human race in Noah's family, to exact blood for blood from him who deliberately, and maliciously takes away the life of his fellow. Had not this been first ordained, no war, without a special divine commission, could be sanctioned as lawful and right. Hence we say that war was first allowed against those who had first waged war against his fellows, and were consequentlly viewed by God as murderers. The first and second wars in the annals of the world were begun by the enemies of God and His people, and reprisals made by Abraham and Moses are said to have been occasioned by the enemies of God and His people.

"But what is most important, and apposite to the occasion, is that these wars waged by God's people were typical in nature, and were waged under a special divine commission, Therefore they were right. For a divine precept authorizing a thing to be done makes it right, absolutely, and forever. The Judge of all the earth can only do that, or authorize that to be done, which is right." Thus we trace civil government back to Noah and his sons, and their successors in government, and find this oldest law in the world delivered to mankind at the fountain head of civil government in the world. This makes it universal because the decree was passed on by Noah to all succeeding heads of government as soon as they came into being.
This sword was given by the Lord to prevent murder, and prevent war, and it has universally had that effect. Do you want to argue, as some have, that if this was its purpose it has miserably failed? How do you know it has failed? How can you know what the world would have been without this law? No law is ever one hundred per cent perfect in preventing crime. We have laws against crimes of every kind on our statute books, but the crimes still persist. Shall we repeal these laws because men still commit the crimes, or refuse to enforce them? This would not cure the crimes, it would increase them a hundred fold.

If there has been failure it is not God that is responsible, nor the law which he gave. Man is responsible, for man was made responsible for the enforcement of the law. “By man shall his blood be shed”-this places the responsibility on man to enforce the law. We have always had wars, and we are having the most bloody war in history right now, but I claim that God’s law has not failed. It has done, and is doing, what God ordained for it, shedding the blood of murderers, and driving the criminals into hiding so the world can again have peace. We are rapidly bringing to an end the reign of terror and blood God’s enemies inaugurated, and we are doing it under the law He gave, and with the sword He ordained.

Who can say what this world would have been without the sword God ordained against murderers? What would the world be on tomorrow if we refused to use the sword God has given us. Some otherwise good preachers have argued with me that we could end this war right now by just refusing to fight with our country’s enemies. That is all, they say, that we need to end it. Just lay down the sword and quit fighting against them, and the war is over! Some people are to be pitied. They think the way to prevent murder is to refuse to punish murderers. Turn the other cheek, they quote, or rather misquote and misapply. We are doing with our sword the very thing God ordained when he gave it to us, and they say we are sinning. We are doing what God commanded, but we will be damned for it. Germany and Japan are doing what God condemned, but we must not punish them for it. No, they say, leave them alone, and God will punish them some day, if he wants them punished.

This law authorized man to execute murderers, and nations who raise the sword against their fellows are murderers, said Mr. Campbell. Had not this been true, he said, no war without a special divine commission could be sanctioned as lawful and right. Since it is true, as Campbell himself, affirms then those who wage war against their fellows have the sanction of heaven, and it is lawful and right.

Answering the question, What then says the Bible about war? he continues, “God certainly authorized, and commanded, wars among the Jews. God had given to man ever since the flood the right to take away in civil justice the life of man for one specific purpose. Hence murderers every since the flood were put to death by express divine authority, ‘He that sheds man blood, by man shall his blood be shed’ He gave authority however to one family, or nation, whose God and King he assumed to be. As soon as that family developed into a nation he placed it under His own special direction and authority. Its government has been called a theocracy, and that of the most absolute type, for certain high ends and purposes in the destinies of mankind-temporal, spiritual, and eternal.”

There is a seeming discrepancy in some parts of this statement, and between it and the quotation formerly given. However, I do not think Mr. Campbell meant to contradict himself, or that he did when rightly understood. He had already told us God gave this divine decree to Noah right after the flood, and through him to his sons and successors in government, and murderers had been executed under it ever since the flood. Then he cannot mean to say in this quotation that it was given only to the family of Abraham who lived hundreds of years after the flood, and not then until four hundred years later they became a nation.

What he must mean to say is that it was given no nation, individually, except the nation of Israel, and in this he would be correct. The other nations all had it through Noah, their great fountain head, for as God told Noah, it was a covenant with him, and his seed after him, which made it perpetual. Israel would have it in the same way, but by special legislation God reenacted it with them, in the law which from Mount Sinai was handed down to them. The same law was given to Israel in the law of Moses, but considerably enlarged, and not only murderers were to be executed, but men guilty of a number of other crimes.

But this was special legislation and did not apply to the other nations of the earth, therefore did not affect them. Israel was made a special nation, as Mr. Campbell said, for certain high ends and purposes in the destinies of mankind-temporal, spiritual, and eternal. But that God’s special covenant with Israel repealed God’s laws, which he covenanted to Noah and his seed, or in any manner affected God’s relationship with other nations I emphatically deny. The high ends and purposes in the destinies of mankind for which Israel was made a special people unto the Lord had to do with giving us our Bible, and providing the world with a redeemer who was to be of the seed of Abraham.

The civil laws of Israel at the beginning was under a more direct supervision of the Lord than those of any other nation. But even with this conceded we know that God left the execution of them in the hands of men, and held them responsible for their execution. Israel had civil government from the wandering days in the wilderness, they had civil courts, with judges in every city, and most of the time a supreme judge over the whole nation.

Abraham must have thought that he had divine authority to wage war against the kings whom he pursued and slaughtered. Melchizedec, who was a priest of the most high God, must have concurred, for he pronounced God’s blessing upon him, and so far as the record shows no subsequent authority had been given him in addition to that which came to him through Noah. He needed no other authority, God had pronounced it right, and decreed that it should be done. Those kings had raised the sword against their fellows, and as Campbell says, God counted them as murderers, and because they had made war on Lot, Abraham’s nephew, and three of Abraham’s allies, he
made it his war, and slaughtered them, and recovered the captives.

This law of God which placed the sword in the hands of civil government, and the execution, of civil laws, in the hands of man has never been repealed. It is as much God's law for mankind, and God's method of enforcing it, as it was the day it was delivered to Noah. "By man shall his blood be shed" makes man responsible for executing the law, this places this sword in mans hands, and consequently in the hands of civil government. God did not take it out of man's hands when He gave the law to Israel, not out of the hands of civil government, but enacted civil laws for them by which it could be enforced.

Jesus recognized that this was true, and reaffirmed the same law in words which means exactly the same the, same law in words which mean exactly the same that, take the sword shall perish with the sword." Compare this with Whoso shall shed man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," and you will see that the thought is the same. And please bear in mind that God did not ordain one murder to offset the other; neither did Jesus mean that. But as Alexander Campbell has so ably set forth, God was issuing a divine decree which authorized the legal execution of murderers at the hands of man himself.

Jesus further recognized that the sword belonged to civil government when he said that his disciples would have fought for him if his kingdom had been of this world. In all of his teaching on the subject, he never once indicated that the civil government did not have the sword by recognized divine right. This emphatically implies that on it rested the authority of God to execute civil law. His own submission to trial in Pilate's court settles that point forever, and especially since he submitted to death on a sentence issued by civil government.

Paul placed the sword in civil government in Romans thirteen and said they are God's ministers to execute wrath upon evil doers. That is where God placed it when He issued His divine decree through Noah right after the flood. "By man shall his blood be shed." Paul must have had this specific law in mind when he said that they are God's ministers to execute wrath upon evil doers. He could not have referred to the law of Moses, it had been nailed to the cross and taken out of the way. And he could not have had in mind the laws which Jesus gave for the sword so far as it was concerned, and ordained a different kind of sword for it. The gospel left. Caesar's sword right where it found it, in civil government, executing wrath upon evil doers, and keeping peace in the world for the good of, the righteous. If his mission in the world was to put an end to God's ordained arrangement in this respect, the Bible is silent about it, and offered nothing that could take its place. He never once hinted that the church could, or that he ever expected that it would.

Paul affirms that God ordained civil government, and ordained the sword which it bears, and he said they do not bear it in vain. Paul appealed to 'it more than once, personally, and his appeal was not in vain. Some argue that the law is in vain because we still have wars, but that is, only man's wisdom, and a wisdom of men who speak from very little information. How can they know what wars we would have had if this law of God had never been given? How can they know that murder would not increase over night if the laws of civil government against murder were all repealed? How can they know how many would-be murderers are., lurking in dark places, longing to strike; but held back from their foul deeds from fear of the law? Who among us would be so foolish as to advise that all laws against murder be repealed?

If the sword God ordained had failed in its purpose, Paul did not seem to know it, he could see the good it was doing, and the good it had done. It has often been misused, I admit, but man and the devil are responsible for that. Man can misuse it, and the devil is always tempting him to do it, as he did Germany and Japan in this war, but in spite of weak man and the devil, it has made a better world for man to live in, and the end is not yet. What God ordained, and commanded, will work good for the human race, and man and the devil cannot prevent it. Without it the world could not have continued.

VII

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND CIVILIZATION

Civilization and civil government have marched hand in hand in all ages of the world. Civil government has sponsored and developed civilization, and in the absence of civil government, civilization perishes. Isolation is the enemy of civilization, it always brings stagnation, and deterioration, and leads in the direction of barbarism. This is clearly proved by the history of China which took an early lead in civilized ways in the world. Chinese culture took an early lead and soon spread over a large part of eastern Asia. Then it became stationary and ceased to grow, China shut herself in, isolated herself, and gradually drifted back into a state of barbarism, great and ponderous, as that nation was. They reached a high state of development, then shut themselves in as a hermit nation within their own lands, and though in number many millions, China became a weak nation.

Of the three types of civilization which took an early lead in the world, those of China, India, and Europe, only the latter has survived to bless the world. India has wielded little influence beyond her own borders. Shut in by seas and mountains they lived to themselves until overcome by foreign conquerors, and they have remained under alien control to this day in spite of their many millions of souls. In Europe alone has there been developed a civilization which has gone to the most distant parts of the earth. Therefore, in the growth and development of civilization, we are chiefly interested in Europe, and its contacts with other parts of the earth in the spread of civilized ways of life.

But our civilization did not originate in Europe, but was to a large degree an imported product from lands to the south and east. It was born in the great river valleys of the Nile, the Tigris, and, the Euphrates, where men. lived and toiled for many centuries, built up the arts, built great empires, and developed settled ways of life, while the people of Europe were mere savage tribes who preyed upon others, and lived an unsettled savage life.

The early culture of Egypt, Mesopotamia, and other parts of the near east spread slowly westward until by the beginning the Christian era it had circled the entire Mediterranean Sea, and broadened out into the civilization of
fruits and grains we have today, learned how to measure and thus the early culture of organized civil government, The world of culture looks back to ancient Greece to antiquity. They originated little that was new, but they distributed to all parts of the Mediterranean world the knowledge as well as the goods of Egypt and Mesopotamia. They early took to the sea for a living, built ships for fishing, and for commerce, and sailed farther and farther abroad until their trading posts occupied most all of the favorable points around the Mediterranean from Asia Minor to the distant coasts of Spain. Many of their settlements, at first mere trading posts, developed into flourishing colonies dominating the surrounding country, and serving as centers through which their civilization was communicated to the people among whom they had settled, and thus the early culture of organized civil government, and civilization, spread to other lands.

I think we must look to Greece for the next great development in human government and civilization. Greece is considered great, not because of numbers, nor from great wealth, nor imperial power, but because of their unusual intellectual powers. The Greek mind was superior to that of any other people known in history, and that is what made them great. In spite of their mistakes which were many and serious, the Greeks did more for human progress in civilization during the three hundred years of their glory than any other ancient people.

The world of culture looks back to ancient Greece today for the beginning of philosophy, history, and literature, and its arts, and sciences. Its architecture in splendid buildings has never been surpassed, and its athletics are still models on the campus of our colleges in many respects. In science they were handicapped from lack of many instruments which we now have, like the microscope, and many other delicate instruments, yet it seems wonderful that the Greeks came so near to understanding many of the modern principles of science. Their thinkers taught that the world was round and came within five per cent of figuring the circumference of the earth, and they thought the sun was the center of the solar system instead of the earth.

The Greeks learned the lesson of democracy but failed to learn the lesson of union. The Greek world, which they called Hellas was divided up into many communities which they called city states. Each city-state was a close ly built and fortified city with the territory surrounding it in which were open villages where lived the farmers. The most important of those city-states was Athens, but each city-state was independent, and conducted its own affairs in a democratic way. The failure of these little states to unite together in a free and equal manner exposed them to attacks from other hostile states. The first of these attacks was from Persia which after conquering Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Asia Minor, sought in the fifth century B. C. to annex Greece to their empire, but for a time were unsuccessful.

