

THE BIBLE BANNER



"Thou hast given a banner to them that fear thee, that it may be displayed because of truth."-(Psalm 60: 4.)

"Lift ye up a banner upon the high mountain, exalt the voice unto them."-(Isa. 13: 2.)

VOL. I NO. 11

Published Monthly At 101 S. Second St., Guthrie, Oklahoma

JUNE 1939

THE RIGHT KIND OF PREACHING

CLED E. WALLACE

Much is being said about the right kind of preaching and writing. Charges of "hard" and "soft" are being bandied back and forth. With as plain a book as the New Testament in hand and with its abundant supply of examples of the very best preaching and writing, it ought not to be a difficult thing to determine the kind of both that should be done. A direct appeal to the New Testament, its preachers and its writers ought to settle any question that arises in such a connection. Men who say the most about "the right method of approach", "constructive articles" etc., betray the fact that a lot of their ideas come from modern psychology, materialistic philosophy and sectarian sources, rather than from Jesus and the apostles. It is futile to do a lot of talking about the method of approach, when you never **approach**. It would improve some preachers and writers if they could forget about the method and go ahead and **approach**. The main idea is getting there anyhow. I shall resort to the rather simple strategy of pointing some scripture texts at some of the approaching methodists among us who never approach, or do so in such timid manner, they are useless after they arrive. They might as well have stayed at home.

Now, John the Baptizer, was a fairly acceptable preacher considering the time and circumstances of his activities. "There came a man sent from God whose name was John." He was an austere man, simple in his tastes and habits. He was neither clothed in purple and fine linen, nor did he fare sumptuously every day. "Now John himself had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins; and his food was locusts and wild honey." He preached the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins and seemed to encounter no difficulty in approaching his subject. He got there a lot quicker than he would have, had he worn a scissor-tail coat and been called Dr. John. Preachers thus handicapped, seldom get there at all, for they are too busy talking about the method of approach. John was not particularly worried, according to the record, about offending people. He demanded of all that they **repent or burn**. There were some "honorable men" in John's audience who were highly connected and proud of their standing. They condescended to submit to John's baptism but John perceived that their motives were unrelated to the personal repentance he was preaching. He made a personal attack on them, called them "Ye offspring of vipers" and demanded of them "fruit worthy of repentance." A questionnaire might have disclosed the fact that a goodly number of very nice people did not savor John's "attacks on honorable men." That did not bother John any. He wasn't preaching to please the people, but to please God by blasting sin and sinners and leading them

to repentance. He even had an invitation to preach to king Herod. This intrepid man of God then said the wrong thing at the psychological moment and got his head chopped off. He told Herod that he was living with his brother Philip's wife and that it was not lawful for him to have her. What would a modern perfumed and manicured preacher think of that **method of approach**? John was a constructive preacher! That word sounds familiar doesn't it? He razed the mountains, filled the valleys, and straightened the crooked and made "the rough ways smooth." By his preaching, he built a highway *in* all the wilderness for the Lord. The "constructive" preaching described by the baby-talk of modern methodists among us would not have levelled any mountains, filled any valleys, nor constructed a highway for royalty. Softly spoken platitudes in religion, mainly designed to be inoffensive, generally true as they may be, **are not constructive of what the Lord wants built up!** When a sinner, even a dressed up sinner, who belongs to "a respectable church," hears a real constructive preacher, he does not feel like he had visited a beauty parlor.

Jesus is by common consent the greatest of all teachers and preachers. He astonished the men of his time and all succeeding time with the sermon on the mount. In it he exalted humility, purity of heart, meekness and mercy. He pronounced blessings on peacemakers and those who could rejoice under persecution for righteousness' sake without, compromising or surrendering their loyalty. While holding forth true standards of holiness, he condemns divorce, hypocritical praying, fasting and alms-giving to be seen of men, the love and selfish use of money, all hate and thirst for vengeance, harsh and hypocritical judgments on others, and voiced a stern warning-against "false prophets, who come to you in sheep's clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves." He was pointed in his definitions. A wise man is one who hears his words and does them. All others are foolish and will suffer a great fall. There is no compromise with or winking at sin, either personal or doctrinal, in the sermon on the mount. It is famous for the scope of its teaching and condemns as much as it applauds. Jesus was an iconoclast. He demolished the false that he might construct the true. Our present methodists of approach, who admit that they are the very sugar of the earth, are too squeamish to chop down the thorns of error. They expect their scanty scattering of "constructive" seed to choke out the thorns. "Preach the gospel and let others alone." Jesus didn't do it that way! Some of them are strong on letting others alone and preach very little gospel.

(Continued on back page)



Published the first of each month at 101 S. Second St., Guthrie, Okla. Entered as second class matter February 24, 1939 at Post Office in Guthrie, Okla. under the Act of March 3, 1879. Subscription rate \$1.00 per year in advance.

Address All Matter For Publication to P. O. Box 1804
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Foy E. Wallace, Jr., Publisher and Editor

Associate Editors :

Cled E. Wallace,-----Austin, Texas
John T. Lewis,-----Birmingham, Ala.
Austin Taylor,-----Uvalde, Texas.

Staff Contributors :

E. G. Creacy,-----Horse Cave, Ky.
A. B. Keenan,-----Detroit, Mich.
C. H. McCord,-----Washington, D. C.
F. Y. Tant,-----Denver, Colo.
G. K. Wallace,-----Wichita, Kan.
Geo. B. Curtis,-----Morrilton, Ark.
Geo. W. DeHoff,-----Lepanto, Ark.
R. A. Turner,-----Montgomery, Ala.
Thos. G. Butler,-----Lakeland, Fla.
O. C. Lambert,-----Port Arthur, Texas
W. Curtis Porter,-----Henderson, Texas
Jno. W. Hedge,-----Greggton, Texas
Will M. Thompson,-----Holdenville, Okla.



THE NASHVILLE (TENN) MEETING

From April 23 to May 7 it was my privilege and pleasure to hold the greatest meeting that I have ever held in Nashville. It was my eighteenth meeting with Nashville churches, but the first since 1934—five years ago.

Sixteen years ago I crossed the mighty Mississippi the first time, going up to the mecca of the church in America, to hold a meeting. I was a young preacher. J. C. McQuiddy, E. A. Elam, F. W. Smith and A. G. Freed were then living and were dynamic forces for the "old paths." The first Hardeman Ryman Auditorium Meetings had just been held, followed by that fatal blow to the Christian Church in Tennessee—the Hardernan-Boswell Discussion. These were all epochal victories for the truth, and the church flourished.

In 1930 I was called from a fruitful work in Los Angeles, Calif., to the editorship of the Gospel Advocate. For four years, in connection with regular evangelistic work, I endeavored to perform my whole duty as editor of the oldest gospel paper published in interest of the New Testament church. It was a new and laborious task. A great door was opened unto me—but there were many adversaries. My position was strategic. The Boll issue loomed. It involved the truth of the gospel and integrity of the church. The issue had to be met or responsibility shirked. The course of duty was plain—the issue was met. This precipitated a break with men who had been ostensibly my friends (some of them fellow-editors), whom I had trusted and who I believed could be depended on to defend the church in any crisis. In this I was mistaken; they could not be relied on; I was painfully disillusioned. Under trying circumstances I resigned my Nashville connections and went back home, to Texas and Oklahoma, where the people have known me from my youth up.

After five years, at the invitation of the Chapel Avenue Church, I went back to Nashville "in weakness and in fear and in much trembling" for a meeting which was calculated to make history. I found a different Nashville. Indeed, Nashville has changed. The Nashville today is not the Nashville of yesterday. The Central Church of Christ that once sponsored a Hardeman Ryman Auditorium

Meeting refused to even announce over their radio and from their pulpit the last one, notwithstanding it was backed by thirty or more churches of Christ in and around Nashville. But this church did announce a meeting held by E. H. Hoover, a known Bollite. Some years ago this church also permitted a sign to be placed in front of its building to the effect that it was cooperating with the Gypsy Smith Revival and invited the attending mothers to leave their babies there. E. H. Hoover is a Premillennialist. Gypsy Smith is a sectarian. Hardeman is a gospel preacher. "By their fruits ye shall know them"—can be applied to announcements. David Lipscomb College pursued the same course as the Central church; their attitudes seem to be identical. The radio facilities in Nashville, the college and the new paper are all under the control of the same element—which is the wrong element.

Back of all this is the blight of Bollism. It is in the Central church. It is in the College. It is in some of the other churches. Bollism and premillennialism are related, but are not identical. There is a shade of difference. A Premillennialist is one who believes premillennialism. A Bollite may be one who disavows the doctrine, but sympathizes with the personnel of the party. All sympathizers, neutrals and neither-nors are Bollites. Nashville has both Premillennialists and Bollites. The church suffers most from the latter—for they are the traitors in our ranks. They are modern digressives. They hold the exact attitude the digressives held fifty years ago, to a tee.

The high spots in the recent Nashville meeting were the three Sunday afternoon meetings, two of which were held in Dixie Tabernacle, and one in War Memorial Auditorium. These meetings were promoted by G. C. Billingsley and Phil House, of the Russell Street Church, in cooperation with the elders of the Chapel Avenue Church, and other friends of the Cause in Nashville. Among these none worked more untiringly than Price Billingsley, whose love and anxiety for the church is known to all who know him. The spacious tabernacle overflowed, hundreds stood, and hundreds were turned away. The warmest welcome I have ever received was given me in these services—and I did the plainest preaching that I have ever done.

These special services were opened by E. R. Harper, Boone L. Douthitt, W. E. Brightwell and James A. Allen, to whom I am indebted for the things they said and did in my behalf. W. E. Brightwell holds a responsible position with the Gospel Advocate. James A. Allen is publisher and editor of the Apostolic Times, which has a larger circulation in Nashville than any other religious paper. The veteran and venerable F. B. Srygley was on the platform in these meetings and his presence was a source of inspiration and a benediction.

I am grateful to the Chapel Avenue Church for their confidence in bringing me back to Nashville to render this service to the Cause we love and defend, and for their further indorsement of the work that was done, expressed in their invitation for me to return for another meeting in 1941. The elders of this congregation are R. W. Comer, Lloyd E. Scobey, S. L. Youree, J. A. Clark and V. E. Gregory. They are faithful stewards. R. W. Comer, president of Washington Manufacturing Company, is senior elder, and known for his unwavering loyalty to the church. He has stood like a stone wall against error in all forms through many conflicts. With him are his sons, Guy and Mont Comer, who will take up his mantle when he lays it aside for his eternal reward.

Also under his counsel J. C. Shacklett has grown up in the Chapel Avenue Church, a potential leader, to whom the church can safely look for future guidance.

Further acknowledgements of appreciation are made to the thousands of Christians in Nashville and Middle

BROTHER ROWE JOINS THE PROCESSION

E. G. CREACY

It seems to be the order of the day to circularize the brotherhood with unscrupulous sheets. To my surprise, my good friend and Brother, F. L. Rowe, sends out a circular to tell us things that he cannot say in the new Christian Leader, though he is one of its directors! I regret that Brother Rowe has been influenced to fall in line with this new order. He certainly has not done himself any good. His plight is pitiful. I have a warm spot in my heart for F. L. Rowe and I respect his age. He has evidently been lassoed, and one blunder paves the way for more.

It will be remembered that Brother Rowe published in the Leader, before it went into the hands of Clinton Davidson, that he had been "lost to us" for twenty years. Now, through the medium of circular letters, Brother Rowe tries to explain what he meant, but he sinks deeper in the mire. He says that Clinton Davidson "was not 'lost' to the Lord, nor to the Lord's work." What is the record? Davidson did not worship with the New Testament church in New York, but "worshipped" with a digressive church, served as Superintendent of its Sunday School, and helped this digressive church start another digressive church. Brother Rowe knew this. Yet, he says Davidson was not lost to the Lord and his work!! Brother Rowe had also been informed by faithful brethren that Davidson ceased to worship with them in Louisville when the Boll division came. Just how Brother Rowe can get the consent of his mind to pursue such a course is beyond me. Does he mean that a man like Clinton Davidson—a Bollite and a Digressive—is not lost to the Lord and the Lord's work? If so, the present Brother Rowe is not the Brother Rowe I thought I used to know. We expected better things of F. L. Rowe.

It is regrettable that Brother Rowe throws an underhanded fling in the direction of the editor of the Bible Banner by saying attacks were being made by jealous publishers to injure the Christian Leader. It would be better to answer Brother Wallace's arguments than to stoop to such low tactics.

Cled Wallace diagnosed the Clinton Davidson set-up correctly, as he usually does, when he said that they smile at us through the Leader and make faces at us through their circulars.

We are seeing some of the fruits of these high-toned, sweet-spirited, non-controversial brethren. The Bible Banner has exposed some of the things that are being palmed off on a charitable "brotherhood" and the promoters are sore. It is proof that the medicine is having desired effect. It is very evident that the Clinton (Copyright) Davidson set-up is not doing the big things in the "brotherhood" that were expected. Somebody's vision was just a dream.

Tennessee, all the way from Cookeville, Tennessee, to up in Kentucky, who supported this meeting with their presence and influence. This gives us heart and makes us know that there are yet the Lord's thousands who have not bowed to Baal or to Boll.

As for Nashville—it reached the point of saturation several years ago. Decline has now set in. Digression and disintegration are the inevitable results. But a good portion of the church can be salvaged, a faithful remnant saved, if the right fight is made. If such a fight is not made, the work of those crusading pioneers who planted the church in Nashville will be lost to digression and modernism as went the Cause to which Alexander Campbell devoted his life and labors in Bethany. The spirit of iniquity doth already work.—F. E. W., Jr.

"WE HAVE NO SUCH CUSTOM"

The eleventh chapter of first Corinthians was the subject of a recent radio talk by a gospel preacher. He made the usual remark that the matter of women cutting their hair is "just a custom" and told them to shingle it if they wanted to—which most of them would do anyhow, if they wanted to. But it is a pity for preachers to encourage women now to do the thing that Paul told women then not to do. This same preacher was heard to tell an audience in a large church, where the elders were trying to curb worldliness, that it would be quite all right for them to attend certain movies if they would take him along! It is worse than a pity for preachers to thus encourage conduct in young people that needs restraint instead—it is a tragedy.

The eleventh to the fourteenth chapters of first Corinthians belong to one essay. Part one is a discussion of certain elements of divine worship. Part two is instructions on how to appear before God in worship. Part three proves the province of spiritual gifts and the use of supernatural endowments. The apostle's conclusion is "that the things I write unto you are the commandments of God." Years ago when "bobbed hair" came into vogue M. C. Kurfes gave a scholarly exegesis of 1 Cor. 11 setting forth the principle back of the customs referred to which makes it a sin for Christian women to shear their hair. Lipscomb and Sewell answered some questions sustaining the same idea on 1 Cor. 11. In fact, no gospel preacher thought that 1 Cor. 11 was "just a custom," which allowed women to shingle their hair, until women in the church began to do it.

Woman's hair is not the subject of the eleventh chapter of 1 Corinthians, but the incidental reference to it certainly does not contain instruction, or even permission, for her to shingle it. After discussing the artificial covering of the head—the veil—and plainly saying that a woman's head must be covered when she presents herself before God in worship, the apostle then referred, incidentally, to woman's hair as her natural adornment; and is her glory. The Christian woman has her divine covering—the hair. "It is given to her for a covering." God gave it to her, and Paul did not say that cutting it off is "just a custom." He said, "we have no such custom." There is a wide difference in saying that a thing is "just a custom" and in saying, "we have no such custom." Yet those preachers who are wont to encourage women to cut their hair (whose wives perhaps have already done so) nonchalantly remark "its just a custom"!

