This is a distinctive age of specials and specialists. Everyone calls for the 'latest models. Some have carried this idea into religion's realm. God can be improved as easily as the Bible and its plan. There is no preface nor appendage to sacred scripture—no addition thereto—no subtraction therefrom—no late editions such as a Mormon copy, Catholic catechism, Baptist confession of faith, Methodist discipline, or Presbyterian code. The church must ever remain free of foreign faiths, accepting only "the faith once delivered." The church as God designed it and Christ established it is perfect, without need of "aids" and "societies." It is a sin to encroach upon God's plan and program. There are some specialists among us who have left the Bible 'appeal for the public's palm. The home and church are divine institutions, yet they are separate and independent. The customs and teachings of the home cannot be bound upon the church. It is quite wrong to tie any institution to the church.

Sympathy Sighers and Seekers

God gives no sympathy to error. Truth is unmixed, a thing is true or untrue. There is no middle ground, one is in or out, with or without, for or against the truth. A man is not settled in truth who squirms and slithers off and on, in and out, who pleads for the blasphemers in error. The Bible rebukes any man in sin. Israel was severely reprimanded when wrong; and what was and is true of a nation is true of individuals. God is no respecter of persons. Obedience to the Word is the standard of heavenly acceptance. It is repelling to hear dirges toned in sympathy to soothe those in error. To defend a false teacher defaces all the good one does preaching the gospel. To bid godspeed to a false prophet or encourage him is emphatically condemned in 2 John 9. As the faithful of old let us cry out against every false teaching and teacher. Let us stand our ground with drawn sword to fight the onrushing tide of error. There is an avalanche of compromise and softness that threatens to overwhelm and crush crystal truth. Let all gospel preachers gird themselves with truth and stand in the path unafraid, and if one falls in the fight another will catch both sword and torch before they hit the ground and fight the battle at the command of the "roaring Lion of the tribe of Judah."

Sectarian Satellites

It is shameful to leave truth and sink into the depths of sectarian partisanship. Some preachers call on the "sects" to lead prayer in church (Continued on Page 15)
RAISING AN ISSUE
CLED E. WALLACE

In the January issue of the Vermont Avenue Church Bulletin an editorial appears on “Great Issues.” Brother R. N. Squire, the author of it, “is one of the elders of the Vermont Avenue Church. He also supervises our program of church music.” The meeting house of this church is situated on the campus of Pepperdine College and Dr. Ralph Wilburn is the preacher. Both he and Brother Squire are teachers in the college. Brother Squire evidently thinks he has raised an issue in the following paragraph of his editorial, and I’m afraid he has.

“Again, in Paul’s writings one reads that God rewarded Abraham for faith while holding Abraham’s works in disregard; and in James’ writings one reads that God rewarded Abraham in accordance with Abraham’s works and not according to his faith. To some this apparent discrepancy in the teaching of James and Paul is an obstacle, even a hazard: Persons who would take a view of ‘verbal inspiration’ which would move them to declare, ‘We do not interpret the Bible: we read it and do what it says’: or which would move them to refuse to study the Scripture in its setting and its application both as to time and to contextual reference, would drive themselves (not seeing that James thought of works as manifesting faith and that Paul thought of faith as begetting works) to being ‘Paulists’ or what not. Such a consequence would represent a turning out of the main channel.”

“Tits application both as to time and to contextual reference” may “drive” me to be more critical of some things in this paragraph than I would normally be. Pointed charges of unsound teaching in the Bible Department, “school of religion” or whatever it is in Pepperdine ‘College, have been made by some men who are supposed to know what they are talking about. This unsoundness is on the modernistic side. Many disquieting rumors are floating about. The position of the school for doing great good or great harm guarantees that its pronouncements on religious issues will be critically perused. If there is no sound ground for criticism, the school has nothing to fear or be jittery about. Otherwise it will be rightly subjected to unsavory publicity based on such facts as may develop from time to time. The claim has been made that the schools will furnish ninety-five percent of the qualified preachers and elders for the churches. You may be sure that churches and brethren generally will be interested in what is taught in these schools.

That “verbal inspiration” which Brother Squire puts in quotation marks catches my eye. I am not interested in theories of inspiration. I do firmly believe in the inspiration the Bible claims for itself. Jesus said to his disciples: “Be not anxious how or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you.” (Matt. 10:19, 20) “Settle it therefore in your hearts, not to meditate beforehand how to answer: for I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which all your adversaries shall not be able to gainsay.” (Luke 21:15-14) Paul claims that the things he preached and wrote were inspired by “the spirit which is from God; that we might know the things that were freely given to us of God. Which things also we speak, not in words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth,” (1 Cor. 2:12, 13) Paul thought that he was using the “words” of the Spirit. That sounds like verbal inspiration to me and I am not tempted to use quotation marks. Just what sort of inspiration does Brother Squire believe in? If the Holy Spirit revealed the truth to men and exercised such influence over them as to guarantee the correct expression of that truth, then you have verbal inspiration or its equivalent. There would not be enough difference to argue about.

The idea seems to be that if you believe in verbal inspiration you will be tempted to read the Bible and do what it says “and refuse to study the Scripture in its setting and its application both as to time and to contextual refer-
ence.” Well now, I confess that I read the Bible and try to do what it says and I have not been tempted as far as I know “to refuse to study the Scripture in its setting and its application both as to time and to contextual reference.” Whether inspired or not, any writing that is worth studying should be studied with due regard to such circumstances. The accepted laws of language are to be applied alike to all writings regardless of whether or not they are inspired. Inspired writings are bound to be true while others may or may not be, according to circumstances. The question of whether or not we have an infallible Bible seems to be bound up in this “great issue.”

Whether or not his views of inspiration have anything to do with it is not clear, but the brother has apparently missed “the main channel” in his reference to Paul and James. Both were verbally inspired to tell the truth and they told it without contradiction. Paul says that justification is “by faith” and not “by works that make faith “void” such as those of the law of Moses or any other kind that would justify on the ground of human merit and give the justified an occasion for boasting. He does not say that obedience to the gospel is not a condition of justification. He emphasizes the necessity of obedience as strongly as James does.

James says that justification is “by works,” the kind that make faith “perfect.” He makes it clear that it is not by faith only and Paul did not say it was. And James did not say that justification is by the works of the law of Moses, or any other kind that Paul says it is not by. A man does not have to put verbal inspiration in quotation marks and make faces at it as though it were a superstition, to reconcile Paul and James or to be more exact, to recognize the fact that they are in perfect agreement on a “great issue.”

A MODERN PROPHET

O. C. LAMBERT

Few men who pose as authorities on Bible prophecies can resist the temptation to do a little prophesying of their own. It has been an interesting pastime of mine for years to file away such literature for future reference. Without exception it becomes amusing reading after a few years.

During the summer of 1936 “Dr.” Bruce Corbin, author of a number of books on the prophecies, lectured for months in my home town. Among his books and lectures was one on the Great Pyramid. Practically all of the dozens of sects which spend their time guessing about the future and the meaning of Daniel and Revelation, have a slight variation of the same thing. The Russellites and Anglo-Israel have their version.

