

THE FOY E. WALLACE, JR. LIBRARY
DOCTRINAL STUDIES

THE
CURRENT ISSUES

by FOY E. WALLACE, JR.

**A Treatise on the Spirit, Intent and Manner
Characteristic of Men and Movements Leading
To Extremism, Partyism and the Fabrication of
Spurious Issues; Principles *VERSUS* Whimseys**

© 1997 ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

FOY E. WALLACE, JR. PUBLICATIONS

5111 ROGERS AVENUE SUITE 504 FORT SMITH AR 72903

RICHARD E. BLACK, PUBLISHER

The Current Issues

BY

FOY E. WALLACE, JR.

Contents

SECTION	PAGE
I. THE SPIRIT OF THE NEW PARTY.	2-10
II. A PARTY OF PROPAGANDA AND SUBVERSION	10-22
III. THE TRUTH BETWEEN EXTREMES AND THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD.	22-24
IV. EXAMPLES OF EXTREMISMS	25-29
V. DANGERS AND DEVIATIONS.	29-33
VI. THE FABRICATION OF SPURIOUS ISSUES IN FOUR POINTS OF STUPIDITY	33-65
VII. CONCERNING PREVIOUS PUBLICATIONS..	65-71
VIII. THE RESTORATION MOVEMENT AND PARTY FACTIONS- PRINCIPLES VERSUS WHIMSEYS.	71-79





FOY E. WALLACE, JR.

THE CURRENT ISSUES

TEXT: *"Of these things put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers. Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing (handling aright) the word of truth. But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness." (2 Tim. 2:14-16).*

Some philosopher in substance said that they who refuse or fail to learn from history are condemned to repeat it. The truth of this statement finds fulfillment in the formation of a factional party headed by a partisan group of ambitionists whose unreliable leadership has caused numerous and unnecessary separations in the long established and faithful congregations; and in the unfortunate and complete isolation from the church of a considerable number of victimized and misguided young preachers who have fallen prey to the radicalisms of the party leaders. The rather sacred nomenclature of "a new restoration movement" has become a shibboleth in the party line of both public and private parlance. But the divisive activities of these insurgent extremists should neither be dignified nor distinguished by such designation. It is not a restoration at all, but a resuscitation of, a breathing again of life into, the lingering but languid form of the Sommer-Ketcherside *isms*, the body of which has become gradually impotent through the past two or three decades. Neither should these disturbers of churches and would-be reformers be honored with the compliment of leading a movement--what they are leading is rather a *move*, moving away from and out of the church. As certain leftist liberalists trumpet to the martial tune of "on the march," the rightist radicals blow the bugle to the blare of "on the move"--both of

them marching and moving in opposite directions out of the church as we have known it in all of our generations. And when these antipodal extremes have marched on and moved out, the church will be where and what it has been always.

I. THE SPIRIT OF THE NEW PARTY

It is a time-tested fact that the adherents of partyism cannot long get along with themselves. Already the church dividers are having internal divisions--the splits are splitting into splinters, and this whole party which has been in the process of separating itself from the church will fall into complete disarray, and its leaders into the resultant disrepute which their ignoble conduct has merited. In the whirlpool of extremes there is a bedlam of disagreement. Every man's freakish notion is against the other man's capricious whim in running the full gamut of extremisms. The handwriting will in its time appear on the wall--they are being "weighed in the balances and found wanting." It is thus that extremism charts an evil course against its own advocates and promoters.

(1) A bedlam of extremisms.

This course has developed into a movement of madness, led by a party of men who are mad--mad at the church, mad at issues, mad at everybody, and who are becoming mad at each other. The preaching of its advocates has degenerated into diatribes and denunciations of everything from the collective care and support of the orphaned, aged and destitute to provisions for eating on the premises of the church after the age-long and universal practice of "preaching all day and dinner on the ground." There is not an older preacher among us who has not had such an experience on many occasions in many meetings. The misuse of the Corinthian passage, "What? have ye not houses to eat and drink in?" is an example of frustration in forcing passages to serve their purpose. Of course, the Corinthian church, to whom this rebuke was administered did not have a "church house" at all, and the use of the passage

is a misfire. Besides, the verse reads “eat and *drink*” so the same argument (?) would require the removal of the drinking fountains from the vestibules and the plumbing from the toilet rooms-for if the text so used condemns the consumption of food on the premises of the church, it also prohibits its elimination, seeing that both procedures belong to the same physical mechanism. The passage could not deny one and permit the other, both being carnal and neither being spiritual. This and all of the other texts employed as a prop to support a semblance of proof for these whimsical absurdities do not yield contextually to these late applications. The passages were never used nor thought of in such connection before by any of the recognized preachers, writers and scholars among us, who brought the church to us, and whose devotion to the word of God surpasses the pretended and paraded loyalty of these late neophytes and new-comers. The passages do not suggest the use that is being made of them, but these “new positions” have forced the meaning attached to them as an after-thought. The party is hard pressed for passages.

The men of this new party are not radical merely because they are wrong, but because of the arrogance so manifest in proclaiming themselves so right above all of the other great and godly defenders of the faith before them, in both the past and present generations, when in reality they are so wrong-grossly wrong. There is need of a mental morality in dealing with the sacred scriptures, and ordinary honesty in the handling of issues, and plain common decency of conduct in general.

The obsession on these deified material issues has created a religious psychosis of festered minds with the pathological cause and effect of disordered thinking. A sample of some radical declarations is all the proof necessary to sustain this assertion. One preacher with much declamatory animation pronounced the anathema that all elders who “take a dime out of the church treasury for a starving child will go to hell,” and further declaimed that any one who remains a member of a church that does so “will also go to hell.” Such haranguing has become common, and pulpits where the gospel should be preached have been turned into the

vortex of vituperation on "the issues" by the deranged and disordered thinking of minds which have been formed in the mold of radicalism. Some of the leaders of this contentious combination are too artful to give vent to such offensive utterances, but the genus is identical, spawned in the same stratum of extremism, and their course of action reveals the same mind, tormented with the same malady--the fever of unbalanced reason--a trouble that distorts thinking and usually lasts a long time.

(2) The course of party movements.

The history of factional dissensions within the church is that the false issues which generate and foster parties will eventually wear out. Pseudo-issues do not possess the intrinsic character of the truth. The party spirit, which is always noisily vocal while it is running its course, as its promoters run here and there as roaring radicals to divide and devour churches, is condemned by its own bitterness. Extremism breeds extremes and engenders revulsion that produces a reaction, and the common sense of the thoughtful minds in their own party begins to assert itself. That is when the party begins to wane, its leaders begin to differ, resulting in disagreements that put them at variance with each other, and in discord the party falls into disarray and disintegrates.

This is what happened to the non-Sunday School, no-class faction which flourished for several years in Texas and Oklahoma and in other scattered areas. They started with a paper and a school, they challenged for debates and split churches--but they divided over internal affairs and divers hair-splitting points of contention, and dwindling down and falling apart, their congregations are no longer numerous--they are as scarce as feet-washing Primitive Baptist churches. That is what will happen to the current defection--without anything tangible to offer in the way of perceptible basic principles or fundamental affirmative truths, with a cynical complex of negativism, its leaders will dissipate their own morbid movement and it will die.

(3) The blight of hobbyism.

At the turn of the century a movement opposed to "Bible colleges" and "orphan homes," with two or three other peculiar tenets, was in full sway in the North. As it was initiated, formulated and dominated by Daniel Sommer, it was inevitably denominated *Sommerism*, in the same way the Boll movement was tagged with the label *Bollism*. The Sommer party was inherited by Carl Ketcherside, who under the name and claim of evangelistic authority, ruled over preachers, elders and churches with the autocratic hand of a dictator. But when he saw certain debase of this movement, to save himself from dying with it, he scuttled the party ship, and is now commanding a party of diametrically opposite extremes--passing from the position of practically recognizing nobody to liberally fellowshipping everybody--all in order to stay at the helm of a party and keep himself alive. But the blight of the Sommer-Ketcherside hobbyism stifled the growth of the churches in the northern sections of our nation for a whole generation.

Now, the second-fiddler leaders of this imitation movement have *breezed* in where Sommer and Ketcherside *breathed* out and are reviving, without so much as revising, the expired Sommer-Ketcherside party. There is no significant distinction nor consequential difference in their teachings and activities. The positions are relatively the same, even to the extent of the exercise of an evangelistic authority over preachers and elders; for when leaders of a party and publishers of a paper can time the calendar and give the signal to a local preacher when to oust elders and divide a church--that is *evangelistic authority* and *institutional control* at its worst.

During the whole course of the existence of religious colleges and eleemosynary institutions there has been constructive criticism with the aim of restraining tendencies and correcting deviations, but not with any purpose of opposing the existence and operations of the institutions; and at the same time these corrective criticisms were being made, we were also exposing and opposing the fallacies of the Sommer-Ketcherside anti-college and anti-orphanage

hobbies. But the ramrods of the current defection have rammed the wheels of their party machine into the abandoned ruts of Sommerism. By the adoption of this relegated curriculum of eccentric doctrinaires, together with the recent erratic credenda of their own creation, they have out-Sommered the Sommers and out-Ketchersided the Ketchersiders in hobbyism. This late party is unworthy to be called a *movement*, it is nothing more than a *current agitation*.

(4) The false face of the new party.