Whatever may be said of customs, Jewish or pagan, the fact remains that Paul's collateral reference to the hair declares that it is woman's natural adornment and God-given glory, a divine principle, indeed, that custom cannot change. Her natural hair is her glory. Her modest skirts are her dignity. With her glory cut off on one end and her dignity on the other—some modern preacher will have to finish the picture, the writer is speechless. Such an attitude does not comport with the pious admonitions of Paul and Peter to Christian women concerning modesty and sobriety in matters pertaining to dress.

The divine sphere of Christian woman ascends to the sublime. For her to follow after the vanities of style, paint the face, rouge the lips, bob the hair, and withal, dress after the latest fashion, is to step down from the throne of her glory to occupy a mere pedestal of fickle fashion. God give us more Christian women who regard favor with God higher than fashion with the world, and fewer preachers who lend encouragement to disrespect for things divine by the prattle "its just a custom—go ahead and bob it."—F. E. W. Jr.

A LAME EXPLANATION

In the old Christian Leader, December 1938, just before Brother Rowe transferred it to the new "Lost But Found" management of Clinton Davidson, he made a labored effort to apologize for Davidson's twenty year nap by saying that he was "lost to us for about twenty years." Now that it has leaked through the news sieve that this man Davidson was worshipping and working with a New York Digressive church, all of this time, because of his general dissatisfaction with the habits and practices of simple churches of Christ, and that all the while he was and now is definitely a Boll sympathizer—all this has soured many of the old friends of the Leader with Brother Rowe's sell out to the New Dealers in religious journalism. It looks very much like Brother Rowe sold out to the combination of a digressive and a Bollite.

Now comes Brother Rowe with a lame explanation of what he meant by his own expression that Davidson was "lost to us" for twenty years. He says that he meant that he was only lost "to me"—that is, Brother Rowe did not know where he was! And that he was merely lost to "Editors, Evangelists, Preachers and other church workers, who are on the firing line in public service." What a revelation! The class of men Brother Rowe names are the very men who would have known Clinton Davidson through those twenty years if he had been worth anything to the church anywhere. Does Brother Rowe mean that Davidson could be lost to the "editors, evangelists, preachers, and other church workers, who are on the firing line in public service" all over the nation, and still be the great church worker that he now boasts that he was? If the wide class of leaders, workers, and public men in the church over this great United States of America never heard of this man whose left hand does not let his right hand know what is going on—it is an indication that he was not doing anything for the New Testament church with either hand.

Withholding The Facts

The fact is—and it is now becoming known to all as pointed out by Brother Hugo McCord and by other brethren in correspondence with Davidson—that he was working with a big New York Digressive church during this twenty year lost period. Why does Brother Rowe seek to withhold this fact? Of Davidson Brother Rowe says: "He was lost to me for about twenty years, but during this period, even though immersed in his business, he was active in affairs of the church, quietly—not publicly." What church—Brother Rowe? When it becomes known that it was with a modernistic Christian Church and not "the church" at all, just what will Brother Rowe's old friends who, he says, "understood my language" think of this language? Is a New York Christian Church "the church"? Still, Brother Rowe says that "Brother Davidson was not lost to the Lord, nor the Lord's work." That is what Davidson believes exactly. He has said recently that while he does not personally approve of instrumental music in the church, he nevertheless does not believe it is wrong to worship where it is used. This is what he did in New York until recently, and Brother Rowe says that "he was active in the affairs of the church, quietly—not publicly"!

It would also be interesting to know **what missionaries** Clinton Davidson was supporting while he was so "active in the affairs" of a digressive church. Why not let us know? Some of us have a strong hunch that they were either digressives or Bollites, or both.

Anyway, why does Brother Rowe and the staff of the New Leader withhold from the public these facts about Davidson's digressive connections? The brethren will find it out, anyhow—then how will the Leader staff look to loyal brethren? There is an evident effort to deceive the brethren by withholding facts in these matters.

Another thing—according to Brother Rowe, Clinton Davidson is too modest to let his left hand know what his right hand does—but he lets F. L. Rowe put out a few thousand circular letters telling of the thousands of dollars he has spent on schools and missionaries! Incidentally, this circular letter which Brother Rowe has put out has every appearance of a Davidson letter. The type appears to be identical with that of the "questionnaire" and "surveys" and of those anonymous letters! Compare the whole series. Those fellows cannot even cover up their tracks. It is the prediction of this editor that when and if the whole truth is known (and the truth will out) some brethren who have flocked to the New Leader, under the lure of "ethical journalism," will forsake it like rats deserting a sinking ship. The Witty-Murch movement, and the New Digressive Leader are "gold dust twins" and they have both won the plaudits of the Christian Standard, the leading Christian Church paper.

Another question: Why does Brother Rowe circularize the brotherhood with one of those suspicious letters? If he is stating facts of vital interest to the brethren, and to his friends, why not put it in the paper? There seems to be a double standard of conduct. Ethical journalism will not permit certain things to be printed in the Leader—so they say it with circulars! If it is unethical to say it in the paper, what makes it ethical to say it with a circular? These brethren are not so ethical, after all.

Betraying The Church

One more thing: Now comes announcement from Abilene Christian College that this modern Rip Van Winkle Clinton Davidson will deliver the commencement address to the young people of that institution. Thus Abilene Christian College is foisting upon the brethren of Texas, and upon the young people who have been intrusted to them by Christian parents, a man who has been a digressive and a Boll sympathizer all these years. Not only that, but as a self appointed Moses among us he seeks through soft-pedal, copyrighted journalism to destroy the defense of the truth and would sell the church down the river. When it becomes known to the brethren generally that promoter Davidson is still a half, if not full fledged digressive, and that during all those twenty years he worshipped with the digressives, and that he has only recently given such evidence by "words out of his own mouth" in an interview with Hugo McCord on his New Jersey estate—I say, when all this becomes known, what will the brotherhood think of those brethren who have foisted Clinton Davidson upon the church? What will they think of E. W. McMillan, editor of the New Leader, for withholding these facts which we know he possesses, for they have been given to him? What will the brethren of Texas think of the Abilene College for bringing him to Texas to impose him on the churches through the college influence? Are the brethren of Texas ready for such as this? Are Christian parents who have trusted the school to protect your young people from digressive influences and ground them in the truth willing to support the school in upholding men who are not loyal to the church and never have been?

It is time for all who love the cause of Christ, and who are jealous of its welfare, to speak out. Just as F. L. Rowe betrayed the cause by selling out to a digressive-Bollite sympathizer, Abilene Christian college betrays the church and the trust of Christian parents by bringing the man from New York to the college.—F. E. W. Jr.

TIME TO RENEW

The first issue of Bible Banner appeared July 1, 1938. The June issue—this number—completes the first year. If your label is dated 6-39 your subscription is due this month. Renew now. Send check or money order for \$1.00 to the Bible Banner Box 1804 Oklahoma City, Okla.

PREACHING AND SINGING THE TRUTH

AUSTIN TAYLOR

When Jesus sent out the apostles to preach his gospel, he finished his remarks to them by saying, "Lo I am with you always even unto the end of the world." The assuring words from the Son of God, no doubt heartened the apostles to go forward to the arduous task of preaching the gospel. But the apostle Paul was not in this group. He was made an apostle later "as one born out of due time." The promise the Lord made to the other apostles, Paul did not have, but with courage and zeal he went here and there proclaiming the gospel "in love." It seems that everywhere he went he encountered much opposition. This loving, fearless soldier of the cross was often arrested and placed in prison and treated badly, but the Lord of glory was so concerned about him, he made him a short visit in the stillness of the night, to comfort and encourage him. In Acts 23:11 we read "and the night following, the Lord stood by him, and said, be of good cheer, for as thou hast testified concerning me at Jerusalem, so must thou bear witness also at Rome."

Preaching the Truth

Brother, as you preach the truth, holding out for the things that are right, and preaching against the things that are wrong, your hearers will be divided. Some will turn away from you, saying all manner of evil things about you; but some will come and stand by your side, and give you all the help you can consistently ask for. I have never seen one who was right and preaching right, have to stand alone very long. There will always be a good brother or sister near.

A few days ago, a preacher said that he never offended anybody, which was just one way of saying that he never preaches much gospel truth. We should all know the truth is offensive to those in error. Of course, one may be offended and later accept the truth and become a faithful worker for the Lord. If one can preach or teach the word of the Lord, and never give any offense, he can do better than the apostles and Christ the Saviour, could do. The sublime words of the Saviour offended many when he preached on earth. Many turned from him, because of his teaching. On one occasion, some of his disciples, being like a few members of the church now, came to him to tell him that some of his hearers were offended at what he had said. I think I can hear them say, Lord, it was not what you said so much as it was how you said it. This experience of the Saviour is recorded. Beginning at Matt. 15:12 we read, "Then came the disciples unto him and said, knowest thou that the Pharisees were offended, when they heard this saying? But he answered and said, Every plant which my heavenly Father planteth not, shall be rooted up. Let them alone: they are blind guides. And if the blind guide the blind, both shall fall into a pit." In this we can see how Christ regards denominations (plants). It is dangerous to be in one of the things. It is unsafe to stand near and look on. Proper love and respect for Christ, his word, and his church, will keep a fellow where he belongs. "Let love be without hypocrisy. Abhor that which is evil; cleave to that which is good." "For he hath said I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee."

"What more could he say, than to you he hath said,
You who unto Jesus, for refuge hath fled?"

Singing the Truth

Alexander Campbell's hymnbook has probably been out of use for fifty years. Very few of the songs in his book are used. One of Brother Campbell's favorite songs can be heard occasionally—"I Love Thy Kingdom, Lord." Some of the songs we use now and regard as spiritual, devotional

HONORING THE HEAD

JNO. W. HEDGE

God has ruled that the head of the woman is the man; that the head of man is Christ; and that the head of Christ is God. (I Cor. 11:1-5). Christ honored his Father as Head by doing those things pleasing unto him. Now for man to honor Christ in the assembly while teaching and praying he must do so with "uncovered" head. For man to teach and prophesy with covered head means rebellion against his head, Christ. Neither can modern custom change this ruling. If every man in the land prayed and prophesied (taught) with covered heads it would be open rebellion to Christ. Now, we are ready for a question? What about women praying and prophesying in the assembly with uncovered heads? The same writer in the same book and in the same connection and to the same church affirmed that every woman who so acts "dishonors her head," man, Can "modern custom" change this ruling? Let the Bible answer: "But if any man seem to be contentious, we (Christians) have no such custom (as women praying with uncovered heads) neither the (putting it in the broadest sense) churches of God." I think that every one will agree that such custom as women cutting their hair off and appearing in public assemblies with uncovered heads was being practiced in Paul's day. But Paul says "we have no such custom." Why? Because any woman who so acts "dishonors her head." Now, if it was "dishonoring" then how can it be "honoring" now?

Another thing, if Christians refused the custom in the days of Inspiration what assurance have we that God will approve of it today? It is significant also that no one ever thought or attempted to defend this practice till the masses fell for it. Of course, some folks don't want to be out of style if it does cost them their "honor" here and maybe their souls in the hereafter. But those who are in dead earnest about going to Heaven after they are through with this world are interested more in what God requires than they are in "modern customs." It is better to be safe than sorry. Let the men in the churches of Christ continue to do Christ honor by reason of appearing in His presence with "uncovered head." And likewise, every woman who appears in the worshipping assembly remember her obligation to be "covered." And, in the language of Inspiration, "If the woman be not covered, let her also be shorn; but if it be a shame for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be covered." (1 Cor. 11:6) The woman who carries out the teaching of Paul in this chapter is "God's Woman" and she stands a chance of being saved, yea, she has "two chances to one" on the part of those who ignore this teaching.

and standard, would have driven our grandparents from the worship. "What a Friend We Have In Jesus," "I Need Thee Every Hour," and "I Am Praying For You," were too light and fast to be used in the worship of the denominations. Robert Lowry wrote "I Need Thee Every Hour" and for a long time his publishers would not accept it for publication.

Moody and Sankey were pioneers in publishing fast music for the denominations. They were so pleased with "What a Friend We Have In Jesus" by Converse that they paid Mr. Converse \$50.00 for its use. Thirty Years ago "Jesus Lover Of My Soul" was the most used hymn in the United States. Now it is seldom heard.

We cannot change truth, but we often change our tunes. Truth is often mixed with error in song. The popularity of a song is no evidence of its being free from error.

Is it not time to put more truth in our songs and in our sermons?

"THE KINGDOM IN MATTHEW"

A Serial Review of R. H. Boll's Theory As Set Forth In His Book — "Kingdom of God"

JNO. T. LEWIS

We have now come to Chapter VI in our review of R. H. Boll's book, "The Kingdom of God." Chapter six is written under the above heading. But before beginning our review I will quote from Brother Boll's letter to me, February 22, 1939. He says: "I have not contended that Campbell, for instance, agreed with me on the Throne of David. H. T. Anderson **did**." Therefore, I hope we will have no more circular letters from our neutral (?) brethren trying to show that Campbell taught what Boll teaches on "these disputed teachings." I will now show Brother Boll that H. T. Anderson **did not** agree with him "on the throne of David." Brother Boll is just about as badly muddled on **what** the pioneers taught as he is in his prophetic views. H. T. Anderson wrote to Campbell and asked him the following question. **"Is not Christ to sit upon the Throne of David?"** His letter was published in the Millennial Harbinger 1849, pages 261-265. I quote from the letter.

"Brother Campbell, Dear Sir:

It is not my intention to write on the subject of the 'coming of the Lord,' nor indeed to consider that subject at all, neither as it respects the time, the preparation for it, nor the circumstances attending it." This was the introduction of the letter.

On page 264, he says: "That the new heavens and earth will be the habitation of the saints, and that the Messiah will be king is nothing new. But that he will sit upon the throne of his father David and reign over the house of Jacob forever, is a subject to which I have not known the attention of this people directed. (There was no Word and Work in those days to direct the attention of the brethren to the earthly throne of David.-Jno. T. L.) This is the point to be decided. You may think that in my mind at least, this is decided. True, it is so. But not so firmly and immutably fixed as not to be changed by a good reason to the contrary." Since Brother Boll was good enough to admit that Campbell did not agree with him on David's throne, maybe when he reads this he will admit the same about H. T. Anderson. Thus by the law of elimination, the only two pioneers that Brother Boll could claim would be Sidney Rigdon and Dr. Thomas, who were once faithful gospel preachers, and co-laborers with Alexander Campbell; but later repudiated, and exposed by Campbell. The former set Joe Smith on the egg from which he hatched Mormonism, the latter founded the Christadelphian sect. But neither one of these men caused any more trouble in the church in their day than Brother Boll is causing today by his vagaries. And "Foy Esco Wallace, Jr." has not been as withering in his exposure of premillennialists as Campbell in dealing with the above named perverters of the gospel. But I must go on to Campbell's reply to H. T. Anderson's letter. It is found in Millennial Harbinger 1849, pages 289-294. I quote.

THE THRONE OF DAVID

"An opinion has been occasionally propagated at different periods of the-Christian Church, that the conversion of the Jews would be effected at once in a national way, and by a personal and literal return of the Messiah to the literal and earthly Jerusalem in Judea, where our Lord was crucified. (This is Boll's theory-J. T. L.) This opinion has again been revived in connection with other kindred notions, propagated also at different periods of the Christian Church concerning the state of the dead, of which I cannot now speak particularly. But the recent attempts to revive the oft alleged, and as often refuted, notions of the

personal and literal return to Jerusalem of the Messiah to sit upon the literal throne of David, and thus convert the Jews by sight rather than by faith, demands a passing notice at our hands, and more especially as it has now been presented to our consideration by our esteemed brother Anderson, of Kentucky." On page 292, he says: "With this induction of all the passages that speak of the throne of David, and with all that is said of the anointing or coronation of the Lord Jesus, can anyone find a vestige of authority for the assumption that Jesus Christ will descend from the throne of God in the heavens, to sit upon anything called a throne of David, in the literal Jerusalem; and, thus, in the form of a man, reign as a prince and priest over one nation and people, for any national, temporal, or spiritual purpose!" After Campbell's answer to his question, if H. T. Anderson ever asked another question about Christ sitting upon David's earthly throne, or if he ever wrote another line in defense of it, I have never read it. If this had been R. H. Boll's course in this matter there would be no trouble in the church today over this question.