In outline the theory is as follows: The pyramidal is of divine origin, having been built by Melchizedek who was none other than Christ. It is a “Bible in stone,” a “storehouse of wisdom,” “incontrovertible,” “unmistakable.” It is represented as being a revelation better than the Bible, which, “will stand when Bibles and prayer books have been consumed in the flames.” The Sphinx is also a companion revelation but they have not, it seems, gotten around to writing books about its message.

Inside the pyramid are certain passages and chambers which were divinely intended, so they claim, to be a portrayal of all time, from creation to the establishment of Christ’s kingdom. A man named Taylor about eighty years ago suggested that perhaps an inch in this tunnel represented a year. They claimed that they followed the channel and in this way read all the great events of history. But they came to a certain point and this no longer was true, so some one suggested that a different measure must from then on represent a year. This man Corbin refers to himself and his co-laborers as “super-scientists.” That means, no doubt, that one belongs to a select race who can reach out in this air and produce such phantasies.

Not only are we able to read history in this passage in the pyramid, but the future is very minutely and accurately foretold. Among the things so “unmistakably presented,” are, that the Battle of Armageddon would be fought not later than 1944 or 1945. The church would be caught up, all nations destroyed, the Jews restored to Palestine, Jesus would be reigning in Jerusalem and the Millennium begun before Jan. 31, 1947! Not the least of the “incontrovertible” message of the pyramid was that Mussolini would “wax stronger and stronger” until he became the greatest man on earth!

Corbin’s greatest date was September 16, 1938. I agree with him that it was a great date for it happened to be my birthday! He said that most of these world-shaking events would take place on this date. I turned prophet and predicted about a week before this date that Corbin would not be in Port Arthur the morning of September 16, 1938! Sure enough, on that morning his tent and truck had been stored and he had translated himself to some other place. A year later his tent and truck was still stored at the same place and no one seemed to know his whereabouts.

And the world goes on as usual!
CONCERNING PEPPERDINE COLLEGE.

(The following article by Brother John Wolfe, previously published, is being reprinted that all may read it and Brother Hugh M. Tiner's reply together. Brother Tiner's article has been in type some time and we regret that space has not been available until now, for reasons all of the readers understand. Other articles concerning Pepperdine College, including further statements by President Tiner, faculty and board members will appear in the next issue—Editor.)

Many of my friends have asked me about the teaching of Modernism at George Pepperdine College. For some time I have had on my desk three letters, two from preachers and one from a college professor asking for information on this question, none of which I have as yet answered. I feel that these brethren, and the brotherhood at large, have a right to know about some of the things that I learned while attending Pepperdine, and which can only be learned by sitting in the class rooms of that institution.

I notice that Brother Love says that Modernism is a word that some “great defender” of the church uses to climb to popularity. I have never coveted such a title or station. Neither am I jealous of the president or of any professor in any college in the brotherhood, as he implies is true of anyone who would call attention to harmful trends in any of our schools. On the contrary, I believe one hundred percent in real Christian education. I went to Pepperdine prepared to find that the rumors I had heard about tendencies toward Modernism were exaggerated. I presumed that they would boil down to a tolerant attitude toward sectarianism and a healthy desire to get away from a too legalistic mode of interpreting the scriptures. I was rudely awakened from these easy-going assumptions.

The Bible Explained by Atheists

I was warned that many of the books I was asked to read were written by men who did not believe in God. I was to learn that there is something far more dangerous than a plain, straightforward denial of the truth of the Bible. That is the interpretation of religion upon the principles of evolution. The majority of the books on my reading lists were written by men for whom religion was something conceived in the mind of man and developed through the ages, mounting to higher and higher conceptions much as the race has developed its systems of languages, arts, or sciences. A large percent of the writers either ignored or tried to explain away anything of a miraculous nature. Thus, the pillar of fire that led the Israelites in the desert was formed by the glowing sulphur and brimstone erupting from Mt. Sinai; the pillar of cloud was formed by the sulphuric vapors of the same volcanic origin; and the voice of the trumpet was the roaring of the lava as it flowed down the side of the mountain. Why is such a large quantity of reading such as this required in a so-called Christian school? The only reason given was that we ought to become acquainted with such writers and their books. However, not one attempt, in any of my classes was ever made to answer the explanations and arguments which these infidel writers set forth. I cannot but wonder about the effect of so much of this kind of reading upon the minds of students who are not firmly and unshakably established in the faith. Nay, I know what the effect has been upon many a Christian, including some gospel preachers. They have landed in the ranks of the atheists. It may be presumed that students must be required to read the learned (?) books of these atheistic commentators in order to maintain the scholastic standing of the school. Such, I am persuaded is not the case, since there are hundreds and thousands of scholarly books on the Bible, written by men who at least believe in a personal God and in divine inspiration of His Word. If such is the case, however, then I am sure that every Christian would say that rather than undermine the faith of students, let scholastic standing be thrown to the moles and the bats.

Evolutionary Mode of Interpretation

Seconded by Professor at Pepperdine

I have referred to the interpretation of religion upon the evolutionary principle, as a belief and a sentiment conceived and developed through the centuries in the minds of men without reference to a miraculous revelations from a Divine Power. He would be blind and deaf who could not discern a strong undercurrent of this very type of interpretation in many of the Bible classes at Pepperdine. In the class I attended, Old Testament prophecy was treated as something that developed with the growing national life of Israel. In the
days of David the prophets were few and their prophecies meager. Later on, the schools of the prophets were developed; and finally, with the period of Isaiah and Jeremiah, the tree of prophecy bore its perfect fruit. That, I believe, is a good illustration of the evolutionary method of interpreting the Bible. Emphasis was also placed on the experiences and character of the prophet as elements that contributed strongly to the nature of his message. Required reading was here relied on to give the student a background for the study of the text. To illustrate, Amos, the herdsman prophet, on his journeys to the sheep markets of Samaria and perhaps to Damascus, had opportunity to observe the morally decadent state of Israel. In the deserts of Tekoa he meditated upon the things he had observed. To this observation and meditation was brought a profound moral sense and spiritual perception which enabled him to utter the teachings and prophecies found in the book that bears his name. I grant that much that is interesting and much that is true can be gained from studying the Bible from the human standpoint; but when the human elements overshadow the great truth that the Bible is of divine revelation, we are treading on dangerous ground, from which many have sunk into skepticism and unbelief.

Concrete Example of Modernism at Pepperdine

So far, I have been dealing in generalities; I will come to specific cases. The example I am about to give was not taken from a book or given to illustrate a theory, but was taught as a fact by one of the professors. It concerns the doctrine of the resurrection, to use the professor’s own words. It is to the effect that Israel for centuries looked in vain for the coming of the Messiah and the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. But so great was the honor and esteem in which were held the Patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that they could not conceive of a Messianic kingdom in which these heroes did not have a share. Evidently, then, being long dead, they would have to be raised again to have a part in the glories of the future kingdom: Out of this logical necessity, the doctrine of the resurrection was born. Now, if that is not Modernism pure and simple I am at a loss to know what to call it.