The cover-up announcement of the formation of "a new congregation" has become routine procedure under the mask of "missionary work" in localities where faithful churches, planted by early and later loyal gospel preachers, have existed and maintained scriptural worship and work for many years. The intent of establishing a *new* congregation in these places is not evangelistic and the spirit is not missionary, but divisive in every respect. Contributions have been made by churches and individuals, not aware of the character of these men and their seditious motives, who thus unintentionally help to underwrite factions, where separations are wholly unjustified, and thereby aid and abet factious preachers who disturb the peace of good churches, and are the hatchet men for the party which is pushing its program of dissension and separation. There are numerous instances where they have entered towns and communities, not populous enough for two congregations of the same faith and order, where the church was established by the truest and the greatest preachers the church has ever known, whose loyalty and fidelity and devotion to the truth were never called in question, and whose stature in all respects dwarfs the size of the small personalities of the current spurious reformation to miniature size--places where some of us have continued to preach through the years and still preach--yet these reformers (?) classify these localities as "mission points" and are sent by some distant or nearby church or outside group of individuals to hold "a mission meeting." Their concepts

and conduct are reprehensible. These men are not holding gospel meetings, they are conducting *factional missions*.

One small town where the church has a numerous membership, and where the church has been faithful from its start, doing no more nor less than what the churches have always done, opportunely comes to be a *mission point*. A hatchet man for the party is sent--not to preach the gospel, but to harry and harass good people and "start a loyal church." In another instance a thriving city of considerable population, in which exists several good and growing congregations, which could not properly be labeled "liberal" in any true sense of the term, was declared a mission area by this new party ; and repudiating all of the long established churches of Christ in the area, they dispatched a haranguer, supported from the outside, to rant on *the issues* and start a *loyal church*. And to add crass stupidity to gross iniquity their party press advertised this faction of fanatics as the only true church of Christ in the vicinity. It is thus that a legion of young men who could become consecrated emissaries of the gospel are becoming predatory merchants of mischief.

The rash decision of the party leaders to pursue such a determined course of deliberate division stems from frustration and desperation--an obdurate course of action by egocentric men who will not turn back from diabolical designs to wreck the churches. Under the external appearances of "saving the church," they divide and destroy congregations with no inner sentiments of restraint, and with no apparent respect or visible veneration for the sacrosanctity of the church of the Lord. It is, indeed, a sorry spectacle to see a radical minority under irrational leadership embroil the membership of a respectable congregation with a record of faithful adherence to the New Testament order, over issues that are not valid, so-called issues that have been ballooned all out of proportion to accommodate a pattern of propaganda and provide some semblance of justification for a division.

When these machinations are exposed, it is plain proof that this new party is formalizing a new creed in opposition to orphanages, collective benevolence and the joint

efforts of churches in the preaching of the gospel-they have formed a cult and are in the process of complete separation from the church. From these quarters of confusion there comes a clarion note of warning, loud and clear, to every young preacher of the gospel who through misplaced confidence or by specious argument has been drawn toward the center of this vortex of hobbyism, to draw back before they find themselves in isolation from the church.

(5) A repeated personal repudiation.

Repeatedly, statements by me have appeared in the papers and declarations have been made from the pulpit dissociating me from any affiliation or sympathy with this party of extremists, with positive disavowals of not only what they are doing but of what they are teaching also. More than once invitations for meetings have been declined when the obvious purpose was to make me a representative of the party, a spokesman for their peculiar tenets, otherwise referred to as "the issues." It has been my practice always to preach the gospel anywhere and to go anywhere to preach it, but when a meeting is planned and promoted on a basis that would align me with a divisive party before the public, as a mouthpiece for their issues of division, my declination has been forthright and forthcoming. This association of men from the beginning has conducted a campaign of disruption. At the first division was announced and during the whole course of their graceless misnamed movement division has been their issue. In unrestrained hobbyism they have earned the stigmatic mark of *anti-ism* and in consequence deserve that party label by which they have been distinguished. As a clique of cranks their party has outdone the most ardent devotees of Sommer and Ketcherside and the same end will be their portion.

Notwithstanding the fact that any endorsement of the doctrines and doings of this party's lawmakers has been unequivocally disclaimed, the assertions persist that my repudiation of them is personal and not conscientious and that the differences consist in personalities and that alone.

That allegation is false *absolutely*, and is again here and now denied. It is true that in the past there has been found a Demas of disloyalty, a Barnabas of broken company, and a Diotrophes concerning whom it was necessary to "remember his deeds" and his "prating against us with malicious words" ; but no man past or present has been or is the subject of malice or object of personal opposition. The unscrupulous conduct, wicked deeds and fallacious issues have been and are the cause of my own rejection of these men and their agitation movement.

When the churches of Christ in Fort Worth, thirty years ago, called me to the task of opposing J. Frank Norris, it was done not in opposition to the man but to his doctrines and practices which were destructive of the truth and of the church. But in opposing his doctrine the nature of the man was discovered--however, it does not mean that all of his followers were of that character. So it is that not all of the people who have been beguiled, deceived and misled into this current defection, including many of the otherwise good young preachers, are as malicious as the party's originators and commanders, who have built a general reputation for mendacity and unreliability.

(6) The charge of changing.

Not being a subscriber to nor a reader of their papers, all that I know is what is heard and observed so it comes to me through others that the chief party paper has currently castigated me, which castigation will of course be re-echoed and parroted in the chain-bulletins and satellite mediums of the party. That is altogether good news, as it should be the final proof to the whole brotherhood *that I do not belong to their party.*

The common charge against some of us who have rejected this recent party's newly enacted articles of faith is that we have "changed" and "switched" positions--yet not one of these partisan instigators believed a few years ago what they are advocating now, and during the one decade of their existence as a party they have themselves changed "positions" so often between the issuance of their weekly and monthly papers and periodical public debates

that their own followers are not certain what *position* to occupy. But true to the form of partisan zealots they "follow the leader," and when the party bosses take snuff their followers all sneeze. The party survives only by loyalty to these leaders, without which the so-called movement would collapse, as eventually it will.

There has been no change in my own views since holding the editorial post of the *Gospel Advocate* in the early and middle nineteen-thirties, or since the cooperative support of the Fort Worth debate by more than twenty churches thirty years ago; or since the cooperative city-wide Music Hall meetings by twenty-two churches of Christ in Houston in 1945-46 successively; or since the Municipal Auditorium meeting in which all of the churches in Louisville (except the premillennial congregations) participated by cooperative support. But some of the preachers who engaged in these respective joint efforts have *switched* to the new party and are vocalizing the charge that the rest of us have *changed*. Recently a group of these party preachers held "a Louisville conference" and "decided" that the 1950 Louisville city-wide meeting was "unscriptural"--imagine it, thirteen years after this cooperative meeting was held, a group of preachers called a "cooperative conference," and they *decided* that the cooperative gospel meeting violated their party dictum and put their *ipse dixit* in writing. Switchers, indeed! They are the champion *switcheroosers* of all time.

II. A PARTY OF PROPAGANDA AND SUBVERSION

It was for the purpose of combatting meaningless disputations that Paul left Timothy and Titus in certain places to prevent these subversions. To Timothy he said: "Of these things put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers. Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing (handling aright) the word of truth. But shun profane and vain babblings: for they will increase unto more ungodliness."

It becomes more and more evident that these mad men of this maniacal movement are "striving about words to no profit" and are "subverting the hearers"--and their subversive work "will increase unto more ungodliness." It was, indeed, for this reason that the apostle prescribed drastic measures in the charge to Titus: "A factious man after a first and second admonition refuse ; knowing that such a one is perverted, and sinneth, being self-condemned." If the good and unsuspecting elders of the strife-torn churches could have discerned the evil intentions of such men, and have followed the inspired apostle's charge to Titus, the debacle of divided congregations could have been averted.

The men of this movement are unconscionable in the methods of propaganda and subversion employed to add respectability and renown to a shameful movement and a graceless cause.

(1) The appropriation of the prestige of the pioneers.

The writings of revered men have been raped. It appears to be the conspired stratagem and understood party policy to print purported quotations from writings of earlier widely known and honored men, in order to add the prestige of these respected names to an opprobrious cause which has declined into general disrepute--though it is factually and indisputably in the record that not one of these men of venerable memory subscribed to the formulated opinions now being ascribed to them by the formulators of the various inconstant and changing whimseys of this peculiar party's beliefs. In my earlier and their later years it was my providential good fortune to be associated closely with the men whose writings these unscrupulous quoters have attempted to adapt. The chair occupied by F. B. Srygley was situated within thirty feet of my own desk in the *Gospel Advocate* office, and with me it is a matter of personal knowledge that he was not in accord with the factious views that have been imputed to him. To the exact contrary it was, that as he consistently endeavored to deter deviations in teaching and practice, he was engaged also in constant editorial exchanges exposing the inconsistencies of the anti-college and anti-orphanage contentions of the

Sommer movement ; and to him was largely due the credit of destroying the Sommer influence by his relentless parallels --that while opposing "institutions" the Sommers were themselves operating a religious institution dependent upon the contributions of their brethren for existence and support. True to this pattern, these late Sommer imitators themselves practice now in some form all of the things they condemn in some other form in others. Their whole agitation movement is one of institutional domination and a centralized control of churches and preachers, a peculiar brand of their own creation.

The same effort has persisted to appropriate my own writings, picking out such parts as may in garbled and misapplied use serve the evil purpose to commit me to their theoretically deformed *positions*. But the inconsistency of that effort is in the fact that the heads of this misconceived current agitation agreed with the contents of these articles before they developed their present views. If they were in agreement with what the articles contained before they believed what they now advocate, it follows that the quoted portions, in proper context, did not denote then what these more recent quoters promote now--therefore, the articles cannot be made to connote now more than they denoted then. This is the solid proof that the quoters are guilty of premeditated and deliberate misrepresentation. My writings did not apply then and do not apply now to what these men are saying and doing.

