MODERN DANIELS IN THE LIONS’ DEN
Cled E. Wallace

Rather persistent reports have been circulating around to the effect that George Pepperdine is a veritable lions’ den of “skepticism, modernism, and infidelity”. Some “witnesses whose qualifications appear to be good have escaped unscratched and brought gruesome tales of others. less fortunate whose faith in the ancient order of things has been devoured or cruelly clawed up by the lions in Pepperdine. This has been disturbing to me as I know it Is to many others. Being a somewhat cautious soul I have waited and watched and listened. Some very good friends of mine are sure they have heard the lions roar and that they have unmistakably grown beyond the cub stage.

Brother Showalter of the Firm Foundation, who is reasonably sure that the Bible Banner never saved the church from anything, flew out to Los Angeles and boldly walked right into the lions’ den. Brother L. W. Mayo got out there by some sort of conveyance about the same time and either went in or peeped in. They both came away with the conviction that the lions were as harmless as household pussy-cats. All they heard was contented purring. Brother Showalter hastily spear-headed a defense of George Pepperdine College and most of its ways with an article from Brother Mayo and seconded the motion with a lengthy editorial in the Firm Foundation. Many of us breathed a little easier and thought maybe the brethren were unduly alarmed and what they heard wasn’t a lion’s roar in the first place.

All of a sudden a shriek rends the air and raises our hair again. Something has happened to Brother Mayo. Brother Showalter’s spearhead has broken smack off and left him holding the handle or whatever it is a spear-head is attached to. Brother Mayo has heard the lions roar, no mistake about it this time, and he publishes “A Withdrawal And Retraction” in both the Bible Banner and the Firm Foundation. It left a funny expression on Brother Showalter’s face. He is not sure he didn’t hear it too.

“If George Pepperdine College is all strong in its teaching of the Bible and in its religious attitude generally, it should be known and exposed. If some of the teachers are teaching modernism or defending sectarianism and are no longer defenders of faith, or teachers of the ‘sound doctrine’ of Christ, I am sure that every reasonable and scriptural effort should be made to have them removed, and that if this is not corrected they should be relieved of their connection with the school, that its power and influence for all time to come be not prostituted to the support and defense of skepticism, modernism,

(Continued on page 16)
NORHILL CHURCH WRITES BROTHER WALLACE

We give you below a copy of a letter written recently by the Norhill Church in Houston to Brother Foy E. Wallace, Jr. This excellent letter reflects the attitude of one of the best churches to be found anywhere toward the “college in the church budget” controversy as well as toward Brother Wallace.

I had the honor and privilege of laboring with these brethren at Norhill for two years before moving to Lufkin in addition to holding several meetings for them back through the years. I have every confidence in them and their loyalty to the truth on every issue. I would have known their attitude on the “college question” without them expressing it. They have stood forthrightly for the truth on every issue without compromise, hesitancy, or wavering through all of these years. They will be at the same old place doing business for the Lord when it is all over, I believe. Brethren like these are the kind of whom Paul said, “Every time I think of you, I thank God for you”.

Their loyalty to those who preach the truth has been demonstrated over and over. In the midst of the vilest kind of opposition they stood by, defended, and liberally supported Brother Wallace in two great Music Hall meetings in Houston. They have supported every faithful gospel preacher who has labored with them. I am glad that they have sent and are supporting Brother Wallace in Flagstaff, Arizona. This work will make it possible for him to gain some much needed relaxation from former work and do some work on some books that are in his mind and heart and needed by all the brethren everywhere.

R. E. C.

Mr. Boy E. Wallace, Jr.,
7102 Foster Place,
Houston, Texas.

Dear Brother Wallace:

As persons active in the leadership of the Norhill congregation, we take pleasure in tendering to you this letter in confirmation of our personal and private approbation, as well as that of the congregation, of the good work you have always rendered the cause of Christ and in particular for the masterful spiritual victory just concluded on the college question.

Every spiritual victory in the history of the church has been purchased with heartache and personal discredit as the lot of those who have stood at the forefront of the engagement and maintained the Banner of Christ. We have reason to believe that the victory on the college question is not an exception to this rule.

Your heroic willingness and personal sacrifices to maintain a position of fearless opposition to issues of error, past and present, is an inspiration to many of us who, while in no position to contribute anything of merit to the more public phases of the discussions are none the less prayerfully and fervently committed to the same cause as your own good self.

Your humility and unwillingness to inject yourself into the affairs of the congregation here and elsewhere has but confirmed our previous judgment as to how much they slander your good name who report anything to the contrary. The knowledge one gains from personal observation of your life is a complete repudiation of the personal slanders that have arisen from the inability of the opposition to meet the doctrinal issues.

In the hope that these words may convey to your mind something of the warm love we entertain for you and your great work, we, the undersigned, subscribe ourselves.

In Christian affection,

W. L. Wharton, Jr., Samuel W. Loe
G. W. Howard, Steve Holmes,
A. L. Green, W. C. Tippett,
Jno. T. McKinney, Z. S. Echols,
A. R. Morris, Lester L. Cockrell,
C. M. Painter, O. C. Batson,
O. H. Owen.

(Elders, Deacons, and Minister of Norhill Church, Houston, Texas.)
SOME OLD DOCTRINES RESTATED AND EXAMINED

R. L. Whiteside

Paul’s Natural Man

“Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged. But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, and he himself is judged of no man.” (I Cor. 2:14, 15).

Various theories have been advanced as to what this natural man is, but in this article we shall give direct attention to only the one that is used as a basis for an argument on the direct operation of the Spirit in the conversion of sinners. Of course, if we can determine what Paul here meant by “the natural man,” we shall in that way overthrow all false theories without pointing out the flaws in them.

The advocates of hereditary total depravity assume that the natural man is the unconverted man, that the unconverted man cannot receive the gospel, and that he must be converted by a direct work of the Spirit to enable him to understand and obey the gospel. The Greek word here translated natural occurs six times in the New Testament, and not one time does it mean inherent depravity. Examine carefully how it is used, and see for yourself. Of the body in death, Paul says, “It is sown a natural body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual body.” (I Cor. 15:44). No one can say that a dead body is either moral or immoral. A dead body has in it the elements of physical corruption, but not of moral corruption. It is just such a body as God created, and then gave it life. Sin therefore is not inherent in the body; it is not a part of the body nature. When Adam and Eve were first created and placed in the Garden of Eden, they had all the human nature that they ever had, or that any had since. From the way some people argue, it seems that they think Adam and Eve had no human nature about them till after they sinned. But notice this: The first man Adam became a living soul. The last Adam became a life-giving spirit. Howbeit that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; then that which is spiritual. (Verses 45, 46). Hence when Adam and Eve were created, they were natural, but not sinful. They were able to know and to do what God said, yet Adam was a natural man.