But jealousies arose between aristocratic Sparta and democratic Athens, and disastrous suicidal civil wars
broke out which involved all of Greece known in history as the Peloponnesian war. The exhaustion that followed this war enabled Phillip of Macedon and his son, Alexander the Great, to bring the Hellenic city-states under their control. With Greek help Alexander then conquered the Great Persian Empire, but his reign was short. Because of his untimely death. After his death the Greek states again obtained their independence only to waste their energies in further civil wars until they were absorbed by the power of Rome.

But Greek culture continued to endure and spread and at an early date surpassed the Phoenicians as carriers of civilization to backward regions. On the Islands of the Aegean Sea, along the coasts of Asia Minor, on the shores of the Black Sea, in Sicily, Spain, Southern Gaul, and Italy, were planted Greek colonies that flourished into growing cities. And wherever the Greeks went they carried with them their science, their literature, and their civilization, and reproduced the culture of the homeland in many countries. They were the leaders in civilization throughout the Mediterranean world except in eastern lands where the older customs of Egypt had prevailed, and had been little affected until the days of Alexander. His conquests not only meant victory for Greek arms, but the triumph of Greek civilization which continued through all of the Roman period and until the arrival of the Arabs under the sword of Mohammed a thousand years after Alexander. Greek became the universal language from the Euphrates to the Asiatic Sea, and the arts, the philosophies, and the literature, of the Greeks had their influence for ten centuries.

Rome is known in history as the great melting pot of the world. While the Greeks were developing their arts, philosophy, and literature, a city-state was being built up, and slowly laying the foundation of the mightiest empire the world would ever know, far eclipsing the powers of Alexander the Great. It was the mission of Rome to unite the whole Mediterranean basin into one great society or government, and to combine all the culture of the world into one civilization, and prepare the world for the coming of Christ, and the spread of the kingdom of heaven, and the gospel, to every nation under the heavens. They were to spread the wonderful Greek culture, and enrich it by practical lessons in the art of government.

The Romans taught the world of mankind the lesson the Greeks seems to have never learned-the value of organization and cooperation through which vast numbers of men could live together in peace respecting the rights of each other, and all united for the common good. The imperial manner in which they solved this question would not suit the world of today which is far different from those of the ancient world, but it does point to the possibility of finding in our own democratic way the path to peaceful cooperation between the people of many nations.

In most respects the rise of Rome was similar to that of other nations and great empires of the ancient world. Wars and conquest, and wars of defense, were the chief business of the people. For more than four hundred years Rome remained a small city-state, fighting for mere existence with rivals often more powerful than herself. Then came a period of rapid expansion, and within seventy five years (338-264 B.C.) she brought all of Italy under her control. Another century brought the other rival states of the Mediterranean under her control, chief of which was her most dangerous rival, Carthage on the African coast of Sicily, and a great empire had been born that was soon to dominate the entire world.

It has been said that Rome made Romans of them all, and it might also be said that she made them like it. She had learned the value of tolerance for the rights and liberty of sister states in her long struggle, and their material interests as well as her own, and how to work with them for the common good. Her own prosperity was linked with theirs, as her allies were made strong she was made strong, and though stronger than any of them she did not rob them, but shared with her Allies the fruits of all of her victories, and left them to manage their own affairs, and this was the general policy of Rome through the years of her early development.

Later Rome departed from this policy in her dealings with some of her most distant provinces. She appointed governors over them who robbed them and oppressed them. This soon developed a governing clique which became corrupt, and this led to troubles which almost brought the empire to disaster which had been the mistress of the world since the year 133 B. C. Heretofore it had been an aristocratic republic, but Julius Caesar overthrew the republic in a revolution which ended in the defeat of Pompey in the battle of Pharsalus in Greece, and he became the first to wear the imperial crown. Thereafter the empire was governed by a single man, but in the year 48 B. C. Julius Caesar was assassinated, and Augustus, his grand nephew became emperor, and was the ruler when Jesus was born.

Augustus soon wiped out the old aristocracy and replaced it with trained officials who were made to rule the provinces more justly, and for the good of the people they ruled. Gradually Roman citizenship was extended to all parts of the Empire, and the distant provinces gained rights and privileges which belonged only to citizens of Rome. One thing only was denied them, the right of self government, but in the absence of modern methods of representation the rule of the absolute monarch seemed to be the only way of keeping the favored classes from tyrannizing over the people whom they ruled, and bringing back the old spoils evils.

From the time that Julius Caesar became Emperor until the year 180 A. D. there was peace in the world, almost two hundred years of peace, and known to historians as the palmy days of Rome, and a period of progress in human affairs unequaled in all history. It was a fit time for Jesus to come to earth, set up his kingdom, and give man the gospel which would revolutionize the world. In spite of the fact that rulers misunderstood the mission of Jesus, the civilization which Rome had planted made it possible for the gospel to be preached in all parts of the world, and Paul affirmed that it had been preached to every creature under heaven. The two hundred years of peace was an opportunity the Lord did not overlook, and no one but a materialist can fail to see the hand of God working out those ends.

The facts briefly stated in this chapter have been lift-
ed from a common school history used as a text book in the high schools of our country. I have not bothered to make lengthy quotations, the historic facts are so generally known that it would seem like an insult to the readers intelligence to burden them with unnecessary quotations from history. Even one hour spent in reading most any general history covering the period I have covered in these remarks will convince the skeptical-minded that I have stated my facts correctly.

But what practical lesson can we draw from these facts? I think the most important one is the fact that all human progress in civilization has been developed through organized civil government. In the absence of civil government the tendency has never been in the direction of progress and useful development, but in the opposite direction of stagnation, disorder and savagery. Since some form of civil government has been responsible for every advance in civilized life as the record clearly proves we have only to consider the question of what value this progress has been to the human race. Has it been good, or has it been bad for the race?

I am not overlooking the millions of mistakes man has made in his struggles for a better existence in the world, and for better ways of meeting and solving the problems and complications the rapidly growing populations have had to face in the world. Neither am I overlooking the vanity of the human mind, nor the puffed up wisdom of this world which is enmity to God; and if to God, then to man as well, but refer only to the useful things which have blessed the human race, most of which we accept as a matter of course today. The mistakes of civil government have been legion, for man is very weak and fallible, but weak as he is, he has been able to profit by his mistakes, and by God's help has been able to progress.

If I am right in my conclusion that the human race has been able to make all of this useful progress through the influence and help of civil government, under the guiding hand of God, we cannot believe that civil government is an invention of the devil, and leads only to evil.

Just what men have in mind who argue that civil government is an invention of the devil for man's hurt has always been a mystery to me. Just what they mean to substitute in its place when they destroy it, is also a mystery. I know they profess a great love for the church, and claim it satisfies all of their needs in the world, but can they really believe it? Can they make the church material, which the Lord made wholly spiritual, and force it to fill material needs?

It seems to me they will have to do this or turn the great mass of humanity loose to choose their own ways, of life. They will not have to turn them loose, they will already be loose when released from the duties and obligations of civil government, and its restraints. Only a small per cent of them confess allegiance to the church, or submit to its rules and regulations. But even if all were members of the church, a condition we will never see in this world, it still remains that the church does not provide for the material needs of mankind. "My kingdom is not of this world," said Jesus, and he was talking about governments when he said it—his government; and the civil governments of the world. Therefore he said, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's and unto God the things which are God's."

The church completely fills all of man's spiritual needs, but it cannot meet his material needs without becoming a kingdom of this world. Will these brethren resurrect the old experiment of the pope and attempt to combine the material government with the spiritual? It does not help their cause to point out the sins and failures of civil government. This is not argument, it is begging the question. Everything with which man is concerned has its sins and its failures. Must civil government be wholly good to be among the things which the Lord approves? What do we have in the world that is wholly good? Man is not wholly good, even the best of them, not if Paul knew what he was writing. None of the churches were wholly good to whom his letters were written, and none are now. Show me a preacher who claims to be wholly good and I will show you a hypocrite who is wholly bad.

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND UNIVERSAL EMPIRE

Universal empire is civil government but not altogether what the Lord intended when he ordained civil government for man. Universal empire is not government with the consent of the governed, it is government based upon pagan power alone, the power of the sword. The great mass of humanity are held in a kind slavery, and lose the dominion God gave them. This prevents the development of the proper kind of civil government, the kind God ordained for man, and leads to many evils common among which is idol worship.

God broke up the first effort of man to form a universal empire at the Tower of Babel by a miracle, usually referred to as the confusion of tongues. But he probably formed the different races by the same miracle, and scattered them over the face of the earth. This confusion of tongues, and the creation of the races, would result in the formation of many independent civil governments in different parts of the world, of the kind ordained of God. The Lord had a use for these nations. He used them as checks upon each other, one nation used to discipline another. The materialist overlooks the hand of God in the development of the nations, and sees only the hand of man, but God has been present in them from the beginning.

Perhaps the next near approach to universal empire was in Egypt, and it had reached a high state in the days of Moses. But it was not universal in the proper sense, where were many other governments in the world in the days of the Pharaohs, among them Mesopotamia, and many small ones near by including the one to which Moses fled to escape the wrath of the King of Egypt. Then the Assyrian Empire became great, and Mesopotamia, at a date before Babylon became the first nation strong enough to merit the title of a universal empire. These nations had great armies which they sent out in wars of conquest, and were feared by other nations.

These wars of conquest were against smaller nations who had incurred the enmity of the greater nation, or who had something. in the way of goods and chattels which...
they coveted. They were often wars of extermination, only those who could flee to the mountains and forests escaped death, or slavery, and the property of the con-
cquered nations were carried back to enrich the mother
country, along with men, women and children, to be used
as slave labor. Babylon seems to have been the first
nation to bring the idea of universal empire to a more
perfect state, and it is in this Empire that we are able to see
more clearly the hand of God working in the midst of it.
After Babylon, only three other such empires ever existed,
and we know from Daniel's prophecy that no others will
ever exist.

While the evidence is clear that God recognized them
as civil governments, and worked through them for man's
good, the evidence is also clear that He was not pleased
with such a development. It was not in harmony with his
plan when He ordained civil government for man. It led
in the direction of human slavery, idolatry, despotism, op-
pression, ignorance for the masses, and other evils which
are the natural products of human slavery.

Therefore it was while Babylon was in her greatest
glory that God spoke the doom of such empire through his
prophet Daniel. The King had a dream in which he saw
a mighty image, it had a head of gold, arms and breast
of silver, belly of brass, and legs and feet of iron, mixed
with miry clay. This showed how many such empires
the world would know, and why. The kingdom of God
would come to earth, and smite the image on its feet, and
destroy the image. They would become chaff before the
wind, and no place would be found for them. God's king-
dom did come, and it smote the image on the feet, and
introduced such ideas of human liberty and freedom, and
human responsibility to God as to make such human gov-
ernments impossible.

But it did not smite civil government of the kind
God ordained for man, just because man had corrupted it.
It did restore, and make possible for mankind the kind of
civil government which God intended when he gave it.
Satan did the same thing to the church which Jesus and
his apostles established in the world, he led it off into
apostasy. But God did not forsake the church, nor count
the work of His own hands an unclean thing just because
Satan led it into apostasy. He still loved His church.
and it is here today saving souls as never before.

We cannot help but see the parallel between the man-
ner in which Satan corrupted the church, and the manner
in which he corrupted civil government - when he led it into
universal empire. There is the same appeal to human
pride and the vain glory of this world, the same concentra-
tion of power we find in the papacy we also find in uni-
versal empire. It was an easy road to lead ambitious
men into, and to human wisdom it looks more promising
than the road the Lord planned. But man could not see
to the end of that road, he could not see the pitfalls, nor
the sin and corruption to which it led. All he could see
was the worldly glory it promised, and if it led through
rivers of blood that only added to its glory.

It was only after these pagan empires were smitten
by the kingdom of God, and scattered like chaff before
the wind, that the civil governments of the kind ordained
of God could again begin to develop in the world, just as
it was only after the papacy was smitten that the church

\[ \text{of the Lord could again emerge from the great night of}
\text{darkness into which it had been plunged.} \]

Men's attitude, toward war has changed all over the
world during the present decade. Ninety per cent of the
nations of the earth are not only tired of perpetual wars,
but are determined to do something toward seeing that
they shall not occur. Ninety per cent are ready to lay
the sword to rest forever, and to do something to see that
the other ten per cent leaves it at rest. Why not? We use
the sword to curb criminals at home and keep peace be-
tween our citizens, why not use it to keep peace between
the nations? God gave us that sword. He gave no nation
a sword to make wars, or raise wars of conquest, but he
gave civil governments a sword to keep the peace by
executing wrath upon evil doers.