The Egg From Which Premillennialists In The' Church Of Christ Are Hatched

We now come to our review of Chapter Six. Brother Boll says: "The Old Testament prophecies and promises of the kingdom were the theme of our preceding studies; and by reference to them the reader may see of what sort they were. By such predictions- as those was the kingdom hope of Israel created; and that most justly and naturally. When John the Baptist lifted up his voice in the wilderness of Judea and announced 'the kingdom of heaven at hand' he used a phraseology which was already common and current among the Jews, and which was perfectly understood by all. John took for granted that it was understood; never a word of explanation was given, so far as the record shows; and never a question or dispute arose between John and his countrymen as to the nature of the kingdom. To the Jews the announcement meant but one thing. The promise of the Messianic kingdom, with all it involved-the destination of the Gentile world power; the deliverance and national restoration of Israel, and her exaltation to earthly sovereignty; the promises God made to the fathers, and the prophets' vision of the future glory of the People, the Land, the City, and the Kingdom 'in that day'-had imbedded itself in the very hearts of the people."

Brethren doesn't that make you dizzy, coming from one who was once a faithful preacher of the gospel, and still considered by our neutral (?) brethren as being the very personification of piety and reverence for God's word? It would take Russell's no hell theory to beat this for nonsense. But we go on with his wild fancy.

"All this we mention merely to show what expectation was existing in Israel at the time of John's announcement, and how the very words John used had their common and current meaning among the people. The burden of proof would certainly lie wholly and heavily with any man who would maintain that this kingdom of John's announcement was a thing entirely different from that which Israel was expecting. The very suggestion that God would so trifle with the hope of the weowle, and by adowning their own language without explanation would leave them under so fundamental a mistake; yes, and would base His call to repentance upon this mistake, and would so confirm them in it, is quite repugnant and unworthy of God the more so when it is remembered that their kingdom expectations were legitimately derived from the language of their scriptures. But if the Jewish

expectations had been utterly wrong (which, as we have seen in our former articles, was not the case), even then a sense of justice would suggest that God would not have left the people under a misapprehension without a clear protest and correction. It is not God's manner to deal thus with **man**, at least not until after they have so rejected His **light** as to have forfeited all claims to further guidance.

We have put much stress upon this matter because of its weight and importance. We trust, however, that the reader would even without **this** discussion have perceived that the kingdom announced by John (and afterward by the Lord Jesus, Himself, Matt. 4: 17; Mark 1: 14, 15) could have been none other than that of Old Testament prophecy and of Jewish expectations in so far as that expectation accorded with the prophecies. And this is borne out by what we find in the following chapters of Matthew. If it be felt a difficulty that that Kingdom, though announced as 'at hand', has never yet appeared, we shall find an explanation unforced and natural, and one which will cast no reflection on the truth and goodness of God."

Here you have the doctrine of the brood of premillennialism hatched out in the church of Christ by R. H. Boll. I believe it is the very essence of blatant infidelity. Paul says: "Faithful is the saying, and worthy of all **acceptation**, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." (I Tim. 1:15) R. H. Boll says He came into the world to destroy the Gentile world power, to restore the earthly kingdom of Israel, to sit upon the earthly throne of David in Jerusalem, and to rule over an earthly kingdom. And Boll says John and Christ both preached this. John, poor fellow, was beheaded before he found out that he was not preaching the truth; but Jesus Christ finally found out that he could not do (?) what he came to do, so he quit preaching that, and went to preaching about "A Spiritual Contingent." In addition to these full-fledged premillennialists, there is a large milk and cider element in the church calling themselves neutrals. They had rather roost with any brand of premillennialists than with faithful gospel preachers. They say the premillennialist manifest the spirit of Christ in propagating their wild dreams of a future earthly kingdom, and that gospel preachers do not show the right spirit in fighting the intrusion of these vagaries into the church, and therefore they **are** the troublemakers in Israel.

Some Consequences and Absurdities

Brother S. R. Logue, an old teacher of mine, in his four page paper recently sent out from Tulsa, Oklahoma. to show that the Gospel Advocate had taken a firm stand against disfellowshipping the premillennialists, says: "The proof of the pudding is in the eating and by their fruits ye shall know them. No churches in the world today are more faithful to the New Testament pattern in their work and worship than the host of churches in which these brethren have ministered these twenty odd years. How could we **disfellowship** these brethren and those New Testament churches without being divisive, without causing division contrary to the doctrine of Christ and without becoming sinners against God?" Be patient, Brother Logue, don't get excited and go off again into digression, or into premillennialism. If the Jews had let Christ do what Brother Boll says God sent him to do, and what he says John the Baptist and Christ both preached He was going to do, there would be no churches for any of us to work and worship in. Yea, there would have been no cross, no resurrection, no blood, and therefore no atonement. You were a teacher before I knew the difference between a noun and a verb, and you were preaching the gospel before I ever thought about preaching; but I cannot help believing that this doctrine is not only divisive, but damnable. In Matthew 3:1, we read: "And in those days **cometh** John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of **Judea**, saying, Repent ye; for the

kingdom of heaven is at hand." R. H. Boll says: "To the Jews the announcement meant but one thing. The promise of the Messianic Kingdom, with all it involved—the appearance of the Great King of David's line; the destruction of the Gentile world power; the deliverance and national restoration of Israel, and her exaltation to earthly **sovereignty**; the promises God made to the fathers, and the prophets' visions of the future glory of the People, the Land, the City, and the Kingdom." I could not swallow this doctrine with salt. In Matthew 4:17 we read: "From that time began Jesus to preach, and to say, Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Brother Boll says this was the same kingdom John the Baptist announced—the **earthly kingdom of Israel**. And he says: "If it be felt a difficulty that that kingdom, though announced as 'at hand,' has never yet appeared, we shall find an explanation unforced and natural, and one which will cast no reflection on the truth and goodness of God." If this does not reflect on the "truth and goodness of God," it certainly reflects on his wisdom; because if he sent Jesus into the world to restore the earthly kingdom of Israel, he certainly thought the Jews were ready for their kingdom; but according to Brother Boll's doctrine they fooled God, and the best he could do was to establish "a new spiritual contingent called the church." Remember now that Brother Boll says John the Baptist and Christ both knew they were announcing "the appearance of the Great King of David's line; the destruction of the Gentile world power; the deliverance and national restoration of Israel, and her exaltation to earthly sovereignty."

Let us look at some of the absurdities of this doctrine. When John the Baptist saw Jesus coming unto him, he said: "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world!" I wonder how John thought a **Lamb** could destroy the "Gentile world **power**," and become a king over an "earthly sovereignty?" Jesus said, to "Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews," "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, except one be born of water and the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." That is, Jesus Christ was telling Nicodemus he had to be born, into something he was already in, the earthly kingdom of Israel. That sounds about like an ignorant sectarian preacher saying "born of water" had reference to the fleshly birth. Again in John 3: 14 Christ said: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up." I wonder what lifting Christ up had to do with restoring the earthly kingdom of Israel? Remember Christ was preaching this before he found out the Jews were not going to let him do what God sent him to do. According to Brother Boll's theories, all the teaching in the first twelve chapters of Matthew had reference to the earthly kingdom of Israel, and no reference to the church. The beatitudes, the whole Sermon on the Mount, the selecting of his apostles, and their first preaching were all done with the view, and for the purpose of restoring the earthly kingdom of Israel. On page 36, Brother Boll says: "In Matthew's gospel we have thus far found this announcement of the kingdom to Israel—the kingdom foretold in the prophets and expected by the people. Now we arrive at an important crisis, which indeed had been brewing from Chapter 4 on, but comes to an issue in Chapter 12." After the crisis came, from the 13th chapter on Christ began to speak in parables, and to talk about "a new spiritual contingent called the church" which God decided to establish till the Jews made up their minds they wanted their earthly kingdom restored. After Christ announced that he would build his church, the Jews decided they would take him by "force and make him king," but God had evidently become **disgusted with** them, so he just let Christ go on with the church—"a new spiritual contingent."

"LET US PRAY"

Though Prayer Is A Good Tonic, It Is Not To Be Regarded A Mere Spiritual Exercise Nor As A Substitute for Obedience, Nor Is It A 'Box of Magic Tricks

GEORGE W. DEHOFF

We believe in prayer. Everybody believes more or less in prayer, but there is about as much misinformation going the rounds on this subject as there is correct information.

Questions About Prayer

1. To whom shall we pray? We should pray to "Our Father who art in heaven." To pray to the Holy Spirit as do the denominations, to the woman who was once the Virgin Mary as do the Catholics, or to the audience as many preachers doubtless do is nothing short of blasphemy. A reporter once wrote concerning a popular evangelist that "He prayed the most eloquent prayer ever prayed to a Boston audience." The report was perhaps correct. I have heard preachers pray when Jews were present and leave off the "In Christ's Name," or its equivalent. Prayer should not be directed to the audience-it should be directed to God. Certainly one may consider the audience for which he words the prayer but remember the prayer is worded for the audience and not to the audience. Let our prayers be directed to the throne of mercy and grace where God will hear through the name of His Son.

2. How shall we pray? One should pray "with the spirit and with the understanding also." He should understand what he is praying about and he should pray so that the people present may hear and understand in their own language-he should not pray in an unknown tongue or in an inaudible tone.

Many people think that prayer is a box of magic tricks and that they can by this means obtain anything they want. But prayer must be accord&g to God's Word, it must be in keeping with His promises. In James 5 we are told that Elijah prayed for it not to rain; later for the rain to come. He understood what he was praying about. God had promised to "make the rain of thy land powder and dust" if Israel broke His commandments. (Deut. 28:24) When Elijah prayed for it not to rain he but claimed the promises of God's word-he prayed according to that Word. Later when the people repented, Elijah prayed for rain. God had promised to send rain if the people confessed His name and turned from their sins. (I Kings 8:35) Elijah's prayers were according to God's Word; they were in keeping with the promises God had given. The modern denominational preacher who prays for a cyclone to come and convert the town in under obligation to show where God has ever promised to send such a cyclone in answer to his prayer or else stop teaching such nonsense to the people.

Jesus prayed for the people who crucified Him to be forgiven. Let it not be thought that He prayed for God to set aside any law that this prayer might be answered. He wanted them to be saved in the same way as other sinners. His prayer was answered in Acts 2 when Peter preached the gospel and they obeyed it.

3. How long should our prayers be? In private one may pray as long as he likes but in public, not so. One should come to the point. Many are long in public prayer and short in private prayer. If Peter had been as slow in coming to the point that day he tried to walk on the water and cried "Lord save me," as many preachers are in their prayers today, he would have drowned before he got to it. There are the usual extremes on this subject. Some have made prayer purely a form. They garble a few words and are anxious for it to be over. Others have stretched the prayer into a sermon. I knelt for nineteen minutes (count 'em) while a man "prayed" at a funeral!

4. Shall we stand or kneel? Posture has but little to do with prayer. There are Bible accounts of men who prayed standing, kneeling and prostrate on their faces. A man once prayed standing on his head. He had fallen into an old well. He said it was the finest and most touching prayer he ever prayed! He who insists that a certain posture must be taken when one prays becomes a hobbyist. Some object to standing for prayer but think it is all right to stand for the benediction; they insist that we kneel but in practice usually a few men kneel and the rest of the men and perhaps all of the women sit through the prayer. I have wondered why in some of our modern buildings the seats were not so arranged that it would be convenient to kneel. (I would suggest prayer cushions before every seat so that both men and women could and would kneel but I fear some would say, "That is too much like the denominations.")

Just remember, my brother, that whether we stand, sit or kneel during prayer we must be humble and contrite in heart.

Putting Action Into Our Prayers

Man must help to answer his own prayers; he should pray, do his best and trust God for the rest. Man should pray for his daily bread but bear well in mind he is to earn it by the sweat of his brow. That does not mean that God is excluded and has nothing to do with feeding man. Man should pray for sinners to be saved; he should preach the word and pray that this word may have free course in the hearts of men. The one who understands the Word will not, of course, pray for God to save independent of means. Christians should pray for the sick to be made well again but all who believe the Bible and have any common sense at all will use every means at hand to assist in healing the sick. We should pray for the hungry to be fed but remember to "take the answer to our prayers along in a basket." God will not do for man what man can do for himself. The question of whether prayers are answered by a miracle or without a miracle, providentially or otherwise, is beside the point. God has promised to hear and answer our prayers. Prayer is not a sort of spiritual exercise which we take "simply because it is commanded." God will do things for us after we have prayed that He would not have done if we had not prayed. Let us pray like everything depended on prayer and work like everything depended on work. Prayer is not a substitute for obedience; it is not a substitute for work.

Group And Individual Prayer

Each Christian should remember his private devotion. He should "enter his closet and pray in secret." There is also power in group prayer-a prayer meeting. Let us not forget the family prayer. Cornelius did a better job teaching his religion to his family than many church members do today. Joshua said "As for me and my house ... Job prayed with his family. (Job 1:5) You have heard of the newly married couple who told the preacher they did not plan a family altar because they already had too much furniture. Yet, "the family altar would alter some families."

The Prayer of Sinners

John 9:31 and similar verses are often used to prove that God will not hear a sinner pray until after he is baptized. That is not the meaning. God will not hear any

man pray-either in the church or out-who turns away his ear from hearing the law. (Prov. 28:9) The impenitent simply will not be heard. Cornelius was heard before he was baptized. Saul of Tarsus prayed before he was baptized. Their prayers did not bring salvation short of obedience. To claim that aliens may pray their way through to victory without obedience is an insult to God's Word. A sinner may pray at a mourner's bench fifty years and he would not be saved in spite of all his tears and piety. He must obey to be saved. He must "arise and be baptized and wash away his sins calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts 22:16)

Prayer would be a good tonic for the chronic sickness which now afflicts the brotherhood-the halting between God and Baal, the grumbling, stumbling, complaining, backbiting (anonymous and otherwise) attitude of many brethren. Prayer would give strength and humility to those who need it. Therefore, "Let us pray."

COVERED PROPAGANDA

CARL HUGO McCORD

Without being brave enough to call names Tillet S. Teddlie sets himself up as a critic of the brotherhood and points out our wrongs. He makes himself a critic of the critics, in these words:

Personally, I do not think we need super-critics in the church. The Lord included none in the divine program. However, he did give some wholesome advice to would-be critics when he said, "First cast out the beam out of thine own eye ; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye." It is not bad taste for a man to examine himself.

Well, why did Bro. Teddlie not "examine himself," instead of examining his brethren?

He further criticizes :

The man who assumes to take oversight of all the churches, and all the colleges, and all the benevolent work of the church is assuming a burden too heavy for one man. The Lord never created the office of critic in the church.

Who is it that "assumes to take oversight" of all those things? Whoever he is, he should be criticized, Bro. Teddlie and I agree, but who is going to do it? Since there is no "critic in the church" to do that work, appointed by the Lord, who will do it? Lo, Bro. Teddlie says, "I will," and he does, does it in such a way that the schism at Louisville approves his criticisms.

Bro. Teddlie criticized well in this criticism:

The Lord will disown the man that sows discord among brethren."

Because some of us believe those words, we have been marking those from Louisville who by their unnecessary theories are sowing "discord among brethren." Bro. Teddlie does not criticize them (Horrors! it is wrong to criticize) but criticizes us for marking them that cause division.

Bro. Teddlie asks:

Does it encourage the spirit of Christianity for one preacher to hold a brother-preacher's faults be for the church?

Why say, "brother-preacher"? Does he mean to say it is all right to hold the faults of a sectarian preacher before the church? It is all right to point out the faults of a Dr. Norris but not of R. H. Boll? Is it all right, even among brother-preachers, to point out the faults of the one who sows discord with instrumental music, but not all right to point out the faults of the one who sows discord with speculations?