In James 3:15 the Greek word for natural is translated “sensual.” “This wisdom is not a wisdom that cometh down from above, but is earthly, sensual, devilish.” But James here does not even hint at the condition of an unconverted man, but a course of life that might spring up among the brethren. This you can easily see by reading the two preceding verses, “Who is wise and understanding among you? Let him show by his good life his works in meekness of wisdom. But if ye have bitter jealousy and faction in your heart, glory not and lie not against the truth.” It is that sort of wisdom that is sensual (natural); that is the course of life he warned the brethren against.

Jude 19 has sensual for the same Greek word: “These are they who make separations, sensual, having not the Spirit.” The words, “these are they,” show clearly that Jude was speaking of people of a certain class, and not of all unconverted people. You can see the people he had in mind by reading the preceding verses. In none of the passages where the word occurs was the writer seeking to prove that the natural man is an unconverted man; yet the advocates of inherited depravity use them to prove their doctrine.

The references show that the word is used with different shades of meaning. In James and Jude the natural man is the one who lives a worldly, selfish life. In I Cor. 15:44 Paul applies the term to the dead body, and his use here certainly proves nothing concerning an unconverted man. In verse 46 the term applies to Adam as he was when created, and certainly not to inherent depravity.

But what is the natural man of I Cor. 2:14? That must be determined by the context and the verse itself. Beginning with chapter 1, verse 18, and continuing through second and third chapters, Paul shows the inability of man by his own wisdom—know God or what God has provided for them that love him. “Greeks seek after wisdom,” and so do scientists and philosophers of today; but “the world through its wisdom knew not God,” nor can it now so know him. But many have ruined for themselves the whole course of Paul’s argument by using chapter 2, verse 9, to prove that God has not revealed the things which he has prepared for those that love him, but Paul was using that quotation from Isaiah as a part of his argument that man by his own unaided powers of research had never conceived in his heart the faintest idea concerning the things God has prepared for those that love him. If people did not do such scrappy reading, they would see how miserably that passage is perverted: for Paul immediately adds, “But unto us God revealed them through the Spirit.” And then verse 13: “Which things we speak, not in words which man’s wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth.” Search closely all that Paul is here saying, beginning with verse 18 of (Continued on page 18)
We are about to grow up and become respectable. We are very much concerned about a good many things that were once matters of indifference largely. Some things are vital now that we did not formerly possess. Twenty five years ago, or a little over, you couldn't find many more preachers than that among the churches of Christ that had college degrees. There has not been a so-called “Christian” college that could confer degrees much longer than that. Up until then the battle of “contending for the faith” and planting the kingdom of God all over the country had been waged and won by men who had specialized in a knowledge of the Bible. The only equipment they had was a thorough knowledge of the Word of God and the ability to tell others in the plainest of language what it taught and cite chapter and verse that taught it. The shoulders the had borne the burden of the struggle to prorate the religion of Christ were strong and broad. They were the shoulders of giants skilled in the use of the Sword of the spirit. Many of those great preachers have gone on. Some are still here. One could only list them partially and incompletely. How many of those men, even if they were in their prime, would be acceptable to the churches today? In many of the congregations would they appear too unpollished to fill the need now? How many of them could fill a place teaching ‘the Bible in one of “our” schools”? Is it too radical to say that such men and such preaching would fall far below the standard expected and required by many congregations now? It would be surprising to know just how far below present standards among some brethren they would come. Yet from among those men, uneducated according to university standards now, yet schooled and skilled in the word and service of God, it would be easy to select dozens, any one of whom knew more Bible, built more strength into the church, established more congregations, won more people to the Lord, routed more false teachers and false doctrines, than all of our “educated ministry” put together would in a life time.

Education of the right sort is needful but if it comes to a choice between P. H. D’s, and R. F. D’s, so far as their contributions to the cause of truth is concerned, you would have to give the decision to the R. F. D’s. Yes, we have grown, but shouldn’t we wonder if it has been as healthy a growth as it should have been? There is much talk and clamor about an “educated ministry” today but the kind of an education needed for building real strength into gospel preachers for preaching and defending the truth is not the kind most of the talk has in mind. To learn a lot about philosophy, sociology, pedagogy, psychology, or something else and very little Bible is certainly not the kind of equipment that counts for the most in Gospel preaching. Would it not be far better rather to know the Word of God and just a little about the rest of these matters.

HUMAN PHILOSOPHY AND DIVINE WISDOM

We need to read and re-read, again and again, some of the pointed passages on this theme. Think of the emphasis given to the simplicity of the Gospel in such as the following passages:

“And a highway shall be there and a way, and it shall be called The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it; but it shall be for those: the wayfaring men, though fools, shall not err therein” — Isaiah 35:8.

“In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank thee Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes.” — Luke 10:21.

“For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect. For the preaching of the cross is to them that perish foolishness: but unto us which are saved it is the power of God. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the understanding of the prudent, will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent. Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world? For after that in the wisdom of God the world by wisdom knew not God it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that be saved, and things which are despised, and things which are accounted foolish, to the giving of the power of God, and the wisdom of God. Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men. For ye see your calling, brethren, how that not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called. But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the wise; and things which are despised, yea, and things which are not, to bring to nought things that are. That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption: That, according as it is written, He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord.” — 1 Cor. 1:17-31.

From whence then comes the idea that such a great accumulation of human wisdom and learning will be a help in preaching the Gospel? Human wisdom and philosophy conflicts with
divine wisdom and when a man pursues his education according to worldly standards to the very highest degree, he has but an accumulation of material which he must lay aside in order to rest his faith upon, the Word of God and effectively preach the gospel of God's Son.

All of the above passages emphasize the simplicity of the gospel and its revelation. Human wisdom is foolishness in the sight of God. Yet men on every hand are rejecting what God says for what they think. “I know the Bible says that, but I think—” is a common remark.

If one does not trust in his own thinking, he is apt to put confidence in what someone else thinks and men on every hand are rejecting the word of God for what Dr. So and So thinks. He is a very learned man with a P. H. D.; T. H. D.; B. D.; D. D., et cetera, and that means he is smart enough that I can afford to take what he thinks rather than what God says.

Still others go by what the brethren are thinking and doing. They are willing to follow almost any trend in “organized religion” regardless of what God has said. They are blind followers of the blind, taking for granted every step of the way and allowing their faith to rest in men rather than the word of God. Here is the truth of the matter, God has not left human redemption up to man’s thinking but has rather made it to depend on man believing. God has thought the way of salvation out for us. What we think will only interfere with our being governed by the mind of God. There is a lot of difference in our doing the thinking and the believing. Some of us have grown smart and wise enough that we think we must help God do the thinking in religion. But we haven’t for “God chose the foolish things of this world that he might put to shame them that are wise” and “Christ sent me to preach the gospel: not with wisdom of words, lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect,” said Paul, and again, “And my speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man’s wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God.”