While speaking of things of Old Testament interest, I would like to record an incident in one of my classes that to me was illuminating. I had called attention to Paul’s explanation of one of the prophecies, and the professor made this reply: “Yes, Paul was very fond of taking statements from the Old Testament and giving them an allegorical meaning.” I would only ask, if Paul’s explanations of prophetic statements were made merely because he was “fond” of this mode of illustrating his point, how much of his other teaching is the result of a mere fondness for the ideas he expresses? And how many subtle suggestions of that kind are necessary to start a student doubting the divine inspiration of the Bible? Finally, what kind of thinking was back of the statement that Paul was “fond” of certain ideas included in his writings. All discerning students at Pepperdine knew the answer to that.

Miracles Are Hocus-Pocus

In another class, the discussion turned abruptly to miracles. Regarding a certain point, I had made the statement: “I suppose the only way to prove that is by the Bible.” Little did I think that that statement could stir up such a hornet’s nest. Without an instant’s hesitation the professor replied: “What is the Bible? Brother Wolfe, how do you validate the Bible?” I replied, “Chiefly by its miraculous element.” Those words seemed to add fuel to the flame, and the professor said: “But what is the need for miracles—some kind of hocus-pocus to sustain our faith? Of course they are all right for adolescent minds, but for minds that are developed they aren’t necessary. I don’t need miracles to sustain my faith.” Those words burned themselves into my mind. They were the most forthright statement I had yet heard concerning this professor’s real sentiments, but now that they were out and openly declared, I was not surprised at them. They seemed to fit easily and naturally against the background of the atheistic books we were required to read. Nor did they seem to cause any great surprise to anyone else in the class. They were all of a piece with the general atmosphere that pervaded the classroom. The class was almost ready to adjourn, but the professor continued: “Mohammedanism also claims many miracles.” Feeling it necessary to make some reply, I said: “But they are false miracles.” The professor said: “But YOU can’t prove it;” putting special emphasis on the word “prove.” The unmistakable impression that was left was that the miracles of Mohammedanism and those of Christianity were to be placed in the same category, and that none of them could be proved to be actual facts.

Wants to Get Away and Forget

One faithful gospel preacher remarked to me after one of the classes: “It’s pretty hard to take, but when you get away from it and get to preaching the gospel you can forget enough of it so that it won’t have too much influence on you.” If such was the feeling of those most strongly grounded in the faith, you may well ask what is the result in the minds and hearts of the weaker members of the class. The answer to that is provided in the statement of another preacher who said to me: “What I hate most about this teaching is that it is making some of the boys hypo-critical in their preaching. Brother_______ said that when he went back home he would continue to preach what the church believes and what the brethren expect him to preach, but that
he no longer believes it.” I wonder if Pepperdine College is proud of that kind of product.

Theological Speculation at Pepperdine

Theology, as the word has come to be used, is something that the brotherhood has a right to hate and fear. Theological speculation has been the most prolific cause of division since the beginning of the great apostasy that followed the apostolic age. Human reasonings, deductions, and speculations from Bible statements and upon Bible themes always take a multitude of directions, and result, and have resulted, in all the human creeds that have cursed the world. This was clearly seen by all the great leaders of the Restoration Movement, who for that reason determined to “speak where the Bible speaks,” and to call Bible things by Bible names.

The “School of the Bible” at Pepperdine, we were told, is actually a school of theology, but the word isn’t used because the brotherhood would not like it. In one of the ‘classes, the position was definitely taken in regard to the atonement that Christ did not suffer and die to pay the sinner’s debt; that his suffering and death did not represent the penalty that divine justice demanded of the sinner. His death on the cross was simply the demonstration of God’s love for humanity, divine love profoundly and divinely yearning over man, and suffering and dying because of man’s wayward and sinful state, the supreme demonstration of divine love.

I do not say which theory is correct. The former, which has been generally held, was first advanced by Anselm in the middle ages. The latter is of more modern origin. If both had been taught as matters of opinion, accompanied by a warning against speculation on the subject, I would have no complaint. As it was, the latter theory was taught as matter of faith, over which, as was only natural, the class was divided. The latter theory was incorporated in a sermon broadcast by one of the students of the president of the college. One preacher who listened to the broadcast became so perplexed and indignant that he said to me, “If that is a sample of the teaching at Pepperdine, then it is the greatest menace that now faces the church.” That is just a sample of the way people divide over theories and speculations. The church could just as easily be divided over different theories of the atonement as it could over premillennialism.

Isaiah 53 Not a Prophecy About Christ

In connection with the discussions on the above subject, Isaiah 53 was mentioned. “But,” said the professor, “the Jew will tell you that Isaiah 53 does not refer to the Messiah. He KNOWS that Isaiah 53 refers to the suffering servant of Jehovah as represented by the nation of Israel.” This, let me emphasize, was not presented as the Jew’s opinion, but as definite and absolute knowledge. Without any reservations whatever, the Jew was set up as a criterion for the interpretation of this passage of scripture. The implications of the professor’s statement in this instance are so utterly astounding as to make the statement seem incredible. For if the Jew knows that Isaiah 53 does not refer to the Messiah, he knows just as surely that Jesus was not the Christ. In fact, the Jew rejected Jesus because he first rejected Isaiah 53 as being a picture of his sufferings and death. How beyond understanding to go to the unbelieving Jew for our interpretation of the prophecies concerning Christ!

The Church Treated As a Denomination

It is a very significant fact that the professor under whom I took most of my work at Pepperdine always spoke of the Church as “our group,” and upon one occasion as “the group called the Church of Christ.” His view of the church was consistently that of a sect among other sects. Upon one occasion he placed a number of circles on the board to represent the different religious groups. Then he said, “No one group can claim to be the one true church.” On one occasion, in discussing the general councils held by the Catholic Church, he said that he sometimes thought it would be a good thing today for the church to have general councils, but that all the groups would have to be represented. I said, “But we do not recognize these groups.” The professor replied: “If you don’t, you just have to shut your eyes to the facts.”

Let Him Stay in the Methodist Church

In view of such sentiments, I was not at all surprised when a fellow-student, a preacher in whom I have the utmost confidence, related the following incident. He said that a Methodist student at Pepperdine had become convinced that he ought to be immersed, but wanted to stay where he was in the Methodist Church. In discussing the matter in a small group, this professor remarked “Why not let him stay where he is?”

Another incident that happened in the class of another professor was related to me as follows: A young lady, a member of the church, had taken a friend to visit the class with the intention of helping her see the truth. The friend was a Baptist, and the professor was apprised of the fact. Instead of trying to point out her error, he publicly lauded the Baptists for their honesty, sincerity and zeal, and the young lady afterward told her friend who had brought her to the class that ‘that was just what they believed in their church, that if you were sincere and lived up to your belief that you were all right. Brother Lowell says that in Pepperdine College Christians are teaching sinners. To preachers who have attended Pepperdine it is pretty evident that someone should begin teaching these Christians.