I do not believe Bro. Teddlie (and many others of his thought) correctly represent the "spirit of Christianity" anyway. If he is right, Paul and John did not have the "spirit of Christianity," for they both held brother-preachers' fault before the church (II Tim. 2:17; III Jno. 9) It

DOES THE REPLY TELL ENOUGH?

CARL HUGO McCORD

Bro. R. H. Boll was asked by a "friend" for a "clean and clear-cut" reply to two questions:

1. Have you at any time, anywhere, made your position on prophetic problems, with any individual or congregation, a test of fellowship?

2. Have you at any time, or anywhere, directly or indirectly, divided any church?

His answers :

1. I have never at any time or anywhere made my teaching on any prophecy a test of fellowship.

2. I have never at any time or anywhere, directly or indirectly divided a church. I have on several occasions helped to re-unite congregations where division existed or threatened.

Those answers look brave and forthright. They leave the impression that all is told, nothing concealed-"at any time or anywhere." They are given as a "clean" reply. But they do not tell:

1. Bro. Boll has been begged and begged not to teach his theories-theories which he admits Christians don't have to know.

2. In spite of the widespread trouble over his theories, Bro. Boll has insisted and persisted in teaching his theories. A large portion of his magazine is devoted to things which he admits we don't have to know.

3. The churches in Louisville are split wide open. They are not in fellowship. Yet they would immediately be in fellowship if Bro. Boll and his coadjutors would stop the trouble raised over his theories.

Brethren, is Bro. Boll's reply a "clean" one? Does it tell enough? Is it true he has not even "indirectly" divided a church? I am not prejudiced against him; I must be fair to him and to every man-but, is he fair in his reply to "a friend"?

To get away from any responsibility in the matter, Bro. Boll denies he has ever made his teachings a "test of fellowship." If, then, his teachings are not important enough to be made a test of fellowship, why does he persist in teaching them so? If he is really pious, and really endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit, he will say: "I will not let this teaching of mine, however much I love it, cause a rift among brethren. It is not important enough to be made a test of fellowship. I'll keep it to myself." But he won't say that. He holds on to it tenaciously, and teaches it doggedly, with thousands of brethren and hundreds of churches frowning on him. He is in a small circle of his own clique, and cannot go the length and breadth of the land among all the churches; they that understand the situation will not have him.

"A friend" could write the editor of the **Christian Standard**:

1. Have you at any time, anywhere, made your position on mechanical music, with any individual or congregation, a test of fellowship?

2. Have you at any time, or anywhere, directly or indirectly, divided any church?

And there is no doubt the editor would reply:

1. I have never at any time, or anywhere, made my teachings on mechanical music a test of fellowship.

2. I have never at any time or anywhere, directly or indirectly, divided any church. I have on several occasions helped to re-unite congregations where division existed or threatened.

Would those answers tell the whole story?

is the spirit of Christianity to forbear "one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." But when members refuse to keep the unity-by mechanical music, by speculations, by disorderly conduct, etc.-it is the spirit of Christianity to "mark and avoid them."



CONTRIBUTORIAL

AN ABBREVIATED TESTAMENT

Exposing the Unscriptural and Impious Attitude of the "Word and Work"
In Their Article, "Not a Word"

A. B. KEENAN

1. O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?

(Not railing for railing, not a word).

2. Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

(How much is lost by a word).

3. It is written again, thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.

(Be still; keep quiet; if they smite you on one cheek, turn the other also).

4. Get thee hence, Satan; for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.

(Never retort).

5. O Generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things?

(Hush-not a word).

6. Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, this people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with their lips; but their heart is far from me.

(Never mind your reputation nor character-they are in His hands, and you mar them by trying to retain them).

7. O ye hypocrites, ye can discern the face of the sky, but can ye not discern the signs of the times?

(Do not strive, nor try, nor cry).

8. Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites?

(Open not your mouth).

9. Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites!

(Silence).

10. My house shall be called of all nations the house of prayer, but ye have made it a den of thieves.

(A word will grieve, disturb, frighten away the gentle dove).

11. Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the scriptures, neither the power of God?

(Hush-not a word)!

12. Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men.

(Are you misunderstood? Never mind).

13. Then answered Jesus and said unto them, verily, verily, I say unto you, the son can do nothing of himself, but what he seeth the father do: for what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the son likewise.

(Will it hurt your influence and weaken your power for good? Leave it to Him. You are His care and charge).

14. When Jesus knew in himself that His disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, doth this offend you?

(Are you wronged and your good name tarnished? All right. Be it yours to be meek and lowly; simple and gentle--not a word).

15. Have I not chosen you twelve, and one of you is a devil?

(Let Him keep you in perfect peace; stay your mind on Him ; trust in Him).

16. Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father yewill do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it.

(Hush).

17. Jesus said unto them, verily, verily, I say unto you, before Abraham was, I am.

(Be quiet before the world and rest in Him. Not a word of argument, debate or controversy).

18. Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up by some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.

(Mind your own business; be still).

19. Jesus answered them, many good works have I shewed you from my father; for which of those works do ye stone me?

(Never judge nor condemn, nor arraign nor censure).

20. Let her alone: against the day of my burying hath she kept this.

(Not a word)

21. He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.

(Never an unclean nor an unkind expression).

22. If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me.

(Never a doubt nor a fear).

23. Go ye, and tell that old fox, behold, I cast out devils, and I do cures today and tomorrow, and the third day I shall be perfected.

(Never a disparaging remark of another).

24. Be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke; exhort with all longsuffering and doctrine.

(As you would others should do in the world, so do ye).

25. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations.

(Pause)

26. Them that sin rebuke before all that others may fear.

(Be still)

27. But there be some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ.

(Selah)

28. His spirit was stirred in him, when he saw the city wholly given to Idolatry. Therefore disputed he in the synagogue with the Jews.

(Not a word, emphatically; not even a look that will mar the sweet serenity of soul).

29. Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord.

(Get still).

30. What must I do to be saved?

(Know God).

31. Make a joyful noise unto the Lord.

Keep silence before Him. Stillness is better than noise).

32. Yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge

her, **lest** by her continual coming she weary me. And the Lord said, hear what the unjust judge saith.

(Not a word of murmuring nor complaining in supplication; not a word of nagging nor persuading).

33. O tuff of all subtilty and all **mischief**, thou child of the **ævii**, thou enemy of all righteousness, wilt thou not cease to pervert the right ways of the Lord?

(Let language be simple, gentle, quiet).

34. But we have this treasure in earthen vessels.

(You utter not a word, but give Him opportunity to speak).

35. Men and brethren, what shall we do?

(Hearken to hear His voice).

36. I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot.

(This is the way to honor and to know Him).

37. Presumptuous are they, selfwilled.

(Not a word-not the last word: listen to obey).

38. Who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy house shall be saved.

(Words make trouble).

39. And now why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.

(Be still).

40. But if any provide not for his own, and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.

(This is the voice of the Spirit. Take no thought for tomorrow; worry not about home, church, or business cares. Cast all on Him, and not a word).

41. Strive to enter in at the strait gate.

(We think so hard, pray so hard, and trust so hard, that we become unrestful and disquieted and noisy, and thus drive Him away ...).

42. Put on the whole armour of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the devil.

(Surrender self to Him. Let your conquered spirit keep quiet. Let your lips be closed, your tongue tied, your voice be hushed, your look be love).

43. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places.

(Let him control, and a sound of gentle stillness will permeate your very being, spreading the sweet aroma of peace and delight upon all around. And while your heart is hushed and your mouth closed, in the sweet, small voice, like the dew of the morning, the gentle light of sunshine, or the sweet breeze of eventide, you will be quickly blessed, by hearing him in the hush of His presence and the joy of His delight, and you will be so glad that you uttered-not a word!)

Epilogue

It is hard to understand how such an article as "Not a Word" could have gotten by the editor of a magazine whose ostensible purpose is "to declare the whole counsel of God." Its tone is not pious, but pietistic. It represents as virtuous a bovine disregard of all that may be sinful. It declares that inward peace is more important than the assaults we are commanded to make on the strongholds of error. It smacks of Christian Science, not Christianity. It commends to us, the hypnotic state of a nun "breathless with adoration" while doctrine, fidelity to revelation, and Christian soldiership suffer in neglect. It holds forth as ideal the state of peace into which a devotee of an East Indian religion mesmerizes himself while amidst the squalor of his surroundings he intently regards his own navel. The article is not only unscriptural, but in the above "testament" is demonstrably antiscritptural.

ANONYMOUS

The church must have sweet peace, says he,
And never brook a fuss,
So he sends vile reports to me,
This guy, Anonymous!

"God's servants must not strive," and then,
"All strife disgraces us,"
As he besmirches faithful men,
Thus raves Anonymous!

He hates contention, and he cries
"Plain speech is libelous!"
But he sends out the blackest lies—
This guy, Anonymous!

Does he not fight? and fight unfair?
The inconsistent cuss!
Why, even hell his ilk could spare,
This guy, Anonymous!

I long some day this guy to meet,
His tactics I abhor.
He makes of me from head to feet
A dirty cuspidor.

And should you hear a moan and sob,
While I his features muss,
The authorship of that neat job
Won't be anonymous!

-W. E. Brightwell.

SECURELY COPYRIGHTED

Here's one who would my leader be.
He has me all excited.
But what's the good of "leads" to me,
If they be copyrighted?

How can I pass it on, prithee?
My chances all are blighted,
For all his "leads" are dead to me,
If they be copyrighted!

Within the ken of writing men
That leader will be slighted,
If all the wit from his own kit
Is closely copyrighted.

The teacher gathers here and there
With chiefest sources noted.
The best things he will ever bear.
Most surely will be quoted.

Apostles wrote to special ones,
Not all the world benighted.
What tragedy to spike their guns,
If they had copyrighted!

You say, "Go preach; the gospel tell,
To free mankind from fetters."
But all the truth I have to preach
I quote from "private letters."

-W. E. Brightwell.

The June number (this issue) completes the first year of the Bible Banner. The second year begins July 1. Send your renewal now to Box 1804, Okla. City, Okla.

The **No-Hell** Doctrine of Russell and Rutherford

An Examination of Arguments That Make More Disciples for Rutherfordism Than Any Other Phase of Their False System.

GEO. B. CURTIS

The most active branch of Russellites style themselves "Jehovah's Witnesses." They follow closely the teachings of "Judge" Rutherford. Their publishing house, "The Watch Tower Tract and Bible Society," Brooklyn, New York, issues numerous doctrinal tracts and leaflets. Their zeal is worthy of a better cause.

The outstanding doctrines of Rutherfordites are: (1) Punishment of the wicked consists of complete annihilation; (2) Man is wholly mortal, that is, he dies body, soul and spirit; (3) Baptism consists of complete submergence of self into the element, Christ-that is, water is not the element of baptism; (4) All Jews, living and dead, will return to Palestine for a literal millennial reign with Christ; (5) All heathen and unbelievers will be given a chance for eternal life after the resurrection; (6) The destruction of all existing forms of government and the establishment of a new and perfect order under the personal supervision of Christ; (7) The legal and visible rulers of this new order will consist of a kingdom class of one hundred forty-four thousand spiritual beings; (8) Under this new order of things, resurrections will take place each century and the resurrected will be given a probation of one hundred years in which to become a perfect human being as Adam was: if successful he becomes an immortal being, if unsuccessful, he is annihilated; (9) Christ returned to earth in 1914 in His second appearing (coming).

Russellism, including Jehovah's Witnesses, as a system, is disloyal to the government of the United States of America; contrary to the letter and spirit of the New Testament; materialistic in all of its views; degrading to morality and spirituality; and utterly contradictory, inconsistent, and foolish. It shall be my purpose in this series of articles to point out the falsity of the major doctrines listed above and expose their contradictions, inconsistencies and foolishness.

Punishment of the Wicked

Russellism teaches that hell is the grave, nothing more nor less. They contend that at death a person absolutely ceases to exist, becomes as though he had never been born, becomes as Adam was before God made him. (Russell in Studies in the Scriptures, Vol. 5, p. 161, 329, 347, 362,

Rutherford in Reconciliation p. 296, and in Deliverance p. 324.) At death the wicked go into annihilation, at the resurrection are recreated and again go into annihilation if they miff their second chance, according to Rutherford's and Russell's followers.

A careful study of the word hell shows immediately the falsity of the Russellite contention that hell is always the grave. In the King James' Translation, the word hell occurs thirty-one times in the Old Testament and twenty-two times in the New Testament. In the Old Testament it is a translation of the Hebrew word, "sheol," and means the "unseen state of the dead." In the New Testament there are three words translated as hell—"hades," "Gehenna," and "Tartaroo." I give here Thayer's definition of "hades," "Gehenna," and "Tartaroo." "Hades, (Gr. Aides) the common receptacle of disembodied spirits, the realm of the dead." (Def. 2, p. 11, Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon.) "Gehenna, (Gr. Genna), the name of a valley on the S. and E. of Jerusalem, which was so-called from the cries of the little children who were thrown into the fiery arms of Moloch . . . and the then his name was transferred to that place in hades where the wicked after death will suffer punishment: Matt. 5:22, 29." (Thayer p. 111.) "Tartaroo, the name of a subterranean region, doleful and dark, regarded by the ancient Greeks as the abode of the wicked dead, where they suffer punishment for their evil deeds. It answers to the Gehenna of the Jews." (Thayer on Tartaroo.) We readily see that the definitions given by Thayer for these words that are in the New Testament translated by the word, hell, that the idea of grave, the receptacle for the dead body, does not enter into the meaning of the word at all. The word, "sheol," is not translated in the American Revised Version at all, but is rendered "sheol" in its sixty-five occurrences. In no place can the word, "sheol," be correctly rendered a receptacle for a dead body. Remember that when you hear one of these false "witnesses" declaiming loudly on the meaning of this word, The word "grave" in the Old Testament, a resting place, or receptacle, for a dead body, comes from an entirely different Hebrew word, "qeber, or qeburah." Where these words are

used in the original they mean "grave" as we understand the term—a place for dead bodies, and not the unseen state of the dead. In the New Testament, the receptacle for dead bodies—the grave—comes from two kindred Greek words, "mnema" and "mnemeion." The first word occurs in Revelations 11:9, and the second form of the word, "mnemeion," occurs in Matt. 27:52, 53; Luke 11:44; John 5:28, 11:17; 11:31; 11:38; 12:17. In the King James Version, "Hades" is translated grave in 1 Cor. 15:55. The American Revision renders it death. In the Old Testament the word "qeber" occurs sixty-seven times, and is translated "burying place" six times, "grave" thirty-five times, and "sepulchre" twenty-six times. Its Hebrew synonym, "qeburah," occurs fourteen times, and is translated "burial" four times, "burying place" one time, "grave" four times, and "sepulchre" five times. It can be readily seen from this study, that hell is not the grave, and the grave is not hell. It is time that these perverters of truth were being exposed in this contention everywhere. They probably make more converts to their false system by their arguments on hell than by any other line of argument.

A Literal Hell

Does the Bible teach that there is a literal hell, and that the wicked will be there in everlasting, conscious punishment? Space forbids the citation of all the teaching of the Bible of this subject, but enough is given to convince any honest truth seeker. Withhold not correction from the child: for if thou beatest him with the rod, he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell." (Prov. 23:13-14) Correcting the child would not keep him from dying a natural death, nor prevent his body going to the grave; therefore, natural death is not the death referred to here, and hell is not the grave. "The sinners in Zion are afraid; fearfulness hath surprised the hypocrites. Who among us shall dwell with the devouring fire? Who among us shall dwell with the everlasting burning?" (Isa. 33:14) The Targum has this to say on this passage: "Who of us shall dwell in Jerusalem, when the ungodly are judged, and delivered into hell for an eternal burning." We leave this pas-

sage without comment. It needs none. "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." (Dan. 12:2) This text plainly teaches the resurrection of the dead, the everlasting happiness of the righteous, and the endless misery of the wicked. To an unbiased mind here the eternal existence of the wicked is evidently set forth. These three passages must suffice for the Old Testament teaching on the punishment of the wicked.