The basis of our faith then must be the simplicity of the gospel and not human wisdom or learning. Paul warned, “Take heed lest there shall be any one that maketh spoil of you through his philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ”. Col. 2:8. Human philosophy and divine revelation just don’t get along together. Perhaps that is the reason why all the uncertainty, doubt, unbelief, double talk, etc. is coming out of some religious schools these days. They have learned so much of what men think and know so little of what God has actually said. They are specialists in everything but real Bible knowledge. You try to insist on them confining themselves to the simplicity of the gospel and they will call you a “dictator”. Therein lies the danger of an “educated ministry” which we hear so much about these days. If a simple plow hand preacher is sometimes tempted to give people the benefit of his own wisdom instead of telling them what God says, what will happen if you send him to a “graduate school of religion” and make a P. H. D. or a T. H. D. out of him? He will be mighty apt to decide that everybody should listen to him, including God.

The Roman Catholic institution affirms that the Bible is an unsafe guide in the hands of the people and that it is not safe for each man to try to understand it for himself. The power to understand and make known what God has said in his word lies, according to them, in the Catholic clergy. This, of course, means in effect that the Bible is not a revelation at all but that the power of revelation is in the clergy. It is entirely possible that such an idea in a little different form might be growing in the minds of many today even among the churches of Christ. We are at least moving in that direction when we depend too much on worldly wisdom in an “educated ministry”. We need to restudy the simple characteristics of nobility in the sight of God that was manifest in the Bereans.

“These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that they received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the scriptures daily, whether those things were so.” Acts 17:11.

We cannot afford to make a part of our faith anything that we cannot read for ourselves in the word of God in language plain enough to understand. That of course means that we are going to be “narrow” and “dogmatic” and in the eyes of many “sectarian” and “bigoted” but in the face of every charge that is hurled we can remember that what men call by such names, God calls nobility.
This is a remarkable age. The whole world worships at the shrine of the superlative. In speed, we bow before the supersonic. In power, we idolize the atomic. In monetary matters, we commune with millions as once we did hundreds. The spirit of the age permeates the church. Immature preachers just out of college promote schemes involving multiplied thousands of dollars. Editors, with so little knowledge of the word of God as to be unable to write an editorial of five hundred words free from pernicious error, plead for millions to be spent as they suggest. “Big things” are the order of the day. The parade is on! The drums from the bandwagon roll! Woe to him who dares not to get in step! The sad thing is the fact that amid the noise, confusion, and enthusiasm for the superlative, considerations that are vital become obscured and lost. Such is the state of the proposed work in Japan.

The Purpose of This Article

The challenge of the millions of heathen people of the ancient East who live and die in darkness and the open door that seems to exist there has so excited some that they have mounted the bandwagon without realizing where it will ultimately take them. Some waived consideration of vital problems and have taken refuge in accusations against the integrity of brethren when objections have arisen. This article is written, not to discourage the preaching of the gospel in Japan nor to give vent to any personal feeling toward anyone, but in the interest of truth and that the brotherhood might have an opportunity to examine and appraise the issues involved. Too much has been and is being said to obscure the issues and to render invalid the widespread objections to the Japanese situation as it now exists.

The Seat of the Trouble

The objections relative to the Japanese work have arisen because of the connection of brother 0. D. Bixler with it. The story is being spread at this time by enthusiasts for the Japanese work that brother Bixler is a man greatly misunderstood and misrepresented. This attempt to glamorize a false teacher is not new. It is as ancient as false doctrine itself. The medium of martyrdom has ever been used to enlist sympathy for unworthy causes. Because the writer has definite evidence bearing on the problem with reference to brother Bixler and his loyalty, this article is submitted to the brotherhood.

Brother Bixler Is A Premillennialist

He says that he is one. Then he says that he is just “sort of one, like Brents. The fact remains that, according to his own testimony, he is a premillennialist. His good friend, Norman Davidson, says that he is one. His intimate association with and warm feeling for R. H. Boll and the other premillennialists and premillennial churches of the Louisville area declare him to be one. His missionary scheme for Japan when first launched literally advertised him as such in that it was honeycombed with premillennialists and their sympathizers. When Bixler launched his movement, it was both unscriptural in its organization and mission and disloyal in its personnel. It was unscriptural in that it had a supervisory board consisting of the “leaders” of two congregations, an administrative board consisting of members of at least four congregations, each board organized with its own treasurer, end proposing to do evangelistic and other work in a foreign field for which they were not able to pay. In fact, it was an incipient missionary society in all of its essential features. This information is gleaned from a printed appeal and prospectus of the work entitled “You Can Help” written, published, and sent to me by Bier. The movement was also unscriptural in the work it proposed to do. It proposed to: (1) Relieve present suffering; (2) Reestablish industries for self support; (3) Enlarge present hospital work; (4) Strengthen old congregations and establish new ones; (5) Reestablish a training school for native workers. Need I tell you that it is not the work of the church to own and operate hospitals, to own and operate schools for secular education, and to establish and support industries?

Brother Bixler’s two boards were literally honeycombed with premillennialists and their sympathizers. His treasurer for administration funds, brother G. E. Worley, is an elder of a rank premillennial church (Camp Taylor) in Louisville, Ky. The sponsoring churches, Brookfield and Cornell in Chicago, are certainly open to question on their attitude with reference to premillennialism and “lists”. Brother H. A. Rowland, treasurer for the supervisory board, is known along with others on that board to be premillennial. The point you need to observe, reader, is that: Bixler’s movement to evangelize and otherwise work in Japan was in its origin essentially premillennial.

Does Bixler Teach Premillennialism?

It is argued that brother Bixler only believes premillennialism, but does not teach it. I am quite in agreement with brother J. Leonard Jackson that such a premillennialist does not exist. But what are the facts in the case? Brother Bixler, not only believes the theory, but he endorses the fellowshipping of those who believe it and also the teaching of the theory on their part. Yes, he advocates fellowshipping the man
and the doctrine. I have before me a manuscript prepared by Bixler and distributed by him through the medium of the radio program of the Cornell Avenue congregation in Chicago. It is entitled: “Some Findings On The Historicity Of Some Prophetic Beliefs In The Church.” It is 23 pages in length and every bit as muddled as the title would suggest. In this treatise, Bixler urges the fellowshipping of both the premillennialist and his teaching of the doctrine in the church. Hear him (page 22), “Consequently, I firmly believe that the best thing to do about this matter is to rise once more from the degraded plane of schism and strife and disrupted Christian fellowship, and allow the believer on any position on this subject (The subject of “Premillennialism” J. W. A.) to have the God-given right for full fellowship and conscientious teaching and belief so long as they, on any side of the question, conduct themselves in the spirit of Christ not demanding that all others accept their view or else be unworthy of fellowship.” This is a long, involved sentence, but here is the gist of it. Brother Bixler believes (1) That the belief and teaching of premillennialism in the church should be endorsed and fellowshipped (2) He urges that to disfellowship a premillennialist is schismatic, contrary to the spirit of Christ, and renders one unworthy of Christian fellowship (3) He advocates that the only limitation be that the premillennialist not be allowed to demand that others accept his view.