Time for a New Religious Movement

In one class, the professor drew a line on the board representing the Catholic Church., He ex-
plained that when that Church became so corrupted, there was a violent reaction and the protestant movement was born. This he illustrated by another line drawn directly under the first one. But this movement finally dwindled down to the expression of partisan spirit and division, and this time the reaction resulted in “our movement.” For this another line was drawn under the two preceding ones. Then came the almost incredible statement: “I like to think that we are now right out here (indicating the end of the last line) and beginning to shape the development of a new era.” Even to one who had grown used to hearing such things as I have related, this statement was a stunning blow. This professor, who teaches more advanced (?) Bible than any other in Pepperdine, hopes that the movement to restore the New Testament Church, which he of course looks on as only “our group,” is now almost at an end. While he did not so state, the implication was clear that he thinks “our movement” has become so corrupted in some form or fashion that it is now time for something new. And that in a college that professes to the brotherhood to uphold the teachings of the New Testament!

Preacher Students Encouraged to Go to the University of Chicago

Preacher students who go to Pepperdine College have now a new and modern Mecca set before them. The theological school of the University of Chicago is now the door of golden opportunity for the would-be preacher of the gospel. In fact so great is the lure held out that one preacher student asked in all seriousness, if the University of Chicago is so wonderful, why take the time to go to Pepperdine? Why not take all of one’s college work up there? Other similar institutions in the East are also lauded as the seats of true wisdom and super excellence. Emphasis is placed on the great need for students to go to these hot-beds of skepticism and atheism in order to prepare themselves to be the teachers and professors of the future in our schools and colleges. As a result, many of the theological students of Pepperdine are planning to go, and some have already gone to sit at the feet of these learned sages and divines, that they may help in the glorious work of bringing the Restoration Movement to a quick end and ushering in the new and modernistic era for the church which my professor envisions.

Reaction Among the Students

Many will want to know what the reaction of the students to all of this. In general, the students fall into three classes. The first class, after staying one term or perhaps a whole year, upon finding out what is being taught, leaves Pepperdine for some other school. Another group stays, but protests against the teaching, secretly desiring, as the preacher whom I have already quoted, to get away and forget it all. And finally, there is the ‘third group, composed of no inconsiderable number, who drink it all in and pride themselves on being liberal. I found myself in the second group. I came away, but have not been able to forget or lightly dismiss what is without doubt one of the darkest shadows that has ever loomed up in the pathway of truth. I bear no malice against any individual, but I warn the church to beware. Modernism, theological speculation, and the spirit of sectarianism, as a three-headed viper has raised itself among us. Let the brethren cease to treat as idle rumors what all the students who go to Pepperdine know to be facts.

4593 Clinton S.
El Paso, Texas
January ’17, 1948

Mr. Roy E. Cogdill
Lufkin, Texas

Dear Roy:

Bow Brother Tiner could report me as saying that Luther Blackmon or anyone else had changed or rewritten my article is beyond my comprehension. Two or three times he asked me if someone had not helped me with it, suggesting words, phrases, or ideas. Each time I told him that the article was mine and that no one else had anything to do with it.

I am glad that you were able to get some first-hand evidence. The situation is much worse, in my estimation, than anyone realizes. I am glad you are going after it.

I shall probably be coming your way in March and if you are in Lufkin at that time I shall drop in and see you. Sorry I missed you and Foy when you were through El Paso.

With every best wish,

Most sincerely,
John F. Wolfe

---

"THE NEW TESTAMENT CHURCH"

By Roy E. Cogdill

is the title of a 139-page book containing a series of 52 Bible outlines on the church. This book is being widely used in Bible classes as a year’s course of study. It has found favor wherever it has gone. There is nothing in print as complete and exhaustive on this theme. A wealth of material outlined in simple form which requires a study of the Bible in its use. Paper bound. $1.25.
REPLY TO BROTHER WOLFE’S CRITICISM

We here at Pepperdine have all read Brother Wolfe’s article with deep Christian sorrow. There are two chief reasons for our concern.

First, Brother Wolfe didn’t offer any criticisms or suggestions to us for the improvement of the work while he was here, or at any time later. When he left he called by the offices of his teachers and expressed his appreciation for their work. We believe that it is a basic principle of Christianity to go directly to the brother or brethren concerned if there is a criticism to be made. We regret that Brother Wolfe violated this principle.

Second, Brother Wolfe implies a lot of things about Pepperdine which will undoubtedly disturb some sincere people who do not know the facts, and most of the implications have little or no relationship to the incidents which he reports. For example, he implies that all of the teaching at the College, and especially all the Bible teaching, is a menace to the church, when probably he refers at most only to a few advanced graduate courses which he may not have understood very well. We do not object to sincere criticism—in fact we are glad to have it—but we regret that Brother Wolfe felt it was wise to give an impression that even he believes that all teaching at Pepperdine is a menace. We do not believe that Christian judgment should be based on hearsay and on isolated statements lifted from context.

The article has given me an opportunity to study even more intensely than before the work of our religious department by talking in great detail with the men in the department and with many who have studied in the department. It gives me great joy that, although there are some misunderstandings now and then on the part of some students, all teaching in our Department of Religion is fully dedicated to the teachings of Christ. The men in the department have the deepest respect for the Bible as the inspired word of God, and their whole aim in life is to defend and proclaim its truth.

The fact that Brother Wolfe and possibly others have misunderstood the purpose and nature of some things taught in probably one or two classes in advanced courses in our graduate department of religion, of course, deeply concerns us and will cause us sincerely to expend every effort to ascertain the reasons for such misunderstanding, because that is the very opposite of our goal and intention. We are convinced of the soundness of and great sincerity of all members of our staff, and they are sacrificing greatly to achieve the fundamental goals of real Christian training.

Nothing would be more foolish than for Pepperdine to drift or in any way depart from the truth. It is our deepest desire to come into closer and closer harmony with God’s will as expressed in the Holy Scriptures. We are striving to express that harmony in sound doctrine, in attitudes, and in manner of life. We ask the prayers and help of Christian people everywhere as we strive toward the ideal of complete compliance with God’s will.

Since many sincere people do not know what we are doing here, and may be misled by Brother Wolfe’s report, I wish to state very briefly what the men in our Religion Department believe and teach on the points mentioned by Brother Wolfe. I have attempted to deal only with the points touched upon in Brother Wolfe’s article. These things are so evident that it seems almost foolish to mention them, but since Brother Wolfe misunderstood perhaps someone else might, so here ‘they are:

1. **The Bible the Inspired Word of God.** The faith that the Bible is the inspired Word of God is the foundation and cornerstone of all religious (and other) teaching at Pepperdine. All of us believe this truth; all of us teach it.

2. **Full Revelation of God in Christ.** We are not sure that we understand what Brother Wolfe means by “the evolutionary principle,” as he used the term. Most people reading Brother Wolfe’s statement probably thought he was referring to something about evolution as the term is usually used, but some who know him say he is criticizing the teaching that God gradually revealed himself to man in the Old Testament and finally fully revealed himself in Christ. This is generally recognized, I believe, as the teaching of the New Testament, notably the book of Hebrews. If this is what is meant by the term, “evolutionary principle,” of course the New Testament teaches it and we believe it, but we would not call this principle “evolution,” rather we would call it God’s revelation of Himself to man.