The odd antics and capricious capers of these associate editors of chain bulletins are rather oblique. They follow a peculiar principle of an unusual exercise of liberty to amend or repeal their own former enactments, with the "chain reactions" in parrot bulletins, to meet the requirements of practices that will conform to fitful changing of *positions*. The irony of this inconsistency is apparent: on one hand, appealing to the past for the support and prestige of the pioneers; on the other hand, declaring the past obsolete and branding the practices of its notable men digressive now. Incidentally, it was one of these notables among the Texas pioneers who initiated the then popular *penny-a-day plan* for the orphans, and he travelled among

the churches soliciting collections for the orphanages. If their positions are true, the editors and preachers of the past generation were not true to the faith.

In these premises, and in my own experiences, it is a patent fact that the associates of this party's papers have no compunctious hesitation to change other men's writings. There have been portions inserted into my articles that were not composed by me, and paragraphs have been deleted that were the selected verbal expressions of my own thoughts, thus changing materially the whole article. This was something called *editorial prerogative!* A better term for it is professional improbity, the definition of which is *plain dishonesty*. The reason, of course, for eliminating lines from reprints of the articles is to make my agreement with them apparent, whereas in the changing of sentences and omission of phrases and statements they conversely prove their *disagreement* with me. My years of preaching cover a half-century plus, and editorial service in defenses of "the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth" has extended over more than two-thirds of that time. It is palpable presumption for these irresponsible editors and writers of papers and bulletins to alter the terminology of my treatises in the discussion of facts and principles involved in the reaching of conclusions, as though they can define my viewpoints better than stated by me. It is manifest that these extracted passages are being misused in the effort to make out their own case. It amounts to a tacit admission that we are not in agreement, and serves to reveal what they themselves have been wont to conceal--that I do not believe and have never believed what these men are now teaching and practicing, and that *I do not belong to their party*.

(2) Operational and functional procedures.

Through the years brethren of recognized ability and equal piety have differed over functional and operational procedures, such as the conduct of benevolent institutions and unanimity of sentiment has not ever been attained. Nor will it be accomplished by the dividers of the churches, for already divisions among themselves are increasingly

in evidence. Wherever deviations exist, let the principles involved be considered with the objective of harmony in all matters of congregational endeavor, without permitting the deliberations to become the cause of cleavages. Such operational and functional questions are not grounds for alienation and division, nor destructive of the identity of the church in the worship and service of God.

The baneful blight of hobbyism was in evidence for a half-century in various states of the North, where the influence of "Sommerism" was dominant. Churches which could have rapidly increased steadily decreased until ultimate decease. It will be so with the revived Sommer party. If the far-reaching influence of Daniel Sommer had been exerted for the truth, free of hobbyism, churches of Christ in the North would have flourished from the beginning, as in the South, through the influence of the Lipscombs and Sewells, the Hardings and the Srygleys. As it was, the only churches in the North that survived to any extent of strength and respectability were the number that cut loose from the ties of hobbyistic authority in the free exercise of an authentic congregational autonomy.

Now comes a company of men of the same breed of crankiness, sprouted in Texas, and with the same disposition of dictatorship over the churches and of dictation to the preachers, vowing to revive the dissensions of Sommerism with all of its resultant divisions. But the sober thinking members who form the marrow of the churches will not countenance or encourage any man, without respect of persons or positions, who is engaged in this revival of discord and division. May God deliver His church from the blight of hobbyism and the withering influence of its effects in strife and contention.

(3) Traditionalism and modernism.

Until very recently the term *modernism* defined a school of theological thought that denies the direct or verbal inspiration of the Scriptures ; the authenticity of the autographs or manuscripts ; the virgin birth of Jesus of Nazareth and his deity as the miraculously conceived Son of God. But of late the dividers of the churches have arbitrarily

imparted unusual and unmeaning significance to the words modernism and liberalism. Their use of these terms are applied to all of the preachers and members of the churches who are not aligned with their party. The preachers and elders who do not subscribe to their notional conceptions are *modernists*; and a congregation that includes in its budget certain benevolent and missionary programs is a *liberal* church. Such usages are neological adaptations of words which have been generally employed and understood to characterize infidel theology. The inclusion of orphanages and missions in the budget of a congregation, granting valid objections to some of the promotions, is not *modernism*; and to brand elders *modernists* who refuse to bow to the *ipse dixit* dictums of a few popish men, cannot be considered less than an act of dictatorial audacity, a deliberate offense to a membership of faithful Christians.

During the whole period of the existence of the church on this North American continent, orphanages have been in operation among us, from the Fanning Orphan School in Tennessee, founded by Tolbert Fanning before David Lipscomb became editor of the *Gospel Advocate*, to the Jennie Clark Orphan Home in Texas, of which G. H. P. Showalter, editor of the *Firm Foundation*, was the first trustee. Like the poor, we have had homes for the orphaned and aged with us always. From the start these benevolent endeavors were the recipients of both private and public assistance, ranging in method or manner from private donations to collections in the churches. It was not a budgetary problem for at that time the churches had no budgets. But the support of them was not an issue (except with the Daniel Sommer party of the North)--and it is not a valid issue now. If such is liberalism or digression now, then all of the nobles of the church before our time, including the editors and the writers and the greatest preachers the church has ever known--the men who fought all error and brought the church to us--they all were *liberals* and *modernists*, according to these late decrees, and we have only now been made aware of it. Here it is presumptuously asserted that these men of the past generation did not understand these "principles," and that "the

issues" had not been "defined." Aside from the stupidity of such a statement, it implies too much of a compliment to the mentality of these late leaders, who in comparison are pigmies in stature and neophytes in understanding. "There were giants in those days"--and their gigantic shadow stands as high over the dwarfs of this ridiculous "current reformation" as the majestic ranges of Pike's Peak tower above the undulating dunes of the desert.

The prating of these party leaders amounts to the claim that they have just recently discovered the church--so consistency in reference to present attitudes and actions will require the posthumous severance of all fellowship with the pioneers of the real restoration movement, together with the late and lamented defenders of the faith closer to us in the generation touching our own--some of whom have passed on in recent years, who were our trusted protagonists in the drama of polemics against all antagonists in the era of notable debates. They knew the truth and could recognize error; they discerned digression and brought it to a showdown, but with the discrimination to avoid pseudo-issues. One of these stalwart warriors, now a man of eighty, recently commented on the current controversies with the remark: "Where did these late-comers learn so many things that none of the older preachers ever knew"? The pungent observation by a man of war and of wisdom should puncture the self-opinionated egotism of the novices of this new reformation. We are not unaware of the apostolic statement, "let no man despise thy youth"--but it must not be mistaken to mean that a young preacher's conduct may not become despicable.

The stereotyped answer to comparisons of the so-called "current issues" with the established practices of the past is--*traditionalism*. Another stock saying is: It makes no difference how long anything has been practiced if it is wrong. But their mere assertions do not make *anything* wrong, and both of these statements intended for a standard becomes a tacit admission that their teachings are novel and new. Frequent reference is made to "re-studying" these questions. This is an admission of an uncertainty which disqualifies them as leaders of other people. It brands

their whole movement as an experiment. It represents them as forcing issues on the churches which are unresolved and unsettled among themselves, and as commanding a whole brotherhood to follow their groping on the shifting sands of changing positions. Contrast this fatal concession of an unsafe and vacillating new movement with the "no uncertain sound" of the pioneers from the first voice heard to its last reverberation in our own time on all principles of faith and doctrine. The charge of modernism against others has bounced. Claiming that the greatest men among us did not understand the issues, accusing all of the churches of the generation past of wrongful practices with respect to the current issues, conceding that they are leading a new experimental modern movement--by these concessions they are themselves, by their own definitions, the self-convicted *modernists* in the church of this generation.

With further reference to the charge of *traditionalism*, to uphold the principles and practices of the men of God at whose feet it was my privilege to sit, and to stand where they stood, has been my greatest single satisfaction in the fifty years of my own proclamation of the gospel; and it is far more honorable than desertion to the *traditions* of the expired Sommer-Ketcherside radical movement of the past, now being revived by a group of men who accuse others of traditionalism. As the charge of modernism bounced, so the accusation of traditionalism boomerangs--they are themselves, according to their own standard, both *modernists* and *traditionalists*.

(4) In the middle of the road.

Certain leaders of political parties are stamped with the image of "wingers"--left wingers and right-wingers. The left-wingers veer to the left of the middle, away from conservative constitutional standards. These are labeled "liberals." The right-wingers swerve to the right of the middle into a false conservatism which leads to a radicalism that ends in fanaticism. So it is, in principle in the church--we have the *wingers* to the left and to the right. Albeit, these terms require some definition. It is now customary to brand all the preachers and churches *liberal* who do not

oppose orphanages and homes for the aged, or joint participation of several churches of a populous area in a cooperative gospel effort, or in fact who are doing no more nor less than the churches have always done; and on the other hand, in retaliation all others who are not disposed to support every promotion and project of a sponsoring eldership or a high-pressure group are accused of *anti-ism*. As early as the 1920's I preached in what was called county-wide meetings in Texas, and as late as 1950 I preached in city-wide meetings both in and out of Texas. This, in the eyes of some, associates me with the liberals; but not approving and endorsing every promotional project that may be launched in the name of "The Church of Christ" connects me, in the eyes of others, with the antis-in which case I am neither. Herein lies the evil of extremisms.

There is little or no difference between an extremist and a radical, unless the latter is louder--both terms defile the cause of conservatism and jettison the effective effort to oppose what is truly liberalism. An extremist is an outsider who lives and moves in an atmosphere of alienation from others, which leads him farther and farther into unrestrained fanaticism. The middle-of-the road is the rejection of extremism, either to the left or to the right. Moses commanded Israel in keeping the law to "turn not from it to the right hand or to the left." Joshua admonished Israel to "turn not aside therefrom to the right hand or to the left." And God commended Josiah because he had "turned not aside to the right hand or to the left." The one who speaks derogatorily of the middle of the road finds himself criticizing what Moses *commanded* and what God *commended*.