Brethren, if you can see any difference between this and what R. H. Boll has always asked for, you have a keener sense of perception than does this writer. I had just as soon fellow-slip Boll as Bixler. You may write that down and underline it.

It is urged all over Texas by the promoters of the Japanese work that Bixler has never taught premillennialism. How do they know? Bixler told them so. Is it true? You be the judge. May I raise this question: Has Brother Bixler ever preached on the kingdom of God, the resurrection, the second coming of Christ, or the judgment? If so, what did he say? He could not preach on these themes, be true to his conscience, and not teach the premillennial doctrine. I have proof that brother Bixler has attempted to enlist others in the ranks of premillennialism. The manuscript already mentioned in this article as prepared and distributed by Bixler purports to be an historical study of the premillennial doctrine. Actually, however, it is to all intents and purposes a subtle apology for premillennialism. My judgment is based on the following and other quotations like them that might be made from the paper:

“There are other passages that show that the disciples themselves expected the earthly kingdom of Israel to be re-established. I believe that many of you can sympathize with them in their views because of such statements as Christ made in the 23rd verse of Matthew, 20th chapter, and also in the 28th verse of the 19th chapter and in the 7th verse of the 1st chapter of Acts. Also Paul’s statement to the church at Corinth in 1 Cor. 6:1-3; 2 Tim. 2:12.” (Page 21.)

“I believe we can all understand that the early Christians and apostles themselves believed it” (premillennialism J. W. A.). (Page 10)

“If you are like I am after these studies that I have made and am passing on to you very briefly, you will feel that indeed premillennialism has been a common belief of Christian people from the pioneers of our modern age back to the very apostles themselves.” (Page 21)

Brother Bixler says of those of the past whom he conceives to have been premillennialists: “These brethren were not only in full fellowship and warmest of Christian affection, but the positions they held were as pillars in the churches” (Page 21).

Such statements as these prove beyond question that brother Bixler’s purported historical study is not a subtle manner of promoting premillennialism. This is the very manuscript mentioned in a current Gospel Advocate in brother J. Leonard Jackson’s article which manuscript Bixler sent to a loyal sister in Valparaiso, Indiana. I have the manuscript and the sister’s name and address in my files. To how many more such literature was sent, we have no way of knowing, but if was sent to one, we may safely assume that it was sent to others. Who said that Brother Bixler was misrepresented? Several years ago, W. L. Totty wrote Bixler concerning his premillennial views asking five direct questions. Bixler answered by quoting scriptures and giving no direct answer to any, hence evading the questions. This correspondence, I have in my files also.

The Danger That Confronts Us

Bixler has been, and is being, and probably will continue to be fellowshipped by the workers in Japan. His praise is being sung on every hand. One prominent preacher writes another, “He is undoubtedly a great Christian”. The young wife of a worker recently gone to Japan writes a warm letter of rebuke to a church at home which refused to sponsor her and her husband. In it she sings in highest key the praise of brother Bixler while charging loyal brethren at home with wilful misrepresentation concerning him. All reports from Japan laud Bixler and indicate intimate relation and close fellowship. Those questions keep insinuating themselves into my mind: Does distance from home render inconsequential doctrinal differences? Can we logically and scripturally fellowship a false teacher in a foreign land whom we will not fellowship at home? Is a premillennialist in Japan (Continued on page 10)
“KEEPERS OF THE WORD”

WALLACE W. THOMPSON

The age is modern, but the Bible is the same Book. The ‘tendency leans towards “institutionalism” to advance the truth rather than the “local congregation” as the Bible designs. Tod many have the idea that doing ‘mission work” one must set sail upon the seas and go to a foreign field. This is truly “mission work”, but the same can be said of the many destitute and barren fields in the Western Hemisphere. There are thousands of communities in these United States that could march forward and present the gospel with a more telling effect if they had a “commodious building”. For over a hundred years the churches in our country have had an open opportunity to assist other communities in building church buildings and few they have assisted in constructing! But they all at once get excited about a program that is out of the bounds of the United States.

Work In Alaska and the Church’s Attitude

The church at Van Nuys, California has shouldered this burden and has really borne the most of the expense for over three years. Brother Boyd Field is on the job there preaching the gospel and helping in the erection of a building that will cost not under $15,000. We are glad to have a hand in this good work, but my point is that many of the churches in the Los Angeles area have turned the other way when we need the help most. Many good folks are assisting, but the cost at present is great. We have a contractor on the job and his salary is $550 per month and brother Field’s salary is $300 per month. One of the elders in a nearby church gave a check for $1,000 to the Tanda Lodge (Recreational Park Program) and they refused to give anything on the Alaska work. One is indeed blind that cannot see how the material and physical is valued over the spiritual. Truly, “they say and do not”!

What are churches doing in their locality? That is their field of labor. The place to begin anything good is at home. Even if we spend all our money to feed the poor and preach the gospel to the lost across the waters, the responsibility at home is not lessened.

“Faithful Men Of God”

I do not like to hear faithful, devoted preachers sneered at and given the “horse laugh” for their unselfish sacrifices in going with the gospel, leaving the family circle and travelling almost constantly “breaking the bread of life.” Brother Foy E. Wallace, Jr. is an example. For years he has gone almost constantly preaching the gospel, helping to erect fine church buildings that are today a credit to the Lord’s cause. Central congregation in Los Angeles owes a great deal to this great man of God who spent and was spent that the church might enjoy the good edifice that it now possesses. That was real going that he did, that was ‘real mission work’ that he engaged in. There’s no way of telling how many hungry, thirsty, and naked have been ministered unto by this congregation. The Central congregation has “sponsored” brother Homer Hailey in the work at Honolulu where brother Love II says “Scores have been baptized—Japanese, Chinese, Hawaiians and others.” Looking back into the days past we can see the hand of him who helped at least make such a program possible. It is possible, in tracing the history of every church or congregation, to really see how that the faithful men of God who helped establish congregations of Christ over the land had a ‘great part in the program of the church today. Some people write and talk as though the church has always been as strong as it is today and simply has just been doing nothing but being “orthodox” in teaching. The churches in the great metropolitan area of Los Angeles are here by sacrifice and toil of men, faithful and great men of God who professed and loved truth. And such is the case in every city the church has gone. We have no information as to how to set up a “hospital” for the sick and an organization for the same. If there was one set up by the New Testament church we do not have any record of it. Then that, if established, would call for a medical school with its organization. This is completely out of the field of the church, it is social and not spiritual. The same would be true concerning a “Baby Mart or Clinic” to care for the unfortunate babies brought into the world by sinful parents. Indeed they are objects of pity, but such does not give the church the right to enter the realm of “institutionalism” to provide for such. The Lord evidently thought the “church” was large enough and good enough to care for the unfortunates. It is completely impossible for the church to take care of all the irresponsibles, the unfortunate mentally and physically, to establish bread lines all over the world, to feed all the hungry and clothe all the naked, but our first duty is toward “the household of faith”! There is a social obligation the world maintains. There are parental obligations to bear, by the parents and by the children. When those are exhausted the church is responsible. The first duty of the church is to preach the gospel to the sin-sick soul, “go tell thy brethren”! The Lord places preaching the gospel to the lost above everything else. All else therefore is secondary or incidental.