We shall now invite your attention to a New Testament study of the subject. "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal." (Matt. 25:46) The phrase "everlasting life" and its equivalent "eternal life" occur forty-five times in the New Testament. It is conceded by all that these expressions mean life without end. "Everlasting" as applied to punishment and "eternal" as applied to life comes from exactly the same word and mean exactly the same thing. Hence, as long as the life of the righteous continues the punishment of the wicked shall endure. Apart from pain, either physical or mental, there could be no punishment. Apart from a conscious existence there could be no pain. Therefore, conscious existence continues after judgment, for these of whom the Saviour spoke had all ready been judged. "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not and their fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched; where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out; it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one, than having two eyes, to be cast into hell fire, where their worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched." (Mark 9:43-48)

These scriptures are too plain to need any comment, but I wish to call attention to two things: (1) the fire is not quenched, (2) their worm dieth not. The anguish of hell will endure as long as the bliss of heaven. When we quit this earth, it will be either heaven eternal, or hell everlasting.

OUR PASTOR SYSTEM Preachers Who Compromise Are Traitors and Therefore No Better Than Judas Iscariot.

R. A. TURNER

God has decreed that during every generation the church must preach the gospel to every individual in the world. "He is not willing that any one should perish." The gospel is God's "power unto salvation" to the sinner, and the church is the only institution that can give the gospel to him.

If the church can not preach the gospel to every person in the world during a generation; then, God has not made sufficient provisions for the salvation of the souls of men. Jesus commissioned the twelve apostles; "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. .. and they went forth, and preached every where."

From these twelve apostles the gospel "went out into all the world," and "was preached in all creation under heaven." All this in a day when there were not any modern modes of transportation such as the locomotive, steamboat, automobile, and aeroplane: Nor, were there any of our modern means of communication such as the press, telephone, telegraph, and radio.

Yet today, we (the church) with five hundred thousand members, are not giving the gospel to America to say nothing of our utter failure to give it to the whole world. Has the gospel ceased to be God's power unto salvation? No, the gospel is the same glad story that it was when preached for the first time by Peter on Pentecost.

Our failure lies in that we have abandoned God's plan of preaching the gospel for one of our own, -the "pastor-plan" or system. God's plan is that the elders are to "take heed unto. .. all the flock. .. to feed the church." God's elders must "be able to exhort in the sound doctrine, and to convict the gainsayer." The preachers are to "suffer hardship, do the work of an evangelist." Every Christian must teach the gospel. It was said of the early Christians, "ye have filled Jerusalem with your teaching." When the first persecution arose, "they that were scattered abroad went about preaching the word." The execution of this plan required great effort and a truly consecrated life, but resulted in the gospel being preached "in all creation under heaven" in one generation.

However, we have invented a plan that takes out all the effort and consecration peculiar to God's plan. It has been said that necessity is the

mother of invention, and our attitude toward the Lord's work necessitated this new plan. We have numbers of men who have aspirations for the honor and authority of the eldership, but very few who are willing to pay the price of preparation to meet the qualifications and assume the grave responsibilities of this sacred office. Hence, we have devised a plan whereby men may sit in this high office and perform the duties thereof by proxy. In short we have devised to hire a preacher-pastor to feed the flock (on sermonettes). This gives our elders (?) the honor and authority to which they aspire, even though they do not possess the qualifications and do not intend to do the work.

If members of the church were to study their Bible, and go daily from house to house teaching the gospel; it would require time and effort that could otherwise be spent leisurely in a movie, at a ball game, bridge party, or a gossiping conference. Therefore, the plan of serving God by proxy pleases them exceedingly; for it is easier to pool their paltry sacrifices and hire a preacher-pastor to do their studying, teaching, and visiting the sick, than it is to do it themselves.

For a preacher to, like Paul, make it his aim to "preach Christ where he has not been named" requires that he lead a life of sacrifice and uncertainties, and so, it is much easier for him to take a pastorate at a substantial salary and remain at home with the wife and children, -a cultured respected man in the community. Of course, under this arrangement he must forget about pleasing the Lord, and members.

God's plan is quite antiquated. The new plan pleases all of us. It is so much easier, but "Woe to them that are at ease in Zion. Many of our religious journals are contributing influences to the furtherance of this new plan, and if some are not advocating it they certainly are not fighting it.

Our Christian colleges are hatching out preachers by the scores who have, because of the influence of these institutions, made it their aim to get a good paying pastorate instead of preaching Christ where He has never been named.

The church is in a state of apostasy. Some think that the majority of the members are but little more than infidels, which if properly analyzed may prove to be more truth than fiction.

A RESUME ON MORMONISM

A Cross-Section Examination of the Claims of the Book of Mormon Compiled From Hancock's "Mormonism Exposed"

D. H. HADWIN

We are herewith presenting the results of a study made several months ago of an old book entitled, "Mormonism Exposed," by G. B. Hancock. The book was handed to me by a brother in Christ who asked me to glean the main arguments from it, and give them to him for his personal use. Believing that these arguments really explode Mormonism, we publish them with the hope that they may be helpful to the cause of truth and right. Most of what follows was culled from the above-named book.

If the Book of Mormon answers any purpose in the divine economy it must connect at some point with the Bible, and at that point there must be an incompleteness, a vacuum, that could not have been filled without its appearance. If there be such point it must be found in the New Testament for there is not a prophecy, an allegory or type in the old Testament, that directs the mind of man beyond what we have in Christ.

When the Old Covenant was given at Mt. Sinai, the patriarchs surrendered their commission at the feet of Moses, the mediator of that covenant. When the New Covenant was established, Moses and the prophets surrendered their commission at the feet of Jesus, the mediator of the New Covenant. Revelation was progressive, never retrogressive. Therefore, if with the appearing of the Book of Mormon a new period was to be ushered in, giving new advantages, advantages superior to any through previous revelations; then it follows, necessarily, that Jesus must surrender his commission at the feet of Joseph Smith.

Unhesitatingly do we say, If the origin of the American Indians be not a gospel idea there is not a gospel idea in the Book of Mormon but what was borrowed from the Bible. Take the professed account of the first settling of America out of the Book of Mormon and the remainder is a game of plagiarism, from beginning to end.

The following syllogisms speak for themselves:

1. Inspiration and revelation ending with Christ, all pretended inspiration and revelations since His were false. (Col. 2:3)

2. But the pretended inspiration and revelations of Joseph Smith were since Christ.

3. Therefore, the pretended inspiration and revelations of Joseph Smith were false.

1. The Holy Spirit guided the apos-

bles into all truth. (Jno. 16:13-15).

2. But the Holy Spirit did not give the Book of Mormon unto His apostles.

3. Therefore, the Book of Mormon was not of the Holy Spirit.

1. The revelation of God's will as made known by the apostles of Jesus Christ contained all things that pertain to life and godliness. (2 Tim. 3:15, 2 Pet. 1:3)

2. But the revelation did not contain the Book of Mormon.

3. Therefore, the Book of Mormon does not pertain to life and godliness.

1. The only teaching Christ is with is that which was taught by the apostles. (Mt. 28:18-20).

2. But the Book of Mormon was not delivered by the apostles.

3. Therefore, Christ is not with the Book of Mormon.

1. Any religious production that Christ is not with is a godless production.

2. But Christ is not with the Book of Mormon.

3. Therefore, the Book of Mormon is a godless production.

1. The purpose for which man was favored with inspiration and revelation from God being reached, that work was complete.

2. But that purpose was reached through the inspiration and revelation granted the apostles of Jesus Christ. (Jn. 8:32, Gal. 5:1)

3. Therefore, with the apostles of Jesus Christ the work of inspiration and revelation reached its completeness. (Eph. 3:5, Rom. 16:25-26).

1. As the inspiration from God gave, through the apostles of Christ, the truth of God, an inspiration that would give anything different or additional thereto would be from the infernal regions. (Rev. 22:18-19, Gal 1:6-9, 2 Thes. 2:9-12, 2 Cor. 4:3-4)

2. But the Book of Mormon is something additional to and different from what the apostles of Christ gave.

3. Therefore, the Book of Mormon was given by inspiration from the infernal regions.

1. The curse of God rests upon any production that contains another gospel. (Gal. 1:6-9)

2. But the Book of Mormon contains another gospel.

3. Therefore, the curse of God rests upon the Book of Mormon.

1. The true grace of God in order to the salvation of man was made known by the apostles of Christ. (1 Pet. 5:12, 1 Cor. 15:1-2, 2 Pet. 3:15-16, Tit. 2:11)

2. But the Book of Mormon was not made known by the apostles of Christ.

3. Therefore, the Book of Mormon is not of the grace of God.

1. Any production beyond the perfection of God in Christ, that claims inspiration, is of the devil. (Heb. 5:9)

2. But the Book of Mormon is a production beyond the perfection of God in Christ, that claims inspiration.

3. Therefore, the Book of Mormon is a production from the devil.

1. Any book claiming inspiration, proven to be a lying document, is the production of a deceiver.

2. But it is proven that the Book of Mormon is a lying document.

3. Therefore, the Book of Mormon is the production of a deceiver.

This places Joseph Smith in his true light, and shows him to be an impostor.

1. When perfect knowledge should be reached, prophesying was to cease. (1 Cor. 13:8-10)

2. But perfect knowledge was reached in the New Testament. (2 Tim. 3:16-17, 2:15, 2:2), NOTE: When Paul wrote 2 Timothy, all of the New Testament had been written except the writings of John.)

3. Therefore, with the completion of the New Testament all prophesying ceased. (Rev. 22:18-19; the last thing written in the N. T.)

Therefore we have the following:

1. All pretended prophets since the New Testament was written were impostors. (Compare Eph. 3:5 with Eph. 2:20).

2. But Joseph Smith was a pretended prophet since the fulness of perfection in Christ was reached.

3. Therefore Joseph Smith was an impostor.

1. God had nothing for man beyond his own perfection. (2 Tim. 3:16, 17, Eph. 1:22-23, Eph. 3:8-10).

2. But the perfection of God is embodied in what is revealed in the Bible.

3. Therefore, beyond what is revealed in the Bible, God had nothing for man.

Therefore:

1. Any production beyond the perfection of God that claims inspiration is a fraud.

2. But the Book of Mormon is a production beyond the perfection of God that claims inspiration.

3. Therefore, the Book of Mormon is a fraud.

1. The doctrine for the people of God is recorded in the New Testament, and God warns them against the reception of any other doctrine. (Rom. 16:17-18, 2 Jno. 9-11)

2. But the Mormon doctrine, not being recorded in the New Testament, is another doctrine.

3. Therefore, God warns His people against the reception of the Mormon doctrine.

1. We need all that is essential to salvation.

2. But Mormonism is not essential to salvation. (2 Pet. 1:3, Acts 20:32)

3. Therefore, we do not need Mormonism.

1. All the nations under heaven where devout Jews lived were represented at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. (Acts 2:5)

2. But there were no Jews there from the American continent. (Acts 2:9-11)

3. Therefore no devout Jews lived on the American continent.

Therefore:

1. Any production declaring that

there were devout Jews on the American continent at the time of the first Pentecost after the ascension of Christ is false.

2. But the Book of Mormon so declares.

3. Therefore the Book of Mormon is false.

Some Facts That Demonstrate The Falsity of the Book of Mormon

1. Christ was never known by His given name, Jesus, till so named by the angel who appeared to Joseph, the espoused husband of Mary. (Mt. 1: 21, 24-25) The Book of Mormon records the use of His name, Jesus, by the Nephites hundreds of years before His birth.

2. God utterly refused to afford those who had the Jewish Scriptures anything additional in order to their conversion (Luke 16:27-31) The Nephites claimed to have Moses and the prophets, yet they did not circumcise their converts, nor did they observe any of the feasts as required by the law (See Ex. 12:48-49) Their preaching and their methods were similar to the preaching and the methods used by the denominational churches of Joseph Smith's day.

3. Repentance and remission of sins were never preached in the name of Christ till the first Pentecost after His crucifixion (Luke 24:46-47, Acts 2, Isa. 2:2-3, Micah 4:1-2). But it is claimed by the Book of Mormon that those Nephite preachers understood and preached repentance and remission of sins in the name of Christ, centuries before Christ was born.

4. The Holy Spirit was not given; and hence not enjoyed by the people of God till after Christ's ascension and glorification (Jno. 16 :7, Acts 1:8, Jno. 7:39) It is claimed by the Book of Mormon that the Nephite churches received and enjoyed the Holy Spirit long before Christ was born.

5. The Nephites claimed to be genuine Jews. Till the time of the beginning of John's ministry, however, Moses was preached (Acts 15:21) It mattered not whether the pious teacher in the synagogue read the lesson from the writings of Moses or from some one of the prophets, the necessity and importance of observing the law was strictly enjoined. Such, however, was not the manner of those Nephite preachers. Their style was very modern, and the Ashdodish language used shows their author to be an ignoramus, one that knew little about either the law or the gospel.

6. Those Nephite preachers claimed to understand the nature and design of the incarnation, the nature and extent of the atonement. Something

THE CHURCH'S BANNERS

JAMES P. MILLER

"In the name of our God we will set up our banners." (Psa. 20:5)

The Church of Christ wages continued war not only against the powers of the world and the prince of darkness, but sadder still and ever more discouraging against the willful "ism's" and "theories" of our own brethren. Men schooled in Military Science from the days of David know that one traitor within their own camp, is equal to a thousand men in the camp of the enemy. Old Israel turned back to wander in the wilderness until all who murmured against God had died, not because of the giants across the river, but because of those giants within the camp that compromised with the Devil in saying we cannot do it.

The Psalmist knew experimentally the nature of the conflict, then and now, when he so aptly recorded for posterity, "In the name of our God we will set up our Banners."

I. A banner is a flag or standard, generally having some inscription, often the name or the arms of the country to which it belongs. Therefore, the Christian's banner would bear the name of "Christ" in bold letters of red and the inscription "Speak Where the Bible Speaks." Any man who does more or less than this is disloyal even to the standard under which he fights.

(1). The Banner is unfurled at the proclamation of war. The spirit, maximums and the statements of the Gospel are all at war with the corruption of idle speculation intent on the destruction of the unity of the greatest army that ever marched. (2 Cor. 10:5): "Casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought of the obedience of Christ."

(2). The Banner is hoisted as the rallying point for scattered troops. The Gospel is the only appointed medium of uniting the Church; God never intended that they should be united by human creeds, distinctions and hobbies.

(3). Banners are raised for direction. When the troops are engaged

that neither angel nor man knew till after Christ was glorified. (1 Tim. 3:16, Eph. 3:8-9, Rom. 16:25-26, 1 Pet. 1: 10-12)

7. Long before Jesus of Nazareth was born, if we are to credit the Nephite record in the Book of Mormon, churches of Christ were established, and the members thereof were called **Christians!** (Mt. 16:18, Acts 11:26)

in the heat of battle they sometimes lose their bearings but they can always look up and follow their own standards.

(4). Banners are waved as signals of triumph. When the conqueror returned of old, Caesar, the citizens hailed him, streaming banners waved and thus he passed through the triumphant arches of his native city. The Christian is a conqueror and by the power of the living God, truth will prevail. Rom 8:36-37: "For thy sake we are killed all the day long; we are counted as sheep by the slaughter. Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us."

(5). Banner is elevated as the token of Peace, The gospel is the message of peace and when the proper time comes, the banners of God shall be the first to be unfurled as a spotless white banner. But not a peace that compromises one jot of the truth.

II. Our Responsibility

(1). Suitable elevations must be chosen. Where the banner of God may be seen and read.

(2). Banner bearers must be supported. Men who shall lift up their voices as a trumpet and stand four-square on the truth of God.

