Error feeds and fattens on ignorance of the Bible, while there is a Bible knowledge that is in the reach of everybody. But, to be familiar with the contents of the Bible, people have to read it. To understand it they have to read it with attention. Attention is the stuff memory is made out of. I trust that we don't have the same definition for memory that a boy in school did, when on written examination in answer to the question, “what is your memory”? he wrote: “The thing that I forget with.” A great many people in this world have that kind of memory - for what they read in the Bible. We are too much concerned often about finding some peculiar meaning in what the Bible says, instead of finding out what it says and believing that. I know of nothing more important than that and the emphasis that we ought to put on it now.

Every once in a while, (I am almost too modest to quote this) every once in a while somebody says, “you shoot over the heads of the people.” Well, I think that is a compliment to me, but not much of a compliment to the people. Once, in West Texas, a few years ago, a man complained that he couldn’t understand what I was talking about. This critic wasn’t a member of the church. One of the brethren said to him, “You are the first man I ever heard of who said that about Early Areeneaux. I thought that was usually the trouble, they knew exactly what he was talking about.” That was what was the matter with him. It wasn’t that he couldn’t understand what I was talking about; he understood too well. He didn’t like it; it didn’t suit hi. Sometimes people say, “It was mighty plain.” I say, “Yes, that is the most offensive thing about it.” Some preachers never give offense, and I’ll tell you how to accomplish that, if that is what you wish to know. Nobody will ever take offense before they find out what you are talking about. If they never find out, nobody will ever get offended at anything you preach. Men don’t give offense because people don’t find out what they are talking about.

Tonight I wish to give you a general survey of what the New Testament says on the subject, “what was true before the death of Christ and what is true since his death.” The contrast, the sharp contrast, clearly stated in the New Testament on that matter is not a matter of deep preaching. The things that I shall give you tonight are not deep, you don’t have to dig after them, you rake them off the surface as you read. They stick, up like pot legs. People, read the book through and don’t know what St says. That’s what is the matter with the world religiously.
not the difficulty of understanding what the Bible says, but the failure to pay attention to what it says.

In the very opening chapters of the New Testament, we read, Matt. 3:2, “In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea and saying, Repent ye: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” That kingdom had been the subject of Old Testament prophecy. Now John says it was closer, nearer the establishment of it, and he said the kingdom of heaven is at hand. Note, as we pass along that where Matthew said “kingdom of heaven,” Mark says “kingdom of God,” and Luke says “kingdom of God;” so, of course, kingdom of heaven in Matthew and kingdom of God in Mark and Luke mean the same thing, because they are quoting the same preacher. Jesus said “kingdom of heaven is at hand.” I’ll not make an argument on that now, simply direct attention to the fact that God had Jesus and the twelve back there preaching “the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” Now come on this side of the cross and hunt for “the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” No matter what it means right now, before his death they said “kingdom of heaven is at hand,” but after his death, nobody ever said that. Why didn’t they keep on saying it if the situation is the same that it was then? But they didn’t. At least, it is not on record that anybody said it was at hand after the death of Christ. Some say they quit it long before his death. We will find out about that before we are through tonight. It isn’t so, but there is a difference between the proclamation concerning the kingdom before the death of Jesus and thereafter. At hand, back there, and a blank space after his death, whatever it means.

Now, another point, John the Baptist said, “the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” Jesus said it is “at hand.” Some people say it was established when Jesus ordained the apostles. All right, now look: John the Baptist and Jesus pointed out to the future when they said “at hand,” didn’t they? Yes. Then he sent out the twelve and told them to preach “the kingdom of heaven is at hand,” but according to the theory it had already been established. It was established when He called them. Then when it was established, “at hand” reversed its meaning, didn’t it? How could John and Jesus mean it was future when they said it was at hand, but when the twelve said it was at hand, they meant that it had already been established? Of course, they didn’t. Whatever John meant and whatever Jesus meant when they said “it is at hand,” the twelve meant they when they said “it is at hand.” If it was established when the twelve said it was at hand, then, it had already been established before John the Baptist ever said it was at hand. And, if it hadn’t been established when Jesus said it was at hand, then it hadn’t been established when the twelve said it was at hand.

“They kingdom come,” Matt. 6:10, in what is commonly called “The Lord’s Prayer.” Just the other side of the cross you have another big blank space. You don’t find anybody praying that way after the death of Christ. Do you learn anything from that? I’ll not stop to make an argument on that. It ought not to be necessary.

John 16:24, “Hitherto have ye asked nothing in my name.” The 26th verse, “In that day ye shall ask in my name.” What happened between the time they asked not in his name and when they should ask in his name, and the law should be in force, which says, “whatever ye do in word or in deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus.” Col. 3:17. We will find out as we go along what it was that made that difference. And note: in what they call the Lord’s prayer back there when they said “Thy kingdom come,” the name of Christ was absent. On this side of the cross, “in his name.” Nobody prayed that way after his death — nobody prayed “Thy kingdom come.” Why? Why didn’t they pray “thy kingdom come?” Well, you say, ‘People pray that way now.” Yes, I know, in ignorance of what the New Testament says. “They don’t agree with you about what it means.” It doesn’t make any difference what it means. I’m talking about what it says.
Before his death Jesus says they didn't ask in his name, but he said "in that day ye shall ask in my name." Then you can't memorize and recite that little prayer called the Lord's prayer and pray scripturally according to Christ now. And on the other point too, "Thy kingdom come," you don't have to do any explaining, just read what it says. That is all.

In the verse between those two, John 16:25, Jesus said "hitherto, I taught you in proverbs," and sometimes that is translated "parables." It is not the word Matthew, Mark and Luke used for parable; and Matthew, Mark and Luke never used the one John used. "Proverb" or "dank saying." "I've taught you, hitherto," up to this time, that was right before his death, "I've taught you in proverbs: but the time cometh, when I shall no longer speak unto you in proverbs." I'll quit doing that and show you plainly of the Father. I wish to give you one illustration of that. Jesus said to Nicodemus, 'A man must be born again.'' Nicodemus did not understand what he meant and that's a dark saying. It is figurative language, of course. I heard a sermon in Houston, Texas, once, by a very distinguished man. (I was very curious to hear him; I invited myself to go.) He was preaching to a colored audience. I think I was the Only white man there except the preacher, possibly. I had a very courteous reception, ushered to a front seat, and when I went in all of the windows were put up, for two reasons, and I appreciated both of them. I was interested in seeing how he would address that audience. I knew they needed simple, plain, easily understood preaching; and they are about as smart as we are. The man said "My subject is the new birth," and I suppose that in forty minutes, at least twenty times, he said "The sinner cannot do anything to get himself into Christ. He must be born again." Over and over and over that was repeated. Preaching the dark saying of the personal ministry of Jesus and ignoring the plain speech given later. When he had spoken forty minutes he paused and asked this question: "What is the one indispensable condition of being born again?" If I had had $300.00 in my pocket to pay for disturbing religious worship, I would have stood up and cried out, "There is no condition, sir. You've already abundantly established that." The idea of a man talking about condition of being born again when he had asserted over and over and over that a sinner can't do anything to get himself into Christ. He gave an illustration, and his illustration was a good one. It made crystal clear what he meant. I already understood it, but he gave an illustration. He said, "You put a fish out here on dry land. He can't swim into the river. That's the sinner. He can't do anything to get himself into Christ; but, you take that fish and put him in the river. He can swim in ft." And he asked, "What is the one indispensable condition of being born again?" He answered: "That you believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." SO he made his own theological fish swim right down the dry bank into the river. And that's not the first time, of course, men of that type have met themselves coming back before they were through one sermon. I just give you that in passing as an illustration of John 16:25"Hitherto I've taught you in proverbs; but the time cometh, when I shall no longer speak unto you in proverbs." I'll quit that and tell you plainly.