The Truth Is Sufficient!

People become dissatisfied with the truth,
invent new things and foster new ideas in preference to the "old paths." I think it is a high compliment to one who "holds the Christian faith" unswervingly. Sound doctrine is wholesome doctrine. Sound speech is Bible speech. Salvation is based upon the "Oracles of God." People still need to "speak the things which become sound doctrine." Oft times truth is not attractive, while error fascinates. It is readily admitted that just speaking the truth will not save one. But just "doing the truth" will not save one either. One must have a "love for the truth!" People that did not receive a "love for the truth" were sent "strong delusions" and by their false faith were damned. It is true that we should be "doers of the word, and not hearers only." But you cannot deny that we must "hear the word." It takes faith and works to save, neither can be dropped. But above all things let our works, actions be directed by the truth.

Congregational Government

It seems to be a conceded fact that local government is as far as we can go in matters of organization. The scope of authority of a congregation is isolated to the community it serves, and that authority must be in accord with Christ's power. It is true that we can associate with other congregations, and we should, in any worthy work that needs to be done under the proper arrangement. But to bypass the God-given authority of doing things is certainly a violation of God's will. Congregations ministered to other saints in 2 Cor. 8 & 9. Individuals who were in need were assisted by contributions. We can logically draw a scriptural conclusion that, when a crisis arises that affects the church elsewhere, unitedly we may assist them. Too, individuals that need aid who are giving their life to the gospel, can rightfully be assisted. That the needy are to be helped is conclusive from Jas. 1:27, but there are still qualifications to be met by widows 1 Tim. 5:9, 10. Some folks ignore the last clause if James 1:27 "and to keep himself unspotted from the world." That applies to doctrine as well as fleshly lusts.

Herod and Pilate Made Friends

In the cruel trial of Jesus that mocked justice, Herod and Pilate were made friends. Herod and his men of war cried for a miracle, and when they were refused counted Jesus as nothing, arrayed him in a gorgeous robe and sent him back to Pilate in mockery. They were made friends that day because of a common enemy. Sometimes that occurs now. Judas became friendly, for a price, with the chief priests. When he saw he had betrayed innocent blood he tried to return the bloody money, but rather with it they bought a potter's field to bury therein strangers. To show Herodias a pleasure, John the Baptist was thrust in prison. To grant the daughter of Herodias a favor, John's head was severed and brought on a platter at her mother's suggestion. Another example, Demas served with Paul for a time ('1 Tim. 4:14, Philemon 24), then forsook Paul "having loved this present world." These people paid the supreme price in forsaking the truth and truthful men, and friendship of the world is "enmity with God." We have modern Herods and Pilates who unite as comrades in the destruction, if possible, of a common enemy who is stronger in the truth and its expression. And while the "old paths" are being shunted by many modern, illustrious luminaries, (?) there are still "7,000" that have not bowed the knee to Baal!

"Keepers of the Word"

To be "orthodox" in teaching is to "hold fast the faithful Word." We are commanded to "Stand fast" and to "Hold fast the form of sound words," and this is in "Christ Jesus"! "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." "Hold fast which thou hast, that no man take thy crown." How many times are we commanded to "Keep" the Lord's commandments? Keep means to "retain or hold fast", to "defend and protect", to "observe and practice", and to "perform as a duty." Old Israel said, "We will not walk therein" and "We will not harken to the sound of the trumpet." Many are repeating the sad refrain. Sometimes folks get wiser than God, and when that happens there is not much anyone can do for them. The gospel began in a radius given, Jerusalem, went forth into Judea, then Samaria, and then to the uttermost part of the earth. It did not begin in Jerusalem and go forth to the uttermost part and finally come back to Judea and Samaria. Too many want to get the cart before the horse. In something over a hundred years we have not reached every soul in this country. This may be slow progress, and that we make mistakes is but to confess we are human. The fellow who has not made a mistake was a 'big mistake to begin with! There are five counties in Northern California in which there is not one church! I am planning every year through the generosity of the Van Nuys congregation by letting me go, to assist in starting a new congregation in that destitute field. Do not tell me that is not "doing mission work" and "going as commanded in the great commission." Other preachers and churches are with the same arrangements. And as we go into the white fields we are determined to "know nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified." We extend a glad band to those in foreign lands where no doubt the work is harder in some phases. We do not intend to discourage that kind of work by this article. The church I preach for is even fostering that kind of evange-

(Continued on page 11)
any different than one in Louisville or Dallas?

I greatly fear that some of our missionary activities are fast becoming the open door through which error stealthily creeps to subvert and to destroy. Ah yes, heathen souls are precious in the sight of the Lord, but the end justifies not a means so fraught with peril. Much has been said concerning the magnanimous spirit of brother Bixler in stepping down and out in favor of loyal churches. Would it be improper to suggest that it should be noted that this was done only after his premillennial, missionary society utterly failed to enlist the support it needed.

A New Sponsor in Japan

The last word is that Bixler will soon leave Japan for a time. That solves nothing. He will return. Next, comes the announcement that brother R. C. Cannon is now "our" representative missionary and that "all is well". It is to be devoutly hoped that it is true that all is well, but before the brotherhood can be sure, in view of the doubt and suspicion which now exists, Brother Cannon needs to declare himself. He is known by but few in the brotherhood and his being a graduate from Harding College (for years notoriously soft with reference to premillennialism) in no way recommends him in this regard. Brother Brewer's and McMillan's assurances may be enough in some quarters, but not to the rank and file of the brethren. The militancy of these men against premillennialism is of too recent origin to give their assurances much weight.