(3). Banners must be set up: "In the name of our God." Let those who choose other banners be the enemy of the truth, and those men who through the years are conscious of the "Gospel as the Power of God" fight on that they may receive "the crown of Life."

I am delighted with the sound character of the Bible Banner and I have heard favorable comment from others who want the truth defended without fear or favor. I believe the Bible Banner, as it is being edited, is filling a real need in the Church. There seems to be a deflection from sound doctrine by some of those who in times past we have regarded as "pillars" in the Church and I am glad that you and others who are writing for the Bible Banner have the courage to "call a spade a spade." I believe your paper will do a great good wherever it is read.

George W. DeHoff

Look at the label on your magazine. If it reads 6-39 your subscription expires with this issue. \$1.00 will renew your subscription one year from July 1. Send check or money order to Bible Banner, Box 1804 Oklahoma City, Okla.



IN-CULLINGS-COMMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

Who Killed Cock Robin? -- **That** Brotherhood Survey

A sweeping claim was made for that famous Davidson Questionnaire and the great "Brotherhood Survey." This straw vote was taken by the promoters of the New Deal in journalism and the advocates of soft-pedal preaching and writing. Clinton Copyright Davidson claims that ninety-five per cent of those who answered the questionnaire were in favor of his modernistic ideas. But who answered his questionnaire? Who are the ninety-five percent? This remains his dark secret. **It** was therefore proposed that the preachers who did not answer his questionnaire send us a card. The May issue of the Banner printed an array of messages from gospel preachers far and wide. It is followed up in this issue with another mighty host-and the end is not yet. The Bible Banner is asking all the preachers who did not answer the questionnaire, or those who did not receive it, or those who answered it unfavorably, **to** send us a card. A one cent card will do the work. If the other papers such as the Gospel Advocate and the Firm Foundation will just give us a lift in **this** campaign we may find out WHO KILLED COCK ROBIN! Write us, brother preacher, Box 1804, Oklahoma City, Okla.

The May issue of the Bible Banner is worth many times its subscription price. Those who take the Banner are highly pleased with it. Keep it hot. More power to you. No, I did not sign the questionnaire. I never did like to be interrogated by one I never knew. It smelled too fishy to me. We "crackers" know the smell of rotten fish.—Thos. J. Butler, Lakeland, Fla.

* * *

No! A thousand times No! I did not sign the Davidson Questionnaire. I read just a few lines, "smelled something up the branch" and tossed it into the waste basket. My articles in "Truth In Love" bear witness to the type of religious journal I prefer. And just as I write, I preach. I have just closed a four months radio preaching program and no "soft-soaping" went out over the air. The contrast was made between the teaching of Christ and the doctrine and commandments of men. I baptize sectarians right along. You are making a great fight against "premillennialism." Keep it up.—W. C. Graves, Birmingham, Alabama.

* * *

I did not answer the survey. I have been so busy studying the Bible to determine what God wants, that I have had no time or disposition to find out what the brethren want. Anyway, I am a mortal; subject to error; and my views of "ethical-journalism" might not coincide with my Lord's. I suggest that we scan the pages of the Book; take a survey from inspired men; and determine the kind of writing and preaching that the brethren need. Peter, Paul, James, Christ, and all of the others are better judges than we.—J. Louis Langston, Grandview, Texas.

I received one of those circulars, but it had the "stench of compromise," also was addressed "Rev." Was compelled to contaminate the waste basket with it. Received a letter some days ago from Brother Rowe, apologizing or rather trying to for Clinton Davidson's 20 years wandering. God's plan has ever been to bring error out into the light of truth. May you continue your firm stand for the truth.—Rolfe Wagner, Sheridan, Wyo.

* * *

If "Mr. Copyright" wants to find out the sentiment of the brotherhood about himself and his "copyright" paper just let him read a few issues of the Bible Banner and he won't need to send out any more circular letters. I pray that he may repent and confess his wrongs and clean up his own back yard before trying to start on some one else, for just worshipping and fellowshiping with the Christian Church is as sinful as any other sin, and should be corrected before he goes before the brotherhood as a reformer and champion of papers. When I changed from the Christian Church I was looked upon with a lot of suspicion from some for a long time, but it has all passed, and I am happy in the Lord's work, and am sure that it was the greatest move that I ever made, and will assure me eternal reward if I remain faithful and true to the Old Book and Old Paths.—Ira B. Sandusky Temple, Texas.

* * *

Here is my card. I did not help kill Cock Robin. Davidson's Questionnaire was a trick. He is still "lost" to the cause of truth. Why some good brethren are influenced by such is beyond me.—E. G. Creacy, Horse Cave, Ky.

The Bible Banner is fine. You are doing splendid work. We need men like you who are not afraid to come out in the open and fight.

We have struggled long in these parts against the various false teachings of brethren who went out from us. It has been a hard fight, but the truth will win out.

I didn't get a questionnaire, for those brethren who sent it out knew how I stand.

Paul said some would depart from the faith, and his prophesies are being fulfilled right along.—R. A. Craig, Shelbyville, Ky.

* * *

I enjoy the Bible Banner and commend you for your fight for the truth. You are bound to win as you are standing for the truth. I did not answer the Questionnaire. I did not know who sent it or why it was being sent. I was afraid something was being done in the dark and I did not want to be found doing something for which I would be sorry later. I stand with you in your great work.—Clyde C. Corner, Wilson, Okla.

* * *

I am one of the number who received the "Copyright" Davidson letters and did not answer it, but on the contrary put it in the wastebasket. My reason for doing so was that I could not see any good that such a survey could do. Unless it was the same motives Israel had as stated by Jeremiah: "The prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear the rule by their means; and my people love to have it so." When the preachers and the papers start giving the people what they want instead of what they need we are getting sectarian.—W. S. Boyett, Sanderson, Texas.

I received all "anonymous literature" as also "Copyright Davidson's Questionnaire." I did not answer the "Questionnaire" but after all things which have been **said and done**, I felt like answering Rowe's defense of such a character as I had concluded Davidson is bound to be; but I just happened to think of what Paul said:—"The love of money is the cause of all kinds of evil." When your heart beats are in such anxious solicitude for the cause of our Lord; and you have the medium through which to make the fight—The Bible Banner and the backing of such as Cled Wallace, John T. Lewis, Austin Taylor, and your splendid staff of contributors, our great brotherhood who has not bowed to Baal, we will see to it that the Bible Banner succeeds. Like you, I think we must make the fight of our life, not only against the "Bollites," but their sympathizers. Filthy lucre, fame and prestige, will develop an unwholesome character, the result of which will be selfishness, greed, and all kinds of worldliness; and true Christianity will be relegated to "the moles and bats." Keep the fires burning. In this fight there is no place for the **faint hearted "pussy footer."** Yours in the **"Fight to the last ditch."**—H. E. Warlick, Norman, Okla.

* * *

I have always enjoyed the Banner, but seems the May issue is the best of them all. That should break the back of those who sympathize with Bro. Davidson and his soft policies. If David Lipscomb had used such methods as he is pursuing, the whole South would have gone digressive. I feel that your fight (and of course it is **our** fight too) is somewhat comparable to the one Bro. Lipscomb made against digression in years gone by. We cannot measure, at this time, the vast amount of good it will be to the church of the future. I know you will continue to press the fight and stay on the firing line till all error and digression are swept from our ranks.

I have asked numbers of preachers if they answered the questionnaire and not a single one said he did. I remember getting several different ones and my impression of them at the time was that some one was trying to sell us down the river. It seemed to me they were worded in such a way as to receive the kind of answer wanted. Seemed a criticism of the past policies if our papers. Of course, I didn't answer them. I would like to know just how Davidson gets the idea he polled 95 per cent of the brotherhood. I venture the suggestion that one reason why he copyrighted his findings was to keep the brotherhood

from knowing just how few really answered them. I think you are giving him just what he deserves. I hope no one will take him seriously. Should we give over to his leadership, the church would be completely digressive in a short time. More power to you in the fight for the right. You have many friends and admirers among whom I am happy to count myself one. It won't be long now till all the Bollites and the compromisers will be whipped out and the tide will turn. In fact, I believe it is already turning as I believe the preachers are waking up to the menace and are fighting it. I have never seen any of the anonymous letters sent out, but others have told me of them. It is a weak cause that has to resort to such cowardly methods. All truth loving people cannot but despise people who are so cowardly that they will hide behind anonymity and pour forth such slander and vituperation against a faithful brother in the Lord. It has always been the case that when people cannot meet the arguments of their opponents, they begin to persecute and slander them. A. Campbell said it was "the adjunct of a weak, and defeated cause."—Jno. H. Bannister, Oklahoma City, Okla.

* * *

Since the door is open for expression, I will drop in to say that I did not reply to the questionnaire sent out to preachers and others to determine what kind of a religious paper the brotherhood wants. Had I answered it, I certainly would have pleaded for pure gospel teaching by faithful brethren, which is our hope and means of keeping the church pure and spreading the borders of the kingdom of Christ—H. E. Taylor, Parkersburg, W. Va.

* * *

Yes, I received one of the questionnaires but threw it into the waste basket. I have also received the anonymous circulars. I am not at all interested in such methods. I think I had just as well give the members of the congregation here a questionnaire and then let the type of sermons I preach be determined by it. It is ridiculous. I think the Banner is serving its purpose. Many of us are ready to sink with you for the truth.—B. G. Hope, Paragould, Ark.

* * *

I received a questionnaire from Brother Davidson but disregarded it because I did not think much of the idea. I do not know of any around here who answered it. The 95% must have been digressives. Keep up the good work.—Clint C. Lovelady, Turlock, Calif.

I did not sign that questionnaire sent out by Clinton Davidson because I thought it was a promotion scheme of some kind and sure enough it was.—L. C. Bankhead, Goose Creek, Tex.

I did not kill Cock Robin. I received one of the questionnaires but not knowing the parties who sent it, I thought it was some sectarian trying to find out how the preachers of the Church of Christ stood on such matters. So I burned the thing up.—J. C. Hunt, Deatsville, Ala.

* * *

I am happy to add my belated testimony to the ones you have. I was not included in the "young" and progressive" class and did not receive a copy of the questionnaire. Maybe the printing of the letter Brother Harper sent you in the January-February issue of the Banner has caused them to mark me off their list. By the way, it was not my request that my name be left off that letter from Brother Armstrong. He did not make any requests that would have forbidden my publishing it; it was written before the "copyrighting" started.—E. G. Couch, State College, Pa.

* * *

Who killed Cock Robin? Well, I'll confess I took a shot at the bird, not recognizing him at first sight. But my aim was bad, scoring only 5%. He was new to me also, and I let my curiosity get the best of me, as I wanted to know more about him. I was already suspicious before I finished all the questions, for my answers didn't want to fit in. But I didn't let a little thing like that bother me. I aimed, and shot straight. However, I was later informed that I lost by a ratio of 19 to 1. Well, I don't feel bad about it.

I, too, have asked several full fledged preachers about their shots, (I'm not counted as a full fledged preacher, you know, just one of those preaching deacons), and I can't find a one in several states who "killed Cock Robin." So I will be anxious to hear the results in an early edition of the Bible Banner.—E. A. Clevenger, Chattanooga, Tenn.

* * *

I want to say that I wish I could do more to assist you in the fight that is being waged against you, and that when I see these vicious attacks at you, it hurts me very much and I feel so helpless and sure wish I could at least run out into the storm to shake hands with you. But rest assured that I endorse your stand and say "more power to you and may your shadow never grow less."—E. E. Young, attorney, Roswell New Mex.

This is to say that I never killed Cock Robin and I never furnished him the ammunition for the other fellow to kill him. I did receive the "New Yorker" questionnaire, but it never entered my mind that I ought to answer it. I appreciate your work, as I should have told you before now. There are many others who will not bow to "high tone journalism" even though threatened to be sued. Keep on keeping on; let the enemy rage. Command me when I can serve. -E. R. Watson, Asher, Okla.

* * *

I received the questionnaire sent out by Clinton Davidson, and gave it the same attention that I gave the anonymous circulars sent to me. We are winning this fight against Premillennialism, but we must never ease up in the struggle. "Cry aloud, spare not, lift up the voice like a trumpet, and show my people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." I am with you in this righteous cause.-Boyd D. Fanning, Glen Dale, West Va.

* * *

Oh, yes, I nearly forgot to tell you also that I was among the number who used Croesus' crapulent questionnaire to light the fire. (To save you the trouble of looking it up, crapulent means "drunken" "besotted," "grossly intemperate")-to my mind the questionnaire was the work of one who was drunken with visions of leadership, besotted with the digressives (he **sot** with them for twenty years didn't he?) and grossly intemperate in his use of facts.

Also, C. E. Fritts who preaches for the Logan Street church consigned his questionnaire to the fire, as did A. J. Rhodes, who preaches for the Sherman Street Church, and Felix W. Tarbet who preaches for church in Colorado Springs.-Yater Tant, Denver, Colo.

* * *

I threw Davidson's questionnaire in the waste basket for several reasons. I did not think a well informed church member would let anything be addressed "Rev." It sounded foolish and silly. I took it as coming from a "Bollite," a sectarian, or a disgruntled person. I do not believe that two hundred preachers, of the twenty-five hundred, even paid any attention to it. I have not met a preacher yet who said that he filled it out. Let Davidson give us the names.

As to slanderous letters, the article by John T. Lewis in the May issue of the Bible Banner "hits the nail on the head." To that article

The Sin of Lying and Stealing

G. K. WALLACE

The Sin of Lying

"Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor" is as true today as it ever was. However, for the comfort of those whose reputations have been assailed, let it be remembered that Jesus said, "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake." There are several ways in which this commandment may be violated.

1. Perjury is a violation of this command. Justice is based on truth. False testimony is a violation of truth. He who bears false testimony helps in the miscarriage of justice.

2. Slander is perhaps the most unblushing form of this sin. Many lies are invented and distributed with malicious intention. Recent letters circulated in the mails are a low type of robbery. Dillinger and Pretty Boy Floyd are good souls compared to the character assassin. They usually robbed of material things that could be replaced. When they took life it was by a swift and sudden stroke, often with little pain. However, the slanderer who invents a lie, forms a weapon which takes away a reputation. The chances are that it can never be completely replaced.

3. Tale bearing should be avoided. It is a sin. Why repeat an ugly report without careful investigation? Why circulate the truth to the detriment of a person? To repeat a story, if it reflects upon the honor of character of another, is not right. If a man's conduct is not right, he should be brought before the church where he holds his membership and given the proper hearing. There are base fel-

I say, "Amen." A moral reprobate has no respect for a man that would circulate such literature and not sign his name to it. How can an honest upright gentleman (to say nothing of a Christian) respect such. If it takes sweet religious journalism to convert the world for Christ, what will be the effect of such letters? Are they trying to do two things at the same time? Of course, it is not known that these bitter and sweet streams can be traced to the same fountain, and I am not now making that charge, but I have failed to read a denial of the two being twin sisters.-Chester Estes, Corinth, Miss.

* * *

Not having been a regular reader of the Bible Banner, I was not aware

lows who seem to delight in this sort of lawlessness, delighting in the very havoc in the tales they tell. If you don't believe this, just watch the mail -or are you on the preferred list?

4. It is wrong to tell a half truth. This is one form of lying. This is harder to fight than a real lie-or rather a lie unmixed with truth. If you have told the bad and only the bad as if it were all about a person, you have lied. The whole truth is never told until the good is also told. Is there any soul who is wholly bad?

5. Men **some** time lie by the impression they leave. A false impression deliberately left is equal to a lie. A false impression can be planted **in** the mind by a hint. "Have you heard about Mr. * * * *?" "No, I have not, what about him?" "Ah, forget it. The least said the sooner mended." The adroit asking of the question has left the wrong impression.

G. It is wrong to impute the wrong motive. To contribute to an action an ulterior, selfish, sordid motive is sinful. Sometimes when men cannot meet the arguments of their opponents, they accuse them of having base motives. If you cannot meet the argument, do not impeach the motive. This is a form of lying. Do you not agree? If not, why not?