Now then, go to the book of Acts of Apostles, the New Testament book of conversations. How many times did an inspired man ever tell a sinner he must be born again? If they ever did, it is not on record. Well, is that supposed to teach us anything at all, or not? It seemed to be a very clear commentary on what Jesus said. "I'll not use proverbs any longer, but will tell you plainly of the Father." A different manner of teaching then, before the death of Christ and since. In Matt. 16:18, Jesus said, "Upon this Rock I will build my church." Coming this side of the cross, Acts 8:1, we read, "The church which was at Jerusalem." Back of the cross, "will build," after the cross, "was built." Future tense before the death of Christ: after his death past tense. Matt. 16:18, "will build;" Eph. 2:20, "you are built." I will not stop and make an argument on that. It makes itself. On the night of the betrayal, Luke 22:18, Jesus said, "I shall not henceforth drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come." Then, on the night of the betrayal the kingdom had not come. Come to this side of the cross, Col. 1:13, Paul said to the members of the church, "God hath delivered you from the power of darkness," that is the kingdom of Satan, and hath translated you into the kingdom of his dear Son. Rev. 1:9, John said, "I am your brother in the kingdom of Jesus." On the night of the betrayal, "the kingdom shall come." Later in both Paul's and John's writings they declared men were in the kingdom.

Now right at this point, I want to spend just a moment or two on another matter, another passage. Somebody says, "What about Luke 16:16, 'The law and the prophets were until John.' John the Baptist, "since that time the kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it?" Some men, those who teach the kingdom was set up when Christ ordained his apostles, used to quote that. They don't quote it any more. They've learned better. Why? Because that, if that passage tells us when the kingdom was established it puts the beginning of it way back yonder before they say it was established; and proves too much to suit them: therefore, they can't use it. I want your careful
attention to the parallel reading in Matt. 11:11-13. “Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist: yet he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than John.” “For the law and the prophets prophesied until John. Since that time the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force.” In Luke they pressed into it, the revised version says “entereth violently into it.” Matthew says they “took it by force.” It suffered violence. Men of violence took it by force. Question: Is that the way men normally get into the kingdom, by violence? “Entereth violently into it.” “The kingdom of heaven suffered violence.” Second: The kingdom of heaven was preached. What did John preach about it? That it is at hand, but the passage is quoted to prove that it had been established and that men had entered an established kingdom. If they did, they entered one he didn’t preach. He didn’t preach an established kingdom. He preached a kingdom at hand. How did they get into an established kingdom when he preached a kingdom at hand? And, another thing, how did his converts get in and John himself did not? John, great as he was, was not in the kingdom. “He that is least in the kingdom is greater than John.” There is a figure in that passage. They are represented as trying to take the kingdom by storm, and that idea is clearly brought out in many passages in the gospels. The key to them is John 6:15. Jesus knew they were about to come and take him by force, and make him king. He withdrew, so they couldn’t find him. They had an idea of an earthly temporal kingdom and they were trying to rush the inauguration of it. Remember the last time, the triumphal entry, they shouted, “Hosannah, to him that cometh in the name of the Lord.” They thought, “Now this will be the inaugural ceremony. He hasn’t established it yet, he certainly will now.” And, Luke 19:11-12, Jesus spoke a parable, as they went up to Jerusalem, because they thought the kingdom should immediately appear and the parable begins, “A nobleman went into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom and to return.” And I catch some writers adding “return to establish his kingdom.” It doesn’t say anything of the sort. But he comes back and judges men who would not let him reign over them. Doesn’t say he came back to establish a kingdom. I want your attention to some other passages of scripture. Dan. 7:13-14, Daniel said, “I saw in the night visions, one like unto the Son of man, and he came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given unto him a kingdom, and glory and power that all nations should serve and obey him.” Sometimes we are told that is still future. Note that he is to be given a kingdom, and glory and power. I Pet. 1:21, Peter said, “God raised him from the dead and gave him glory.” But that wouldn’t necessarily establish the order. Just keep that thought in abeyance for a moment or two. Luke 24:25-26, after his resurrection, Jesus said, “O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: (now watch what the prophets spoke) that the Christ must suffer and enter into his glory.” But he was to receive glory and the kingdom when he went back to the Father. Matt. 20:21, James and John requested that they might sit one at Christ’s right hand and one at his left hand in his kingdom. Mark 10:37 quotes “That we may sit, one at your right hand and one at your left hand, in thy glory.” Kingdom and glory are used interchangeably, and the prophets taught he must suffer and enter into his glory. I am not arguing that necessarily means that he had to suffer before he entered his glory, but we’ll see whether or not that is what it means, and I’ll not do the explaining. I’ll read: I Pet. 1:10 to 12. Note: “Concerning which salvation the prophets sought and searched diligently, who prophesied of the grace that should come unto you: searching what, or what manner of time, the Spirit of Christ which was in them did point unto, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glories that should follow.” Now we won’t have to explain which was first, the glory or the suffering. “Unto whom it was revealed, that not unto themselves, but unto us they did minister the things, which now have been announced unto you through them that preached unto you the gospel by the Holy Spirit sent forth from heaven; which things the angels desire to look into.” What was the prophet talking about? Salvation. The things that are brought to you, announced in the gospel of Christ. That’s what Peter says the prophets were talking about. Look at Luke 24:44. We will begin with that verse, and note carefully the reading of this passage. This is the language of Christ, the record of what he said. And he said unto them, These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things (note, all things) must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms concerning me.” That would be just about everything that was written about him in the Old Testament, wouldn’t it? “Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the scriptures.” “Law, prophets and psalms.” And he said unto them, “Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day, that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all nations, beginning from Jerusalem.” That is what Jesus said. of the “all things” con-
cerning him in the law, the prophets and the psalms. The same thing that Peter says is salvation, and that it was, revealed to the prophets that it was reserved for them to whom the gospel of Christ should be preached. But, we pass on.

Hebrews 8:4. “If Christ were on earth he should not be a priest at all.” Back of the cross Christ was not a priest. This side he is a “priest forever after the order of Melchizedec.” (Hebrews 5:10) Peter wrote to Christians and said, “You are a royal priesthood.” But Christ was not a priest on earth. Was the church established while he was on earth? If it was it didn’t have any high priest. Christ couldn’t be a priest on earth. If Christ had undertaken to serve as a priest on earth, he would have been a sinner. He would have been violating the law of Moses. He wasn’t of the right tribe, and the Levitical priesthood was still in force. Christ was of the tribe of Judah, “of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priests.” Hebrews 7:12-14.