One Thing Is Needed

If the Japanese work is to have the full support and endorsement of the brethren at large, Brother Cannon will have to declare himself on the following points:

1. His personal belief with reference to premillennialism.
2. His attitude toward fellowshipping premillennial workers in Japan or elsewhere including Bixler.
3. Will he recommend for entrance into Japan and work with premillennial preachers whom Bixler or others may recommend.

Conclusion

The parade is on and the pressure to get churches on the Japanese bandwagon is great. Some loyal churches have been urged to sponsor workers for Japan though they themselves cannot give a penny toward their support. What is the idea? Give the Japanese work respectability despite its premillennial connection. Brethren and churches would be wise to stay off the bandwagon until they know where it is taking them. May God help us to keep our eyes open and our feet on the ground that the church may continue to be "the pillar and the ground of the truth."
SERMON OUTLINES FOR SALE? NO!
By C. R. Nichol

In my effort to teach a group of young preachers, I said, in part:

*My* young brethren I think it may be timely for you to make an "outline of the sermon" you will preach next Sunday-it seems necessary that some men have a written outline, and consult it while speaking. I advise that if you use a written "outline" you destroy it so soon as you reach your home, or at the first convenient place-tear the "outline" as it appears on the paper you use, into bits and throw it into the waste basket, or fire. At least destroy the "outline."

If you wish you may keep a record of the sermon-the "name" by which you designate the subject discussed; but do not keep the sermon "notes," or "outline."

The habit formed of preaching from "notes," or an "outline" leads one to depend on the "outline." To preserve the "outline" or "notes" has a tendency to make of you a poor student. The "outline" if filed away has made more than one preacher grow stale. You spend a year or two in some place laboring with a congregation, preaching twice each Sunday, and filing away your "outlines." Then you remove to some other city to labor with another congregation; and there is the tendency on the part of some to rely on the "outlines" used in the former place they have labored. You thumb through the filed outlines you have, look over the notes, review them and *reprehend* the same sermon, you make no further investigation, but depend on the notes you have made; and as a result you make no further preparation. Such will never result in your becoming a Bible scholar.

I regret that there has ever been published a book of "Sermon Outlines." Too many preachers rely entirely on the "Outlines" without having devoted any time to real study in the preparation of a lesson. Some other man has outlined for you what to say, and you become, in a large measure a follower of that man in the presentation of the sermon. The "outline" may be a good one-though I have never seen a "Sermon Outline" that I would give space in my library, nor an outline that I could *use*—using the "outlines" prepared by some other will never make of you a Bible scholar. In a measure you become a parrot.

I do not intend to question the desire of those who make and *sell" Sermon Outlines" to do good: but I think they have ruined a number of young men who might have become real Bible scholars had they been made to study for themselves the Bible.

Were I financially able I would buy every book of "Sermon Outlines" my brethren have published, and burn them to ashes, and then discourage the publication of any more such books.

Study your *Bible* my brother.

It may be well to keep a record of the title of a sermon you preach, but do not keep the "outline." Restudy the subject from beginning to end. Do not allow the "outline" to become a part of you, and make you a *stereotype* speaker. Do not rely on others to do your thinking in constructing the sermon you are to deliver to the people, making the impression on the audience that your lesson delivered is the result of your study.

Study your *Bible*, rather than "Sermon Outlines."

It has not been many moons since I saw a statement in one of our papers that a brother had *it* in his heart to publish a book of "sermon outlines"—his sermon outlines. I trust he may experience a "change of heart" before he publishes them—and publish them not!

Study your *Bible*. Make the BIBLE your source book.

YOUR CHANCE TO DO "MISSIONARY WORK"
Cled E. Wallace

"At age 60 I prayed God to be merciful to me a sinner. That moment peace came into my heart. If you don't know this wonderful Saviour who now protects me from all temptations, I beg you seek him, don't delay. Make your choice for eternity of suffering, misery or peace and joy. 20 years ago the Lord called me to *distribute* gospel tracts and place plywood holders. I mail one full of assorted tracts for 50c. . . Anyone burdened for the unsaved can do missionary work at home by hanging near door holders full of tracts to be given all callers." This was not copied from the Baptist and Reflector but "From the Harvest Field" of the Firm Foundation, a "National Weekly, Worldwide in Mission, Definite in Policy—the Defense of the Ancient Gospel Delivered to the Saints."

It isn't likely that we are about to see a mourner's bench set up in the Firm Foundation. Possibly the editor was just asleep or on a journey when that one got in.

"KEEPERS OF THE WORD"
(Continued from page 9)

*listic* labor. But let us remember that every place and every race has an equal right to receive the gospel. There are houses around you that you can toss rocks on wherein people are unsaved! *Let* us roll up our sleeves and get into the work at home and abroad!
SPOILING FOR A FIGHT
Cled E. Wallace

It will be recalled that some time ago Brother Carl Etter "left the church of Christ" and went to the Congregationalists. His idea seemed to be that he needed to break out of the straight-jacket of traditionalism and find peace and freedom in an atmosphere more in keeping with his advanced attainments in mental and spiritual graces. He now appears to feel that he has won his wings in the high and mighty loftiness of modernism, and is in the grip of an overweening pity for us poor clods who have not yet learned to fly. He was once a missionary who felt a mighty call to carry the gospel of Christ to the heathen. The heathen won the fight and he is now back in America using what missionary spirit remains in him trying to save the church by making infidels of its members. It is a sad anti-climax. Since he was unable to win the Japanese to Christ, he has addressed himself to the task of winning the church to the anti-Christ of modernism.

Brother Etter has written a book entitled "Ainu Folk Tales From Japan". His interest in them is their resemblance to "Biblical Traditions." The Japanese have traditions of creation, magic, incarnation, "virgin-born gods", miracles, Jonah and the whale stories and the like "resembling Biblical Traditions". Ergo, the Bible is no more factually reliable than "Ainu Folk Tales From Japan". This is the modern gospel the missionary-minded brother wants space in the Bible Banner to propagate. He writes: "I am a modernist and have at no time tried to hide behind false colors." He suggests that we publish the "table of contents of this book", review the book when it is off the press and give him a chance to review the review.

Brother Etter is likely to find more of that sort of "courage" if he will contact Brother Brewer or Brother Bales of Harding College. They need the practice. We don't.