3. **An Educated Ministry.** We do believe that it is valuable for those who preach to be educated. We have no faith in or respect for learning that creates pride or weakens faith. But we are confident that a faithful, well-educated ministry absolutely true to God’s will will be a great aid to the Cause of Christ. We do encourage men who are mature and who wish to teach to go on to the universities for the training that is required for teachers, but we constantly warn and guide them against influences that might lead them from the truth.

4. **Christ died for our sins.** No one could be a Christian and not believe the truth that “Christ died for our sins” according to the Scriptures. In courses in the history of Christian thought since New Testament times the student must study the ideas that many thinkers have had.
about the meaning of the (atonement. Perhaps Brother Wolfe’s misunderstanding arose out of this study. However men may interpret the Scriptures, we all believe the simple, beautiful truth that Christ atoned for our sins, and as Christians we would not think of teaching anything else.

5. **Miracles of our Lord Genuine.** We believe as the Scriptures teach that God gave Jesus the Christ great and special powers, and we have no doubt whatever about the reality and genuineness of the miracles. That anyone here believes that the special powers of our Lord were merely “hocus-pocus” is simply unthinkable.

6. **The Christian Teacher Must be Informed.** This is perhaps the most important point in Brother Wolfe’s article, for it was here that his misunderstanding arose. In advanced study, a student must read, study, and understand from varied sources what has been written on the subject. We get some students who wish to have an advanced degree (which merely represents certain study), but who seem disturbed and afraid to do the study involved. It may not be wise for some persons to read and study widely, for it is true that advanced study is for mature students who wish to acquaint themselves with all error in order to be able to refute it. Advanced study would be meaningless if the student merely read one side of the issue, especially if he read only what he believed already. Although the teacher guides the students it is necessary that the student do some thinking on his own. In short it is true that we require our students ‘to read widely and thoroughly in the books that we do not believe. We are sure they cannot be staunch defenders of the truth unless they are acquainted with error. Perhaps this reading is what was meant by the somewhat unkind phrase, “Bible explained by atheists.”

7. **All Scripture Inspired.** Quite a point was made of the statement, “Paul was fond of.” This may have been used, but if so, it was used merely to emphasize the manner of speech that the Holy Spirit used when speaking through Paul, as compared with the manner of speech used when the Spirit spoke through John. This is all there is to the point about “Paul was fond of,” and of course we are sorry if there was misunderstanding.

8. **Christ’s Resurrection a Basic Truth.** We are not sure we understand Brother Wolfe’s point about the resurrection. He may be raising a point about what is sometimes technically called the “doctrine of the resurrection” which seems to have something to do with a theory about how the idea of the resurrection developed in Jewish thought. But the sincere Christian reader not acquainted with these technical terms will get the impression that Brother Wolfe is saying that we here at Pepperdine deny the resurrection. Whatever may have been Brother Wolfe’s point on this matter, all may be assured all of us here believe and teach the simple teaching of the New Testament on the matter of the resurrection.

9. **One Faith, One Hope, One Baptism.** We believe that the church of the New Testament is the true church of Christ, body of Christ; that all who obey the Gospel of Christ are members of that body; and that all who have not so obeyed the Gospel are not a part of that church. We are opposed to all forms of denominationalism, and of course never advised anyone to remain in religious error. We do not seek or hope for any new movement. We believe the Gospel of Christ is complete and adequate, and agree with Paul where he said in Galatians 1:8, “But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.” We do believe that the problem of keeping the church pure is a continuous problem, and that we must constantly work in every generation to keep it like the New Testament pattern. All of us here are dedicated to such a continuous “restoration.” In that sense I judge we are all interested in a “new movement,” except, of course, it isn’t new.

I believe I have mentioned as simply and sincerely as possible what we believe and teach on the questions raised by Brother Wolfe. What I have said is not hearsay. It comes from long discussion with the men involved over a period of years and coming down to this very hour. If some point has not been covered in what I have said, suffice it to say that we stand firmly and squarely for the teachings of Scripture on all matters of religious faith and conduct. God being our helper, nothing will move us from this stand. Our teachers of religion are especially selected on the basis of their devotion to Christianity, their earnestness of conviction, and their purity of life, as well as for their excellent quality of teaching.

Our work here is open to public inspection at all times. All interested persons are invited to visit our campus, attend our classes, and raise questions about the work being done. Our sole desire is to be well pleasing to God in all humility and truth. We shall do all in our power to be true to the trust that an increasing number of Christian parents put in us.

**HUGH M. TINER, President**

---

**“GOD’S PROPHETIC WORD”**

By Foy E. Wallace, Jr.

A Complete exposure of Premillennialism

$2.50 per copy
BROTHER WOLFE'S COMMENTS

I will be glad to say a few words about Brother Tiner's reply to my article. What I have to say will be brief and to the point respecting each of his nine points.

1. The Bible the Inspired Word of God. "All of us believe this truth; all of us teach it." Such a general declaration does not cover the issue, since most evolutionists and higher destructive critics occupying denominational pulpits make the same claim. Teaching that raises the question of how the Bible is inspired and then takes no forthright position but leaves the whole question hanging in the air often leads to a doubt as to whether the Bible is inspired at all.

2. Full Revelation of God in Christ. "We are not sure that we understand what Brother Wolfe means by 'the evolutionary principle,' as he used the term. Most people reading Brother Wolfe's statement probably thought he was referring to something about evolution as the term is usually used, but some who know him say he is criticizing the teaching that God gradually revealed himself to man in the Old Testament and finally fully revealed himself in Christ."

Anyone reading my article, even casually, would know that I referred neither to one nor the other of the above things. Here is what I wrote: "The majority of the books on my reading lists were written by men for whom religion was something conceived in the mind of man and developed through the ages, mounting to higher and higher conceptions, much as the race has developed its systems of languages, arts, or sciences." Again I wrote: "I have referred to the interpretation of religion upon the evolutionary principle, as a 'belief and a sentiment conceived and developed through the centuries in the minds of men without reference to miraculous revelations from a Divine Power." There is no ambiguity in the above statements. I give my readers credit for being able to understand the English language. If someone else was trying to explain to Brother Tiner what I meant, they did a good job in leading him away from the issue.

3. An Educated Ministry. "We do believe that it is valuable for those who preach to be educated."—"We do encourage men who are mature and who wish to 'teach to go on to the universities for the training that is required for teachers, but we constantly warn and guide them against influences that might lead them from the truth."

That is like telling a man to drink poison and then warning him against its effects. Denominational theological seminaries are known, for the most part, to be hotbeds of higher destructive criticism. We have fought denominational error and its handmaid, skepticism, too long to begin now to sit at the feet of these 'blind guides for instruction and inspiration. If preachers want to be educated, let them major in literature, history, or one of the other social sciences, but let them by-pass the polluted wells of denominational theology. For men trained in the atmosphere of modernistic seminaries to be the instructors of our young preachers is to invite disaster and a new apostasy.