Stealing Just Swiping

Why do seeming decent people steal and laugh it off by saying, "I just swiped it." Americans perhaps the greatest pilferers on the face of the globe. Go into supposedly Christian homes and see the Pullman towels and hotel soap. Where did it come from? Hotel managers say about the only thing guests do not try to steal is the bed. The complete lack of respect of other people's property is a manifestation of hoodlumism. God calls it stealing. A thief cannot be saved.

that you had turned detective; but the truth will out and the news has come to me in a round-about way that you are trying to find out who killed Cock Robin. Now I like to be helpful and might just suggest that the 95 per cent are the murdering crowd, if I didn't know that you have known that all the time.

It seems that the only thing I can do to help is to speak for myself. I think I found some of that mind-prying matter in my mail some time ago, but I am not sure now that I went to the trouble of throwing it into the waste basket. Anyhow, it is not to be found now and I didn't answer it. That leaves me out of the 95 per cent, and I **did not** help kill Cock Robin!—J. E. Nowlin, Sparta, Tenn.

D. B. Killebrew

This will announce the death of my father, D. B. Killebrew, elder of the church, McAlester, Oklahoma, on April 29th, 1939.

Having stayed at home from birth until I was forty-two years old, I am privileged to say that a true and devout child of God has gone home to take his place at the right hand of Christ, our Redeemer. The scriptures say "Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God," and his conversation at all times and to all men was pure, uplifting and edifying. I can truthfully say that he was a man of pure heart and always did the will of God to the best of his ability.—
Frank Killebrew.—

I am writing relative to the passing of Brother Killebrew. He died quietly in bed—his heart failed. He had not recovered from the December spell—only partially. A good man has gone. Our association over thirty years in the church and family circles drew us close as friends. During these years we relied upon the other, especially when under deep and overshadowing sorrow, we bore one another's burden. There was never a shadow of doubt as to Brother Killebrew.

I was asked by the family to talk at the funeral. A large crowd attended. I did the best I could, but the effort was a trying one. You knew us and our confidence in each other. We will miss Brother Killebrew so much, both as a neighbor, friend and brother in the Lord.—B. M. Strother, elder Church of Christ, McAlester, Okla.

(The above letters from Brother Frank Killebrew and Brother B. M. Strother, of McAlester, Okla., bring word of the passing of a great man of God, D. B. Killebrew. He was near eighty years of age, and his death was not altogether unexpected. His service in the church has been constant through many years. He never wavered, but was firm in his faith, strong in his convictions, and would never forsake them even if he had to stand with the few or alone. Brother B. M. Strother, aside from the family, will miss him more than any other. For thirty years they have been fellow-elders in the church and through many conflicts they fought together for the truth, and for the purity and integrity of the New Testament church.)

We join in prayer to God that family and friends may be comforted in the passing of this "noble servant of God, and that his memory may remain with us all as an undying influence for the right and encouragement to personal fidelity to God.—Editor)

From Cam Taylor

(The following letter from Brother Cam Taylor was not written for publication but it has a definite bearing on the spirit of the fight now being made, and that has always been made, behind the mask of sweet-spiritedness of the Boll group and their sympathizers. Brother Taylor is one of the men the Jorgenson church withdrew from because of his opposition to the teaching of heresies in the Highland church. It fell to Cam Taylor to take the lead in opposing such teaching and those who were doing the teaching. They did for him what they would do, and virtually have done, for any man who lifts his hand against them—withdrew fellowship. Yet it is they who decry disfellowship. When the brethren come to realize that these sweet-spirited brethren are carrying "sugar in one hand and acid in the other," and discriminate between piety and putty, it will rob the adherents to these theories and their sympathizers, and all the neutrals, of their chief stock in trade.—Editor)

Because of illness reading of April number of Bible Banner has been delayed but have now read most every thing in it and want you to know that it is, in my opinion, the most useful publication of which I know. In fact, I wonder sometimes what would become of the defense of primitive Christianity if it was not for the Bible Banner and men like you, who are willing to "pay the price," always involved in condemning false teachers.

As I read "Just The Facts," in April edition of the Banner, saying another anonymous six page sheet has been placed in circulation, two experiences of my own came to mind. Both occurred during the early stages of our first fight with Boll, Jorgenson, Janes and their crowd, here in Louisville, some twenty-five years ago.

When the Highland Church trouble began those members opposed to speculative teaching depended upon me, largely, to take public lead in that fight, and well do I remember what one of the older sisters, a good friend of mine, said to me. Her name was Mrs. W. C. Priest, one of the finest, most cultured women and one of the best Bible scholars I have ever known.

She said, "Bro. Taylor I hate to see you take the lead in this kind of trouble for it means that you will be falsely accused of everything short of murder."

She then told me why she made such a statement. Her brother, John T. Frazier, one of God's noblemen, led the opposition to the introduction of the organ into the worship at the old Floyd and Chestnut Street Church, now the Broadway Christian Church here in Louisville, where Bro. W. N.

Briney now preaches. Because of that opposition Bro. Frazier was the first one in this section from whom the organ people withdrew fellowship in that great fight over sixty years ago. She remembered how her brother, because of his prominence in that church trouble had been persecuted by unholy wicked personal abuse and false accusations.

Sister Priest was correct in her prophecy, for I too have been falsely charged, by those pre-millianists, with most everything in the catalog of sin.

The other statement was made about the same time by my good friend, that great man, Bro. M. C. Kurfees.

When the personal attacks upon me became "hot" Bro. Kurfees, to encourage me, would often say "Bro. Cam, remember that it is a long lane that has no turning." Well, the way was long but the turn was finally reached when I realized that my real friends were still loyal and that I had, in a small way, contributed something toward protecting the church from those speculators.

And so I, for one, fully sympathize with you in the difficulties and trials which have come to you because of your splendid and now effective opposition to these wicked dividers of churches and say to you that all thinking people understand why you are attacked, all good people love you and honor you for the work you have done and are doing, your enemies fear and respect you and the turn in the road is apparently at hand.

May the richest blessings of a loving Heavenly Father reward you, keep you in good health, give needed courage, when the shadows gather, bless still further your efforts in His cause and at the end of the journey give unto you an abundant entrance into the joys and blessings prepared for the faithful.

Yours in the bonds of Christian love,

C. A. Taylor,
Louisville, Ky.

With July issue the Bible Banner begins its second year. If your label is dated 6-39 it means your subscription expires this month. Send \$1.00 to Box 1804, Okla. City, to renew your subscription.

I faintly recall receiving the questionnaire but it made only a brief stop-over on my desk before going on to my wastebasket which is kept pretty full of such bait. I am of the younger element, but too old for any sympathy with such purity—all the way from the questionnaire to the copyright.—David H. Bobo, Chattanooga, Tenn.

The Charge Of The Light Brigade

GEORGE W. DEHOFF

Following the publication of the notes "What I Learned in Brother Armstrong's Classes" in January-February issue I got called "liar," "unfair," "unkind," "traitor," "un-Christian" and a few other similar names. (Now who believes in harsh treatment?) Many insisted that I had misrepresented Brother Armstrong. I wrote him and them offering to correct any misrepresentation. He writes that he has no request to make concerning the article. Also that the "few scraps" of his teaching were "taken entirely out of their context" and that he is willing for the matter "to rest here." He does not choose to speak but meanwhile the "Charge of the Light Brigade" continues. I am perfectly willing for these toy popguns to keep firing, for Brother Armstrong to remain quiet and for the whole matter "to rest here" but be it remembered that I reported what I believe to be the truth and that I offered to make any correction suggested by Brother Armstrong.

A Profitable Vacation

DR. C. B. BILLINGSLEY

Where-Eureka Springs, Arkansas. When-July 23 to August 6. Why-Foy E. Wallace, Jr., preacher, and Austin Taylor, singer, will be there in an Evangelistic Meeting at that time.

Eureka Springs, one of the highest, coolest and most scenic spots in the Ozarks, invites you to its wonderful springs, its beautiful mountain drives, and restful parks, camps and hotels.

B. M. Strother and the church of McAlester, Oklahoma, and C. B. Thomas, Shidler, Oklahoma sponsoring this effort to plant the church at Eureka Springs, say the finances have been assured.

Why are we insisting on numbers of Christians spending their vacation, or at least a part of that time? That we may join our splendid forces in prayers, songs, and our presence to the end that a fine harvesting of souls may be had there.

You can get any accommodations you desire from the six story Basin Park Hotel (every floor a ground floor believe it or not) to inexpensive tourist homes, clean, cool, sanitary parks and cabins.

Remember the date July 23 to August 6. Come, relax, and enjoy physical and mental peace, and a spiritual feast worth going far to get.

Park Hill Church of Christ,
Fort Smith, Arkansas.

Friend of God-Enemy of the World

BUFORD HOLT

(Corpus Christi, Texas)

"Ye adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship of the world is enmity with God? Whosoever therefore would be a friend of the world maketh himself an enemy of God." (Jas 4:4)

The great apostasy was not caused by those usually called infidels but by "the falling away." The greatest danger today is not from the outside but from within—from those who claim to be the true. They, like a piece of veneered wood, appear to be the finest, but when examined are found to be inferior. Jesus said, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites; for ye cleanse the outside of the cup and the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first the inside of the cup and of the platter, that the outside thereof may become clean also ... Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but inwardly ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." (Mat. 23: 25-28)

Today we hear much about "the spirit" of Jesus in condemning error. The "sugar" from these "sweet tongued orators" is likely to draw flies, but the gospel (not sugar) is the power of God to save the lost. (Rom. 1: 16; Jno. 6: 44, 45) When we examine this veneering of sweetness we find it serves only as a decoy to lure its victims. It reminds me of one who went duck hunting. After using some valuable ammunition he was amazed to learn that he had used it on a wooden decoy. So much like the duck but so different. So these from afar seem (to some) to portray the spirit of Christ but in the thick of the fight they tuck their heads and leave "faithful Uriah" to die alone. Jesus was the greatest fighter who ever lived, or shall live. He knew no compromise and made no mistake; all others have. He fought hard enough to conquer the enemy, but we are conquered by the enemy—Satan. Surely, we should all have the spirit of Christ—that spirit that silenced every accuser and conquered every foe.

Jesus said, "But this thou hast, that thou hatest the work of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate." (Rev. 2:6) To have the spirit of Christ is to hate everything Christ hated. He hated every sin. If we fellowship that which Christ hates we make ourselves an enemy of God (Jas. 4:4) The present day "method of approach" group evidently would have rebuked the Ephesians for trying the spirits of those

who claimed to be apostles, but were really wolves in sheep's clothing.

Anyone claiming to be a Christian, who will give a sectarian of any kind information to use against the truth, will make himself an enemy of God. The "Tishbites" and "Anonymous-ites" have stooped to worldly methods and thereby oppose the truth. They think they are being sweet, but others see it as the poison of Asps.

A member in Alabama whose husband was a Presbyterian would persuade him to stay at home if she learned the preacher would use anything conflicting with his belief. I have heard her speak of it with pride. She will never make a Christian of him using such tactics. She is only one of many scattered over the country who hinder the growth of the church. Let a preacher go where the church is unknown and he will meet little opposition. Then let the same man go where there are church compromisers and he will meet not only opposition but receive persecution.

Others become enemies of God by yoking themselves with unbelievers. A man in Shreveport, La., let it be known that he used to attend D. L. C. and was a member of the church, but now worships at the Baptist church because he is paid five dollars a Sunday to sing. Balaam's love for "the hire of wrongdoing" still exists among us. "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers: For what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity? Come ye out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, And touch no unclean thing; And I will receive you, And will be to you a Father, And ye shall be to me sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty. Having therefore these promises, beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from the defilement of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God." (2 Cor. 6:14 - 7:1)

A number of preachers are enemies of the cause because they love the "glory that is of men" more than the gospel. They will sacrifice truth for "position" by passing over worldliness in the church. If a man ever had occasion to compromise, Elijah was the man; but the false prophets were defying the God of Israel and he contested the matter. A number of our brethren would have said, "Let them alone, Elijah, and if they are in error the thing will die of itself." We need more Davids to say, "Is there not a cause?" (1 Sam. 17:29), rather than so many of his big brethren to shudder at the mere presence of Goliath. I heard a preacher say he refused to read the "Gospel Guardian" because there was controversy in it. To be

logical, he shouldn't read the New Testament, for it is full of controversy.

Elders fail to exercise discipline. I suppose they are afraid pressure will be brought to bear on them. As a result we have adultery, liars, and thieves in the church. Teachers in some of our congregations play bridge, dance, cater to the movies, and think more of the world than of the church. These are friends of the world and therefore enemies of God. "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." (Heb. 10:31)

Let Us Alone

Those of us who have places of responsibility and leadership in the church should not occupy the fireside easy chair and let people go to hell just because of their indifference in wanting to be "let alone." They should be aroused. It is our duty to awaken them. We have many ways and means of doing this—the radio and the printing press are the two most effective and far reaching.

Everybody wants to be let alone. The liquor traffic wants to be let alone in taking its toll in the lives of the flower of our civilization—our young people. The gambler, the highjacker and the bootlegger would like for the law to let them alone. Revellers, card-players and dancers in the church would like for the preachers to let them alone. The spineless jellyfish preachers do not want to be exposed; neither the factionist with his heresies. The devil wants his works let alone, whether it be denominationalism, compromise, heresy, or ungodliness. In the midst of indifference on one hand and opposition to the truth on the other hand, it takes the spirit of a crusader to uphold the truth.

I heard a preacher declare recently, in substance this: "I expect to carry on the fight until the Lord says it is enough, and bids me come home. When I stand in the judgment and look into the faces of the ungodly, paganized, demonized, hell-bound crowd to whom I have preached, not one of them will be able to say, You knew we were headed for hell but you were a pussyfooting, softsoaping, preacher, too cowardly to tell me." That preacher is a crusader, who will save himself and those who hear him. We have been asleep. It is time to wake up.

Guy C. Saunders, Pampa, Texas.

With July issue the Bible Banner begins its second year. If your label is dated 6-39 it means your subscription expires this month. Send \$1.00 to Box 1804, Oklahoma City, to renew your subscription.

ON COMPROMISING

ORAM J. SWINNEY
Dallas, Tex.

People that do not live in cyclone areas are not afraid of them and do not dig storm cellars. Go into an area that is visited periodically by wind storms and you will find those folks prepared for the visitation of those storms. They have seen houses blow away, lives snuffed out in a moment's time and strong trees twisted and gnarled beyond recognition, and are not to be caught napping by these perilous, but short lived, freaks of nature.

So we find in the spiritual realm that there are certain districts, at different times, subjected to freak visitations. People there are who are not accustomed to anything but the plain truths of God's book, but in an unguarded moment the devil sends his representatives among the flock and the "hireling" flees for his life, leaving the sheep to the mercies of the wolves. The church at Ephesus was disturbed for a time by just such men as are creating division today, but they were measured by the standard, found lacking and put out of the congregation, and the church commended by the Lord for such action. Members who have never been visited by one of these who "are members of the synagogue of Satan" cannot realize just what devastation can be worked in so short a time. Hence the necessity for warnings at all times to all Christians to be on their guard, to try the spirits and see if they have divine sanction, and if not to cut them off immediately. The only method that can reach large numbers is by the press, so we must support those publications that are defending the Truth, and see that they are read by the people that need them. That is real missionary work.

I have in mind a pertinent example of false teaching and resultant waste of spiritual life and destruction of good. The congregation at Heath, Texas, thrived over a period of years under able leadership, paid for a large lot and house, and also a goodly sized tabernacle on the lot. The leading spirits in the church finally went the way of all flesh and left what was looked upon as a very strong congregation of disciples. However some of the younger leaders, two or three years ago, permitted a false teacher to come among the flock, lay waste the altar, and use strange fire. Today the congregation is about one sixth its previous size, the wolves have fled, but have left in their wake souls writhing in the dust, bogged in

the mire, and some beyond hope of recovery. If one has never been partaker of such unscriptural work he has no right to urge others to overlook false teaching and compromise with denominationalism, and if he has, experience will forbid his condoning such practices of Satan.