Brother Etter's obvious anxiety for some attention from us makes me wonder if he is getting all the attention he thinks he deserves where he is. He thought so little of us, he left us in rather lofty disdain. He reminds me of the man who divorced his wife, but could not get her off his mind and could not leave her alone. He may be satisfied with his new-found liberty and his liberal views but I doubt it. If his antics were submitted to a psychiatrist, the findings might prove interesting. I know enough about human nature to draw some conclusions of my own. He can write as many letters as Brother Beam and seems to think we ought to publish every thing he wants to say, if we even mention his name. By now it ought to be pretty well known that we handle things our own way and that we do not allow our critics to dictate the policy of the Bible Banner. Dares and taunts and insinuating charges of cowardice are wasted on us. We are not swapping compliments with either digressives or modernists. As far as we are concerned Carl Etter has renounced the faith and there is no scriptural basis of fellowship whatever between him and us. We stick to the scriptures which to him are comparable to "Ainu Folk Tales From Japan". We are under no obligation to furnish space for the sordid story of how the Japanese made a modern heathen out of a gospel missionary. It is bad enough to state the facts without going into all the gruesome details. We see no reason why we should let him turn the Bible Banner into a personal experience meeting. His personal experience in unbelief could not light anybody's way to heaven, besides I am not sure that he even believes in heaven or wants to go there.

Brother Etter is professedly in a frame of mind to stir up something on what he calls "a real live issue and I anticipate some rather lively times in the days to come if the Modernists in the Church of Christ have the courage to fight-and, of course, are given a chance to defend themselves." Who are these "Modernists in the Church of Christ" whose courage and will to fight are questionable enough to deserve an "if"? For some strange reason Brother Etter thinks they are "teachers at Pepperdine". How do you suppose he got such an impression? We have in our possession a sheaf of letters he wrote to Foy, Roy, Brother Pepperdine and Dean Pullias. We did not steal them, and even have permission to publish them. I wonder why they were not sent to the Firm Foundation "A
National Weekly, World-Wide in Mission, Definite in Policy”; or to the Gospel Advocate. These papers have shown a willingness almost tantamount to anxiety to publish most anything that reflects on us or discredits us. Anyhow the letters were sent to us. We are beginning to think we amount to something even if it is short of being “World-Wide” and “Definite”.

These letters are revealing and very, very interesting. In a letter to Brother Pepperdine dated April 29, 1948, Brother Etter with characteristic modesty says:

“For several years Bill Reedy and I have stood alone for fundamental religious truths which we knew to be right. You know the story and I need not relate it here.”

He has one advantage over the Biblical Elijah. There are two of them. I won’t blame you if you think he is standing on his head to imagine such a thing. Modernism and “fundamental religious truths” are identical! Ugh!

His impression of “certain men on the faculty of George Pepperdine College” is interesting, revealing, slanderous—or what?

“From recently printed accounts, it is obvious that certain men on the faculty of George Pepperdine College have come to see the light and are being persecuted for honest and true convictions. You know these men more intimately than I and recognize, as I do, their true worth. Will the church and the college repeat the same old error and drive out these young men because they have dared to stand for irrefutable truth? “I have pled with you both personally and in public meetings in the past to take your stand for modern scholarship and truth ... I ask you in the name of common decency, to stand by these younger men and give them a free hand in teaching what they know to be right. Their true characters will be revealed by the courage they manifest under the pressure of the hour.”

Brother Etter thinks that he and Bill Reedy no longer stand “alone for fundamental religious truths”. He has able confederates in George Pepperdine College, he thinks. Is he mistaken, dishonest, or telling the truth? It is the sixty-four dollar question and don’t think it is not stirring things up. Brother Showalter may have to fly out again for material for another editorial. I don’t think Brother Mayo will go back. He has already decided that his limitations as a saviour are too pronounced for a job of that magnitude.

Brother Etter sent copies of his letters to Brother Pepperdine, Foy and Roy, to Dean Pullias. The good Dean reacted about like he had sat down on a hornet. Hornets are sometimes useful in their way. Anything that can stir Brother Pullias up has its points. He wrote Brother Etter a pretty hot letter-for hirn. As horrifying as it may appear there are even indications of irritation and righteous indignation. Says Brother Pullias to our modernistic Elijah who thought he had discovered some others who had not bowed the knee to Jesus:

“It is difficult to understand why or how you could feel that you are either capable or responsible to say what the men here at Pepperdine College believe. You have had almost no contact with the College or the men on its faculty during the past ten years, and particularly since you made your decision to cast your lot with the Congregational Church.”

‘Now, Brother Pullias ought not to be too hard on Brother Etter, even though he appears to have a point. You know Dean Pullias “cast his lot” with the Christian Church at Durham for six years. Christian churches and Congregational churches seem to think they have a lot in common judging from the way some of them are amalgamating. Brother Etter has been with the Congregationalists only about two years. Maybe he will at least change as much as Brother Pullias did if you give him four more years to run with the goats. A Professorship in Pepperdine might help. Besides Brother Showalter and Brother Mayo “had almost no contact with the College or the men on its faculty during the past ten years” or ever, and showed it by what they wrote, and Brother Pullias seemed willing enough for them “to say what the men here at George Pepperdine believe”. However, some very intelligent men at the time wondered just how “capable or responsible” Brother Showalter and Brother Mayo were. Brother Mayo has broken down and confessed that he wasn’t, and Brother Showalter is lately pedalling on editorial “ifs”. It is getting to be somewhat of a mixed-up situation.

Brother Pullias informs Brother Etter that “it is vitally important that everyone understand that you are in no position to speak for the men here.” Then he up and speaks for them himself. What some very good people would like to hear is for the men under suspicion to up and speak for themselves and be even more “Definite” in answering some questions than even the “Policy” of the Firm Foundation. Brethren are gaining the impression that somebody is trying to whitewash somebody out at Pepperdine. “If”, as Brother Showalter would say, suspicions and charges are unfounded such a course is doing George Pepperdine College no good. Understand, I have not been out there “during the past ten years” and all I know is what I read in the papers and from various and sundry letters that fly about and light on me. I suppose I could be regarded as a sort of moderator in this fracas.

Brother Pullias tells Brother Etter that he does not in or has any respect for the sophisticated, unsubstantiated, now generally outdated viewpoints of so-called Modernism. This point of view was much in vogue in many circles ten to fifty years ago,
But the best in recent thought and scholarship have completely discredited that view. All over the world there is a definite swing back toward orthodoxy.

He further says that “there is no person on this faculty who believes” otherwise. That sounds very good as far as it goes. Brother Pullias sounds like he wants to be sound and is bending over backward to sound that way. Far be it from me to hinder or discourage any improvements in that direction. However, there is too much Ashdodish speech employed when anybody in George Pepperdine publishes or writes about what he or “this faculty” believes. The Christian Gospel”, ‘the Christian beliefs”, “the Christian doctrines”, “the Christian thought”, “the Christian theology”, “orthodoxy” and the like. It sounds like men who have soaked up some modernism they have not fully digested. Maybe they just don’t know any better. When men are “contending for the faith once for all delivered to the saints” they should use “sound speech that cannot be condemned”. Brother Wilburn who admits that he is a scholar, and wants to debunk all “traditional beliefs” and start from ignorance when he teaches, believes the Bible, but distrusts his “interpretation” of what he finds in it. I suppose when he preaches Christ he preaches his “interpretation” and doesn’t have much confidence in that. The time appears to have arrived in the mind of some young scholars when it is no longer proper to preach “the faith” specifically and precisely. All we can do is to give “our interpretation” of it and those who accept “our Interpretation” will be saved, unless “our interpretation” is wrong and we can’t be too sure about that. Going to school doesn’t seem to do some folks much good.