4. Christ Died for Our Sins. "In courses in the history of Christian thought since New Testament times the student must study the ideas that many thinkers have had about the meaning of the atonement. Perhaps Brother Wolfe's misunderstanding arose out of this study."

I do not object to studying the "history of Christian thought" from the close of the Apostolic era to the Restoration Movement if it is studied with the full consciousness that it was one continuous departure from the truth and in fact what Paul calls the working of "the mystery of iniquity." The very phrase, "the history of Christian thought" betrays a false attitude toward the long, dreary period of apostasy and spiritual darkness that descended on the world following apostolic times. Of course, if one subscribes to the idea that the religion of the Bible sprang from the thoughts and aspirations of men it follows as a natural and logical consequence that he will see in this period of apostasy "the history of Christian thought," since for him all religion, of whatever category, derives from the same source, and consists of the evolution of men's thoughts.

Speculative theories about the atonement or about anything else, I repeat, may be all right if studied as such, but to contend for any speculative theory as for something clearly revealed is dangerous. It is the direct source of human creeds and sectarian bodies.

5. Miracles of Our Lord Genuine. "That anyone here believes that the special powers of our Lord were merely "hocus-pocus" is simply unthinkable."

"By their words they shall be justified, and by their words they shall be condemned."

3. The Christian Teacher Must be Informed. Under this heading, as under most of the others, Brother Tincr mentions my misunderstanding, though he doesn't say just what it was that T misunderstood. What becomes perfectly clear after reading my first article and his reply is that he has failed to understand almost every point in my article, or if he understood them has failed to deal with them. He says: "In snort it is true that we require our students to read widely and thoroughly in the books that we do not believe. We are sure they cannot be staunch
defenders of the truth unless they are acquainted with error."

The value of wide and thorough reading in books tainted on almost every page with the subtleties of higher criticism and evolutionistic thought depends altogether on one's approach and attitude toward such reading. My criticism was directed 'toward the fact that no effort was made to refute these false teachings which are supposed to be so beneficial. I will take my stand on the proposition that a student should not be required to study any false teaching unless the instructor sees to it that he is able thoroughly to refute it.

7. All Scripture Inspired. I will admit that the statement I quoted, *"Paul was fond of,"* etc., taken alone, might be innocent enough. I gave it, as but one indication among many others of a general tendency and direction. We should be careful to use "sound speech that cannot be condemned."

8. Christ’s Resurrection a Basic Truth. Brother Tiner’s remarks under this heading show that he is confused regarding the whole question at issue. He is worried, not about what I said, but about what someone may think I meant to say. His own phraseology serves to confirm my charge on this point. He says: "He (Bro. Wolfe) may be raising a point about what is sometimes technically called the “doctrine of the resurrection” which seems to have something to do with a theory about how the idea of the resurrection developed in Jewish thought.

I deny that the idea of the resurrection “developed in Jewish thought” at all. If Brother Tiner thinks it did, he places himself in the ranks of modernistic thinkers. I believe that “the idea of the resurrection” was revealed by Jehovah.

9. One Faith, One Hope; One Baptism. “We believe that the church of the New Testament is the true church of Christ, body of Christ; that all who obey the Gospel of Christ are members of that body: and that all who have not so obeyed the Gospel are not a part of that church. We are opposed to all forms of denominationalism.”

I gave concrete evidence to prove that the spirit of compromise is abroad in the school. No attempt was made to deny the things I reported. Who but one who condones sectarianism would speak of the church as “the group called the church of Christ?” The speech of Ashdod is too easily recognized to pass unnoticed. If Pepperdine College is “opposed to all forms of denominationalism,” let them begin to make that opposition known and felt among the student body. I will be the first to applaud such a change of policy.

JOHN F. WOLFE

**WOLFE’S LETTER TO TINER**

After studying your letter of August 26th, in which you renew your invitation for me to come to Los Angeles and talk over the matters presented in my Bible Banner article, I am still of the opinion that such a talk would be fruitless and a waste of time both on your part and on mine.

In the first place, Brother Tiner, this is not a personal matter, by which I mean that it is not a matter between myself and Pepperdine College, but a matter that affects the whole church. In order for a meeting to be of any value it would be necessary to call in dozens of other witnesses who sat in the same classes I did, heard the same things I did, and understood them in the same way. It simply fell to my lot to give expression to facts that are of common knowledge and that can easily be verified if you wish to make a genuine and impartial investigation of the matter. Even if for some unimaginable reason I should be persuaded to deny the facts as I know them and retract everything I have said, your problem would not be solved, for there would still be all these others who would continue to spread the knowledge wherever they go concerning the modernism and other matters of an unsound nature being taught at Pepperdine. For me to retract or to make any statement that would lessen the force of my testimony would simply brand me as a falsifier in the eyes of all who know the truth.

If my statements are not true in the full import of the term then why are other students making the same charges in private? The first preacher who spoke to me about the article told me that he knew such things were being taught because a certain other student and friend of his who is unknown to me personally had told him the same thing in almost the identical language I had used. Also I have a letter at hand from a student whose veracity is above question fully approving my article and expressing the hope that it, together with other evidence that may be brought to light, may serve to save Pepperdine College from modernism. Other statements in the letter give strong support to my charges.

Both your telephone conservation and your letter bear strong evidence that I have already been judged and found guilty, either of misunderstanding or of deliberate misrepresentation of facts. In that case I can see no reason for any further examination of the witness. In your own estimation the case is closed. Why should I appear and repeat my testimony before a judge who has already rendered his verdict? On the other hand, if you are sincere in your desire to get to the bottom of this matter, as you stated in our telephone conversation, I shall be very
glad to appear before an impartial group of preachers and elders where the whole matter may be examined carefully and at length and where other students may be called on to testify. If you are as sure of your position as you seem to be, I should think that you would welcome such an occasion as an opportunity to correct before the whole brotherhood the multitude of reports that have gone out.

Why did I not go to Brother Wilburn? Because he knows the Bible as well if not better than I do and a thousand times more about the higher criticism. There is nothing that I could tell him that would add to his store of knowledge. Should I then merely have urged him to give up his modernistic learning and return to the simple faith of the New Testament? I did not feel that I was close enough to him to do that with any possibility of success. Moreover, it is pretty generally conceded that those who become enmeshed in modernistic thought must battle their own way out of it.

Why did I not, then, go to you? Because I had been told on good authority that when other students had given information about immorality in the college that instead of going to the roots of the situation the matter had been hushed up and the students themselves who had given the information had been treated as rank offenders. You stated to me on the phone that those charges had been mere rumors and without foundation. I happen to know that such was not the case. Was there any reason to suppose that my charges would be thoroughly and impartially investigated? Is it not safe to assume that you would have taken the same course that you have taken in the present situation—consult with those who have a personal interest in the matter and then persuade yourself that I was either too ignorant to understand plain English or else that I was maliciously misrepresenting the facts?