A few years ago, some man wrote a little leaflet in which he said that Christ was an Israelite, but not a Jew. Somebody sent that to me and asked me to comment. I took a pencil and wrote in the margin, Hebrews 7:14 and mailed it back to him. Christ was of the tribe of Judah, “of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priests.” Hebrews 7:12-14.

Before Christ died the New Testament was not in force, Hebrews 9:16-17. “Where there is a testament there must also of necessity be the death of the testator.” A testament is in force after men are dead. I don’t have to guess about this. I don’t have to tell you what it means. “A testament is in force after men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all, while he that made it liveth.” The Revised Version says, “it doth never avail while he that made it liveth.” We all understand that. A man’s will is not executed while he lives, but after he dies. “Before faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the faith.” “Before faith came,” that is the faith, “we were kept in ward under the law.” The law was in force until Christ died. Col. 2:14. He nailed it to the cross and took it out of the way. Then before that the faith had not come. Now imagine the advocate of faith only establishing his church before Christ died. “Before faith came, we were kept in Ward under law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.” Gal. 3:23, 24. But now, this side of the cross (and that “now” used in that sense in the New Testament never goes back of the cross, don’t forget that.) “Now that faith is come.” “The law was our tutor to bring us to Christ.” “To bring us” was supplied however, and that is the thing that is nearly always emphasized. That% the thing Paul didn’t say. The law is our tutor unto Christ. There wasn’t any use to supply anything. The law was our schoolmaster unto Christ. That is plain enough. That is what Paul said. “Now that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster.” I don’t need to spend time on that. That is a matter that all of us are perfectly familiar with, but it is a very clear distinction between what was true before Christ died and what is true now. I think that I can give you a pretty good summary of the main ideas that I am trying to get before you by simply reading another passage of scripture. Eph. 2:13, “Wherefore remember, that once;” and I’m asserting that once is back of the cross. “Well, your assertion doesn’t prove anything.” All right, watch the reading now. “Ye, the Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called Circumcision in the flesh, made by hands, that ye were at that time separate from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of the promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ.” You get the line there between at that time and now, don’t you? “Ye who once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ. For he is our peace, who made both one.” Both what? Jew and Gentile. “Made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; that he might,” (now watch, he brought the Gentiles nigh, he made peace between them and the Jews, he broke down the middle wall of partition, abolishing the enmity, even the law) “that (in order that) he might create in himself of the two one new man, so making peace.” That forever explodes the theory that the church was established before Christ died. Paul says he died that he might create it; but again somebody says that you are asserting. How do I know that one new man means the church? Read the next verse: “and that he might reconcile both unto God in one body.” We don’t have to guess about these things if we take what the book says and are willing to let God’s word settle these issues. The body is the church. (Col. 1:18)

Again, John 16:12, “I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot hear them now.” Just before his death. Next verse, “But when the ‘Spirit is come He shall guide you into all the truth.” John 7:39, “the Spirit was not yet given,” (That is, before the death of Christ) “because Jesus was not yet glorified.” The Spirit was not yet given. Jesus was not yet glorified. Before his death he was in his humiliation, “he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross.
Wherefore also God hath highly exalted him." Phil. 2:7-10. And right there, when he went back to the Father, the New Testament says he was exalted, crowned, glorified, and sat down on the throne, was made high priest, given to be the head over all things to the church, given a name that is above every name. Named of God a high priest forever after the order of Melchizedek, made both Lord' and Christ, angels and authorities and powers being made subject to him, and all things were put under his feet, at the time he went back to the Father.

Again, this is just a matter of getting together in one view everything the New Testament says on the subject, and accepting them. In these studies, you understand, I've already been trying to put emphasis on method, proper method in Bible study. Just in the moment or two that I have, that I shall use now before I close, I want your attention to what I consider some important principles. First, and that is already indicated in the things I have brought before you, things I have read. It is a misuse of Old Testament prophecy whenever anybody goes back there trying to make the New Testament teach something you can't read in the New Testament. You just save yourself years of toil in trying to sift out false theories on that subject, if you will just understand it is a misuse of the prophets whenever anybody is trying to make an Old Testament prophecy make the New Testament teach something the New Testament doesn't say. And whenever you go to a parable to prove a doctrine that you can't read somewhere in plain speech, you will make the parable teach something it doesn't teach and something the Bible doesn't teach. When you go to the symbolical language of the Book of Revelation trying to prove a doctrine that is not plainly taught before you get to the book of Revelation, you are making Revelation teach something it doesn't teach and make it contradict what the Bible does teach. Men go back and quote Ezekiel 36:25, "I'll sprinkle clean water upon you and you shall be clean." Therefore, sprinkle means "baptize." Prove it by Ezekiel's prophecy. Come over here to the New Testament and say baptism is the fulfillment of Ezekiel. Well how do you know it is? Nobody would ever have thought it was if he hadn't been trying to prove that baptism means "sprinkle." If baptize fulfills Ezekiel, why did Ezekiel use one word and the New Testament writers always use a different word? None of them ever used sprinkle, when they were talking about baptism. Suppose I were to invite you down to a river and say, "I'm going to fulfill Ezekiel's prophecy." Suppose Philip had done that, if he had had an audience. Ezekiel said, "I'll sprinkle clean water upon you," and Philip would have said, "I'll show you how that is done. They both went down into the water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and he baptized him." Why did they go down into the water if they were going to fulfill Ezekiel's prophecy concerning sprinkling? And suppose you had been there, and Philip reached down and got water in the palm of his hand and sprinkled or poured it on the man's head. Would you have written Col. 2:12, "buried with him in baptism, wherein also you were raised with him?" You never would have described what you saw that way.

BROTHER McMillan "NOT GUILTY"
JAMES W. ADAMS

In my recent criticism of Brother McMillan's article, I chided him for waiting until the fray was over before he came on the field of battle with his pea shooter. Now, one of Brother McMillan's friends writes that Brother McMillan did not wait until the fray was over, but that the article in question was in the office of the Firm Foundation about two years ago.

It appears then, that Brother McMillan was a braver man than I gave him credit for being. He wanted to get in the battle while it was hot with his pea shooter, but Brother Showalter being much more experienced than he, and evidently recognizing the fact that Brother McMillan was not exactly loaded for bear, decided to restrain Brother McMillan lest he get hurt. Now, after the worst of the battle is over, he is willing for Brother McMillan to have his day.

Brother McMillan will please accept my apologies for misjudging his courage, but, of course, the reader will recognize the fact that the brother's courage adds nothing to the strength of his article. Too, the reader will please not hold me responsible for the fact that the Firm Foundation waited two years to print our brother's article. However, I cannot find it in my heart to criticize Brother Showalter, for had I been in his place I would have waited longer than that. Yes, yes, much longer.
WAS THE DEBATE A SHAM?