The definition of a road is a *path going in one direction*. It does not imply the dual highway with the center line, which separates two roads or paths of travel. If one's vehicle is not in the middle of the road, it is off-center to one side or the other: and one who cannot stay in the middle of the road is a poor driver, or drunk, or needs his front end aligned. And if he does not know the difference between the middle of the road and the dividing line of the highway to the left of the driver, which separates two

lanes of traffic, well--his driver's license should be revoked. And to confuse the middle of the road with straddling the fence is stupid. Considering the usual distance between the middle of the road and the fence on either side of it, the one who straddled the fence while in the middle of the road would be some straddler!

Thirty years ago in the *Gospel Advocate*, of which this writer was then editor, there appeared an editorial, written by me, under the caption, *The Truth Between Extremes*, which discussed some incipient extremisms then existing that have been accentuated in various forms in later developments. The present editor of the *Gospel Advocate* reprinted this article later with editorial endorsement, indicating that properly appraised it does not serve the cause of the radical party. However, this article has also been reprinted, with their usual misapplication, in several of these factional party papers; but if this article had been entitled *The Middle Of The Road* instead of *The Truth Between Extremes* it would be condemned and ridiculed by the radical extremists. Yet there is not the difference of one jot or tittle in the connotations of the two titles.

(5) Ballooning the so-called issues.

The divisive spirit has become deeply ingrained in party adherents and is deepening. A mass media of inter-church meddling bulletins, swapped and rotated in printed material, echoes from one source, parrots of the same party line. The whole party spirit is wrong and its atmosphere is obnoxious. The questions that have been pressed into focus to provide party issues do not possess the inherent substance of doctrine. They are afterthoughts of a factious group searching for propaganda to distinguish them as a movement. Not one of the forced issues are in essence preventative of the worship and service of God or destructive of the identity of the church. They have never been considered in such a connection by any scholar in the church. It is a propaganda of strange and forced exegeses of scriptures appropriated for party purposes which has developed into an unhappy episode of radicalism, masquerading as a reformation, plying the churches with theoretical

views of congregational autonomy and creedalized personal opinions on everything the people may or may not do, from opposition to harmless gatherings on the premises of the church property to objections against weddings and funerals in the church building, thus making the property sacred and the building sacramental. Altogether it represents a pseudo-loyalty more accurately diagnosed as spiritual neurosis. The entire picture presents a profile of revolutionary and factional thinking, with a display of premature pronouncements by immature aspirants who speak with an air of wisdom which older men would not assume.

The grounds of cleavage are fictitious and intangible. The "orphan home issue" is an example. *There is no source for the corruption of the church in an orphanage.* Through all of the years of their existence there is not an instance of orphanage control or domination or supplantation of the churches. These pseudo-issues have been solely provisional and evolutional; that is, a development for convenience and not from conviction. They have become expediential contrivances, subject to alterations according to the changing positions of unstable men. The proof of this conclusion is in the fact that none of the leaders of this faction held these viewpoints *before the decision to make the opposition to orphan homes the party issue.* By so doing they have transplanted the propaganda of Sommerism from the northern states to areas of the south and the west. Despairing, indeed, is the state of men who are willing to divide the churches in order to be the heads and leaders of a party. It is the same type of frustration which causes psychotic political leaders to perform acts that plunge nations into war. In the same character the radical leaders of this propaganda agitation have ballooned "the issues" all out of proportion to truth and fact.

(6) The real threat of modernism.

In the same party spirit the charges of modernism and liberalism are being shouted against congregations that are doing no more nor less than the churches have always done. But the component elements of *modernism* do not consist in what the churches generally are practicing now,

nor is *liberalism* composed of what is included in their budgets. The liberalism confronting the church of Christ today is the alarming use by the teachers and preachers in the schools and the churches of the so-called new Bibles. The *new* translations are in fact *no* translations--they are not versions but *perversions* of the text of the manuscripts. It is known to all who are informed that the translators are all ultra-modernists--their names and backgrounds are available and accessible, and their denials of the fundamental doctrines of the virgin birth of Christ, the verbal inspiration and inerrant integrity of the Scriptures are all in print. This accounts for the liberty exercised to rephrase and rewrite the text of the Bible, admittedly using their own words and phrases, not of the text, to implement their own theological concepts, the purpose of which is to destroy Christianity as it has been revealed and as we have known it. The perfidy of the perversions of these pseudo-bibles becomes more and more evident to me the further the perusal of them is pursued. There are many hundreds of examples of corrupting the text and changing its doctrine. The objections to the long accepted versions (the King James and the American Standard Version) are largely prejudicial and based on false insinuations, stemming from the campaign to relegate the old versions. The King James version was produced in the same era of the English language as the writings of Shakespeare--in the period of its greatest elegance of style and excellence of diction. Have any of the professors proposed to relegate Shakespeare? There is not a literary body of people in the world who would dare tamper with the plays of William Shakespeare, but they feel no compunction in mutilating the written Word of God. It is my purpose to publish several hundred comparisons to demonstrate that the contents of the purported new Bibles are contradictory to the teaching of Christ and the doctrine of his inspired apostles, and vitiating to Christianity.

It is not an orphanage that will corrupt the church, nor programs in the budgets that will destroy the gospel--it is rather the threat of modernism in the form of spurious bibles on one hand, and the religio-politico octopus of Roman

Catholicism together with the propaganda of the National Council of Churches for a compromised unity of denominational Christianity, on the other hand, that confront the churches of Christ with impending threats and dangers. It is now time, and high time, for preachers of the gospel everywhere to close ranks for this confrontation of the common foe--Catholicism, denominationalism and modernism.

III THE TRUTH BETWEEN EXTREMES- OR THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD

In evidence that the new radical party leaders have seized upon functional questions as forced issues for lines of cleavage, an editorial in the Gospel Advocate, written by me in 1931, while I was editor of that century-old medium, is here inserted. Later, in 1939, after the present esteemed editor, Brother B. C. Goodpasture, came to the editorial chair he reprinted this article in the same medium with his personal editorial indorsement as common ground.

THE TRUTH BETWEEN EXTREMES (May, 1931)

In establishing the identity of the New Testament church, the necessity of being Scriptural in doctrine, worship, and name has received due emphasis. While these essential features have not been overemphasized, there are some other points that have been more or less minimized.

The organization of the church, for instance, is vital, and Scriptural *work* is an essential feature of its identity.

The organization of the New Testament church is simple, not complex. It is the local church with elders, deacons, and members. No other organization is known in the New Testament. The local church with elders and deacons is a complete and perfect organization through which to do everything God has commanded the church *as such* to do. It, therefore, follows that any organization larger or smaller than the local church, designed to do the work of the church, is an infringement upon the divine arrangement and is unscriptural. The truth of this principle is so evident as not to require proof to one who is familiar with New Testament teaching.

In the application of the above principle, however, some

have failed to discriminate between *methods* and *organization*. The church may use any expedient *method* of doing anything God has commanded so long as it is a *method only*. The protracted meeting is a method of saving souls. Class teaching, sometimes called "Sunday school," is a *method* of imparting instruction, whether pursued on Sunday or some other day. But there is a vast difference between methods and organizations. It has been claimed that the missionary society is only a method of evangelizing the world. That is not true. The missionary society is an organization, an established institution, and uses methods of its own.

It is easy to encroach upon principles, and such encroachments are in evidence in some of the churches of Christ today. For instance, the Sunday school as a method of instruction violates no Scriptural principle. Quite to the contrary, it is the application of the Scriptures that enjoin teaching, but prescribe no method. But when the Sunday school becomes an organized auxiliary, functioning apart from the church, it ceases to be a method and becomes an organization. It is not uncommon for Sunday-school classes, young people's meetings, women's Bible classes and other groups to function as organized groups even to the point of maintaining a separate treasury and doing certain work belonging to the church in the name of their group. If one group has the right to so organize and function, other groups have the same right, and if followed to its logical end the congregation as an organized unit would be destroyed. Such is a perversion of an otherwise Scriptural work. When Sunday-school classes and young people's meetings so organize and function, they differ from the denominational B. Y. P. U. and C.E. societies only in name.

The autonomy of the church--the independent existence and functions of the local church--is an accepted principle among all who oppose the missionary societies. But to what extent congregations can engage in cooperative work without infringing upon autonomous functioning of the church is a question not altogether easy to decide.

The truth is usually found between extremes. The extremes in this case are, organizations that usurp the functions of a congregation, on one hand, and an aloofness between churches that would prohibit all cooperation, on the other. The missionary society usurps the functions of the church. And when an individual does the same thing the missionary society does--namely, independently receives and disburses missionary funds for the churches--that individual usurps the functions of the church. On the

same principle, if the elders of one congregation solicit the funds of other congregations for general distribution, then the elders of one congregation usurp the functions of the congregations whose funds they receive and disburse. It is the same in principle as if a society or individual should do so.

How then, and to what extent, may churches Scripturally cooperate? Fortunately, we have a New Testament example. The prophet Agabus prophesied of the famine that should come over the world (the Jewish world, or Judea); and "the disciples [at Antioch], every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea: which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." (Acts 11:29,30).

The disciples at Antioch cooperated with the churches in Judea *through the elders* in relieving an emergency in Judea. For one church to help another church bear its own burdens, therefore, has Scriptural precedent. But for one church to solicit funds from other churches for general distribution to other fields or places, thus becoming the treasury of other churches, is quite a different question. Such procedure makes a sort of *society* out of the elders of a local church, and for such there is no Scriptural precedent or example.

There should be no infringement upon the local church as a functioning unit.