The article appearing in a periodical recently stating that there were not two sides to a question in the church, that he could not be on one side and I on the other and still be in the church of Christ, is very true, and we cannot afford to teach otherwise. The spiritual adultery taking place today is astounding, but it has always been so according to the Bible, and we must combat it uncompromisingly with the Sword of the Spirit, keeping our ourselves unspotted from the World, lest the cyclone of false doctrine take us from the true foundation.

Do The Two Go Together?

It has just come to my attention that "Dr." J. N. Armstrong said in Little Rock, Arkansas, to a "prominent lawyer" that Dr. Ben M. Bogard got the best of Hardeman in the Hardeman-Bogard debate on the subject of the work of the Holy Spirit, and that Bogard published this in his paper.

So far as I know, Bro. Armstrong has not denied, clarified, or even "Bollistically" explained (to Bollistically explain your stand on a thing is to do so in such a way that no one can understand it) his statement in this respect.

I have studied carefully, collated and compared the arguments in this discussion on the Holy Spirit, and if Bogard got the best of Hardeman, as Armstrong says, then pray just what, I wonder is Bro. Armstrong's position on the work of the Holy Spirit? If Bro. Armstrong does not hold with Bogard's position, is he willing, I wonder to repeat the debate with Board and thus accomplish what Hardeman failed to do?

Mullins and Wood went with Norris in the Wallace-Norris discussion at Fort Worth and now it looks like Armstrong goes with Bogard in the Hardeman-Bogard debate in Little Rock. Does Bollism, and Boll sympathizing, mean that they will use their influence against fundamental principles of New Testament doctrine? It looks like the two go together. C. J. Garner, Old Hickory, Tenn.

GAZING AT THE STARS

THOS. G. BUTLER

"Two men looked through prison bars,
One saw mud and the other saw stars."

These two lines were recently quoted by Andy T. Richie, Jr., in the Christian Leader to picture two different groups of preachers in the church of Christ. Although he was writing for a religious journal opposed to personalities, he used these two lines to hit some one below the belt.

This young man, who is wandering around in the ethereal regions star-gazing, said to another young preacher and me that there were five preachers (Hardernan, Harper, Lewis, Nich-01, and Wallace) causing all the fuss over Bollism. He said that Hardeman raced horses, that Boles was accused of stealing, and that Wallace was dishonest. All this was said in that Cathedral were nothing unkind is ever uttered—Central Church of Christ, Nashville, Tenn.

The star-gazers in the church remind me of a hybrid—the offspring of a butterfly and a poisonous asp. One moment they are flying around radiating beauty in all its fascinating colors; the next moment they are crawling in

the dust and slime of the earth spewing forth poisonous words to kill the influence of men who are trying to keep the church "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners."

The New Testament tells Christians how to deal with false teachers. The Christian life is a warfare, and the soldier that compromises is guilty of treason.

Denominational tenets and tactics are being absorbed by members of the body of Christ. Preachers are crying out that names should not be called, and false institutions should not be condemned. Some are joining the ministerial associations, making "goo goo eyes" at premillennialists, seeking popularity, and courting the sects. Members not a few are encouraging such preachers and criticizing those who would expose them.

A new nomenclature is being rapidly formed by leaders and writers. They talk about "approach" in sermonizing. That means to go easy in preaching. We hear much about "positive preaching." That means not to condemn anything. The word "not" must not be used. "Establishing missions" instead of churches has

become the habit. We hear more of "missionaries" than of evangelists. Preachers are "taking charge of a church" instead of preaching the word. "Boards" have been formed to say what should be written and what should be preached. If the restoration depended on a proper terminology, it must necessarily follow that a departure from New Testament expressions will cause a falling away.

Any false conception of the work, worship, and service of the church demands a strange or new word to define that false conception. Watch for these words and those who use them, and you will find those who are relinquishing the fundamental principles which made the restoration such a glorious success.

The movement is on to modernize, to impose interdicts by councils of men, to unite with the Christian Church, to take all the negations out of the New Testament, and to turn premillennialists free to plant their pernicious heresy in every congregation of the land. Shall they pass? "They Shall Not Pass."

The star gazers are seeing stars. Let us hope that they do not get moon-eyed. There is not any mud in Florida; but let the star gazers, stay away; they might get sand in their eyes.

OKLAHOMA CITY'S NEW CHURCH BUILDING



Church of Christ — Tenth & Francis Streets — Oklahoma City

Foy E. Wallace Jr. of Oklahoma City and Ross O. Spears of Memphis, Tennessee will be in a meeting with Tenth and Francis Streets church June 11 to June 21,

These series of services will open the new auditorium which has been under construction the past four months. The new structure has architectural lines to conform with the Bible School building constructed several years ago, and will seat comfortably 1250 people. Special afternoon services at three o'clock will be conducted both Sundays of the meeting, and those of neighboring towns are cordially invited to come for the afternoon service the opening date. It is urged that June 11 be a homecoming for those who have at one time been members of Tenth and Francis church and have moved away.
-C. E. McGaughey.

COMMENTS ON THE KINGDOM

A. W. DICUS

The Bride: John saw the holy city, new Jerusalem coming down from God out of heaven, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband. And the voice that he heard said, "Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God." (Rev. 21:2-3)

The Wife: Paul says, "The husband is head of the wife, even as Christ is head of the church"-the church is subject unto Christ, so let the wives be to their husbands, in everything -let a man leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife--"this is a great mystery, but I speak concerning Christ and the church." (Eph. 5:24-33) Christ's first coming was to be joined to his wife. This was why he left his Father in Heaven and the Old Jewish Church, his mother. The Old Woman was bound to the law of her husband, (Moses) as long as he lived. The death of Christ and the death of the Law provided for the marriage. See Rom. 7:4. The old Jewish church with her ways of running the house, (Heb.3:5) becomes the mother-in-law and no young wife should permit the mother-in-law to run her home, neither should the church of Christ be subject to the rulings of the Jewish laws.

The Mother: Paul says (Gal. 4:26) "The Jerusalem which is above, is free, which is the mother of us all." Notice the tense of the verb-is the mother of us all. No longer is she a bride but a wife and even a mother. Christ says, (Jno. 3:7) "Ye must be born again." (Jno. 1:12-13) "As many as received him, to them gave he power to become sons of God, "which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." There must be a begetting and a coming forth, or birth, before there can be a mother, or off-spring.

Children: Power to become (Jno. 1:12) Born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God. (I Peter 1:23) Three thousand added on the day of Pentecost. (Acts 2:41) The Bride has become a wife and the wife has become a mother and the offspring to this union are called Christians.

.. Premillennialists: According to this doctrine, the kingdom hasn't come. The church is still a bride. They, if children, are born out of wedlock. What are they? They are not legitimate children. This is their question to answer. Christians are like Christ; like the father; must resemble him.

This is why he must **add** them. They can't join the family; must be begotten by Father. If this doctrine is true, there is no adding, no mother, hence no offspring, no children and no Christians.

The Communion: Matt. 26:26-29. "Jesus took bread and blessed it and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take eat, this is my body. And he took the cup and gave thanks and gave it to them saying, 'Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins, but I say unto you I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it **new with you in my Father's Kingdom.**"

In Luke 22:16, Jesus says concerning the bread, "I will not anymore eat thereof until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." And in the 18th verse of the same chapter he says concerning the fruit of the vine, "I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God come."

From these passages we learn that the communion service, instituted by Christ, was also commanded to be observed by the disciples. We also learn that Christ promised to be present on such occasions but that he would not be present nor even participate until after the coming of the Father's kingdom or as Luke says the Kingdom of God. Then as Matthew records, He will drink it **new**, not only for the first time but for a new purpose or in a new manner. It was not to be a repetition of an old feast but the partaking of a new one for a new purpose.

In Acts 2:42, we learn that the disciples communed on the day of Pentecost and continued the practice. Did Christ commune with them? In Acts 20:7, it is recorded that the disciples came together to break bread. Did Christ meet and commune with them? Then in Matt. 18:20 is a passage that is often quoted, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Does this mean that when professed Christians assemble around the Lord's table on the first day of the week that Christ is with us but he will not participate in the communion? It certainly does if the kingdom of the Father is yet to come. Now Paul was present on at least one of these occasions, the one mentioned in Acts 20:7. He also partook of the communion. To the brethren at Corinth, Paul says, referring to the communion, "I have received of the Lord Jesus that

which I also delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it and said: Take eat, this is my body, which is broken for you, this do in remembrance of me." 1 Cor. 11:23-24. Likewise Paul refers to the cup and then in the 26th verse of the same chapter, he states, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come."

From these scriptures we learn that the Disciples communed, the apostles communing with them. That they would continue communing until Christ comes at which time the Disciples would cease for it will be no longer necessary to commemorate his death. Since Christ was not to commune until the coming of the Kingdom, all such communion today and in the days of the apostles was a Christless communion, if we are to accept the premillennialist idea that the kingdom will not be set up until Christ comes.

Let us now try to harmonize the statements of Christ, Paul and the Premillennialist. Christ says, I will not drink with you until the Kingdom comes. The Premillennialist says, the Kingdom will not come until Christ comes. Paul says when Christ comes, the disciples will quit. Hence the premillennialist has Christ beginning after Paul has the Disciples quitting. But Jesus says to the disciples, I will drink it **new with** you. They are to drink together in the kingdom.

The doctrine of premillennialism reflects on the honesty of Christ, rejects the Holy Spirit's guidance on the day of Pentecost, questions the authority of Paul and reduces the Lord's Supper to an unscriptural formality. "If there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think of these things." (Phil. 4:8)

Look at the label on your magazine. If it reads 6-39 your subscription expires with this issue. \$1.00 will renew your subscription one year from July 1. Send check or money order to the Bible Banner, Oklahoma City, Okla.

NOTICE

The publisher of the Bible Banner has acquired the B. C. Goodpasture stock of second-hand books at Atlanta, Ga., with Brother Goodpasture's list of customers. It is one of the largest collections of religious books known. These books are being removed to Oklahoma City, and a more extended statement will be made in the next Bible Banner. We solicit the continued patronage of Brother Goodpasture's mail order customers.

THE RIGHT KIND OF PREACHING - - Continued from page One

Jesus aroused powerful opposition among "honorable men," met them face to face in hot exchanges, answered their captious questions, directed parables against them, withered them into defeated silence by his repartee, warned his disciples and the people against their teaching, and when it was called to his attention that they had become offended at him, he said: "Let them alone, they are blind guides." He called their worship "vain worship" and their teaching "the doctrine and commandments of men." He charged them with making void the word of God because of their traditions. The last days in the temple area were hectic. He charged them with turning the house of God into a den of robbers. He did justice to his subject in highly descriptive language. He attacked some of these "honorable men," chief shepherds of the flock, as "whited sepulchres" "serpents," "offspring of vipers" "sons of hell" and told them they could not escape the judgment of hell. He called them fools and blind, gnat-strainers and camel-swallowers and charged them with all the righteous blood shed on the earth from the days of Abel. He said other nice things like this to them; What do you think of his method of approach? Anyhow, he approached! Yet, when some of us make a comparatively mild attack on the false doctrines of our time, long-faced mourners over the departed journalistic glory of Zion, wail like children in the market places, that we are utterly void of the spirit of Christ! What a pity that Jesus could not have made a pilgrimage to New Jersey and learned something about the sweet freshness of a right approach! He did not even have the softening benefits of a brotherhood survey! Some of the loudest talkers about the spirit of Christ, know least about it. He was not doctrinally tolerant. "He that believeth not shall be damned." Wouldn't it be better to preach "a positive gospel," make heaven so inviting that nobody would want to go anywhere else? Jesus preached some hell-fire and damnation along with it, and it can be recommended to warm up the modern method of approach. We have the example of Jesus and apostolic precept for preaching the truth and exposing error. Preach the word: be urgent in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all longsuffering and teaching. For the time will come when they will not endure the sound doctrine; but, having itching ears, will heap to themselves teachers after their own lusts: and will turn away their ears from the truth, and turn aside unto fables." (2 Timothy 4:2-4) Itching ears can be tickled with questionnaires followed up by "higher journalistic standards": diluted to the formula of the proper method of approach. Such methods may please the sects and soil the brethren. The right kind of preaching ought to convert some of the sects, agitate all of them, and put fight in the brethren. "Contend earnestly for the faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints." (Jude 3.)

If a man wants to be the right kind of preacher and writer, he should form the acquaintance of Paul and watch him approach. He might also make a side-study of Stephen with profit. Paul expressed a high degree of aversion for "some that trouble you, and would pervert the gospel of Christ." He pronounced an anathema on all who preached any other gospel than that which he received from the Lord and made known to the people. There isn't anything in Paul's record to show that he would be pleased with a man today, who for some twenty years was "lost" to loyal contenders for the faith, found the fellowship of digressives more satisfactory than that of "the alleged

loyal church," and gained sudden prominence among loyal churches by making a survey to find out what kind of preaching and writing the brethren wanted. "For am I now seeking the favor of men, or of God? or am I striving to please men? if I were still pleasing men, I should not be a servant of Christ." (Gal. 1:10, 11) Paul's preaching drew fire. Honorably connected men "contradicted the things which were spoken by Paul, and blasphemed." Paul met the challenge boldly. "Seeing ye thrust it from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." Instead of criticising Paul's method of approach, "the disciples were filled with joy and with the Holy Spirit." They did not rebuke Paul by saying, "peace, brother, peace!" Paul was charged with madness, teaching unlawful customs, being the ringleader of a sect, turning the world upside down, and being a pestilent fellow. If he lived today, he would not be sending out questionnaires and making surveys to feel the pulse of the brotherhood. A study of Paul ought to toughen up some tenderfeet among us who tread about over gospel principles about like a barefooted boy in a grass-burr patch. "Preach the word. Be urgent."

BROTHER MURCH GOES A COURTIN'

In a recent issue of the Christian Standard, Brother James DeForest Murch straightens his tie, slicks up his hair, turns on a most gracious smile and talks so sweetly about "our forgotten brethren" that I feel constrained to let prudence, go with the wind, and blush all over with pleasure. It looks as though our progressive brethren who have carried on a shameless flirtation with sectarians of many colors have discovered unheard of beauty in the erstwhile "insignificant, ignorant, cantankerous minority, unworthy of any consideration." This knock-kneed, snaggle-toothed little spitfire in pigtails who has in the past played such cruel pranks on progressive dignity, has suddenly bloomed into a ravishing beauty and Brother Murch is simply bursting with ecstasy over her. She has influence, has come into some wealth, has dolled up her premises, sports some colleges and papers and other forms of entertainment and has become rather swanky otherwise to the delight of our enraptured brother. It seems that Brother Murch did not even know she existed until the gentle-mannered Brother Witty introduced her to him, or him to her in the most approved fashion. Now, don't let Brother Witty mislead you. He would not do it intentionally, of course, but he is a trusting soul. Take my word for it, I know her. She is still capable of scratching your eyes out, if you get too fresh with her. She may not be quite as unapproachable as she used to be, but she is still pretty particular about the kind of company she keeps. Her standards are a little too strict as yet to marry a cavalier in religion in the hope of reforming him. In spite of her outside attractions, she is still as old-fashioned as the New Testament even in a little matter like instrumental music in worship. And she would not be gond company in the conventions and around society headquarters.--Cled E. Wallace.

TIME TO RENEW

The first issue of Bible Banner appeared July 1, 1938. The June issue - this number - completes the first year. If your label is dated 6-39 your subscription is due this month. Renew now. Send check or money order for \$1.00 to the Bible Banner Box 1804 Oklahoma City, Okla.