C. R. NICHOL

Some months ago two gospel preachers engaged in a public debate before a large audience in a town where there are several churches representing different denominations. In the debate brother “A” affirmed a doctrine to be true that he did not believe. He made free use of the Bible in his effort to prove the doctrine he believed to be false, to be exactly what the Bible teaches. His best efforts were put forth to prove what he did not believe. Brother “A” had been assured by more than one party that brother “B” who had been selected to reply to his false teaching in the debate, was fully able to expose — show the fallacy of his every contention; that he was able to show all in the audience with honest hearts and who listened without prejudice, that the doctrine brother “A” advanced, and contended to be true, was false.

How many were in the audience who believed the doctrine Brother “A” was affirming I do not know. Nor do I know what they thought of brother “A” as he contended earnestly for a doctrine he did not believe; using the Bible in an effort to prove what he believed to be false. Did the brother pervert the Scriptures in his contention — in his effort to prove true the doctrine he does not believe the Scriptures teach? He certainly did. There arises the question: Was he speaking forth the “words of truth and soberness” in trying to prove true what he believes the Bible DOES NOT teach? Can a man contend for a false doctrine and be guiltless? Is one obeying the teachings of the Scriptures: “Preach the word”, when he spends time trying to prove what he believes ‘to be false? Is it an evil thing to teach false doctrine? Is it ever right to do “evil” even if it is thought good will come therefrom?

There is more to the story than recited in the foregoing. The false doctrine which was knowingly taught by brother “A” was to be exposed. Brother “B” had been selected to do that very thing; to show that the false doctrine Brother “A” had so earnestly contended to be the teaching of the Bible, was (is) not taught in God’s word, that those who teach it are not teaching the truth: But brother “B” made a failure, he was unable to answer some of the arguments brother “A” had presented, and the debate closed that night. The audience was dismissed, with arguments made, false arguments made by brother “A” not being answered — and to quote one who heard the debate, “the truth did temporarily suffer in the debate.” The audience left the building that night without hearing the false doctrine preached by brother “A”, a gospel preacher completely exposed. No,

I am not advised how brother ‘A” felt about his part in the debate, his presentation of false doctrine, and perverting the Scriptures in an effort to prove true that which he knew was false. Nor do I know how others felt in ‘the audience. But there is more:

I am advised that the “next day” the unanswered arguments made by brother “A” were “thoroughly threshed out” — completely answered and shown to be false contentions.

No, I do not know that all who heard the false arguments made were present to hear the unanswered arguments “threshed out” and “exposed.” Nor do I have a doubt that the false arguments were shown to be false.

I am bothered though about the righteousness of those proposing such a debate, as well as of the brother making the effort to prove what he believes to be a false doctrine, and using God’s word in that effort. I cannot keep ‘another matter out of my mind: What do we people think of a gospel preacher using the Bible in an effort to prove what he does not believe. Was some man in the audience who believed the false doctrine for which brother “A” contended confirmed in his view, and returned to his home more satisfied in his false views than ever. If “Yes” what part did brother “A” have in settling the man in his false views?

Recently I read, in one of the papers published by brethren of the church of Christ, of a debate in which on another occasion one brother affirmed a proposition, and presented the arguments which some think prove a false doctrine to be true; and another brother replied to the arguments. I wonder will it be thought by the advocates of the doctrine the brother affirmed, which is false, were presented fairly; if they were properly represented; and is it possible that some one will think that there was an agreement (between the two brethren that the one presenting false doctrine presented only such as he knew the brother representing the truth could make a refutatory reply. Will it be thought by the teachers of the false doctrine that they have been treated right, I am frank when I tell you I would not be willing for some man in the Baptist Church to represent my brethren and present arguments for what I believe, and then have another Baptist preacher make replies to the arguments a Baptist made, purporting to represent what I believe. Nor do I think a Baptist would be willing for me to propose to represent a Baptist, present Baptist doctrine, and have one of my brethren reply to the arguments; even though I know some Baptist preachers who believe me to be honest:

(Continued on page 13)
BROTHER BIXLER’S PLEA TO HIS BRETHREN

JAMES W. ADAMS

An article bearing the appealing title, “To My Brethren In Christ” by O. D. Bixler, has appeared recently in at least two brotherhood papers. Surrounding it is an aura of pathos and humility that is immediately apparent and not without appeal to the emotional nature. Not being callous emotionally and earnestly desiring to recognize every particle of good in all men, this scribe would like to withdraw every objection he has made to Brother Bixler’s close connection with the Japanese work, but feelings and sympathy cannot void the cold facts of the case so as to make such action possible. Between Brother Bixler and this writer, there is no personal issue, hence nothing that has been written stems from any personal aversion to the man himself. Your scribe is ready to concur in every good thing that may have been said about him, but so long as his faithfulness to the truth of God’s word is questionable, this writer and the Bible Banner stand committed against any connection he may have with a program of evangelism seeking the support of loyal churches.

QUALIFICATIONS OF A LEADER

One who aspires to a position of leadership in any program of work of the Lord’s church must necessarily have two qualifications: (1) He must be faithful; (2) He must be able. Paul wrote, “Thou therefore, my son, be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus. And the grace that is in Christ Jesus. And the power of discernment, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also” (2 Tim. 2:1, 2). Paul’s statement has particular reference to teachers of God’s word, but the principle stated is equally applicable to any position of leadership in the kingdom of God. Brother Bixler’s ability to make a very splendid contribution to the evangelization of Japan is not questioned, but his faithfulness to the Truth is questioned. Until the question mark is removed, he will continue to be opposed.

BROTHER BIXLER’S REAL BELIEFS

In our brother’s appeal to his brethren in Christ, he makes the following statement:

“Brethren who have been sufficiently interested to ask my real belief tell me that I have done myself and my work an injustice by allowing the general designation of “A premillennialist” to be applied to me. Possibly I have done so, but I do not desire to attempt to explain myself out of anything; but I do consider it my duty, for the sake of the Japanese work and the cause of Christ in general, to make my beliefs clear.

That desire is the entire reason for this article.”

In this statement, Brother Bixler reproves by implication those who have not “run him down” and asked him personally what he really believes about premillennialism. Why, Brother Bixler, we hardly thought that necessary since you had styled yourself a premillennialist. Are we obligated to seek out every self-styled false teacher in the brotherhood and ask him if he is really what he says he is, or just “spoofing”? Can any explanation really explain why a supposedly sensible man would style himself something that he is not? Brother Bixler says that “possibly he has done himself and his work an injustice” by such a course. What does brother Bixler mean by “possibly”? Does he not know even yet? Surely our brother is not so naive as he would have us believe. Can any man have such an appalling lack of judgment that he does not know whether he is or is not wrong in telling people that he is something which he is not? However, one gets the feeling from his article that at this late hour, he is seeking to leave the impression that he does not know whether he is a premillennialist or not. Could such be the meaning of his “possibly”?

Our brother says that his article is for the sole purpose of setting forth his “real beliefs,” Now this writer makes no claim to superior intelligence, but he does believe that he has a reasonable degree of the power of discernment, and he 4s obliged to say, after reading the Bixler plea, ‘that the brother’s real beliefs would never be learned by anyone from that source. The article says nothing tangible with reference to the man’s real beliefs concerning premillennialism. It is really about as clear as mud in this respect.

DOES BIXLER OPPOSE ‘AND DISAGREE WITH THE PREMILLENNIALISTS?