Before and after the foregoing 1931 editorial I had written in defence of orphan homes against Sommerism, and had repeatedly held meetings where such homes were operated such as Tipton Orphan Home at Tipton, Oklahoma, and the Potter Home at Bowling Green, Kentucky, and had commended them publicly and privately and in print. As later comments in this treatise will show the comparison of missionary and benevolent work had reference to the United Christian Missionary Society and general Board of Benevolence as operated by the Christian Church denomination. I have never preached a sermon nor have I ever written an article against orphan homes, or against joint-efforts of churches, but rather have defended the former and participated in the latter. The above article is explicit on the point that one or more churches may send money or aid to another church where the need exists.

IV. EXAMPLES OF EXTREMISMS

While extremists one way virtually claim that the church can do everything, and the radicals the other way practically declaim that the church cannot do anything, the elders and the members of the churches generally are realizing the need of restraining the extremists; and of manifesting attitudes and maintaining conditions conducive to temperate reflection and honest consideration of these various functional and operational questions, without divisions and cleavages ; and to preserve peace within the congregations and unity among the churches.

(1) Extremes beget extremes.

For example, first, the opposition to imbedding the colleges in the budgets of the churches has led to the other extreme that the church alone can teach the Bible ; and opposition to turning Bible departments of colleges into seminaries fosters the extreme that there should be no paid teachers of the Bible in the colleges. Consistently, this extreme would apply equally to a paid editor of a religious periodical and prohibit a publishing company from paying a writer for a manuscript that teaches the Bible, or for the publication of a book on a Bible subject. Such extremes are without bounds.

(2) Institutional control.

The ostensible opposition to college domination of churches and preachers by the radical element is being matched by themselves in the control of churches and preachers by their own institutions--their publishing companies and schools; for when certain publishers can give the signal to a preacher when to divide a church, and when both churches and preachers within certain circles are controlled by the pressures and influence of a school of their own--that is *institutionalism*, and *institutional control*.

(3) Cooperation versus subsidy.

The failure to distinguish between cooperation and subsidy is another example. The objections to subsidizing the general work of the church through one eldership produces

the opposite extreme that one church may not help another in a cooperative work, or under any circumstances unite its funds with another church, thus condemning the cooperative city-wide meetings in which these men themselves have in the past participated.

(4) The administration of benevolence.

The opposition to some objectionable features or operations of an orphanage leads a radical element to conclude that the church cannot use or help such an orphan's home, nor contribute money to another church in connection with benevolent work. Yet in the entire history of the existence of the orphanages there has never been an example of orphanage domination or control of churches, nor in any one of them an existing potential of corrupting the church. To make an orphanage the ground for division is indeed a poor issue.

(5) Religious real estate and dedicated buildings.

The opposition to church banquets has caused the other late extreme of objection to eating on the premises or the using of the property for any other purpose than the worship, or for any gathering other than the services of the church—even to the late contention that weddings and funerals should be excluded from the church buildings. In the years past all gospel preachers stoutly and rightly condemned the denominational practice of “dedicating” their church buildings ; but now, after the fashion of the Roman Catholics, real estate properties of the church are made sacramental.

(6) The collective care of the poor.

The objection to making the care of the world an immediate obligation of the church has engendered the extreme of “the saints only” theory and the perversion of Gal. 6:10 and Jas. 1:27. To escape from the argument for the collective support of the poor, when such benevolence comes within the range of congregational responsibility, the extremes have evolved into the doctrine that the church has no benevolent obligation to anyone under any circumstances.

This "alien benevolence" argument, based on the notion of *saints only*, calls for the splitting of the Gal. 6:10 verse, for it is admitted that the church may do the bottom part of the passage, but it is asserted that the church may not do the top part of the same passage, although the whole passage was addressed to the same people.

This *saints only* concept is more Masonic, Mormonic and Catholic than Christian. The Catholics in Italy display untold wealth while the masses starve in sight of them. The "saints only" doctrine would withhold contributions of the church from "alien" children at their door, suffering in need. The system of welfare and moral standards of Masonry apply to the families of Master Masons only, and so it is with the Mormons. The "saints only" concept reduces the church to the level of fraternity membership and the benefits of lodges. It presents a selfish Christianity that becomes a contradiction in terms. Moreover, the new notion that a child is inherently an alien is a false doctrine bordering on the dogmas of original sin and hereditary total depravity.

It is contended that such benevolence is the duty of *individuals*, not of the church; but at the same time it is insisted that every member of the church must contribute all that he has been prospered to give into the treasury on the first day of the week; so, if he fulfills this duty he has nothing left to do individually; and if the church cannot scripturally help the one in need, and the individual cannot economically do so, it follows that the destitute can receive no benevolence at all from either the church or the individual! These are some of the unworthy inconsistencies into which radical men have been forced in the effort to escape the various traps into which "the issues" have cornered them. Howbeit the *saints only* doctrine has become with them a major issue.

In the matter of care for the orphans it is insisted that they should be adopted into the homes--yet there is not one passage of scripture that makes such a requirement. To thus bring outsiders into the family, in the nature of it, is not mandatory. The adoption of children into one's home and family is strictly a matter of judgment, especially

where there are flesh and blood children; but in any event, it is an optional privilege and not a scriptural command. Here is an example of a partisan group making law in a realm where the Bible has not legislated.

(7) Concerning congregational autonomy.

The oft-repeated cry for *congregational autonomy* has become a mere phrase in this bedlam of extremes, for it has become a matter of common knowledge that the radical proclaimers of this dictum have no respect for the unity of a congregation, nor for the authority of the elders, when it serves their purpose to ignore both. When an elder of the church stands in their way they push him aside and oust him if they can; and if the congregation does not bow to their dictatorial demands they will divide it. They talk and write on congregational autonomy, but the men of this party movement have no respect for congregations or for elders who do not follow their dictates.

Many good people who are devoted to the service of God and who are in heart loyal to the church of the Lord, are being victimized by party leaders who ostensibly oppose what is called centralized control through congregational organization, but who practice it themselves through a publication organization and a college institution; who profess pious opposition to the concentration of power in an eldership, but practice the same concentration of power in a publishing corporation which dominates preachers and churches to the point of dictation in the affairs of various congregations--by personal intrusion and by infiltration through the circulation of inter-church bulletins imposed on the membership of churches as a means of driving their dividing wedges; and when the time appears opportune they give the signal for division and separation. With the hand of dictators these party leaders revel over ignominious victories in some localities, with a specious plea of adherence to the scriptures--but neither in teaching and practice nor in course of procedure are they scriptural. What price victory--the dividing of churches! As these facts become more and more evident, the churches generally will continue to be governed by the written Word, not by the assump-

tions of arbitrary authority by a party of dictatorial church splitters.

To engage in constructive criticisms and instructive discussions of real, rather than manufactured, issues is one thing--but the forming of a party to divide the churches is another thing. In the former, along with others, I have freely engaged, but in the latter, I have had no part either in the past or in the present. The cry of the bleeding cause of Christ, where the ruthless disruption and senseless division of congregations have been perpetrated, ascends to heaven, the anathema of which descends upon the dividers.

V. DANGERS AND DEVIATIONS

But the truth of the foregoing does not mean that there are no existing deviations and danger signals. These symptomatic conditions are not new; they are recurrent issues that have required repeated discussion; and as in the past, so it will be in the future that renewed attempts to commit the churches to practices and promotions incompatible with the character and mission of the church must be periodically repulsed.

(1) The liaison between the colleges and the churches.

There is an unmistakable trend in some of the colleges to water down the doctrine and broaden the organizational structure of the church to accommodate certain projects. Certain forms of extremisms would substitute plans and programs for scriptural principles and precedents and procedures, all of which are matters of concern. A group of college professors may assume to be custodians of the scriptures and of what they teach; and presume to decide what is *scripture* and what is not, claiming that ordinary preachers and members of the churches are not capable of knowing for themselves, and must therefore look to the professors in the Bible departments of the colleges for direction, which means the incipient establishment of human authority in the churches.

A further danger signal is seen in college endorsement of preachers conforming to the college standard, but a

withholding of endorsement from non-conformists to their standard of judgment. This is a sort of liaison between the colleges and the churches in the matter of endorsing or un-endorsing preachers of the gospel, thereby establishing an agency that has the potential power to make or break any preacher in the brotherhood, and by intimidation pressure the preachers into conformation. Herein lies an immediate danger in the relations between the colleges and the churches. It is a sure warning that the activities of colleges should be restricted to their academic sphere--*let the college be the college and let the church be the church*. There has been a gradual tendency to make the school the church and to remake the churches into schools.

The potential danger in the college, church and preacher relation is in the exercise of power. Therein lies the danger. The reality of this potential danger is discernible in the growing tendency for the colleges to operate the churches by remote control. It is on the same principle of the Harvard Professors in the branches of our government, who seek to mold the political and philosophical thinking of the American people. Already some of our college professors are apparently attempting to harness the thinking of the brotherhood, and to attain that end through the generation of young people going from the schools into the churches, and to thus determine the teaching, control the preaching and formulate the practices of the churches. It is an assumption that the "uneducated" masses in the churches are not capable of deciding what the Bible does or does not teach, and the professors, as a self-appointed cultured and educational group, exercise the prerogative to make the decisions, and by propoganda to enforce them.

(2) The interference of extremisms.

On the other hand, the radicalism of the party that is now posing as guardians of congregational autonomy and custodians of conservatism is not an alternative, but has only complicated the conditions ; rather have their own extremisms jettisoned the effective oppositions to some improprieties that exist. Their own publications and institutions are doing the same things, the only distinguishable

difference being in the fact that they are less powerful--a difference only in degree.