Brother Tiner, this matter will not be decided and settled until it is settled right. It will not be settled by you or by me, nor by both of us together. It can only be settled by the enlightened opinion of the church at large who will act as an impartial tribunal, and who, if I am not mistaken, will want to have the facts in the case brought fully to the light of day. I bear no malice toward anyone, and I beg of you not to take a biased or partial attitude toward this issue, such as might cause you later on considerable grief and embarrassment.

John F. Wolfe
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WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE?

W. CURTIS PORTER

In the current controversy about cash for the colleges from church collections a question of distinction has arisen. For example, some boy deserves to attend a Christian college to further his education, but is not able to pay fully his own way; he must have assistance. A church, realizing his need, furnishes money from its treasury to assist him in his purpose. Either it sends the money direct to the school to apply on the boy's board and tuition, or it gives the money to the boy to be thus applied by himself. But suppose instead the church decides to make a contribution to the college and leave it to the school to use the money as they see fit. In both cases the school eventually gets the money. What is the difference?

Perhaps there are a number of differences. In the first place, if the money is given to the boy to apply on his expenses in school, or if sent to the college to be applied on his board and tuition, the boy gets the money—he gets the benefit of it. But if the contribution is made to the college to be used as the college officials see fit, the boy does not get the money. He is still without the needed assistance to enable him to pursue his education. Or, at least, if colleges have been taking the money contributed to them and applying it on the tuition and board of students, I have never heard of it. So that is the first difference.

But another difference may be seen by applying the Same principle to other matters. Suppose some preacher boy is in need of some good religious books to go into his library—and most of them are—but he has not the means to purchase them. His home congregation, or some congregation that knows of his needs and has an interest in further equipping him to preach the gospel, decides to furnish the necessary funds to buy books. Or perhaps the church gives him the money and tells him to buy the books for himself. The order for the books is placed with the Firm (Foundation Publishing House, the books are obtained and go into the young man's library. Suppose, however, that the church did not follow that course, but it decided to make a contribution from its treasury to the Firm Foundation Publishing House to be used as they saw fit. Would there be any difference?

Looking from another angle, suppose some one is hungry, and the church decides to help him. Some one from the church, with money furnished by the church takes the man to the Fred Harvey House and orders a meal for him and pays for it. Or it might be that he is taken to the Safeway Stores and a liberal supply of groceries is purchased for him. The church certainly has a right to do this. But suppose it decides on another course. Instead of buying a meal for the man at the Fred Harvey House or groceries from the Safeway Stores, it decides just to make a contribution to the Harvey House or to the Safeway Stores and leave it to their discretion as to how the money is to be used. Would there be any difference?

Some one may be sick and in need of hospital care but lack the funds necessary to secure such care. A congregation, knowing of the need, takes the person to the Catholic hospital, enters him as a patient and pays his bill. This certainly is within the realm of the work of the church. But suppose the church follows a different course. Instead of paying the sick man's bill at the hospital it decides to make a contribution to the hospital to be used as they desire. Can you see any difference?

It seems to me that any one who is able to see the difference in one case should be able to see it in the other cases. When a congregation pays the bill for a sick man at the hospital it is engaging in its God-ordained work—that of caring for the needs. But if it merely makes a contribution to the hospital to be used by those in charge as they see fit, it has turned its work over to a human institution to be carried on according to the desires of those who have control. When a church buys a meal at the Harvey House or purchases groceries at the Safeway Stores it is doing the work assigned it to do—it is feeding the hungry. But when it makes a contribution to these enterprises to be used according to their discretion it is turning its work over to a human organization. When a church buys religious books for a young preacher that he may be better qualified to preach the gospel it is simply performing its work of assisting gospel preaching. But if it makes a contribution to a publishing house to be used as it sees fit, the church is turning its work over to a human institution. Just so, when a congregation assists some young man to further prepare himself to preach, by paying his way in a Christian college, it is engaged in its work of preaching the gospel. But when it simply makes a contribution to the college to be used at the discretion of its officials, it turns its work over to a human institution. Certainly there is a difference. The organization in any of these cases is a human institution engaged in a private enterprise. The college has as much right to exist to engage in the work of secular education as the publishing house has to sell books, the cafe to feed the hungry or the hospital to care for the afflicted. But when the church simply turns their money to any of them, to be used as they wish, the church is surrendering its work to human organizations. Yes, "there is a difference."
EXALTING THE CHURCH
BRYAN W. VINSON

By inspiration the prophet Isaiah foretold the establishment of the church. In his prediction he stated it should be “exalted above the hills.” This exaltation was to be and is effected by our being “taught his ways,” and in consequence thereof, “to walk in his paths.” To disregard his ways or instructions, to fail to walk in his paths, necessarily results in the degradation of his church. Hence, the tragic result of denominationalism observed today.

While we lament the general state of religious society, reflecting as it does an utter lack of appreciation of the church of the Lord, we should not be unaware of the danger of our being improperly regardful of its superlative significance and all-sufficient importance.

The digressives originally digressed from the faith through a failure to adequately appraise the value and sufficiency of the church to accomplish the purpose and perform the will of God. The missionary society was doubtless conceived by pious and sincere men who brought it forth in their zeal to save the lost. The end sought served as a justification of the means employed for its attainment. There is no more dangerous and specious mode of reasoning than that of seeking to justify the means by the end. No doubt that in the advocacy of this decided departure there were numerous partisans who constructed the opposition to their efforts as arising from an indiffERENCE to the saving of the lost by the gospel; which they were seeking to expedite by the dissemination of the gospel through their society. It is not improbable that those who oppose, or shall oppose, kindred departures today will be subjected to an impugnment of their motives. This should not move us.

While others are dealing with the encroachment of the colleges upon the church rather than standing apart and wholly independent, I wish to call attention to another dangerous situation among us. A situation which involves not an instance of encroachment but of entrenchment. The establishment and support of numerous, and ever-increasing benevolent institutions warrants a serious study by all who supremely desire the approval of God. I certainly disavow any sentiments adverse to the care of orphans and the aged. Is there anyone but that believes the New Testament enjoins caring for the needy; and furthermore, that such care was given without the creation of another organization to perform it?

The command to visit the fatherless and widows in their afflictions is the proof-text of such institutions to establish authority for their existence. Anyone who can read an institutional orphan home in that verse should have no difficulty in seeing the missionary society in the great commission. To aid the needy, and to care for anyone in an hour of affliction, is certainly within the providence of the church. However, to make permanent charges of the church anyone except, perhaps a certain limited and qualified class (1 Tim. 5:10) is without scriptural warrant.