In his article, Brother Bixler says that “he opposes and disagrees with all those extreme actions which premillennialists as such ordinarily practice concerning the return of Christ and a thousand years literal reign on earth.” From this statement, one learns very little about Bixler’s views. It is apparent to any thinking person that he says nothing about opposing or disagreeing with the premillennial theory. He represents himself as opposing and disagreeing with some “extreme actions.” He fails to tell us what these “extreme actions” are. Brother Bixler needs to write another article telling us specifically, point by point, wherein he opposes and disagrees with premillennialists and pre-
millennialism. Will you write such an article, Brother Bixler? If so, let your language be plain and unequivocal. Yes, do let us know what you really believe. We are “sufficiently interested” and we are “asking you”! On the other hand, if you oppose and disagree so with the premillenialists, why has there been such intimate fellowship between you and the Louisville crowd? Why was your “You Can Help” movement honeycombed with premillenialists and their sympathizers? Why did you write and circulate the “Historicity of Prophets Beliefs in the Church” which advocates the fellowship of the premillenialist and his teaching in the church? Why did your friends such as Norman Davidson think and tell that you were a premillenialist? Yes, in the answer to these questions, we are “sufficiently interested”!

BROTHER BIXLER EMPLOYS THE FAMILIAR PREMILLENNIAL DODGE

The escape hatch of every premillenialist under fire is employed by Brother Bixler in his plea to the brethren. He feigns ignorance with reference to premillenialism seeking to make the whole controversy but a difference of opinion over a literal or figurative interpretation of Revelation 20. Some may feel that to say Brother Bixler “feigns ignorance” is to use rather strong language. Some may wonder how one could make such a statement. If so, this is to inform you that the evidence is in the files of your scribe. Several years ago Brother Bixler wrote a treatise on premillenialism entailing considerable research. He calls the tract which resulted from this investigation “The Historicity of Prophetic Beliefs in the Church”. A copy of the same is in the files of the writer. In it, Brother Bixler quotes from: Gibbon; Newton; Origgen; Justin Martyr; Irenaeus; Tertullian; J. F. Silver; Commodianus; McllGiffert; Taylor; Berkaeauer; Smith; Harnaek; Moses E. Lard; Tixerant; West; Duffield; Gieseler; ‘Luther; Alexander Campbell; J. W. McGarvey; I. B. Grubbs; Brents; J. A. Harding; and the New Testament. All of these quotations were made to prove (?), according to his own testimony, that:

“The church fathers for the first three centuries believed in and taught the 1000 year reign of Christ on the earth” (Cover).

“The early Christians and apostles themselves believed it” (Pg. 10).

“That indeed premillenialism has been the ‘common belief’ of Christian people from the pioneers of our modern age back to the very apostles themselves” (Pg. 21).

“The positions the (premillenialists J. W. A.1 held were as villars in the churches” (Pg. 21).

(All quotations from: “Historicity of Prophetic Beliefs in the Church” by O. D. Bixler)

No, Brother Bixler is not ignorant concerning what premillenialism is. He fully understands the “theory, hence when he styled himself “a premillenialist,” he knew what such involved. He knew full well the positions of premillenialists both ancient and modern, and yet, said, “I am a premillenialist”. Now he says, “Possibly” (emphasis mine J. W. A.) I have done myself and my work and injustice”. It would take a great deal of explaining for such action to make sense to a genius much less to an ordinary individual. Gullibility would probably help one to swallow it better than anything else.

Brother Bixler now says that he ‘has but one thing in common with premillenialists; namely, that Revelation 20 should be interpreted literally rather than figuratively. Thus does he seek to place the whole matter on the basis of a difference in human opinions with reference to unfulfilled prophecy. This is not a new course with the premillenial crowd. Such has been their course always, but let us get Brother Bixler straight on this point here and now. The premillenial controversy has resulted from the teaching of a materialistic theory utterly at variance with the plain teaching of the New Testament in all of its fundamental features and which claims as its authority Revelation 20:1-6. Such a theory cannot be classed as an opinion. It is a false doctrine. Knowing this theory in all of its parts, Brother Bixler, styled himself a premillenialist. The only way he can ever vindicate himself in the eyes of the brethren is for him to come out with a definite statement concerning his personal conviction with reference to every subject that bears upon the premillenial doctrine. What does he believe about: The kingdom of God; the reign of Christ; Christ on David’s throne; the resurrection of the dead; the judgment; the second coming of Christ; the return of the Jews etc., etc., etc.? Another thing, does he yet advocate and practice the fellowshipping of the premillenial teacher and his doctrine?

BROTHER BIXLER’S PLEA TO BE USED IN JAPAN

Brother Bixler’s fervent plea to be used in Japan is, we take it, completely sincere. It has a touching ring to it that arouses our sympathy, yet, with the shadow under which our brother has placed himself still hovering him, he makes it impossible for many, many brethren who love the truth and desire to see it preached in Japan to endorse and support the work so long as he has connection with it. Assuming that Brother Bixler is sincere in his plea, we make this plea to him: Come out on the truth of God’s word and take a firm stand against premillenialism and the way will be clear for you to be used in Japan. No one has any desire to force the (Continued on page 15)
“RECEIVE HIM NOT . . . NEITHER BID HIM GOD SPEED”.

WRIGHT RANDOLPH

“Whosoever tranagresseth, and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son. If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed: For he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds.” (2 John 9:11).

Yes, I know John was talking about the man who would “confess not that Jesus Christ is come in ‘the flesh.” However, there is a principle involved in this scripture which prohibits a Christian from having anything in common with the person who transgresses God’s word.

It has been said that the West Coast is a “hot-bed for isms.” Perhaps this is true. At least there are many “isms” making their appearance here from time to time. I think, however, this is not limited to the West Coast. We have had, and will perhaps always have, these “isms”. It is to be expected in those who are not members of the Lord’s church. But when we find it among the members of His Body it is disgusting indeed; among men who wear the name of Gospel preachers of whom we have a right to expect better things. Many indictments have been brought against such men in the pages of the Bible Banner. Indictments which have been proved and substantiated by many infallible proofs. This article is not so much in regard to these men. I am raising the question as to what should be our attitude toward those who receive such false teachers and “bid them God speed”?

Brother Beam has taken upon himself the responsibility of championing the cause of the “Instrumental Music Brethren”. He is willing to fight their battle for them. Those brethren may be rejoicing because he is willing to battle for them; for it seems that they are not disposed to champion their own cause. Following this course brother Beam has turned aside from the truth. He has denied the Word of God and spurned the knowledge of recognized men through the generations past. But my Question is; Is Brother Beam in worse condition than the man who will support Beam in his efforts? Recently Central church in Long Beach conducted several nights meetings, using different speakers each night. Among these speakers were preachers who say; “We do not agree with brother Beam on the Music Question”. Preachers who have been known to publicly state their position as being contrary to his. These men helped brother Beam and the Central church to stage these meetings. Did they not encourage an erring brother and congregation? It is possible that they could have done what they did without being charged with doing wrong. If they had spoken out against the position of Central and their preacher while making the ir speeches they would have done well. And there could be no criticism. Did they so speak? If so the information has not come to us. Did Brother Beam feel that he was safe in inviting such men to speak for him? Was he pretty well assured in his own mind that they would not attack his unscriptural position? I know of some preachers who were not invited. Could it be that Ernest knew they would, or at least might, speak against the use of the Instrument or declare themselves as being opposed to the position of Central church. I imagine he thought they might do just such a thing — and I imagine he would not have been disappointed. Did these brethren violate John’s teaching? If so are they not guilty of sin and as much so as brother Beam? Frankly I had as soon espouse a false doctrine as to be guilty of encouraging the one who does.