Daniel's prophecy covers all time from the head of gold
to the feet and legs of iron mixed with miry clay, and this
is the image he said the kingdom of God would destroy. This
embraces the four universal empires which ruled the whole
world, and no more. To force it to include more is to
misuse it. It cannot include the civil governments which
preceded the image, nor those which have followed it.
The kingdom of God would smite this image on the feet
and destroy it. It would destroy not only the feet, but the
enitre image, the belly of brass, the breast of silver, and
the head of gold. It would destroy the ideal of universal
empire.

You may wonder how it could destroy those empires
which had been destroyed already by the carnal sword,
or why mention them since they had long since been de-
stroyed. But they had not really been destroyed, that is
the weakness of the carnal sword when separated from
proper ideals. Taken alone it can destroy, crush, and
punish, but will not destroy the ideals of evil doers. It
cannot produce moral reforms unless it is combined with
moral ideals. The pagan sword lacks all moral ideals, but
the sword God gave civil government always has moral
ideals. The gospel furnishes the world with the moral
ideals which those pagan powers lacked. In their case it
was a mere matching of carnal power, Cyrus did not over-
come Babylon because it was evil, he coveted the riches
and glory which Babylon had. In each case it was a mere
transfer of pagan power from one ruler to another, pow-
ers of the same kind.

But the kingdom of God, when it came, planted a dif-
f erent idea of government in the world. It was to be over
all other governments, but it was to be over them through
the ideals it planted in them through the gospel. Jesus
was made head of all government when he ascended on
high, King of kings and Lord of lords. From that time
his was to be the only universal empire in, this world, and
it would be affected through the gospel he gave. Be was
to rule over the governments of this world through the
gospel. It would be foolish to claim that he now rules all
of them in all of their acts, but it would be equally as
foolish to deny that the principles of the gospel have not
permeated them, and like the leaven hidden in the meal is
gradually leavening the whole lump.

The kingdom of heaven did not destroy the Roman
Empire the very day it was established in the world, it
does not work that way. But it set in motion the leaven-
ning power which did destroy it, and Jesus went back to
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heaven, from henceforth expecting until his’ enemies be made his footstools. The same gospel influence, and principles, which destroyed universal empire from the earth, brought back to it independent civil governments of the kind God ordained for man. Representative government in which man in the generic has the dominion, and is responsible to God for the kind it is. The gospel did root up the one kind of government, and banish it from the earth, never to return, but it fosters and encourages the other kind, and they have not been rooted up, nor will be while man needs them. God ordained the latter kind for man’s good, and gave him dominion in them.

I have mentioned the weakness of the carnal sword when separated from moral ideals. That is the weakness of paganism, and always has been. That is a mere matching of carnal power in which the strong overcomes the weak. It only proves one thing, it proves which pagan power is the strongest. But it does not lead to permanent peace, nor work any moral good to any one. Time will shift the balance of power, the weak will become strong, and the strong weak, and the same struggle will be renewed on a bigger and grander scale.

Let us apply this principle to the war we are now fighting. If we are fighting this war just to overcome Germany and Japan, and demonstrate our power over them, we are fighting it in vain. If our ideals in this war are the same as theirs, victory for us would mean no more to the world than victory for them would mean. If we have ideals of conquest, and power over others, as they have, we are not better than they are, and no more pleasing to God. But we have different ideals, we have ideals which were planted in us by the gospel of Jesus. We have ideals of human liberty, freedom to worship God without let or hindrance. They are fighting a war that broke the peace of the world, we are fighting to restore peace to the world, and bring an end to war.

They are using the sword of Satan, we are using the sword of God. The difference is the difference between God and Satan, between heaven and hell, between the gospel of Jesus and paganism. All we ask of them is to lay down Satan’s sword, and we are ready to help them back to the ways of peace. While they wield the sword of Satan we must wield the sword of God, for we are His ministers, trusted with this sword for this very purpose. We are ready to help them heal their wounds which they have unwittingly brought upon themselves. We always have been ready, and we have always helped them, and never did harm them.

All we ask when they are ready to lay down Satan’s sword is permanent peace for the world among all nations great and small. We will help to feed their hungry people, clothe their naked, and rebuild their economic life which they have so ruthlessly thrown away. Is this gospel principle, is this what Jesus preached? This is what we are fighting for, and all we are fighting for. Is this returning good for evil? Is this doing good unto them which do evil? We will do all of this, and much more, when they lay down Satan’s sword, and return to peace.

IX CML GOVERNMENT AND SATAN

Is civil government an invention of Satan? The entire question raised by the conscientious objectors will be settled if we can find the proper answer to this question. If conversion to Christ and Christianity cancels man’s citizenship in the civil government, then the Christian owes it no duties or obligations, not even that of tax paying, and of course, should not be required to bear arms in its defense. On the other hand, if conversion does not cancel man’s citizenship in the civil government, he will owe it all of the duties and obligations which rightly belong to citizenship, and is required by Jesus and the apostles to render them, even to bearing arms for proper purposes. The question of bearing arms is a mere side issue, like paying taxes, and can only be settled by a proper solution of the general question.

If civil government is an invention of the devil and belongs among the powers of darkness against which the apostle tells us we must wrestle, then D. Lipscomb was right when he classed them as the natural enemies of the kingdom of God, and no child of God, in this dispensation or any other, could affiliate with them any more than they could with any other work of darkness. This would not only make it sinful for a child of God to bear arms in defense of the civil government when it is made the subject of unlawful attack, but to perform any other function of government similar to those performed by Joseph in Egypt, or Daniel and others in Babylon, who were made rulers in civil government by God’s own acts.

In a former chapter I have considered civil government from a material standpoint, pointing out some of the many ways in which civil government has been a great blessing to humanity, protecting man from evils which would have destroyed the human race, and developing a civilization which has made it possible for men to live together in large communities in peace, and opened a door for the gospel when in the fullness of time God was ready to give it.

Now I want to examine some of the passages of Scripture relied upon by those who consider civil government an invention of Satan, and the natural enemy of the children of God. I cannot examine all of them in the space allotted, but will consider what I consider the most important ones, and the ones most generally referred to and relied upon. I cheerfully admit that the Christian is to have no part in the unfruitful works of darkness, and if it can be proved that civil government is a work of darkness, and is unfruitful for man’s good, then I will admit that Christians should have no part in civil government.

One of the passages most often referred to is the one in Matt. 4, where the devil offered Jesus all of the kingdoms of the world if he would fall down and worship him. I admit that Satan claimed he had power to give them to him, and that he could give them to whomsoever he would. But those who rely upon this passage overlook the fact that Jesus did not admit what Satan claimed he could do, nor admit Satan’s claims upon the kingdoms of this world. We know he lied when he said he could give them all to Jesus, and we have other passages which declares positively that God sets over the kingdoms of this world whomsoever He wills. Every word Satan said was a lie, and he was tempting Jesus for his own destruction just as
he tempts man. I think it is a poor theory that must rely upon the words of Satan for its proof.

Another passage is Eph. 6:11-13. "Put on the whole armor of God that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God—.

It is assumed that the principalities and powers, the rulers of darkness of this world, means the civil governments of the earth, and that Satan invented them for an evil purpose. I suppose it will be admitted that if Satan invented them it was for an evil purpose, all he does is for an evil purpose. I admit that civil governments are principalities and powers, but deny that they are of the kind Paul is here condemning as evil, and with which he said we must wrestle.

To wrestle with a power is to resist that power, and the same apostle warns the Christian in Rom. 13 against resisting the civil government. He warns the Christian to submit to those who have the rule over them, and Peter commanded them to submit themselves to every ordinance of man, whether it be to kings as supreme, or to governors sent by him for the punishment of evil doers. (1 Pet. 2:3) Of course this means we must submit to them only in those things which belong to them, Jesus explains this fully when he said, "Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's." I also admit that there are principalities and powers which do belong to Satan, with which we are to wrestle, but deny that we are ever commanded to submit to them or obey them.

There are two kinds of dominions, powers, and principalities, in the world, one kind ordained of God, the other kind ordained of Satan, and this latter kind are the ones Paul called the unfruitful works of darkness. He said we should have not fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness. Then what is the flesh and blood the apostle said we do not wrestle against, and the principalities and powers of darkness against which we do wrestle? Civil government belongs in the things of flesh and blood, they deal only in material things, and are of the things which Jesus said belongs to this world, or to Caesar. God ordained civil government for man, and those who minister it are ministers of God for man's good. (Rom. 13:1-7)

Read,' also Col. 1:16: "For by him were all things created that are in heaven and on earth, visible, and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him." Of course, this cannot include things invented by the devil, the unfruitful works of darkness, but the things which were created for God's glory and man's good. He had just told these same Christians that they had been delivered from the power of darkness, and had been translated into the kingdom of God's son. But what was this power of darkness from which they had been delivered? He explains it fully in chapter three, verses 5-8. "Mortify therefore your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affections, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry."

Therefore he said, "put off all of these, anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy, evil communications out of your mouth." Lie not one to another seeing that ye have put off the old man with his deeds." Now, "these were the things which they had. come out of, and which they had put off," and therefore the things which belongs to the unfruitful powers of darkness, the principalities and powers, the rulers of the darkness of this world, the spiritual wickedness in high places, against which he said the man of God must wrestle, and for which struggle he is armed.

That this is true, and that Paul has no reference in this passage to the civil government under which the people lived, was well known to the church in Ephesus who had seen the great apostle battle with this armor for two long years. They knew what the powers were with which Paul wrestled in Ephesus, and they knew he had not wrestled with the civil powers, nor offended them in his preaching, but rather had appealed to them for protection against the wicked powers of Satan with which he did wrestle from the first day he entered among them. Diana of the Ephesians was perhaps the most powerful among these powers of darkness, but they had many others, some authorities say as many as thirty thousand, and Paul wrestled with them. The Jews also were a power of darkness against which the apostle wrestled.

Christians are not of this world, we are told, their citizenship in heaven (Phil 3:21); and they are a holy nation (1 Pet. 2:9); and therefore do not belong to "the nations of the world, but a peculiar people unto the Lord. But this is not a new thing that they have discovered, the same has been true of God's children in all ages of the world. The old patriarchs had no abiding city in this world, their citizenship was in heaven, and they looked for a city whose builder and maker is God, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. (Heb. 11:13) I suppose none of them will claim to be better than Paul. He claimed to be both a Jew, and a Roman. "I am a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city of Cilicia." And this in spite of the fact that he said there is neither Jew nor Greek in Christ. Paul was also a Roman, to the chief captain he said, "Is it lawful to scourge a Roman and uncondemned?"

Paul's citizenship in heaven had not canceled his Roman citizenship. "Tell me, Art thou a Roman? He said, Yea. And the chief captain answered, With a great sum obtained I this freedom. And Paul said, But I was free born. Then they that would have examined him departed, and the chief captain was afraid after he knew that he was a Roman, and because he had "bound him," (Acts 23:1) I think none of us would charge Paul with hypocrisy, and unless we so charge him the point is settled definitely in his case, and unless we are more spiritual than lie, in our case as well. I have never met one of these fellows yet who deny their citizenship in civil government, and claim it has been canceled by their citizenship in heaven, who fail to claim all of the benefits of citizenship which it is put to the test. They are willing to accept all of the benefits of citizenship but refuse to accept the responsibilities of it.

With this point settled, and I think it is settled definitely by the facts enumerated above, the only point remaining is whether the carnal sword properly belongs to civil government. Did God ordain the carnal sword for the punishment of evil doers in the hands of civil government?
Every conscientious objector with whom I have had contact, and they are many, frankly admit that he did. Jesus affirms as much when he said if his kingdom had been of this world his disciples would have fought for him, and both Peter and Paul give positive evidence to that effect, and command Christians to be in submission to them.

Most of the writers for the conscientious objectors which I have read, make much of the fact that we find no large armies during New Testament times, and no great wars being waged. They challenge me to find where Christians were drafted into the Roman army, or where some Christian joined the army and fought in a carnal war. They even say I must do this or lose the argument. They overlook the fact that there were no wars during New Testament times, and none for a hundred years afterwards. The Roman Empire had brought peace to the world, and they did it by their sword, and the Lord chose that as a proper time to launch his kingdom in the world. The only soldiers we find during that two hundred years of peace were in small bands, like the one Cornelius commanded, sent from Rome to preserve the peace, and keep down insurrections in the provinces. They were used to prevent wars, which Satan then, as well as now, was all the time trying to bring about. That is the most important use of the sword, it is much better to prevent war from starting than to fight to end it after it has got under way. The threat of the sword prevents men from committing crimes, that is its greatest value to mankind. But if criminals are not punished when they commit crimes there is no power in the fear of punishment.