Like the leaders of the Birch group of recent notoriety in politics, who seek to weld the radical elements of the nation into a political movement of power under its own control, according to the laws of its own Blue Book, rather than our national constitution--so in the church we have that group of bully boys all over the brotherhood, who with the media of papers and bulletins, together with radio raving and pulpit ranting, attempt to bulldoze the weak preachers and steamroller the small congregations into their party-power-controlled movement, with the deliberate aim and effort to undermine the whole church. To this end they have formulated their own radical Blue Book of recently developed *views* and *tenets* and *positions*, all of which were heretofore unknown. Their methods are much the same; they are a sort of *Birch Society* within the church, with apologies to the Birchers in politics. But they will not succeed. Already they are on the wane and will come to the same end of all such factious movements within the church in the past.

The particular "issues" upon which the course of this party was charted are not grounds for division. But they have been made the bond of fellowship and cause for dis-fellowship that will require the posthumous withdrawal of fellowship from all the pioneers in the church before us, who "blazed the trail" and brought the church to all of us in every part of the nation. They knew every phase and form, degree and grade of digression; and they fought it to a standstill. It is a silly thing for a set of radical smart-alecks now, who think they have recently discovered the church, to go about over the brotherhood with an air of superiority, haranguing the churches and repudiating the great preachers who were defending the truth on all questions before they were born. This complete lack of reserve and humility in the promoters of this malodorous movement casts doubt on the sincerity of its motivations.

The whole effort of the leaders of the so-called movement, like certain political machines, is party control. The spirit of it destroys independence. It is blandly affirmed that all

of us must be on one end or the other of the opposite extremes. That is the same as saying that one must join one party or another, that there can be no independence. But when two extremes are both wrong, the truth lies between--and that is the middle of the road, the road of truth, and the extremes are to the either side of it. The elders of the churches and preachers of the gospel should possess too much self-respect and personal independence to allow any factious party or pressure group align them with existing extremisms, all of which are pressure groups. Some of them are represented by travelling elders or paid agents, demanding participation in various projects, columnizing the churches, labeling the congregations, with implied intimidation in veiled threats to both preachers and elders of ostracism if at least *token* contributions are not made to their promotions. Here is where the independence of elders and preachers should be asserted, for whether the program, project or promotion is right or wrong that system is wrong and the party that it creates is as evil as the party that opposes it.

(3) The committee system of congregational government.

Another development is the government of the churches by multiple committees, supplanting the divine arrangement of elders in every church. In some areas these committees have become inter-congregational and statewide. Representatives have been known to make trips to a college in another state for consultation with certain professors on procedures to depose elders and set up committee government. Such as this lends impetus to the opposite radical extremes and "these things ought not so to be."

(4) Imparting images to the church.

Another promotion not good for the church is the popular practice of imparting a denominational and public image to the "Church of Christ" through certain publicized personalities and advertising mediums and methods. There is the television image, the movie image, the radio image, the advertising image, *ad infinitum*, through popular per-

sonalities. Out of these activities the church has received a mass of bad advertisement, spiritually, and its true character has been misrepresented.

Withal, the radical party, though it seeks to capitalize on these conditions, offers no cure ; it has only complicated the problems by manufacturing multiple opposite extremes. It is my own firm conviction that through all of this welter of confusions, changes and extremisms, the core of the church will remain fixed and anchored to God's word and His way.

VI. THE FABRICATION OF SPURIOUS ISSUES IN FOUR POINTS OF STUPIDITY

In the entire structure of this new insurgent party there is not one so-called "issue" that involves a doctrinal point--not one basic or fundamental doctrine. Their whole credenda can be reduced to personal predilections, whimsical absurdities, gross nonsense and crass stupidity. Their party is destitute of a real issue, and must seize upon some minor local irregularity which they exaggerate and balloon into a major issue.

(1) The four points of stupidity.

These four points are the pivot on which the *anti* movement turns in the manufacturing of *issues* in the development of *positions* which were not anticipated by the leaders of this party, but which resulted from argumentations driving them from extremes to extremities in order to extricate themselves from conspicuous inconsistencies, difficult dilemmas and the inevitably embarrassing consequences. Every one of these points that have been made an issue were previously preached and practiced by the leaders of the new party themselves and only lately have been seized in the frustration of grasping for issues where there were no issues, to form their party line. The mere enumeration of these senseless opinionated personal sentimentalisms is a sufficient exposure of their spurious peculiarity.

First: The belated outbursts against orphan homes in the effort to revive the dead issues of the *anti* college and

anti orphan home Sommer movement, the success of which was prevented by the opposition of the greatest men and minds in the church among the pioneers of Tennessee and Texas. The orphanage as an expedient means of providing care for orphan children, when the circumstances require it, is as old as the churches in Tennessee and Texas, and for the whole century has had the approval and support of the men "who have spoken unto you the word of God," whose teaching was trusted and whose faith was followed, as was mentioned in Heb. 13.6. But now, a sort of motley, heterogeneous and disordered group of men, who have failed to agree among themselves, have initiated a recalcitrant "movement" to inaugurate "a new restoration" whimsically based on opposition to orphan homes. And they brand all of us (which is most of us) as *new digressives* who will not *change* to their own *new movement* and submit to the dictates of the novices who compose their precipitant leadership. Yet in the whole history of an orphan home there is not an example of corruption *to* or *of* or *in* the church stemming from one of them. Making an issue of them is a senseless, stupid thing to do.

Second: The cynical attitude toward the joint efforts of churches in metropolitan gospel meetings. The historical Nashville Ryman Auditorium N. B. Hardeman Meetings successively, in the 1920's 30's and 40's; and our Houston Music Hall Meetings of 1945-46 ; and the more recent Louisville Municipal Auditorium Meetings of 1950--and others previous to these years--all these, were within this classification. Although some leaders of the present opposition were the promoters of these joint efforts then, they now charge without compunction of conscience that *we have changed* and are under anathema in apostasy from the faith. Yet they are themselves engaged in joint efforts in certain ways of their own to avoid the appearance of cooperation in so-called missionary endeavors in towns, cities and sections where the church was flourishing sound and strong before these late comers were born. Their rash of bulletins and papers are cooperative, as they attempt to sow discord in all the churches, by mailing under questionable postal practices these "me-too" mediums to the mem-

bership lists of every congregation that can be obtained, in many instances with money from the *church treasury*, and in other circumstances in cooperation with some other source. In their programs *preachers may cooperate, but not elders, or churches.*

Third : The ludicrous incongruity of the sacramentarian sentiment toward church buildings in the dedication of a material house in which the church assembles. At the mandate of these would-be reformers and self-styled restorers the old fashioned dinner on the ground has been abolished among their followers, and the basements of the buildings and the premises of the property have been ordered proscribed for any such practice or purpose. But one of these *preacher-leaders* said to me: that anyone bringing their food could eat it on the premises *outside* but not *inside* the building. I asked him, *Where are the toilet rooms?* So--we can *eat* the food on the outside and *eliminate* it on the inside. But the meeting house is a sacred building ! Now, how stupid can men get? According to this new notion, rural churches must return to the old-fashioned "out-house," and urban churches have a problem to solve!

We have condemned always the denominational practice of dedicating church buildings, and now a new tribe within the church has set up as a cardinal doctrine the idea of making the church building sacramental. It has even been recently suggested that they should be called *sanctuaries*. The statement of Stephen to the Jews in Acts 7 that "Solomon built him a house, howbeit the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands"; and the declaration of Paul on Mars Hill, in Acts 17, that God "dwelleth not in temples made with hands," appears to have perished from the perceptions of these late sacramentarians.

On this point I recall an article in the *Gospel Advocate* by M. C. Kurfees (a giant in the church in his day) in the late 1920's suggesting that gatherings of members of the church in some part of the meeting house, to eat and visit together, would promote the impartial friendliness of the members and contribute to the peaceful and harmonious atmosphere of the congregation. Brother Kurfees was a staunch defender of the purity of the church against inno-

vations, wrote the best work ever published against the use of instrumental music in the worship at a critical time, and contributed more to the fight against digression than any man of that crucial period, except David Lipscomb himself. No one attacked Brother Kurfees for his good advice nor called him a digressive.

It will not be *apropos* here for someone to quote, "What? have ye not houses to eat and drink in?" of 1 Cor. 11:22, for the Corinthian church had no *church house*, and the reference was not to eating in some part of it, but to turning the Lord's Supper into a banquet. And anyone who does not know the difference between a simple "dinner on the ground" gathering of members, where and when they bring food to eat and visit together (either inside or outside the building) and a church banquet, is either ignoring the distinction or does not know enough about the difference to talk or write about it. But opposition to this purely social practice has been made a creedal doctrine by the new party, and it adds to the nonsense of their pseudo-issues.

The New Testament does not contain the command for the churches to build meeting houses or church edifices. No New Testament church had one, and such buildings are expedencies only, not essential to acceptable worship or divine service; and the church could exist today, meet for worship and carry on every work the church is commanded to perform without owning a "church building"--for they could rent or lease the accommodations for assembly, as many business firms do in the conduct of their enterprises. This does not mean that the present practice of building meeting houses is improper or unscriptural, but it does mean that meeting houses are optional expedients and to *dedicate* a building to make it *sacramental* is contrary to Christianity and is wrong. It is this misconception that has generated the new notion that it is unscriptural for any part or partition of "the church building" to be made available under proper circumstances for the serving of food along with other material provisions and conveniences on its premises.

All of the ado over "the social gospel" is altogether be-

side the point, for all of the past practices of "dinner on the ground," whether inside or outside the building, had no connection with the gospel then, suggests no concurrence with it now, and it is not relative to the recent religion of the social gospel theologized by certain ultraliberal cults in modern religious society. The pain of searching for the sources of information on the cultus of the social gospel is all that is necessary to ascertain the meaning of it. The doctrine of the social gospel is the religious thesis comparable to that political and economic concept of social organization known as socialism. It is the religious philosophy that Christianity is fulfilled in humanitarianism and that social interests are the sum total of the gospel. Now anyone whose eyesight can peep through a ladder can see (unless he is looking the other way) that there is not even a similarity between the so-called *issues* in the church and the social gospel *species* of theological thought. To apply that term to the century old practice of dinner on the ground at gospel gatherings by either rural or urban congregations is either an evidence of a lack of sincerity or it is another example of stark stupidity.