Certain brethren have banded themselves together in an organization known as Tanda Lodge. At least one of the purposes of such an organization is to do the work which belongs to the Church. We are told that this is separate from the church and that the church is not responsible for it, financially or otherwise. However these brethren make their appeal to the church for support of the organization. They invite members of the church to take part in a contest to raise money for it; and as a reward for their efforts the young people of the winning congregation will be given a free vacation. The Old Fashioned Pie Supper idea was given up for fear it might be wrong. The contest with its prize was substituted in its place. If it is not the responsibility of the church then why make appeals to the church for financial support — why send letters to members of a congregation asking them to pledge a certain amount for the support of Tanda Lodge. The Organization seems to compare favorably in its existence with the U. C. M. S.$59,000.00 plus all the interest that will accumulate before the debt is retired doesn’t seem like a very good financial venture to begin with; and that to purchase property where Christians may have their vacations and, engage in some sort of religious activities. But brethren who are opposed to such additional organizations; at least they tell us they are, will have a part in furthering such an institution; appear on their programs etc. Will ‘they speak out against such an

(Continued on Page 16)
THE NEW LOOK IN EVANGELISM

JAMES W. ADAMS

The ladies, bless their hearts, have undergone a remarkable transformation in the last few years. A look in the family album will bear me out when I say that a lady of yesterday and one of today reminds one of the familiar “before” and “after” pictures which one sees in the magazines. Now do not be hasty ladies, this article is not a criticism of the “new look”. The fact is, I am quite pleased with the “new look” in women’s dress. I would not want the ladies of the church after me. It is bad enough to have some of the good brothers on my trail. This article has to do with the “new look” in evangelism, and it is new.

For many years the brethren have prided themselves in such slogans as: “We speak where the Bible speaks and remain silent where the Bible is silent”; “We call Bible things by Bible names and do Bible things the Bible way”; “We have a thus saith the Lord for every act of Christian work and worship”. In our present day, however, our taste for such attitudes has become stale. The time was when we went to the New Testament for our information and instruction with reference to New Testament evangelism. Today, there is definitely a “new look” in this respect.

NEW TESTAMENT EVANGELISM

Jesus said, “Go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” (Mk. 16:15-16). Functioning under this commission the apostles of our Lord and the early Christians “went forth and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them”. The gospel was preached in Jerusalem and Judea, then, upon the scattering of the church by the persecution that arose about Stephen, “they went everywhere preaching the word”. Philip “went down to the city of Samaria and preached Christ unto them”. Peter and John “preached the gospel in many of the villages of the Samaritans”. Saul was converted. Peter preached to the Gentile Cornelius and his house. Teachers from Jerusalem went as far as Antioch “preaching the word”. Paul and Barnabas went out from the church in Antioch into Asia Minor and “preached the word of God”. Paul and Silas went into Europe and “spake unto them the word of the Lord”. Finally, in one generation “the gospel was preached to every creature under heaven”. New Testament churches sprang up all over the civilized earth and prospered to such an extent as to be able to shake the very foundations of Imperial Rome. All of this was done by gospel preachers preaching the New Testament gospel under the direction and oversight of one organization, the local church. This was and is the Lord’s way, the New Testament way, the Gospel way.

MODERN EVANGELISM

Now it is different. There is a “new look” in evangelism. The great commission has been reconstructed to say, “Go into all the world and build orphan homes, colleges, and hospitals and operate benevolent enterprises of colossal proportions so that we may have an opportunity to preach unto men the gospel of Christ”. In New Testament times, the above mentioned items have appeared in the wake of Christianity. They have been the logical fruits of the Christian influence, but nowhere in the inspired record do we find an intimation of such enterprises of the gospel of Christ in lands where Christ had not been named. It seems that some of our brethren see Christianity only through an institutional peep hole.

But says one, “You cannot preach the gospel to the cold, the hungry, and the naked without first feeding, warming, and clothing them.” Is it possible that in the perilous days that saw the establishment of the church of our Lord that there were none who were cold, hungry, or naked? History surely reveals that the earth teemed with such people. The whole world lay to a large degree in wretchedness beneath the oppressive heel of Rome. Poverty was rampant in the land. Slavery held sway as an established and even honorable institution. Surely the misery of the masses of that day was no less than the misery of the conquered peoples of our day. The church guided directly by God’s Spirit did not go via the route of institutionalism to evangelize the world that then was, hence why should it be necessary for it to travel that road today? Man’s ways have never been as good as God’s ways. If the plain preaching of the gospel of Christ made Christians in Paul’s day and established New Testament churches without the building and operation of colleges, hospitals, orphan homes, and benevolent enterprises in ‘mission’ fields, will it not accomplish the same results today? If not, why not? Ah, my brethren, it was never in Paul’s day with reference to evangelism as it is today. It is too bad that Paul and the other apostles did not realize how much more effective it would have been first to establish colleges, hospitals, orphan homes, and benevolent enterprises of preaching the gospel. Yes, I suppose if they had thought of it and tried it, they would still be

(Continued on Page 15)
A BEGGING TRAFFIC

W. Wallace Layton

These remarks are not directed toward congregations who are overseeing a work in a mission field, and who are helping that field buy a building, or even asking other congregations for cooperative help. But there exists a begging traffic that has become a racket among the churches as annoying as it is degrading. Unlearned and overly-zealous young preachers have gone out into the mission fields, rounded up a few members and straightway plunged them into a building program and a building debt beyond their needs and means. Such a program tends to stifle the group before they have caught their first Christian breath.

The spirit of this begging campaign is not confined to young congregations. Some churches 20 to 40 years standing have caught the spirit of the racket, and now their appeals are pouring in also. These letters are based on the appeal that they just never will be respected in their community until they build a modern, up-to-date meeting house. And they want someone other than themselves to do this for them.

Just to illustrate what I mean we will note a few examples from the hundreds of such appeals that I have filed.

“The church here had its beginning in June with five members. We now have 25. We have bought a lot and need a building. The contractor needs $1000.00 before he will start, and then of course it will take much more than that to finish the building.”

The above letter relates of the progress made, of the opposition the little band has overcome, of the public attention they have drawn. It seems to me that if they have all the zeal and public attention described, they can surely muster enough congregational pride to build a meeting house, or rent one until they grow stronger. Truly, brethren let their enthusiasm run away with them.

Another church up north writes that a year ago they had “faith enough in every one to buy a property. But now there is a pressure of a $5500.00 balance due on the property that must be paid.” “We have faith now,” the letter continues “that churches with a missionary spirit will send a donation.”