We do not know that Cornelius, or any of his band, ever had to take the life of a single man to preserve peace and order in the territory they presided over. But we know they would have done it, and rebellious souls under their jurisdiction knew it, and that fear restrained them. Augustus had not sent this band of men, and others like them in many places, to make war on the people, he sent them to prevent war, and preserve peace, and they did it.

We have a number of men in New Testament times who were converted to Christ who were affiliated with the Roman government in various ways, some as soldiers (Acts 10), even officers in the Roman army, one man the keeper of a prison (Acts 16), one as the treasurer of a great city (Rom. 16:23), and one as a man of great authority under a Queen (Acts 8), and who kept all of her treasures. Of this latter it is said that he went on his way rejoicing after Phillip had baptized him, back to serve his Queen and the country of his adoption. All of these men continued in their callings after they were converted, and I am sure they were better officers for their country after they were converted than they were before. Paul said, “Let every man abide in the calling wherein he is called. Art thou called being a servant? Care not for it. But if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. . . Brethren, let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God.” (1 Cor. 7:20-24).

The only attempt I have seen yet to answer this passage by Paul was from a preacher who claims to be a great debater. He said this passage would make the booze peddler and, the whoremonger continue in their calling. But he was arguing with Paul instead of me, and if he can prove that booze peddling and whoremongering is a calling, and especially one ordained of God, he would have the old apostle in a hot spot. He also thinks little of the calling of the Jailer, Cornelius, the Eunuch, and Erasmus, not to mention all of our soldier boys in the army, to compare them with booze peddlers and whoremongers. I had never thought of booze peddling and whoremongering as a calling, but rather as evil doers whose crimes should be punished by the sword which God gave to His ministers.

Of these Roman officials we know that the Jailer was still abiding in his calling the next day after he was converted when he released Paul and Silas, and sent them on their way. The Ethiopian Eunuch went on his way rejoicing, and Luke spoke very highly of the calling of Cornelius, saying he was devout man, a just man, one that feared God, gave much alms to the people, and prayed to God always. Erasmus was both the treasurer of the great city, and a Christian, and Paul thought it well to mention his official calling in sending his salutation to the brethren. In all of these cases it seems that their callings are mentioned by the inspired writers in a complimentary way, and as men of importance rather than as men of low and vile callings incompatible with Christianity.

I am sure that no one can deny that their conversion to the Christian religion would have made them all better servants in their callings, and would not have interfered in the least with their duties. Regardless of their virtues as Roman officials before their conversion, Christianity would make them better ones, and they could certainly apply the principles of the gospel to their duties, and even the golden rule could be applied to them. And since God ordained civil government, and ordained every duty that any of these men had to perform, it certainly would not be a sin for them to act as God’s ministers just because they were Christians and would perform their many duties in a Christian spirit.

* * * * *

CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND THE BIBLE

We have already learned how civil government developed civilization for mankind, and preserved it for future generations, handing it down from one age to another, and from one nation to another. After the dispersion at the Tower of Babel the human race was scattered over the face of the earth, and men lived a more or less unsettled life. The various families would seek out the most favorable localities, settle there for a number of years and lead a kind of pastoral existence with their herds and flocks, each family living unto itself. Land was there for them to raise such grain crops as they cared to bother with, without money or price, and for a long time they built little in the way of permanent improvements.

When the range would become depleted, or game scarce, they would take up their tents in a body, and driving their herds before them would seek homes in some other locality where natural resources were more promising, and fresh ranges could be found for their flocks and herds. While the beginning of the nations was at the Tower of Babel, it was many centuries before nations of any considerable size existed in the world. First, it was the family form of government with the head of the family making all of the civil regulations, and enforcing them, then the uniting of families into tribes for mutual protection.
against hostile tribes, and later the uniting of the tribes into larger units forming incipient nations.

Beneficial as the great dispersion at the Tower of Babel had been in preserving the memory and worship of the one God for the people it seems to have served its purpose in the period surrounding the times of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the world had practically forgotten God. We have a very incomplete history of the world during that long period of time, but we have enough in our Bible to make us know that while it was very bad, there still were men of great integrity who worshipped God, and who kept His name alive, men like Job, Melchizedec, Abraham, and Jethro, but they were few among the many who worshipped only idols.

But the kind of life they were forced to live did not develop or preserve the kind of civilization the world must have if men were to live and work together in large communities which was becoming imperative as the populations increased, and the habitable portions of the earth were occupied. Such discoveries and inventions as they made would soon be largely lost in their tribal wars instead of being preserved and improved, and passed on to future generations. In countries like Egypt, Mesopotamia, Phoenicia, where the people were permanently settled, and had permanent improvements, valuable discoveries and inventions would be preserved, and improved, and woven into an orderly civilization.

This civilization not only grew in the lands of its birth, but was handed down to other nations which continued to improve and develop them, and we have already learned how our civilization came down to us through the instrumentality of civil government as the population of the world grew and multiplied.

Now we want to know what part civil government had in giving, and preserving our Bible for us. Why did God wait so long before giving man a written revelation of His will? Why did He not have Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob, write the book of Genesis, and other books revealing his will to man? My answer is that God had no nation at hand to whom these books could have been delivered, and who could have preserved them for future generations down to the end of them. He began with Abraham to raise up such a nation, and he finished it in the days of Moses and Joshua. When He had a people ready to receive and preserve such a revelation it was written and delivered to them, and in such a manner that they knew it came from God.

This nation was prepared and trained under the tutelage of the greatest civil government the world had known at that time. God sent them down into Egypt, lock, stock and barrel, and kept them there for four hundred years and until they had multiplied to at least a million souls. Moses, who was to mold these people into the kind of nation God wanted of them, was raised up in the courts of the king of Egypt, and taught all the learning of the Egyptians, which at the time was far superior in the arts of civilization to any other nation on earth. Egypt in spite of her high civilization for that age of the world was steeped in idolatry. But no doubt the sojourn of these people of God among them for four hundred years had tempered their idolatry, and had contributed more to Egyptian civilization than they had received from Egypt in the art of civil government.

But God kept His people in the wilderness for forty years during which time he taught them to loathe the abominations of the Egyptians, and they were given a law which would govern them throughout their national life. This law was given them in a way that made them know that it came from God. Only the five books of Moses had been written at that time, but the people who received them knew the facts around which it was written were all true. They had witnessed the plagues in the land of Egypt, they remembered that night when the destroyer passed through the land, and the miraculous crossing of the Red Sea, and they heard the thunders of Mt. Sinai, and saw the lightnings. They ate the manna for forty years in the wilderness, and drank from the flinty rock that followed them the water that God gave.

The other books of the Old Testament were delivered unto them after they had become a nation in their own land. The books of Joshua and Judges, and the books of Samuel, the Kings, the Chronicles, and other books of that nature, were history that any well informed Jew could have written at the time, and the people knew that the facts related by them were true when they received them. They had lived them, and experienced them, and they were matters of common knowledge.

The prophetic books were different, and rested upon a different kind of evidence, but the evidence was sufficient to make the people accept them as from God, and they afterwards proved themselves when the events they foretold came to pass just as the prophet had written them. The manner in which those books were written and delivered unto the nation prepared to receive them, and the jealous manner in which they preserved their purity of text, is our strongest proof that they came from God and are inspired. Without this nation to receive them and preserve them we never could have had those books.

Regardless of what we think of civil government the fact remains that God did not make a revelation of his will to man in written form until he had a civil government ready to receive it and preserve it. And this nation did preserve it pure for fifteen hundred years and present it to the world at that time in such a manner as to make us know that it was the very book God had given, the basic books of which were written by God's own prepared legislator, Moses. And they were not an obscure people unknown to the nations of the world, God saw to it that they were known to all the nations of the earth.

And to know about these people was to know about their religion, their God, and the book which revealed him to man. What the Jews contributed to the civilization of the world through this book God gave them was of more value than all the other nations had contributed from the beginning of time. It was used to purify what the other nations contributed, weed out that which was evil, and preserve for the race that which was good. They contributed only in material things, while the Bible contributes spiritual things. The material things were valuable in making possible the civilization necessary to man's material well being, but without the moral and spiritual contributed
by the Bible it is just as apt to lead man away, from God, and make him vain to trust in his own powers.

Without some form of civil government the children of Israel never could have been moulded into a nation, and held together as a people, and made to work together to perform the mission God had for them in the world. And without this nation the Bible never could have been prepared for man, and preserved for him through all of the centuries. It would have perished like the myths of other ancient nations. The Jews understood very little of the great purpose God had in mind when He made them into a nation. They accepted it as a special favor to them, and the Bible as their own private property in which other nations could never have a part, but we know now it was given for the whole world.

God not only gave them a civil government and, made them a nation but he made of them a great nation among the nations of the earth. He gave them a government, and a glory, which attracted the attention of the greatest nations in the world, and the things which made them great was their religion and the books in which that religion was revealed. When the kingdom finally fell because of their sins there was not a nation on the earth which did not know about these Jews, and about their religion, and their God, and many of the mightiest kings of the world were made to tremble at the name of Israel’s God.

Nebuchednezzar the king of Babylon knew about the God of heaven, and pretended to worship Him; and the only source from which he could have learned of Him was from the Jews, and their books of revelation. The Jews lost their civil government, they lost their kingdom, but their contribution to the civilization of the world was not lost. Even in their captivity God preserved them as a people, and they preserved faithfully the books he had committed to their keeping, and we have them today just as they were written by the Spirit of God.

The influence of those books on the civilization of the world was never as great as all history as it is today. Just a short time ago we heard the President of one of the three greatest nations of the world take the oath of office, and solemnly promise that he would rule these people as God of heaven, and pretended to worship Him; and the people in and about their religion.

Some of those, backward races may be descendants of nations who once enjoyed the benefits of a high civilization, and a strong government. Through the fortunes of war, or from internal decay brought on by their own corruptions they lost their government and became a sub-j.&. people. Gradually they fell into decay, and lost their civilization, and in time became savages and barbarians.

Civil government is responsible for our code of civil laws, and our entire system of jurisprudence. And it is through the same that ‘civil conduct between citizens is regulated- and they are able to live and work together in peace. Without this code of civil laws no one could be sure at all times what his rights were, or when he was acting within them. Civil law not only defines these rights, but provides means of enforcing them in a manner fair and equal to all citizens. Do we need this code of laws, and the machinery for enforcing them? Have they proved a blessing to humanity, and especially to the righteous?

Are they a stumbling block to criminals who would rob and defraud his neighbor? If so we must thank civil government for them, for it was civil government which gave them to us.

Our public free schools, and system of free education for all, is one of our most cherished blessings. Without organized, cooperative, civil government we could not have them. Without them we would soon become an illiterate, ignorant race of people, and civilization would perish among us. No other conceivable system can be substituted for it, or do for us what it has done. Other systems have been tried, private schools, religious schools, family tutors, but all have failed. The private school, no matter what its nature, can only serve the few.

The pope of Rome undertook to suppress public education, and substitute religious schools in their place,’ but it brought on the dark ages. Rome still hates public education systems sponsored by the state, and does what she can to discourage them where she has power to do so. Where she succeeds, the people degenerate into illiterate, ignorant slaves of a governing class of priests, clerics, and petty
Mexico was cursed by such influence until with the recent years, and we need only go down there to find the effects of such a system.

Any government which stifles public free schools under the supervision of civil government is signing its own death warrant. Any government which encourages them, supports them, and builds them up, is building its own greatness. Our own government is all we need to prove this point. Our country owes more of its greatness to the educational system we have than any other one thing.

One of the most important contributions civil government has made to our civilization is the postal system. The handling and distribution of mail to all parts of the world is a gigantic task, entirely too big for anything short of the government itself. And what would our civilization be without it? Think of the millions of personal letters and communications handled by our postal system every day, and by night as well. While we sleep the letter we wrote yesterday is rushing on its way to its destination ready to be delivered in the morning's mail a thousand miles away. Then think of the millions of magazines, papers, parcels, books, and tracts, rushing to their destination thousands of miles away on the wings of the wind, and we see something of the importance of the postal system.

Can we over estimate the value of the spread of gospel truth through the postal system? It is just as important in the dissemination of knowledge of other kinds. But without cooperative, organized, civil government, we could not have this great blessing. And remember that it took civil government thousands of years to evolve and perfect our postal system as we now have it. Can you see some bad features to it? Some people can always see the bad in everything, but overlook the good. They would even be willing to sacrifice the good in order to destroy the bad.