Fourth: The arrogation of usurped authority to legislate the whimsical use of "the Lord's money" including and excluding at their own arbitrary will. The creedism is that no money can come from the treasury of the church to help the orphans in an orphan home (or a needy child in any home unless one of its parents is a member of the church)--but the treasurer may write a check on the church in payment for *horse manure* for the *sod* to fertilize the church yard! Whatever word that may be employed to describe that sort of thing will be a synonym for stupidity.

Concerning budgets--it is now a mark of the identity of a scriptural church to have or not to have certain benevolent programs and missionary projects in the budget; but the time was when churches had no such problems, for there were no budgets. The apportionment of the contributions into a pre-arranged budget is comparatively new, and it met with opposition from the early writers of both the *Gospel Advocate* and the *Firm Foundation*, perhaps for

the foreseen reason of what is happening now--an issue develops on what may or may not be scripturally included in the budget, and the budget becomes a sacramental thing, the depository for *the Lord's money*.

The examples of New Testament liberality then were based on the existing need, as stated in Acts 2:42-45 and 1 Cor. 16 :1-2, and not on commercial budgets, but now *the Lord's money* concept makes legal tender a sacrament--on that basis the pope and the Vatican are a way ahead of the Lord and his church ! Money is not sacramental and *giving* is not a sacrament to be "instituted" alongside the Lord's Supper as "a part of the worship." It was not so instituted in the New Testament and had no such place in any New Testament church. It simply belongs to the duty of liberality, performed *daily* as a temporary practice of the first church at Jerusalem, in Acts 2 and Acts 4:37--and it was later ordered by Paul in Galatian and Corinthian churches for convenience and dispatch, as a ready means to an end, at the time of assembly on the first day of the week. The same reason exists today, of course, and as a matter of fact, but that matter of fact does not make *money* a sacrament nor mean that *giving* is an institution of worship beside the Lord's Supper for which thanks should be offered.

Do not misunderstand my words--I am not opposed to budgeting the first day of the week contributions, but rather mean that *the budget* is no more sacrosanct now than the contributions were sacred when the churches supported gospel meetings and preachers by a spontaneous liberality, and when elders of the churches announced that the "fifth Sunday" contributions would go to the orphans.

Now, the new reformers will split churches over whether to take "the Lord's money" out of its bed--the budget--to feed and clothe a child, insisting with much animation that to remove *the Lord's money* from its treasury to help a home for orphans is digression; but they will raid the treasury for all modern conveniences of the preacher's home, and may even spend its money to buy the refuse of the barnyard and stable to fertilize the lawn of the church and the premises of the parsonage.

Another matter of fact is that the reformists practice

in a pattern of their own everything that they choose to condemn in the forms practiced by others. A look at their church bulletins and budgets is all that is required to sustain this assertion. They do everything the which they assert others cannot do, and their vaunted congregational autonomy is reduced to *the rule of the preachers* over their churches--which is another relic of the *evangelistic authority* of the system of Sommerism which they have revived. They have substituted the *preacher* rule for the rule of elders, and they call that *autonomy*. Their entire dogmatic system, if it should be honored by that term, is Daniel Sommer *redivivus*--Sommerism living again--and it will follow the same course to end in demise.

The United States Supreme Court ruled that Federal assistance to education was in purpose aid to the child rather than to a private or parochial school, and government aid to the student through the institution of education was therefore within the constitution. On the same principle, the relation of the church is to the orphan, not to the orphanage in which its needs are provided--and anything that simple should not divide a great and growing brotherhood.

(2) The fabrication of spurious issues.

The superficial and false issues of this pseudo-reform agitation revolves around personal and private interpretations of passages with patently forced applications of the scriptures which amount to an artful manipulation of text and context. It indicates an intellectual dishonesty that Paul condemned as "craftiness" in *handling the word of God* deceitfully--and that is the worst sort of deceit.

First: The confused ado in the effort to make an argument by inference from the eighth chapter of Second Corinthians against any joint endeavors between congregations is a capricious conjuration and provides an example of the type of erroneous exegesis necessary to make out a case in favor of their baseless assertions.

It is said that 2 Cor. 8 :12-15 prohibits the mutual assistance of a plurality of churches. Read the verses and search for such a conjectural conclusion: "For if there be

first a willing mind it is accepted according to that a man hath, and not according to that he hath not. For I mean not that other men be eased, and ye burdened: but by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance may also be a supply for your want: that there may be equality: as it is written, He that had much had nothing over; and he that had gathered little had no lack.”

It is asserted that these Corinthian verses teach that one church may not extend pecuniary assistance to another church in any work to which they are equally related. But where is the premise for such a conclusion? It is without either a major or a minor premise, and the conclusion is not there, it is not deducible from the text : that a congregation may not extend financial help to another congregation in a mutual endeavor. What sort of hermeneutics is that? Who made that rule? There is not an implication in the text or the context of the Corinthian passage from which we may draw an inference upon which to reach any such conclusion. There is no process of deduction from such an assumed premise, and upon it no tangible argument can be constructed. It represents the effort of hard pressed men to find some semblance of scriptural support for a conspired issue by forcing scriptures to serve an end which originated in their own conference chambers as an after-thought.

It is claimed that the equality of the Corinthian chapter equals congregational autonomy. Now that is exactly as clear as black land mud in Texas! A congregation engaged in a scriptural work without any assistance from another congregation is *autonomous* and has *equality* with another church that does the same thing, so things equal to the same thing are equal to each other--at least in autonomy! Shades of Socrates and Hedges rules of logic! And their whole propaganda is just that intangible, which is the reason why the members of the party are groping in the confusion of muddled issues, changing *positions* from one printing of a paper to another, never able to offer a clear explanation of their premises.

No scholar past or present, in the church or out of it, I will venture to say, ever offered an exegesis of the Corinthian passage that could yield the intangible "equality argument," and none of the able gospel preachers and editors before us ever thought of such vague elucidations. It is a fallacy conceived in the sophistry of late leaders of this new cult for some sort of an abstraction against pecuniary mutual assistance of congregations when needed.

It is not claimed by these men that one church may not assist another church in ways and means other than money. One church may give another church songbooks and benches ; or an able church may give a struggling church property, such as a building and its furnishings--but cannot give it *money*. According to that notion, a stronger church may send a weaker church a preacher who costs money, but cannot send the money ; it may give the money to *the preacher* sent to them, but cannot give the money to *the elders* where he does the preaching. The belabored application of this incoherent theory is that when *the Lord's money* is in one church of the Lord, it cannot under any circumstances be contributed to another church of the Lord, for that would destroy "equality" and violate the teaching of the Corinthian passage !

It is impossible to penetrate the viewpoint or understand the mental motions of men who possess the determination to form a party and separate themselves from the church over such abstruse notions not worthy to be named issues.

The question now in mind and in order is: What was the *equality* of 2 Cor. 8:12-15? The Gentile Christians had been made partakers of the inestimable spiritual blessings of the gospel at the expense of their Jewish brethren, and it was equal--that is, equitable--that they should in return impart to them of the carnal (material) things in the spirit of reciprocity. This reciprocation in the *giving* and the *blessing received* is mentioned by the same apostle in Rom. 15 :26-29 : "For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem. It hath pleased them verily; and their debtors they are. For if the Gentiles have been made

partakers of their spiritual things, their duty is also to minister unto them in carnal things. When therefore I have performed this, and have sealed to them this fruit, I will come by you into Spain. And I am sure that, when I come unto you, I shall come in the fulness of the blessing of the gospel of Christ." This blessing of the gospel had proceeded from the Jews to the Gentiles, and therein and thereby were the Gentile Christians debtors to the Jewish Christians.

In reverse example, the Philippians had provided Paul's material needs--Phil. 4:15-19--and Paul desired for them the fruit in return that would abound unto their spiritual account. So it was in the case of the Corinthians--there was reciprocity in the contribution being made by them to the Jewish Christians in Judea for their material want in return for the spiritual blessing of salvation that had come to them from the Jews. Therein was the equality mentioned by Paul to the Corinthians. It was to establish this equality that Paul mentioned the reciprocity in verse 14: "But by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want: that there may be equality." The apostle emphasized that *at this time* the abundance of the Corinthians supplied the want of the Judeans, but at *another time* in the future when the Corinthians perchance would stand in need of similar assistance, the abundance of the Judeans would supply the wants of the Corinthians, wherein they would find requital, or return in kind for their liberality. This squaring of a debt due the Jews from the Gentiles placed them on equal basis.

The apostle then applied the illustration of the Israelites gathering manna in the wilderness: "As it is written. He that had gathered much had nothing over; and he that had gathered little had no lack." So it was among the Jewish and Gentile Christians, as it was among the Israelites: there was no lack in equality due to the reciprocation of the Gentiles to their Jewish brethren, the wants of each having been supplied, although one was spiritual and the other material. In the brotherly love which compensated

for the unevenness existing between the spiritual and the carnal there was found a full requital.

The repeated expressions concerning "a work to which churches are equally related" and "an arrangement of churches" are just so much phraseology to add more confusion to the bewildered minds of the befuddled members of the factional party--it is talk that means nothing. After all the polemics the *equality argument*, so styled, is answered in one sentence: it rests on an assumed premise, and with an asserted premise anyone can conclude anything.