To herald abroad that it is “sponsored by the Church of Christ” presents this challengingly interesting question: Is the Church of Christ authorized to sponsor anything? Where did the church make itself responsible for, and vouch for any institution, benevolent, educational or evangelistic? The church is God’s only institution to accomplish his work of amelioration and redemption. “Unto him be glory in the church throughout all ages;” Who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity and purify unto himself a peculiar people zealous of good works; “For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesusunto good works which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them”; This peculiar people is the church nothing more nor less, no different from “The purchased possession.” (Eph. 1:14)

What constitutes good works? “Every scripture inspired of God is profitable...that the
man of God may be perfect throughly furnished unto every good work." Hence, the church is that institution in which we labor, directed solely by his word in the doing of his will. Again "L-estimate your light so shine that others seeing your good works." Therefore, let the church perform those acts of charity in their own surroundings so that others may see. Relieve emergency distress among the unfortunate members, and insofar as able go beyond these to those of the community.

I have been reliably informed that the number of applications for adoption received by one home many times exceeds the number of children cared for in the home. Why not, therefore, open the doors of those homes for adoption to those who desire children and are fit characters to rear them? That accomplished, divert the support they have heretofore received into more benevolent work at home and to the support of the gospel in weak and virgin fields.

'Some time ago there appeared a statement to the effect that the work of caring for the needy and preaching the gospel were both works of the church, and that the writer confessed he did not know which was more important. Christ told the apostles "the works that I shall do he also; and greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father." He fed the hungry, relieved the suffering and cured the afflicted. His apostles did likewise; and in addition thereto, they offered remission of sins "in the name of Christ." Christ knew this was greater. We should be able to appreciate this. It is sometimes urged that the matter of feeding, clothing and housing these orphans is secondary and that the spiritual environment and instruction are the primary consideration offered in their behalf. If this be true, then they are educational institutions primarily, and, as such, they should be classed with the colleges. Yet, there are many who would oppose the church supporting the college, and then strongly advocate using funds of the church to support the orphanage. This would be illogical reasoning, and an indefensible position. Among the most vehement and partisan pleadings employed in their defense is the bold assertion that they rear children better than we do in our homes. Doubtless they do a better job than some, but that is too sweeping a statement. Reduced to its final analysis, it constitutes an apology for a communistic form of society, and the superiority of the state over the individual and the home. The home is debased and the state is elevated whether it is political, or social, it matters not. The home is the oldest of all institutions and constitutes the basic unit of society. It is of divine origin. I am unwilling to yield to such regimentation in preference to the Christian home, where parental affection, a mother's love and a father's care constitutes a blessing while we have them and is revered in our memory, so long as we live. There is no substitute for this hallowed institution.

Finally, the supreme issue is whether God wills such an arrangement. Remember the Lord gave us a foresight of "that day" when many would say they had done "many wonderful works in his name;" yet he will profess "I never knew you." Why? Evidently, they professed to be governed by his 'authority but ignored his instructions, disregarded his will and went beyond his doctrine; hence they have not the Father.

Let us abide within the teaching of Christ, both in what we teach and practice, with the comforting assurance we shall have both the Father and Son while we live and be with them when we pass on."
those who would overstep Bible authority and plan instigate these “sectarian movements.” The duty of youth to God is the same as the duty of the aged, to obey and respect, to revere and to fear God’s word. It is certainly the duty of elders to keep these operations of partyism outside the church.

**Political Preachers and Party Practice**

**No cliques nor clans have approval in the church.** In any organization of size, the trend to “play politics” is most certain to appear. The lesson God gave the church at Corinth should forewarn all. And “to be forewarned is to be forearmed!” Democracy cannot be carried into the body of Christ. If a man reaches the place he cannot serve truth, he ceases to be a servant of God. If a man cannot learn to serve truth, he is unfit to rule. Political maneuverings by a preacher, preachers, or a church for prestige or power should be avoided by all. Preacher jealousy is a bane to Christian influence and a boon to vice. Loose talk about a yokefellow in the gospel, deliberately calculated to render personal injury is premeditated sin. Some preacher luncheons are “gossip bees, the subject is generally the absent preacher. That’s why a preacher ought not to miss one! If these things exist, they should not exist. If they do not exist, we should see that on our part they never exist.

**Some Song Books**

Several Christian brethren are engaged in this enterprise. All of them compile good books. According to the Bible we ought to “prefer” them. It is common knowledge that E. L. Jorgenson is a pre-millennialist. He compiles a song book known as “Great Songs of the Church.” Many brethren on the West Coast, and I suppose elsewhere, buy this book. Where the book is found suspicion is cast on that church. If it does not sympathize with the erroneous doctrine, why the book? The materialistic faith the publisher holds threatens to divide the church. If my financial support goes to that kind of organization, I help indirectly foster the doctrine to divide the church I love. I will not support that which despises all things sacred and spiritual, and upholds a materialistic view of the Kingdom of God. It indeed is a weak brother who subscribes to such!

**Some Sister Specialists**

Godly women in the church are legion. My mother and yours are among the number. Their pure lives are esteemed. They inspire courage and beget love. They are deeply appreciated for their works sake. Their labor is one of subjection, ever respecting their husbands in honor as their head, just as Christ is head of the church, leading their children in the way of righteousness. Usually they know their place and stay in it. However, it is possible to get out of it. For years denominational women have passed from the pew to the pulpit. Their parade as public proclamers is nauseating. They have been advertised with and without their husbands in “special meetings.” It seems rather odd to read such an advertisement of a gospel preacher and his companion. The fault may belong to the church that employs them, the employees, or both. This sort of billing hurts church and preacher. Anything harmful should not be practiced. Then there seem to be a few women “Special teachers” called in by the congregation to give special instruction to the sisters and children, as though the elders and preacher were not fit to feed the flock of God. Some women overshadow their husbands in polish and education. They still should be pleased to receive their glory through their husbands. Such might be lawful in politics and society, but certainly not in the church.

**Special Schools**

No institution can rightfully supplant or supplement the church. Christ has elevated it above all earthly things. It is the Lord’s sphere of glory. There is nothing lacking in the church that a school can supply. If so, the church is imperfect. No school contributes to the church financially. The church does not ask the support of the college, but the church is a ‘greater institution, and admittedly does a greater work. I think the presidents of the colleges can express themselves where we common folks can understand them; let them tell us in print that they do not believe in asking the church to support them, if of course they believe it, and all the fight will cease. If not the first round of ammunition has not been fired. Nothing can attach itself to the church as a white elephant or adjunct while faithful preachers love it and would die to uphold its glory and New Testament purity and beauty. If a man, or group of men can successfully operate a school without making it the Lord’s burden and responsibility, I know of but few that would object. Rank teaching has been and is harbored in some schools. It is generally accepted, that, materialistic and modernistic views of the Bible originate in the midst of the “doctors of higher learning” and not among the common people. It appears that men are using the schools to break down the defiant stand against sin, leaning to the cheers of popularity, making a mockery of truth. Are the “sons of God” looking upon the “daughters of men” to be dragged into apostacy? It is time to forsake such and stand on the Bible!

**Conclusion**

Let us be common, what we are, down to the earthy servants of Christ. Let us esteem truth above everything, and the church above any institution. May we find our place in the Master’s cause and apply ourselves thereto. And if we must suffer reproaches for our Bible stand, the sneers, leers, and jeers of the insolent will be hid in the darkness of hell.