There is no good thing which Satan cannot use for evil. God created the tree of knowledge of good and evil for a good purpose, but Satan made it a source of evil.

Civil government has provided us with a monetary system, a medium of exchange, which nothing short of organized civil government could handle. We find it a great blessing in every activity of life. Schools could not be maintained without it, commerce and trade by which we live depends upon it. The prosperity and well being, of a people depend upon their monetary system, and it takes a strong, well organized, civil government to maintain a stable monetary system. In some countries they do not have such governments right now, and their money is practically worthless. They call it inflation for lack of a better term, but the real trouble lies in the government, and its stability. The currency of a country is measured by the stability of the government which is back of it. The currency of almost the entire world is now measured by the value of our own dollar. Our money is valuable because the government back of it is strong, and can redeem it dollar for dollar in any market in the world. It will be accepted at its face value for the necessities of life in any part of the world, and that is all of the value money ever has.

I could increase this list of the blessings which civil government has provided for us to most any length, but will let this suffice.

June 1945
WHAT NATIONS ARE ORDAINED OF GOD

In a certain Dallas paper of June 22nd issue I find an exchange between a Brother Ross Weeks, of Texas, and the Query Editor of the paper which made me wonder why men do not think a little before they write so much. All I see wrong in Brother Weeks’ observations is that he does not seem to understand what the word carnal means, and the Editor has not helped him any. The word carnal simply means fleshly, or that which pertains to the fleshly man, and it may be sinful, or not sinful, according to the use man makes of it. All of our appetites are carnal appetites, hunger, thirst, but they are not sinful, unless abused. Everything we do which pertains to the fleshly man is carnal, farming, carpentering, banking, are carnal occupations, and belong to fleshly man.

While man is in the flesh he is compelled to look after fleshly needs, and there is nothing sinful about it, although these are carnal things. We serve God with our body as well as with our spirit, or we don’t serve Him at all, but we are told to keep the body under, and bring it into subjection to the will of God, and not let fleshly appetites dominate and rule our lives. Any use of the sword, or the hoe, or the ax, or saw and hammer, belongs to the carnal man, and a war of defense is just as much a carnal war as is a war of offense, the difference being that the war of offense is inspired by Satan, and is therefore sinful, while a war of defense is one ordained of God to execute wrath upon evil doers, and therefore cannot be sinful without making God a party to the sin. The carnal man is the fleshly man, the body, and it was created by God, and he called it good and very good. When it yields to Satan’s temptations it is bad just to the extent it yields, and the service it renders him is sinful, but the service it renders God is not sinful.

What powers are ordained of God? The only powers Paul had in mind when he said “the powers that be are ordained of God” were the civil powers, one of them being the Roman government, and the spiritual powers, or the church. Satan has access to both, and can corrupt them, and he has been very successful in bringing sin, and offensive features into both. The evil that Satan brings into either through power to deceive and mislead belongs to Satan, and in some churches, and some civil governments, like the governments of Japan and Germany, the devil has complete control over the governments God ordained for the people. But the people can put that evil out, just as they helped the devil to put them in, and the Lord expects them to do it, and will hold them responsible if they fail.

The only way God can put evil out of the church is through man as His agent, He operates through human instrumentality, both in the church and in the civil government. He committed the gospel to earthen vessels, that means carnal vessels, or men, and told them to go preach it to every creature. The entire responsibility is upon man in the civil government and in the church, and if man will keep the devil out of both, and man only can do it, they will be all the Lord ordained for them to be, and will serve the ends of righteousness.

The Lord ordained the devil, said this Editor, for the work he is doing, and then sought to cover up this blunder by adding that He ordained hell to receive the damned. Hell was ordained of God to receive the devil and his angels, just as our government has provided jails for its criminals, but our government did not ordain the crimes they commit, they are responsible for them. God did not create any devil, if He did then the devil is good and very good, and that which is good should be accepted with thanksgiving. God created the being called the devil, but he made himself a devil through disobedience, and rebellion. The word, devil, means a calumniator, traducer, false accuser, while the word, Satan, means adversary, or enemy. So while God created the being who became the devil through rebellion, he did not create him a devil, or Satan, he made himself a devil. God did not create man an evil being, he was good and very good, but man made himself evil.

Yes, the Roman government under which Paul lived, the benefits of which he claimed for himself because he was a free born Roman citizen, was a very bad government in many respects, but Satan, and man as his willing tools, were responsible for all the evil in it. But it was the only government they had, and it was the one Paul taught them to be in subjection to, and it had stabilized society, and maintained law and order, and had prepared a soil into which gospel seed could be sown, and bad as it was, just imagine if you can how much worse the world would have been without any civil government at all.

The powers which be, and which were ordained of God, and which Paul told the Roman Christians to be in subjection to, we can be sure did not include the devil as this Editor argues. Whatever those powers were which he said were ordained of God, he commanded the Christians to not resist them, and told them if they did they would receive to themselves damnation. The Editor says the devil was one of those powers, therefore we are not to resist the devil for if we do we will receive to ourselves damnation. But we are taught also to resist the devil, and if we don’t resist him we will be damned, and now this Editor has proved we will be damned whatever we do about it. We will be damned if we do, and be damned if we don’t.

The Editor says we should remember that civil government came into being because man wanted it; God permitted them. I suppose he must be referring to Israel when they demanded a king like the nations around them, I can see nothing else he could have in mind. But man had civil government thousands of years before that event happened, and Israel had civil government before they had a king. They had civil government from the very day they became a nation, but they did not have a king. We have no king in our civil government now, we have a different form of civil government. They had a form of civil government approved by the Lord under the Judges, and the Judges, were more responsive to the will of God than’a king would be. If a judge became corrupt it was an easy matter to replace him with a better Judge to administer their civil affairs, and the Lord knew the kings would become corrupt.

Man wanted civil government, and the Lord permitted it. The Lord was merely passive in the matter. He just permitted man, under the guiding hand of a benevolent devil, to organize civil governments. All of that stuff about the Lord “ordaining them” is just mere piffle Paul worked off on these brethren in Rome, they were not ordained of the Lord, he just permitted man to have them and the devil to run them. But the devil is nice to the Lord in one way.
when the Lord wants to use one as His minister, he just bor-
rows one from the devil, as avengers of wrath upon him
that doeth evil, for which we should thank the devil, I sup-
pose.

The Editor can see no difference between using the
sword offensively, and defensively, it is all carnal and is of
the devil. We are just as guilty in this war as Germany and
Japan, and just as sure for hell if we raise a sword in de-
'ense of our lives and property as they are for using it to
murder our people, and rob us of our goods. I freely grant
that the devil raised this war, he inspired both Germany
and Japan to make this unprovoked attack upon civilization,
but I deny that the devil raised up a sword among the
United Nations to resist this aggression, he is not that big a
fool.

The sword we are using in this war is the one God
ordained, the avenging sword of God against him that doeth
evil. It is as much the sword of God today as it was in
the days of Joshua and Gideon when it is used for the same
purpose, to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. One
thing I cannot understand, if Satan is running both sides
of this war is why he is letting his arch ministers who started
it for him get such a beating from the allied armies.

Does not the old fool know that this will have a bad effect on
future wars he will want to raise if he lets Germany and
Japan reap nothing but a whirlwind fram it? Had he let
them have a complete victory the next war would have been
a cinch, but it looks now like he is defeating his own pur-
pose in allowing the allied armies to win the war.

Another thing I cannot understand, and that is that if
Satan is the author of civil government why he ever let so
many wholesome laws get into our statute books. These
laws are very severe on crime and criminals, and their
entire effect is to discourage crime, which is what Satan
wants, and encourage righteousness, which is the one thing
he does not want. Does the devil want the people to be
good, and threaten them with severe punishments when
they do evil? We have our laws against murder, theft,
robbery, adultery, perjury, and every other form of evil,
and they have a powerful effect in keeping men from com-
mittting them.

Now since. Satan delights in such crimes, and wants
them increased, and not diminished, why did he pass these
laws against them? Does not the old fool see that in pass-
ning such laws he is defeating his own purpose and helping
him cause of righteousness? The Lord had nothing to do
with passing these laws, and putting them on the statute
books, neither did the Lord's people, they are too pure ac-
ccording to this Editor to meddle in such unclean things as
civil government.

In this country, and in some others I know about, the
levil has done a fair job in giving us wholesome laws which
loes great good in keeping down crime, promoting right-
ousness. Looking over our statute books I would conclude
that if the devil wrote the laws he is not such a bad fellow
after all, maybe some one has lied on him, and he is not
his enemy of righteousness he has been pictured. And the
way he is turning this war in our favor, if he is doing it, and
he is if he is running both sides of it, then he must not be
such a bad fellow. Of course, he gave us a drubbing at the
tart when we were unprepared for the armies he sent
gainst us, but he evened it up in the end, and we should
thank him for the favor. Even if the Lord is giving us the
victory, but had to borrow soldiers from the devil to do it,
we have the devil to thank for lending the Lord such good
soldiers.

I read in a certain paper today where a staff Editor is
trying to answer a close question some brother had asked
him, and he told this brother that God, permitted civil gov-
ernment, and they came into existence because man wanted
them, and God only uses them as ministers of wrath, making
one evil government punish another. Paul said God, or-
dained them, and they are ministers to thee for good, but
this Editor could not see that.

Neither can he see the use God is making of them to
keep down crime within the civil government. He can only
see them when God uses them to punish some other wicked
nation, as He sometimes does. But the important work of
civil government is to preserve law and order within itself,
but the Editor is blind to that work, and he thinks the devil
ordained them, and the Lord only permitted them. He
thinks they belong to Satan by creation instead of by cor-
rupption, and the Lord only borrows them from Satan on
special occasions when He happens to need them. Civil
government is of the Lord, not of the devil, as this Editor
argues.

In this country at least, and in some others that I know
about, the devil has done a mighty good job in giving us a set of
wholesome laws which goes far towards discouraging
crime, and promoting the cause of righteousness. Looking
over the laws on our statute books I would conclude that the
devil is not such a bad fellow after all if he is responsible for
them. In fact I dont see where I could improve on them
much if I had written them myself.

Then about this horrible war, I can agree with the Editor
that the devil started it, and inspired Hitler and the Japs to
attack us, and he wanted it that way. But what I can’t
understand is why then he turned around and went to Rus-
sia, England, and the United States, and had them defeat
his ministers, which they are surely doing, and giving them
a drubbing which will discourage them from ever wanting
to begin another such war. Does he not know that this will
have a bad effect on future wars he will want to start.
Had he let them win their war, it might not have been so
bad, but now it looks like he is defeating himself.

I would not be so foolish as to argue that any civil gov-
ernment is all the Lord wants it to be, man is an essential-
element in all of them, and man is never perfect. But
neither is the church perfect, and some of them are so bad
the Lord simply spews them out of His mouth. Nevertheless
the Lord ordained the church, and it is perfect for the thing
He ordained. But Satan has access to it, and he can cor-
rupt it, and often he is very successful, varying from slight
deflections from the truth to total apostacy from the faith.

Such churches belong to the devil, but he got them
not by creation, but by corrupting the churches the Lord
ordained. That is how he captured the civil governments,
by corrupting them. Satan worms his way into the church-
es, and into civil governments, and corrupts them, and then
claims them as his. All that the Lord ordained, or did
in either, is good, but all that Satan puts into them is evil,
and the Lord expects us to root this evil out of both. That
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is the only way the Lord can do it is through His people as His agents.

The church can only grow and prosper where it has the support of a strong civil government to keep down crime and encourage righteousness. The better the civil government, the better for the church, I wonder ‘who will deny this fact. In the second century the church grew rapidly because five good Emperors followed each other in succession, Nerva, Tragan, Hadrian, and the two Antonines. Also, it grew rapidly after Constantine took the throne, and Theodosius, who is called the Great, and it became almost universal in the Empire. Then men began to meddle with it, and sought to make the church take the place of the civil government, and all they did was to bring about the great apostacy. Jesus found a place for both, so did Paul, and they will no more mix than will oil and water. Each kept in its own proper place and both, are fine for man, but combined and mixed they are unfit for God or men, but may serve the purpose of Satan very well.

XIII

WHAT CHAPLAINS CAN PREACH

In a series of articles in the Firm Foundation R. 0. Ken-ley recently wrote about “pistol packing preachers,” as he calls them; there are a number of rash statements which deserves a further consideration. Among them I find one which I consider a reflection upon the sincerity of the many fine preachers we now have serving as chaplains in the army. I quote, “Christians are not needed as chaplains in the army. If an army chaplain preached the truth to soldiers he would be shot as a saboteur. Happy for the armies of civil government that the chaplains do not preach the truth. I have as much faith in an army chaplain saving a soul as I have in a catholic priest praying one out of purgatory.”