This is typical of the “faith pressure” letters. In other words they do not take into consideration that those to whom they appeal may be actually supporting several preachers in actually preaching ‘the gospel (not running up blind indebtedness.) It implies that if we don’t send a contribution to help them overcome the embarrassment of poor management, and short-sightedness, that we are not a church with a “missionary spirit.” While the word “missionary” is a misnomer, still I think I know what the common use of the term means. And accepting that meaning, I fail to find where building elaborate buildings falls into the category of mission work anyway.

Here is another from a church of several years existence:

“We the church in _______ (population, have a membership of 10 women and 5 men. We have a lot and most of our building material on the lot. But we must have a little over $2000.00. We are now meeting in a tin building which is very hot.”

So to get them out of the “hot tin building” they expect the churches over the land to fall over themselves to rush two thousand dollars up there. It seems to me that if such a place had a lot clear of indebtedness, and practically all the needed materials, that if the five men amounted to anything in the community they could put up enough collateral to finance the building of the church house. Truly such appeals are efforts to ease their individual responsibility, at the expense of the larger churches who are what they are because they grew by congregational pride and responsibility from their own “tin house” to what they are today.

Another elaborate appeal comes in as follows:

“The membership is small but we have had an encouraging growth. Have been meeting in an old dwelling. By a great sacrifice (didn’t say how much) we bought a piece of property in the heart of the city. We have a fifteen year loan and will sacrifice to meet the payments. But the property cannot be used in its present state. The necessary improvements will be around $20,000.00 so we are asking you for a liberal donation _______”

Here is a picture of a small group of brethren, who obligate themselves head over heels in debt for the next fifteen years, for a piece of property that, in its present state, is as worthless to them as though it didn’t exist. And all they want out of the brotherhood for this leap in the dark, is just $20,000.00. A deduction of the fool-hardiness of this appeal is too apparent for any further special mention here.

Another illustrative appeal comes revealing the tragedy of not counting cost ahead of time.

“We have the lot, the walls of the building are up, and we have materials for the roof. But we cannot go on. We must have $2000.00 to enable us to move into the building. Without help the unfinished building will become a laughing-stock in the community.”

Well, is not that kinds like the story Jesus told, when he said men wouldn’t start a tower
until they had counted the cost. .. "lest when he lays the foundation, and is not able to finish it, men will mock." But why should the church try to jeopardize the good name of others by trying to make them feel they are obligated to pay through the nose for this short-sightedness and poor management.

Thus it could go on, but the above are typical. The best way to put a stop to this campaign of begging and shirking of responsibility, is for churches to ignore these matters. As long as these appeals are answered, the traffic will increase to chain-letter proportions. But when brethren find out they must paddle their own canoe, there will be a little more caution, and congregational responsibility displayed.

These are but samples and they all run true to these forms. It is these kinds of appeals that we are striking at in this article. Certainly the congregations with a competent eldership who launch a new work in some mission field, and then seek assistance on building a building (getting the money before the leap is made), do not fall under this indictment. It is a matter of sound business policy, caution and good judgement that is needed in matters of this kind.

WAS THE DEBATE A SHAM--

(Continued from page 7)

nor would I be placed in a position which would require me to knowingly affirm as true a false doctrine.

How a man who believes the gospel, a man who holds the Bible to be God's word, and subscribes to it, can bring himself to stand before the people and present doctrine which false teachers believe, and use the Bible in an effort to prove the doctrine true is more than I can understand. I know I do not want a book of that kind in my library; and I know I would not have part in such a debate. To me it is not one step short of a sham.

It is my persuasion that in the first debate mentioned in the foregoing the brother affirming a false doctrine did his very best to represent the people whose doctrine he was affirming; nor do I question that in the last debate mentioned in the foregoing the brother affirming the false doctrine, presented the very arguments the false teachers would present, nor that the arguments were successfully answered; but I do not think it is ever righteous for a man to contend for a false position; I think it is a bad example. I have no place in my library for such a book, if it is ever published; and I trust it will not be.

"Preach the word." (2 Tim. 4:2.)

"AND WHEN THOU ART CONVERTED, STRENGTHEN THY BRETHREN"

LaGrange, Arkansas
Aug. 8, 1948

Brother Roy E. Cogdill
Lufkin, Texas

Dear Brother Cogdill:

Find enclosed $1.00 for which please enter my subscription to BIBLE BANNER for one year. I happened to run across a copy of it, and like its tone. I am a new member of the church of Christ, being converted from the Methodist church, and I need something pretty rough and solid. I have had that soft and easy stuff long enough. I (believe this will fill the bill.

Kindly,
James Allen

"BULWARKS OF THE FAITH"

To the many who have sent in money for the second book of sermons delivered in the music hall in Houston, by Foy E. Wallace, Jr., we are happy to announce that the book is now in type. Brother Wallace has the galley proofs, and as soon as they are corrected and returned to us (and that should not be long) we will begin printing the book. The title of the book was to have been "Modern Denominational Doctrines Exposed," but Brother Wallace decided that "Bulwarks of the Faith" would be a more fitting title. We sincerely regret that the printing of this book has been delayed for such a long time, but it is impossible to anticipate the difficulty you will run into in getting out such a book. Let us thank you for your patience.

Please don't send in any more money for this book until announcement is made that it is ready for delivery. It will be some time yet before the book can be completed.

L. B.

OLD BOOKS

We have recently come into possession of some good used 'books. Among them six copies of "Butler's Analogy," $1.50 per copy. One copy "Butler's Works" and this is the analogy plus fourteen of his sermons, $2.00.

Two sets of "Hours With the Bible" by Geikie, three volumes per set, excellent condition, $4.50 per set. "The Life and Words of Christ" by Geikie, two volumes, $2.50. "Waddington's Church History" 8.75.

All these books are in good condition, First come first served.
Strange as it may seem, some people find it difficult to believe in an Eternal **Uncreated** Creator: An Uncaused Cause; An Unmoved Mover; that Being which the Bible describes as God. But if you think that believing there is a God **is** difficult, try believing that there is no Cod. Get outside some starlight night and look up. While you are looking remember that you are standing on a planet that makes an annual journey of five hundred and fifty-eight million miles around the sun traveling at the speed of sixty-three thousand miles an hour. That this little planet is one of nine that go to make up our solar system. We are so close to the sun that it only takes three hundred and sixty-five days to go around, while Neptune is so far away that it requires one hundred and sixty-four and one half years to make the trip. When you have comprehended (?) the magnitude of this solar system and the perfect timing with which it operates, then remember that this solar system is one of three hundred and fifty million such solar systems. **Try** to imagine the immensity of space required for such a galaxy of worlds. If you think it is hard to imagine illimitable space, try to imagine space with limits. What would you find at the end of space? Remember that the closest fixed star to this earth Alpha Centauri is so far away that the light from it, traveling at the rate of 186,000 miles per second takes nearly five years to reach us. Remember further that these innumerable planets, stars, suns and satellites move with such precision that the astronomers can predict a hundred years in advance when the sun or moon will be in eclipse. No human instrument is so perfectly made. If you can conclude, with these facts before you, that no intelligence was required to produce and arrange all this; or that no power was needed to wind up this gigantic clock and keep it running; that it is all the result of blind chance, then don’t “kid” yourself that you are thinking, or that you have made anything like an honest investigation of the matter.