According to Dean Pullias “there is no person on this faculty” who is not thoroughly devoted, “wholly devoted to these great truths”:

“...The existence of God, the inspiration of Scripture, the divinity and power of Jesus Christ (the Word that became flesh), the saving power of the ancient Christian doctrines of faith, repentance, confession and baptism, the meaning and mission of the Kingdom of God—that is, the Church of Christ, which is the spiritual body of Christ. These are the heart and core of our faith and practice.

I have no disposition whatever to say that any of these brethren do not believe anything they say they do. If they can state it in terms that a common sort of a Christian like me can understand. It would help some, maybe a lot, if Brother Pullias or Brother Wilburn, preferably both would write some articles on “the inspiration of Scripture” and “the divinity of Christ” with particular reference to a definition of inspiration and the Virgin Birth. An article from Brother Wilburn on Miracles might also help. Remember that the readers of the Bible Banner do not all have post-graduate degrees. Some of them milk cows and hoe cotton for a living. You can insert a big word occasionally for the benefit of Brother Etter. He also reads the Bible Banner. I can remember though when he spelled corn and cabbage with a k and God with a little “g” like common folks, as Brother Srygley used to say. He has gotten back to spelling God with a little “g”.

Now about that debate that Brother Etter wants so badly. The difficulty is in finding somebody with enough education to meet him. He said to Brother Pepperdine:

“Those who are attacking the teachers at Pepperdine are, for the most part, men whose educational attainments were arrested on the high school or undergraduate levels. I have contended for years that the person who has had a high school course in physiology is hardly qualified to judge what should be taught in a modern medical college. The same is true in religion. You and your college board should ponder this fact carefully before being stampeded by modern crucifiers of truth.”

That just about leaves us out in spite of the fact that Brother Pullias thinks that Brother Etter is “sophisticated” and “unsubstantiated”. Likely we’ll have to wait for Brother West to finish his post-doctorate in Oxford before we can furnish a worthy opponent for Brother Etter. I’m surprised that he even lifted an eyebrow at the Bible Banner. Maybe Brother Pullias and Brother Wilburn can take him on for some preliminary rounds and warm things up for the big fight to come. Personally, I would like to see it. I think I could learn some things from it, I have been curious to find out.

WHAT DO YOU SAY?

What is your reaction to putting the Bible Banner on a weekly basis instead of monthly? There is a lot of interest being shown in making the change. Brethren everywhere are feeling the need of a weekly paper that has a militant, positive, and yet constructive attitude in that will build while we can build and will stop and fight when we must fight. What would be your reaction? We will not start until sufficient interest has been shown by those sympathetic to what we are trying to do to insure enough help to put it across. What is your attitude? We would need to write at least five thousand new subscriptions. How many will you be responsible for in order to get the Banner on a weekly basis? Suppose you let us know how much you are interested.

Your publisher,
Roy E. Cogdill.
Contact us about your Church Furniture needs. Our field representatives will meet with your committee to discuss your plans.

We manufacture all types of Pews, Communion Tables, Pulpit Sets, Choir Railings, Altars, and Lecterns. We can supply all your Church Furniture needs.

COMPETITIVE PRICES  REASONABLE DELIVERY
and infidelity. For my own part, I shall certainly oppose any departure from the faith among any teachers in the school."

This embarrassing retreat behind a screen of "ifs" was made necessary by the utter collapse of his right flank and we can't blame Brother Showalter for mildly berating Brother Mayo for recklessly charging into something he knew so little about. But Brother Showalter was a bit reckless in charging in after him. He now shows a disposition to wait and listen, until he is more sure of himself, before talking any more which will undoubtedly be an improvement.

As for Brother Mayo, his main weakness doesn’t seem to be modesty. He talks about "my recommendations", "I have tried my best to get the brethren at the head of the school" to do this and that, "my effort to save the school has gone much further than I have stated in this article but to no avail", "brethren in whom I placed my confidence evidently betrayed me", "I further recommend" etc. The only really humble thing he did was to "apologize to Brother John F. Wolfe" which is a fairly good sign. I am not at all surprised that Brother Mayo was unable to "save the school" all by himself. It is entirely possible that those brethren out there, considering what they think of themselves, did not concede to Brother Mayo the importance he admits is his.

Now, I'm not investigating George Pepperdine College. I'm not even making an "effort to save the school". Whoever heard of anybody ever saving an institution? Whenever one heads in the wrong direction, it never reforms or turns back. That is one main reason why the Lord's churches today are examples of orthodoxy, and some of them have been inclined to brag about it. I am a rather small potato in my way, but if, as Brother Showalter would say, and when I hear a lion roaring in my neck of the woods, there is nothing I know of to keep me from taking a shot at him "if" he exposes himself enough for me to get a bead on him.

SOME OLD DOCTRINES-

(Continued from page 3)

chapter 1, and you will not find one thing said about the condition of an unconverted man-no contrasting the condition of the unconverted man with the condition of the converted man. The contrast is between man's wisdom and God's wisdom-between man's discoveries and God's revelation in the gospel. Worldly wisdom learns many things about the material universe, but it cannot find out God nor the things of God prepared for those that love him. Natural science and philosophy are useful, but have limitations. The gospel--God's wisdom-is foolishness to the one who thinks nature reveals all that can be known. He is the natural man-the man of nature-to him revelation by inspiration is foolishness. So long as he depends on nature as the only source of knowledge, he will not, he cannot, "receive the things of the Spirit, for they are foolishness unto him." The ultra modernist rejects all revelation as foolishness. The natural man rejects revelation, because, to him, it is foolishness. Any man therefore that rejects revelation as foolishness is a natural man, for that is what the natural man does. Can such a man be converted? Not so long as he holds that attitude toward the gospel as a revelation from God. He must realize his limitations, his poverty of spirit. "If any man thinketh that he knoweth anything, he knoweth not yet as he ought to know." (I Cor. 3:5). "Let no man deceive himself. If any man thinketh that he is wise among you in this world, let him become a fool, that he may become wise." (I Cor. 3:8). A man in that frame of mind is in position to examine and judge concerning spiritual matters.

But if the natural man is an unconverted man, how is he ever to be regenerated and converted, for both regeneration and conversion are things of the Spirit; and if the theory is correct, they are things the natural man cannot receive. The natural man is not the unconverted man, but the man who seeks knowledge only through the study of nature, and thinks the idea that God ever made a revelation to man is foolishness.

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.