We have many fine young gospel preachers serving as chaplains in the army, and they are preaching to soldiers what they conceive to be the truth, and many soldiers are accepting what they preach, and believe they are saved when they obey it. They were preaching the gospel before they became army chaplains, and sinners were saved under their preaching, even R. 0. Kenley will admit this, I think. They could preach it then without being shot as saboteurs, and Brother Kenley can preach it now and not be shot. Now, if there is some secret truth, which soldiers need, but which other sinners do not need, Brother Kenley should let it out. He must know what it is since he writes so boldly about it.

We don’t want our young preachers shot as saboteurs, and he should point out this truth to them, lest they should let it slip out, and be shot. If there is some secret truth which soldier must hear before the gospel will save them, and the ordinary gospel sermon is not enough, I don’t see how that proves that Christians are not needed in the army to preach it, as he affirms. Unless he means to say that our soldiers in the army are entirely beyond the reach of salvation, I think they would need the gospel above all men, including this secret truth which chaplains cannot preach without being shot. Let them, be shot if that is the price they must pay for preaching the truth. Paul was beheaded for preaching it, and Peter was crucified, and Stephen was stoned to death for preaching the gospel. I don’t know as either of them ever preached this secret truth Brother Ken-ley hints about but does not drag out into the open, but they preached the gospel. And they did not refuse to preach it under the threat of death, why should Brother Kenley?

We go to the record of the preaching of these apostles to find out what sinners must do to be saved. Peter on Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius, Paul in the Philip-pan Jail, Phillip in Samaria, and to the Eunuch, and others and we find out what they preached to sinners. Now, suppose we take all of these sermons of record in the New Testament, and sum all that we find in all of them, what do we find that an army chaplain may not preach to sol-diers today without being shot as a saboteur? Does he claim that these are not fair examples for the thing he is talking about? Then where will he go to find a fair example? Some of these men were soldiers, and one of them was a captain.

Then there was that devout soldier that Cornelius sent down to bring Peter to him. We know that Cornelius, and this devout soldier, needed to hear some word from Peter before they could be saved, and Peter was the man the Lord sent to speak the words. Luke is the man who tells us what Peter preached when he got there, and what they did about it. The Lord and Peter must have thought the words Peter did preach would save Cornelius and his whole house if they accepted it, and Luke tells us they did accept it and were baptized. But what did Peter preach to Cor-nelius that any chaplain may not preach to soldiers today without being shot? But they tell me that Luke does not record all Peter preached. Too bad, indeed, that Luke left out the very thing that Brother Kenley thinks is the one essential to a soldier.

Peter says we were furnished to all things which pertain to life and godliness in the Scriptures, and Brother Ken-ley’s remarks seems to me to be a reflection on both Peter and Luke-Peter for not preaching this essential truth to this Roman soldier, or if he did preach it, Luke for suppressing it, like Brother Kenley does in his article. At least Brother Kenley did not tell us what the essential truth is that chaplains would be shot for preaching.

As there was some truth which Cornelius needed to hear before he could be saved, we naturally suppose it was the very things Peter preached to him. It was not a question of morals with Cornelius, even though he was soldier, and a good one, for only good soldiers can become captains. And though this statement by our brother indicates he thinks salvation is not for soldiers at all, since he said we do not need Christians as chaplains in the army, it does seem that salvation was possible for Cornelius and his sol-diers. It was not piety, prayer, devotion, or the kind of life he was living. He was a devout man, feared God with all of his house, and gave much alms to the people.

But he was not a saved man, he needed to hear words of Peter whereby he and all of his house could be saved. Now, what were those words? Will our Brother say that first of all he must resign his commission and quit the army? Was that what he needed to hear from Peter? Luke tells us what he preached, or pretends to, and there is not one word about him resigning, or quitting the army. If faith, repentance, confession, and baptism, will save Cornelius and leave him in the discharge of his duties in the army of
Rome, why will they not save our boys when they obey the same commands?

Peter expected some objections when he told those Gentiles to be baptized from his Jewish brethren, and was prepared to meet them. God had shown Peter by two miracles that Cornelius was the kind of man the gospel would save, and who was Peter to withstand God? Who is Brother Kenley to withstand God, and say that when our soldiers believe, repent, confess, and are baptized, that they can not also be saved? What would Brother Kenley have said if he had been among those Jewish brethren Peter had with him?

Would he have told him that he had as much faith in a Catholic priest praying a soul out of purgatory as he had in Peter saving a soldier in the Roman army? He would have served an ultimatum on Cornelius right there, the very one I suppose he would serve on soldiers in our army which he thinks would get him shot as a saboteur-resign from the army and lay down the sword or you cannot be saved. Had Peter been foolish enough to do a thing like that, he might have got shot as a saboteur right then, or his head snapped off with a sword. Certain it is that he would get into serious conflict with the Roman government if he had preached anything like that to Cornelius, or to any one else.

And it is no reply to this to say that he did get into trouble with the Roman government, and he did lose his life. It was not from anything Peter preached, or Paul, that caused their death, but a misunderstanding of what they preached, and what the church stood for in the world. Hear Paul on this very point, “Neither against the temple, nor the law of the Jews, nor yet against Caesar have I offended anything at all.” (Acts 25-8.) Hear also what Festus thought of this matter when he reported to King Agrippa, “They brought none accusation of such things as I had supposed. But had certain questions against him of their own superstitions, and of one Jesus which was dead, whom Paul affirmed was alive.” Agrippa also heard the matter, and said Paul could have been at liberty if he had not appealed to Caesar, which proved that he had not offended the government.

But could he have claimed he had not offended it if he had been going about the country with Peter and the other apostles preaching a doctrine that would disband the Roman army, and leave the Emperor without soldiers? The Jews were searching for some excuse to accuse them to the Roman official whom he served an ultimatum on Cornelius right there, the very one I suppose he would serve on soldiers in our army which he thinks would get him shot as a saboteur-resign from the army and lay down the sword or you cannot be saved. Had Peter been foolish enough to do a thing like that, he might have got shot as a saboteur right then, or his head snapped off with a sword. Certain it is that he would get into serious conflict with the Roman government if he had preached anything like that to Cornelius, or to any one else.

And it is no reply to this to say that he did get into trouble with the Roman government, and he did lose his life. It was not from anything Peter preached, or Paul, that caused their death, but a misunderstanding of what they preached, and what the church stood for in the world. Hear Paul on this very point, “Neither against the temple, nor the law of the Jews, nor yet against Caesar have I offended anything at all.” (Acts 25-8.) Hear also what Festus thought of this matter when he reported to King Agrippa, “They brought none accusation of such things as I had supposed. But had certain questions against him of their own superstitions, and of one Jesus which was dead, whom Paul affirmed was alive.” Agrippa also heard the matter, and said Paul could have been at liberty if he had not appealed to Caesar, which proved that he had not offended the government.

But could he have claimed he had not offended it if he had been going about the country with Peter and the other apostles preaching a doctrine that would disband the Roman army, and leave the Emperor without soldiers? The Jews were searching for some excuse to accuse them to the Roman officials, and Brother Kenley admits this would have been sabotage, and they would have been shot. It would be sabotage for our army chaplains to preach it now, and I hope he does not mean to argue that our government is less generous than the Roman Caesars were.

If this is not the truth (?) which he says chaplains cannot preach to our soldiers without being shot as saboteurs! it would be interesting to hear him tell what that truth (?) is. What else can he mention that army chaplains cannot preach freely to our soldiers without being shot? I admit that if our chaplains preached Brother Kenley's theory to our soldiers they might get into trouble with the government, I don't think he would be shot in this country; dishonorably discharged from the army and sent home, perhaps, and he, should be.

It is peculiar how a hobby when once espoused colors all of a man's thinking. Even the gospel loses all of its power to save in the absence of the hobby. It becomes one truth around which all other truth revolves, without it the gospel is powerless to save, but with it all other defects are cured. The premillennial hobby has that effect, and all others that I have known. With the hobby accepted other defects become harmless, but without it you are damned no matter what you do. They need them a catechism much longer than the one Phillip used with the Eunuch.

Brother Kenley could not preach to them if they were in the army fighting for their country. He would preach to them in a way that would get him shot as a saboteur, otherwise he could not save them. Peter missed a fine opportunity to preach this truth (?) down at the house of Cornelius. We don't know whether it was cowardice on his part, or whether he just did not know about it like Brother Kenley does. Paul also missed a fine opportunity in the Phillipian Jail to expound this truth (?) to a Roman official, and pull him out of a job that would damn him if he kept it up, and he left him in the position when he left him the next morning that he found him in.

Had Brother Kenley been the preacher instead of Peter he would have had to refuse to go with that “devout soldier,” down to that other soldier, on the ground that preachers are not needed to preach to soldiers. They could not save them any more than a Catholic priest could pray them out of purgatory, and if he preached them the truth (?) he would be shot as a saboteur. Therefore, Christians are not needed to preach to soldiers in the army.

Christians are not needed as chaplains in the army, affirms this brother. Why are they not needed? Does he mean that. He believes, as I do, that the gospel is the power to give him to be saved? No, I am sure he does not mean that. He believes as I do that the gospel is the power of God unto salvation, and without it there can be no salvation. Then what else can he mean except that there is no salvation for men in the armed forces. Being soldiers alone closes the door of salvation to them, regardless of what else they do. They can believe, repent, confess Christ, and be baptized, but that will not save a soldier. Nevertheless that is all Cornelius was required to do, so far as the record goes.

I don’t know just what reply Brother Kenley might make to this but one able Brother with whom I have discussed, these points boldly asserts that Peter did require Cornelius, and all other soldiers who accepted the gospel, to resign right then, and lay down the sword for all time to come. Repentance, he said, demanded that they do this, just as it required the Jews on Pentecost to renounce Judaism. Nothing short of this would have been genuine repentance, he thinks, and he thinks Peter explained this to him in a part of his sermon which Luke failed to record. He is sure all of this took place though Luke is silent about it, and Peter was, too, so far as the record shows, and so was Paul down at Phillippi. Yes, and Phillip, in his sermon to that Ethiopian official whom he baptized, was also silent on the point.

Their theory is proved by the silence of the Scriptures, and he said this silence proved as much for his side as it did for mine. I affirm that the apostles preached every thing that is essential to salvation, and the inspired men who wrote it gave us all of the essential items. Not one essential item is left to the silence of the Scriptures, nor to guess work, or conjecture. Where the Bible speaks, we speak.
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and where it is silent, we are silent. But they spake where the Bible is silent, and say all will be damned who will not heed them.

One brother thinks this point belongs under the head of duty as Christians, and Peter taught them later they would have to resign from the army as a work of the flesh which they must put off. He even thought Cornelius should have forthwith become a preacher, even as he is, and devote all of his energies to the work of the ministry. And if Cornelius, then all other converts should do the same, and then who would pay the preacher for his work? The sisters, maybe, but unless they were widows they would all be preachers wives, or preachers children, and poor preachers at that, for their pay would sure be scanty.

Yes, it was a work of the flesh, or fleshly work, that Cornelius, and the jailer were doing, but so also is farming, carpentering, banking, and bakers, and candle stick makers, and even tent making. Paul made tents and that was a work of the flesh, which they say Christians must lay aside if they want to be saved. Paul labored with his hands that he might preach the gospel without charge to one church, not that it was right, for he said it was a wrong. And the members of that church no doubt had good jobs at which they worked, and could have paid him, but he did not even require this of them, much less require them all to become preachers.

All Christians are teachers, and should be, but they cannot all be preachers as this brother argued, for then they would all have the same office, and Paul asked, Where would the body be? While there is but one body there are many members, but all members do not have the same office, or gifts. Lots of preachers that I know could serve the Lord much better on a farm than they can in the pulpit, and do more good for the cause. In fact some of them do more harm than they do good, and the church would be better off without them in the pulpit.

Paul did not think all Christians should become preachers, hear him on the point, “Let every man abide in the calling wherein he was called. Art thou called being a servant? Care not for it. „Brethren let every man wherein he is called therein abide with God.” (1 Cor. 7-20-24,) That would leave Cornelius and the Jailer in the same calling the apostles found them in, and if any differences are to be made in different callings the apostles would have told us. That was why the apostles left them right where they found them, much to the chagrin of these brethren.