**PURELY PERSONAL**

**CLED E. WALLACE**

It appears to be news when I become “seriously ill”. And well it may be for there have been very few days during my whole life that I have not been hale and hearty. This escapade has Qeen downright embarrassing to me. Right here at home rumor has had me in two hospitals and at least one undertaking parlor. Letters, cards, telegrams, phone calls and flowers from friends, enemies and neutrals from a wide area suggest to me that the public is entitled to the low-down on my case from an authoritative source. The genuine concern expressed is heart-warming to me.

To the best of my knowledge here are the facts in the case. Without much warning during the afternoon of June 26th I blacked out with an acute heart attack. I was down town, fully dressed and had on my hat. Now think of a thing like that happening to me! An ambulance conveyed me to a hospital — just one — and not to an undertaking parlor. A doctor who either knew his business or is a mighty good actor located the cause of all the static in “a post&coronary occlusion.” As near as I can understand it, that is a sort of traffic-jam in the arterial highway system of the heart. It often means a one-way ticket to whatever destination the ticket calls for. **Life looks and tastes good** after what may be fairly considered a brush with death. They kept me in a bed a full six weeks. I speak advisedly. It was not angelic patience on my part. I was not sick, did not hurt anywhere and had a whale of an appetite considering the circumstances. A hard-boiled and efficient doctor, some good nurses and a solicitous wife kept me out of action and circulation. The doctor took my tobacco and coffee away from me and made a face like he might not ever give them back. I haven’t quite figured out whether he is trying to make a well man of me, or merely a nice one. The chances are that if I can’t use them, I’ll be preaching and writing against them before long. In which case I hope that a longsuffering public will make due and charitable allowance for another of my faults. I used to know a fine old preacher who loved his pipe, except during rare periods when he was attacked by acute integrity and his conscience hurt him. Then he preached against tobacco until he recovered from his acute attack and went back to his pipe. I could always tell when he wasn’t smoking. He was preaching against it. So if the public doesn’t hear from me again on the question, the chances are I’ll be sneaking a few draws between visits to the doctor. So far I haven’t touched the “putrid” stuff.

What caused this blowup? Well, I’d like to
know. The doctor says it was caused by "ten-
sion" which is associated with worry or hard
work, or both. Since I have neither worried nor
worked much, I doubt it. Anyhow, about all I
am able to do is pace under the shade of a tree
until it gets cooler and I get stronger. I am up
and about a bit and will be able to resume my
preaching within a few weeks. According to the
doctor book it will require a year for full re-
covery. Then I can do about all I ever could in
the way of work and play, I hope, I hope, I
hope, considering the limitations of my advanced
age. I am fifty-six, going on fifty-seven. So by
the grace of God I expect to be up and at 'em
again off and on as the need may be. To you
who have been so gracious in your expressions
of good-will and friendship — I thank you.

BROTHER BIXLER'S PLEA--

(Continued from Page 9)

brother's mind on anything nor to cause him
to misrepresent it. He has done enough of that
already according to his own testimony. The sit-
utation is this: Many of us do not intend to
endorse or support any work that has in its
personnel premillennialists or their sympathiz-
ers. If Brother Bixler is not such, he should
clear himself by forthright statement and ac-
tion. If he is such, the sweetness of his plea to
the brethren is wasted on the desert air, and
'to this moment, all evidence indicates that he
is a premillennialist and a sympathizer!

RECEIVE HIM NOT--

(Continued from Page 10)

organization? Or will they be identified in the
minds of faithful brethren as favoring such?
We shall see!

The Bible Banner is doing a fine job in de-
fending the church against all "isms" and ev-
ery encroachment of false teachers, Those who
support, and sympathize with, error stand self-
condemned. They have drawn the line 'themselves and are to be rebuked; having become
partaker of the evil deed.

THE NEW LOOK--

(Continued from Page 11)

trying to preach the gospel to their generation
instead of getting it done as they did in one
generation.

Brethren, the "new look" in evangelism has
a "fetching" appearance, but it would be well
to take a second look at it and a good, long
look at your New Testament. Let the ladies
have the "new look" in their dress, but let us
in religion "seek out the old paths and walk
therein".

ROY COGDILL IN HOSPITAL

As this issue of 'Bible Banner goes to press
Roy Cogdill is in the hospital in Sulphur Springs,
Texas, recuperating from an operation. Cled
Wallace is in bed as the result of a heart attack,
and Foy is in Arizona. If this issue of the Ban-
ner doesn't measure up to the standard in some
respects, blame it on me.

L. B.

BAPTISMDAL SUITS

The baptismal suits which have been selling
for seventeen fifty ($17.50) are sold out. That
was a war surplus and there are no more avail-
able. At least we have not been able to find
any more that we can sell at that price. We
have baptismal suits which are as good as the
others but we are not able to sell them for
$17.50. They are $27.50.

TYPEWRITERS

We are now in position to supply you with new
Underwood Portables and Standards at regular
prices.

Universal Model Portable, $76.85 tax included
Champion Model, $99.97 tax included
Standard Model, $150.99 tax included

We have also some used machines, rebuilt and
in excellent condition at a bargain.

ROY E. COGDILL PUBLISHING CO.
Box 980 Lufkin, Texas

Subscribe for

"ANCIENT LANDMARKS"
Edited by
YATER TANT
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principles of the gospel of Christ.

$1.00 per year-100 subscriptions mailed
direct for $5.00 per month.
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"THE CERTIFIED GOSPEL" BY FOY E. WALLACE, JR.

A book bearing the above title was published in 1937 by Lambert and Son in Port Arthur, Texas. This book contained a series of sermons preached by Foy E. Wallace, Jr. The new book which has just come off the press contains all of the original sermons and about twelve additional chapters making the book twice the size of the original. The enlarged edition has 257 pages in it, printed on 60 lb. egg shell paper, a fine job of printing and bound in excellent cloth binding with jacket. Subjects discussed are:

Introduction by O. C. Lambert
The Certified Gospel
Who Wrote The Bible?
Christ and the Church.
How and When the Church Began.
The Last Will and Testament.
What It Means to Preach Christ.
The Gospel In Old Testament Example.
Why Send For Peter?
What To Do To Be Saved.
God’s Call To Repentance
Restoring The Ancient Order.

Faith and Baptism.
Repentance and Baptism.
Baptism In the Acts of The Apostles.
Baptism In The Apostolic Epistles.
God’s Law of Conversion.
Broken Cisterns.
The Sin of Sectarianism.
The Lord’s Day.
What the Church Must Do To Be Saved.
Seventh Day Adventism.
The Music Question — Pro and Con.
The Boll Movement.

$3.00 Per Copy
ORDER FROM
ROY E. COGDILL PUBLISHING COMPANY
BOX 980, LUFKIN, TEXAS

Seed for the Sower
By LEROY BROWNLOW

THREE HUNDRED
SUGGESTIVE
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Cloth Bound
$2.00

Every family can profitably use a copy as a reference book; thousands of scripture references are given.

The author of this work is the author of WHY I AM A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST, which has been and is one of the nation’s best sellers among the churches of Christ.
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