**XIV**

**HEROD AND PILATE ARE MADE FRIENDS**

“And in that same day Herod and Pilate were made friends, for before this they were enmies.” Sometimes we find strange bed fellows, but in every case it will be found that they are united as one in some peculiar theory which they consider the hub around which the gospel revolves. The hob-nobbing of the premillennial members of the church with J. Frank Norris at the Wallace-Norris, debate is a good example. To them premillennialism is the hub around which the gospel revolves, and all other things are nesses.

I was made to remember this incident in the trial of Jesus when I received a clipping in a letter from a brother with strong Russellite leanings who since his apostasy from the faith holds a morbid hatred for the church, and for all preachers of the gospel who refuse to follow his apostacy into Russellite. This Brother is a Russellite of the ancient order, the kind invented by Russell in person, and he spends all of his waking hours reading our papers and hunting for something to criticise in the writings of our preachers. Then he writes them personal letters containing his criticism, inviting them to measure arms with him, and seeking a point in which he can slip in his Russellite. He even criticised my short article on “Is Sprinkling And Pouring Baptism,” published in the Banner a short time ago, and proceeded to show me that though I am right, I am still wrong. You can well imagine his delight when he saw an article by one of the “unmentionables” criticising my recent article in the Firm Foundation on “Who can speak for the church on the war question,” from a man supposed to be a brother preacher of the church of Christ. Like Hitler in the war he never overlooks an opportunity to drive a wedge between his enemies. So he sends me a copy of the article and a personal letter, and his letter is meant to drive the wedge home, and prove we are hopelessly divided.

I do not know the brother nor the paper in which the criticism appeared, but suppose he is a conscientious objector, and among those who have been making so much noise since the war began. I would have been glad to receive the article in a proper manner, and more so if the spirit of the criticism had been more fair, but it was neither fair nor constructive. He misrepresents my article in the Firm Foundation and slanders every preacher who differs from him on the question, calls them carnal, and says they drive wedges of hatred and distrust into the body of Christ, not only on this question, but all others on which their carnal natures stimulates a battle.

He resurrected the “pistol packing preacher” slogan of Brother Kenley, suin’ lawyer,” and thinks it should be published in the paper that published his criticism of me. He then calls especial attention to my article on “Who can speak for the church”, misrepresents it to readers who never saw my article, laments the fact that we do not do a little investigating before we take up pen to write, calls us “war-minded preachers” who turn out reams of paper in a time of paper shortage to justify ourselves as enlisting officers without portfolio, and says that in our conception of our ability to appeal to the majority we show our indifference to the teaching of the New Testament, and show open defiance to the principles of the Sermon on the Mount. He calls us “saintly scribes,” who will not face them in debate, but says our “inward spirit urges us to burn the midnight oil to drive a wedge of hatred and distrust into the body of Christ, not only on this question, but on any other question our carnal natures stimulate us to battle, and concludes, “a chronic mental bellicose I would call it.”

This is the supposed argument in a nutshell, and if it were even true, the spirit in which it was delivered would destroy its value. I learned long ago that the best way to make an opponent in debate angry and desperate is to make an argument he cannot meet, then the fireworks begin. I am sure if these preachers could meet the arguments on this question they would make an honest effort to do it instead of venting their spleen in name calling, making false charges, and misrepresenting the position of those they consider their enemies.
I do not know the age of the brother but believe I can assure him that I spent more years in investigating this subject before I ever wrote a word on it than he has been living in the world. I may be as ignorant as he seems to think I am, but I still think I have forgotten more on the subject than he has ever been able to learn, and still know more than he will ever learn, unless he is willing to approach the matter in a more reverent manner, and with a better spirit. I want to be right on the subject because I considered it one of great importance, and I listened to both sides for around forty years with an open mind, and my mind is as clear on what the Bible teaches on this subject as any other.

Now a few words about this Russellite bed fellow of the brother (J. R. Lynn, of Arkansas) who sent me the clipping. He pasted it on the left side of a sheet of paper, and wrote his letter on the right side, and this suggested the idea of good bed fellows to me. Two of a kind, a "conscientious objector" preacher, and a Russellite, and we might include Jehovah Witnesses and the Mennonites with them.

I quote from the letter: "You claim the church of Christ is the angel which is in process of binding Satan so he cannot deceive the nations. Yet you urge body members of Christ whose citizenship is in heaven to take up a carnal sword in warfare to perpetuate war among non-Christian nations who are fighting and killing for the sole purpose of factional supremacy of material power. The supremacy of the church is not the issue in this war among nations."

I don't think I ever read so short a paragraph which contains so much that is false, and so little that is true. In no article have I ever advised a Christian as such to take up arms. But if I have advised them to obey them who have the rule over them, to submit themselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, to be in submission to the powers that be, and to render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things which are God's. The reason I teach this is because Jesus and the apostles taught it, and if this requires them as citizens of the government to bear arms for all God-ordained purposes, I leave it there.

But unfortunately for my critics I have proved that God gave the carnal sword to civil government, and made them admit it. They also admit that civil government is God's minister to execute wrath upon evil doers, and his minister for good to the righteous, and that Jesus commanded his followers to render it the things which belong to it. Peter said do it for the Lord's sake, and Paul said render to all their dues, which includes civil government. One of the ordinances Peter said submit to might be to bear arms for a God-ordained purpose, and all I ever advised anyone to do is obey these commands of Jesus and his apostles.

But this Russellite brother assumes that citizenship in heaven cancels our citizenship in the civil government. This is foolish and absurd, and Paul shows it is not true. He said he was a Roman citizen, and this was absolutely false if this assumption is true. He makes Paul out a hypocrite and a falsifier, who claimed a citizenship he had forsaken when he entered the church. If Paul was still a Roman citizen I am still an American citizen. If I am not an American citizen as a Christian, then Paul spake falsely when he said he was a Roman citizen.
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is that it would have some effect, and whatever effect it did have would be on the side of the devil and the war he has raised. Whatever effect any obstructionist, or conscientious objector of any kind has in this war it goes to the benefit of the enemies of civilization, weakens the power of the sword God gave us, and strengthens the sword of Satan, makes the war last just that much longer, and costs the lives of just that many American soldiers. There is no neutral ground for these fellows to occupy, they either help our war effort or they hinder it, and by so doing help our country's enemies.

He winds up his letter by advising me to “crack down on him,” and burn him up in some other paper friendly to my unsupported human reasoning, which will not grant him the privilege of defending himself in the same medium of publicity. He always complains bitterly that the editors of our gospel papers will not furnish him space in which to air and advertise his version of Russellism, and thinks they are all afraid of him. In my office I have numbers of articles from him, some of them running to eighteen and twenty thousand words, and each of them a repetition of the one which went before it, and all of it devoted to a single end, the advocacy of old time Russellism.

From this last letter I quote to show how he bends everything to that one single end, “In defense of your teaching, eg: this carnal warfare teaching, based upon your transfer of title of land promise, your baptist doctrinal teaching pertaining to becoming sons of God through John’s baptism prior to Pentecost, and your sins rolled forward teaching that saves all who lived and died under the law to heavenly award and glory, et al.”

This is his Russellite manner of ridiculing the methods the Lord provided for the salvation of souls who lived before the cross. He claims God had no such methods, and no salvation was ever offered people before the cross; nor was any salvation possible for them at that time, not even Abraham the father of the faithful, Job, Daniel, Moses, or any one else. No-salvation to “heavenly award and glory” was reserved for only those who have lived since Pentecost, and then only for the “little flock” of which himself and fellow Russellites are samples in the latter days, and they will get all of “the heavenly award and glory.”

When this “little flock” is gathered out then old Abraham, Moses, Job, and all others who lived before the cross from Adam down will be resurrected, and the “little flock,” headed of course by “Uncle Charley” Russell, and his followers, will forego their “heavenly award and glory” long enough to come down to the earth and offer these sinners, who never had any salvation offered them, a second-grade salvation which promises them only an earthly award, and they can take it or leave it. If they take it, such old saints as Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Moses, can go back to their sheep and goats, plant them some vineyards, build houses, live in tents, till the soil, and they will be permitted to live as long as they are faithful. The little flock, still headed by old Uncle Charley, will then take its flight back to the heavenly mansions, and their “heavenly award and glory,” but will leave God down here to live with them-drink milk from their goats, and wine from their vineyards.

I don’t know how the brother will like this Russellite who has crawled into bed with him, but I imagine they will soon be fighting over the “kiver,” and pulling each others hair. Strange bedfellows, indeed, these two! Again Herod and Pilate have been made friends for the day. I don’t like this hair-pulling, name-calling manner of discussing religious questions, but nothing else seems to satisfy the appetites of these riders of hobbies. I think they are just angry because they cannot meet the arguments.

---

**BECOME A MEMBER OF THE OLD PATHS BOOK CLUB**

The Old Paths Book Club begins its life with this year. The first book is due off the press in March. Its title is “Preaching in the Twentieth Century.” The Editorial Committee is composed of Horace W. Busby, Roy E. Cogdill, John Allen Hudson, and C. R. Nichol. Both new and rare old books will be issued through this Club. It is a serious attempt to provide the best in literature on all vital phases of the ancient gospel. The best talent in the Churches of Christ today will find this a ready medium. Biographies of strong preachers and leaders will also be issued. The average price per volume will be about $2.00. Send no money now. Simply sign for membership.
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Paul's Sermon on Mars Hill

Introduction: After leaving Philippi, Paul went through Amphipolis, Apollonia, Thessalonica, and Berea, with varying success and persecution. He then came to Athens, the center of learning and culture of the ancient Greeks. While he waited at Athens for the arrival of Silas and Timothy, his "spirit was provoked within him as he beheld the city full of idols," which led him to preach in the Jewish synagogue and in the market place every day. He also came in contact with the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers. They insisted on him delivering a public discourse in a prominent place in the city with the avowed purpose of learning "what this new teaching is." So Paul delivered this famous sermon from the place called Mars Hill as recorded in Acts 17:22-31. An analysis of this sermon and its startling similarity of application to modern conditions is evidence of the divine inspiration by which Paul spoke and the fact that human nature does not change.

1. "Very religious." Paul had observed that they were a very religious people. A people may be very religious and still not be Christian. The King James Version says, "Too superstitious." The marginal reading in the American Standard Version is, "somewhat superstitious." Religion may be on a low plane and be merely superstition, as in the case of savage peoples, or is may be a combination of several elements: for example, the Roman Catholic religion is a conglomeration of Judaism, Christianity, and heathenism. The Athenians were "too religious:" they had too much religion of the wrong kind. America today is "too religious." The popular notion is that we do not have enough religion, but we have too much. It is true that we do not have enough pure religion practiced, for James says, "Pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep oneself unspotted from the world." (Jas. 1:27); but it is also true that we have a conglomeration of religions, all claiming to be pure Christianity and offering salvation to deluded man in the name of God. In the New Testament there is set forth one church, one way of salvation, one authorized form of church government, one plan of divine worship, and one guide in all of these matters. Paul to the Ephesians put it this way: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is over all, and through all, and in all." (Eph. 4:4-6). And Paul told the Romans that, "there is no distinction between Jew and Greek: for the same Lord is Lord of all, and is rich unto all that call upon him." (Rom. 10:12). The Lord, therefore, gave just one plan of salvation. The Gentile is saved on exactly the same terms as the Jew and the Jew on exactly the same terms as the Gentile. But looking over the religious set-up of our times, we see hundreds of different "bodies," "faiths," and "callings," as well as the more than "one hope" of the premillenialists, who have at least two-one on this earth and one after that, whatever it may be. The charge Paul brought against the Athenians of being "too religious" may very appropriately be brought against the denominational religious set-up of the world today.

2. What they worshipped. Paul was also interested in what they worshipped. "For as I passed along, and ob-

served the objects of your worship, I found also an altar with this, inscription, To an unknown god." The Greeks, like all of the ancients, had a multiplicity of gods. Their main interest was to keep all of their gods in a good humor with them so that no calamity would be inflicted upon them by incurring the disfavor of some god. And since they attributed-to their gods all of the passions of men, they included that also of jealousy. In the fear that there might be a god they did not know about, and neglecting him, might bring down his wrath upon them, they had erected this altar "To an unknown god." Paul very wisely began where they had left off and told them of the one true God. But think for a moment of the millions today, who like the Athenians, are ignorant concerning the God of heaven and the true worship he requires of all who approach his holy presence. Paul said to the Ephesians, "Wherefore be ye not foolish, but understand 'what the will of the Lord is.'" (Eph. 5:17) No man can approach God who does not know him. "It is written in the prophets, And they shall all be taught of God. Everyone that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me." (Jno. 6:45) Again, the utter impossibility of coming to God without knowing him, is stated by Paul in these words, "How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in him whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a. preacher?" (Rom. 10:14) And verse 17 states, "So, believe cometh of hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ." Yet millions of otherwise intelligent people are taught, and believe, that God communicates to them directly in some sort of mental telepathic way. In this they show that they do not know God.

3. What therefore ye worship in ignorance. Not knowing God, it followed logically that they worshipped in ignorance. Not knowing God nor the Scriptures, denominationalists worship God today in ignorance. They know only what they are told by their preachers and editors; and since these are interested chiefly in furthering their partisan interests, they are unsafe teachers and prefer to keep their members in ignorance of what God actually requires in worship. A second hand knowledge of the Scriptures is a dangerous thing. But bad as it is to worship in ignorance, it is still worse to worship in wilful ignorance. Speaking of religious scoffers who would 'scoff at the idea of the second coming of Christ, Peter says, "For this they wilfully forget." (2 Pet. 3:5) These scoffers forget on purpose what they knew the word of God taught. Many religious leaders of today know the truth on the plan of salvation, organization, and worship of the New Testament church, but knowing that to admit it would ruin their sects, they feign ignorance of the truth and contend for false positions. God 'demands an intelligent -worship for those who would worship him. A knowledge of God's will is necessary. His plan of worship is clearly and intelligently set forth in the New Testament.

4. Paul told the Athenians that God dwells not in temples made with the hand of man. All about Paul stood the magnificent temples erected to pagan deities. Paul was challenging a system of worship that had been accepted for hundreds of years and was closely entwined with their political, social, intellectual, and economic life. They had
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been taught that idol worship in highly ornate temples attracted the benign attention of the gods. It is startling to observe here the parall between these heathen temples full of images of what they conceived their gods to be and Catholicism. The Catholics erect magnificent cathedrals and fill them with the statues of what they conceive Christ, his apostles, and "the saints" to be. As the pagan worshipped before an image of Zeus or Apollo, so the Catholic prays before an image of some "saint." Since Paul here declares that "God dwelleth not in temples made with hands," we might inquire, where does he dwell? This same apostle answers the question, when to the Ephesians he wrote, "So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself being the chief corner stone; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, growth into a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are built together for a habitation of God in the Spirit." (Eph. 2:19-22). Here Paul plainly declares that God dwells in the church.

5. God created man to seek after him. "... me made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth, having determined their appointed seasons, and the bounds of their habitation; that they should seek God. ..." The Creator intended for man to "walk in paths of righteousness for his names sake," but man has always had a different notion. God said through the prophet, "...it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps," but man thinks that he knows more than God. Beginning with Cain, who offered the first substitute in worship because he thought to direct his own steps, down to the modern denominational practices of putting in instrumental music, human societies, ecclesiastical organizations, a separate priesthood composed of pope, cardinals, prelates, monsignors, archbishops, bishops, etc., and every other human device that God has not authorized, man has shown plainly that he does not intend to "seek after God" in God's appointed ways. Man does not seek after God, but prefers to seek after worldly glory and engage in excess of pleasure and foul dealing.

6. Man ought not to have a warped conception of God. "Being then the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and device of man." These Athenians had a warped conception of God. Men today may not be idolaters as the Athenians were, but they have just as warped a conception of him. In the beginning it is said that "God created man in his own image." The Athenians created God in their image. Men today make God in their own image. They try to make God say through their false interpretation of the Scriptures that their human organizations are divine. They attempt to prove everything by divine authority from popery to rolling in the straw. What is this but trying to make God in man's image? God said through Jeremiah, "Every man is become brutish and is without knowledge; every goldsmith is put to shame by his graven image; for his graven image is falsehood, and there is no breath in them. They are vanity, a work of delusion: in the time of their visitation they shall perish." (Jer. 10:14, 15). The "goldsmiths" or founders, or fashioners of denominations are deceived by their own creations.

7. God overlooked the times of ignorance, but now commands all men everywhere to repent. The maker and perpetuator of false religions and systems has no excuse today for not knowing and doing his Maker's will. The implication is clear that all men must turn from their "brutish" conceptions of God to the truth, for God commands it. But as in Athens, where the majority mocked, and some were puzzled, so today men mock the true gospel and content themselves with the idea that the majority cannot be wrong; and that just any church will do and take them to heaven. To turn from the beautiful temples of the gods they had created and which were marvels of beauty and human perfection of art, was a difficult step for the Athenians. To the man who is "wedded to his idols" of human doctrines and institutions today, is equally a hard step for him to take. Yet God commands "all men everywhere" to give up their misconceptions of himself and the worship he expects, and turn to the truth. This truth can only be obtained by a devout and sincere study of the word of the Lord.

6. "He hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world." This judgment day is set in God's mind. Man does not know when this day is coming, but he can be ready when it does come. It is not in the province of man to put in his time speculating about when this day is to come, but to give his time and efforts to being ready when it does come, no matter when. The teaching of Jesus on this point is always timely. "Take ye heed, watch and pray: for ye know not when the time is. It is as when a man, sojourning in another country, having left his house, and given authority to his servants, to each one his work, commanded also the porter to watch. Watch therefore: for ye know not when the Lord of the house cometh, whether at even, or at midnight, or at cockcrow, or in the morning; lest coming suddenly he find you sleeping. And what I say unto you I say unto all, Watch. (Mark 13:33-37).

9. The Results. When the assembly of intellectuals heard of the resurrection from the dead, some mocked and others said they would hear Paul again sometime. Isn't that typical of the reaction to the gospel today? When a true gospel preacher sets forth the gospel plan of salvation by faith, repentance, confession, and baptism; the New Testament plan of church organization, work and worship, many mock. "Why, the very idea of baptism having anything to do with salvation! That's Campbellism!" Others say they have never heard anything like it and will "think it over." Members of the Lord's church in this section have come in contact with many soldiers, especially from the Atlantic seaboard states, who are simply astounded at the doctrine of "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism."

10. "But some believed." Among them was Dionysius the Areopagite and a woman named Damaris. The gospel today, as then, will be accepted by some. We are not promised that the gospel will be believed and accepted by all to whom it is proclaimed, but we are commanded to go and preach it to every creature. Our task is large, but our stewardship demands that a "man be found faithful." (I Cor. 4:2).
"THE RELATION OF THE CHRISTIAN TO CIVIL GOVERNMENT AND WAR"

A Forty-two Page Booklet In Its Second Edition

By Glenn E. Green

A defense of the Christian citizen's participation in government and of the many Christian soldiers who are fighting in the cause of true government and who "beareth not the sword in vain."

A scriptural study of the following phases of the subject:

I. What Jesus taught.
II. What The Apostles Taught.
III. The Position Of The Conscientious Objector.
IV. Government As Ordained Of God.
V. Objections Answered.

A lively Discussion Of Many Tense And Timely Questions

The author of this treatise is not an amateur. He has been a student of these particular issues many years. His further study of all related questions in answer to objections of his critics and inquiries from various readers has confirmed his faith in the scripturalness of his views.

PRICES: Single Copy, $.50; Ten Copies, $3.00; Twenty-five Copies, $6.25; Fifty Copies, $10.00.

ORDER DIRECT FROM THE AUTHOR

GLENN E. GREEN

VERNON, TEXAS

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE
ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912.

Of The Bible Banner published monthly at Oklahoma City and Guthrie, Oklahoma for October 1, 1944. State of Texas. County of Dallas, ss.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Foy E. Wallace Jr., who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Editor and Publisher of the Bible Banner and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912. as embodied in section 411. Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit: 1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor, and business managers are: Publisher, Foy E. Wallace Jr., Box 1804, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; Editor, same; Managing Editor, same; Business Managers, same.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.) Foy E. Wallace Jr.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: There are none.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner: and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

Foy E. Wallace Jr.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 16th day of October, 1944.

J. W. Denny, Notary Public in and for Dallas County, Texas

(My commission expires 6-1, 1946.)
Christianity was born and has triumphed in the heat of controversy. It claims and demonstrates divine origin. It treats all opposition as rebellion against God, and every manifestation of “Anti-Christ” as a huge and destructive lie. It spurns all offers of compromise or fellowship with rival religions. He that exalts himself against its perfect and exhaustive principles of truth is called a “son of perdition” and is denied the salvation that can be found only in Christ. This sure and dogmatic attitude precipitated a conflict that loosed tidal waves of persecution and drenched the earth with blood.

Jesus, the Christ, is called “the author and perfecter of our faith.” He came down from Heaven with the expressed purpose of doing the will of God. He propagated no opinions of his own. He was the mouthpiece of supreme authority. “For I spake not from myself; but the Father that sent me, He hath given me a commandant, what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that His commandment is life eternal; the things therefore which I speak, even as the Father hath said unto me, so I speak.” (John 12:49-50)

Jesus, the Invincible Polemic

There could be no compromise of this perfect revelation of truth out of consideration for any conflicting system of doctrine or philosophy, however respectable it might be. The stage was all set for bitter and ceaseless conflict until error was banished and the will of God held undisputed sway. Jesus, the Apostle of God, to wrest a world of humanity from the dominion of Satan, must be a strong contender, an invincible polemic. As a matter of fact He was the greatest fighter and the most successful debater the world ever saw.

The first great conflict was with the devil himself, the commander-in-chief of the forces of evil. A compromise would have been a victory-for the devil. The truth of God would have been crushed to earth to rise no more. Without the aid of even one angel, and he had legions of them at his command, Jesus emerged from that contest in sole possession of the field. The devil left him. The only weapon Jesus used was the Word of God. He repelled three major attacks with an “it is written.” Jesus entertained supreme respect for the written word of God, something that many of his professed followers sadly lack.

The War with Tradition and Hypocrisy

The fight was not over when the devil left Jesus “for a season.” He was deeply intrenched in the organized religion of the day. It was organized rebellion against God in the sheep’s clothing of piety. They paid the Almighty a lip devotion while they worshipped tradition and taught “as their doctrines the precepts of men.” Jesus was not deceived, as the people were, by the long faces and long robes of Pharisaism. He clearly discerned the trail of the serpent beneath it all and was unimpressed by sad faces and street corner prayers. He quickly joined issue, and started a fight to the finish, with the lovers of money, power and popular applause, whose highest ambition was a position of influence in an earthly kingdom ruled over by a speculative Messiah.

They quickly and instinctively recognized Jesus as the enemy of their cherished ambitions. They were jealous of his influence over the people. The war was on with no thought of compromise on either side. The enemies of the truth used traditional weapons and used them skilfully. At first they hoped that it would be effective to ignore Him. His spreading fame put an end to that. He was active and persistent in a most tantalizing way. He clearly held them in contempt and was getting it over to the people. That the people might have a clear right of way for fellowship with God, their leaders must be utterly discredited. They tried ridicule. He came from Nazareth. His family was poor. He did not enjoy traditional training. He was not orthodox. In fact he was just a plain nobody. His company was bad. He associated with publicans and sinners. This line of attack failed. Something must be done to stop this young prophet. They put forth their shrewdest to, meet him in debate. He made fools of them. It came to the point where they did not dare to ask him even a question. He carried the war to the courts of the temple and branded them “blind guides.” “hypocrites,” strainers of gnats and swallowers of camels,” “whited sepulchres,” “serpents.” “off-spring of vipers,” “fools” and “sons of hell.” There was one weapon left and they used it. They said “Let’s kill him,” and they did. They mocked him and scourged Him and crucified Him.

Contending for the Faith

The triumph of falsehood was brief. A guarded and sealed tomb could not hold Him. He arose from the dead. Seated at the right hand of God with all authority, He began His reign. Chosen and inspired ambassadors in Jerusalem launched a world wide campaign to bring all nations into captivity to the law of Christ.

The law of the Kingdom of Heaven is found in the “Apostles’ doctrine.” The Holy Spirit came to guide them into “all truth.” The truth that they preached, defended and died for we now have in the New Testament. It is “the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints” and Christians are commanded to “contend earnestly” for it.

Politics is a game of compromise and party platforms are constantly changing. There is room for a broad tolerance in the realm of opinion. But it is not so with faith. Faith must believe what God says and do what he commands. Faith must not go beyond what is written.

Issues Not Settled by Prayer

There is a place in the life of the Christian for prayer. But doctrinal issues are not settled by prayer. A schismatic might be talking so volubly to God that it might be in order to tell him to hush and let God talk awhile. Doctrinal matters are settled by the written word of God, not by an impression that some mystic receives in answer to prayer.

A prominent feature of the Christian’s armor is “the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God.” False doctrine is the chief means that Satan uses in deceiving men and keeping them from obeying the truth. It is the duty of the disciples of Christ to meet it and expose it.