Second: The futile attempt to circumvent the Galatian passage of chapter six, verse ten, to escape the clear teaching of a general collective benevolence by an accommodated intrepertation of the text, is promptly perceived when the text of verse ten is considered with the context of verses one to ten.

The tenth verse reads: "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." That this passage was an apostolic admonition for a general collective benevolence "for all men," but with priority for "the household of faith," was never disputed until the frustrated effort of the new party leaders to devise a combination of ideas that would rob the verse of the forthright simplicity of its statement and dispose of the admonition for general collective benevolence. And all of this to establish the tenet of no collective aid or support for an orphan or any other person not a member of the church. In order to press this passage into service and force its meaning to accommodate their devices, they are confronted with two insurmountable difficulties: first, that the admonition for the benevolence to *all men* of verse 10, though included with injunctions to the churches, is nevertheless limited to the *individual*; and, second, that an orphan child not a member of the church is inherently *an alien*. If the first contention is true, it splits the verse, for it goes without argument that the church may collectively perform this benevolent duty to any indigent member of the "household of faith," but the church cannot perform this humanitarian

service to "all men"--that is, to a destitute non-member of the church. So, according to the concept, the church can do the lower half of this verse but cannot do the upper half of it--yet it is addressed to precisely the same, the selfsame, identical people, *the churches of Galatia*--and to separate the injunction, to make the bottom half of it collective but the top half individual is undiluted disregard for all principles of scriptural exegesis and rules of sentence structure. Furthermore, the same assertion applied to verse 6 limits the support of preachers to individual contributions--for if verse 10 is asserted to be *individual*, we may assert that verse 6 is individual also, and the collective support of a preacher, or teacher, by a congregation is thereby cancelled. It avails nothing to say that *other* scriptures provide the authority for the church to pay the preachers, as that procedure would nullify one or the other and would play both ends against the middle--for if the *individual* of verse 6 *communicates* with the preacher *in all good things* it relieves the necessity--there would not be anything remaining for the church to provide.

With reference to the slant on the issues, that a child is an alien and therefore not a scriptural subject for congregational benevolence--how and when does a child become an alien? If it is born an alien, that is the doctrine of original sin or inherent depravity, and all the scriptures against that doctrine will apply to this issue. Jesus said of little children: "In heaven their angels (spirits) do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven"--that is the Father in heaven beholds the spirits of the little children such as Jesus mentioned while they are here in the world. On the other hand, if the child is not born an alien, the age at which it becomes alien must be determined in order to know when benevolence may begin and when it must be discontinued. It is, indeed, a sorry thing for men to attempt to make aliens of children as a technicality to deprive them of the collective benevolence from a congregation of Christians.

As a rebuttal to the collective command of verse 10, these new *exegetes* put great stress on the references to

a man and every *man* in the preceding verses, claiming that such reference is proof of an individual and not of a collective duty. But these singular phrases apply to the lower half of verse 10, "to the household of faith," in the same degree of application to the upper half, "to all men." That being *exegetically* true, it follows that the collective benevolence must either be denied to "the household of faith" or it must be admitted that the individual command may be collectively performed.

A comparison of passages where there are references to duties of *a man* and *every man* and *any man* will exemplify that there are commands to individuals that require collective performance. A solid example of the collective performance of an individual command is in the observance of the Lord's Supper, described in 1 Cor. 11:23-34. In verse 28, the apostles admonishes *a man* to examine *himself* and so let *him* eat of the bread and drink of the cup. And in verse 34, the apostles exhorts that if *any man* hunger, let *him* eat at home, "that ye come not together unto condemnation." If 1 Cor. 11 requires *a man* to collectively perform the individual duty to observe the Lord's Supper in the assembly, it follows because it must follow, that the *a man* or the *every man* of Gal. 6, may collectively perform the individual duty in the giving of money for benevolence "to all men" as well as "to them that are of the household of faith."

The apostolic order to observe the Lord's Supper was a command to the individual, as shown in verses 28 and 34 of 1 Cor. 11, but that it required collective compliance cannot be denied. If this is true of the Lord's Supper in assembly worship of 1 Cor. 11, it is nonetheless true of benevolence in congregational procedures.

Another apostolic order to the individual but connected with collective compliance is the command concerning the first day of the week contribution: "Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye. Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him, that there be no gatherings when I come." It is not insignificant that the apostle here uses

the phrase "the churches of Galatia" with reference to this order, which identifies it with a congregational action in collective obedience ; and it is no less significant that the command of Galatians six, verse ten, was just as certainly addressed to the Galatian churches in the phrase of chapter one, verse two: "Unto the churches of Galatia." The comparison follows through in the use of the singular reference to *a man* and *every man* in Galatians six; *a man* and *any man* in Corinthians eleven; and *every one* and *him* in Corinthians sixteen. The command to "lay by in store" was given to *every one* of the Corinthians, using also the singular pronoun *him*, but the order was given for its collective performance in the first day of the week assembly. So if *a man* in Galatians six limits the benevolent command of verse ten to the individual, the same logic will limit both the Lord's Supper and the contribution commands to individual compliance--if collective benevolence for "all men" is barred in Galatians six and therefore limited to "saints only," the same identical expressions will limit the Lord's Supper to individual observance, and the contribution to individual giving, barring both from collective and congregational actions in the Lord's Day assembly of the churches.

This exemplified principle applies with equal force to the individual and collective significance of James 1:26-27 in the use of singular term *man* and *himself*, as will be later discussed in this discourse.

Continuing the dissertation on the controversial sixth chapter of Galatians, an analysis of the whole section of verses 1 to 10 will settle any further disputation in the minds of all who are not controlled by factional prejudices and impostures on *the issues*, "falsely so called."

There is an essential relation between the last division of the fifth chapter and the first section of the sixth chapter. The fifth chapter ends with the contrast between the *works* of the flesh proceeding from heathen passion and the *fruit* of the spirit borne in the life of the Christian ; as he lives in the *spirit* and not in the *flesh*, let him walk by the rules that govern the spiritual life. But in the weakness of the flesh some of the *brethren* of the Galatian churches were

not removed from heathenism so far as to be strong, and some of them in weakness would yield to the works of the flesh rather than maintain an adherence to the rules of the spirit. It is here that the sixth chapter exhortation connects with the fifth chapter formula for spiritual life against the works of the flesh. A cursive analysis of the sixth chapter gives a view of a membership relation of mutual dependence, interdependence and collective responsibility.

Verse one: The appellation *brethren* with which the chapter begins is representative of the collective relationship sustained, and is a reminder of the mutual affection that should exist between the members of the body. The clause *if a man be overtaken in a fault* indicates that a brother had been taken by surprise, and in his weakness was caught by what had tempted him in the doing of the works of the flesh that were named in the preceding chapter, before he could fortify himself against backsliding into his old practices and habits. The reference to *ye which are spiritual* meant the men in the church who possessed the special endowments classified as "spiritual gifts." The *spiritual* men, or the spiritually-gifted men, were specially qualified by their possession of the spiritual-gift endowment to *restore* the stumbling member by correction and healing, as the mending of the bones instead of a process of amputation--an orthopedic illustration applied spiritually. But the spiritually-gifted men should perform this duty *in the spirit of meekness*--that is, with equanimity or evenness of mind, with proper equilibrium, composure and self-possession--not with an air or attitude of superiority in their exercise of special endowments; but rather *considering thyself lest thou also be tempted*, to indulge in some of the "works of the flesh," for even the spiritually-gifted men were not immune to the works of the flesh, and if they should yield to temptation they would themselves stand in need of the same restoration.

Verse two: The encouragement to *bear one another's burdens* denoted communion in burdens, and the word here meant trials with specific reference to the aforementioned works of the flesh in the heathen society wherein

they had formerly lived. The word *burdens* here is not a reference to want or need, for the poor and the rich alike had this burden in the dependence of the weak on the strong, as in verse one, and the interdependence on one another as in verse two ; and in so doing they would all respectively *fulfill the law of Christ* concerning this collective relation by accomplishing its purpose and completing in action that which is in the new law of Christ by word--that is, the "new commandment" to love one another which Jesus gave to his disciples.

Verse three: The precautionary counsel, *for if a man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself*, is directed to the spiritually endowed man who might esteem himself so highly in the possession of the spiritual gifts as to think that he had become *something* that others were not in the sight of God, due to his special endowments; but he had done *nothing* to obtain them as they were imparted gifts which had been distributed according to the will of God for the benefit of all in the church and not for high positions; and for a *man* who possessed these gifts to selfishly regard them would not be a true judgment of himself--he would be *deceived* in the requisites and prerequisites of his gifts and the reason for the possession of them ; for the endowment of these direct gifts was bestowed, having nothing to do with superior character, to improve it or to enhance his favor and standing before God.

Verse four: The behest for *every man to prove his own work* was the forbiddance of extolling himself in comparison with another, and in inspired instruction to the spiritually-gifted to stand on *his own work* rather than on the position that he occupied as placing him above another, thusly to *rejoice in himself alone* in having as a ground of congratulation his own worth and not the inferiority of another by comparing and contrasting merit or demerit.

Verse five: In juxtaposition with verse two the obligation here *for every man shall bear his own burden* had reference to duty, whereas in verse two the word *burden* meant trial. The advice of verse two related to a collective

dependence and interdependence in reference to weakness in the matter of yielding to the flesh, and therefore *burdens* meant *trials*; but every man was independent of any other in moral obligations and spiritual responsibilities, therefore in verse five *burden* meant *duty*. It is significant that the Greek words in the two verses are not the same, but indicate the distinction as explained; in the first it was in the plural *burdens* and was mutual and collective; in the second it was in the singular *burden* and was personal in obligation and responsibility in acts of duty, though collectively performed.

Verse six: The collective responsibility for the pecuniary support of teachers in the church of this early period is attested by the directive: *let him that is taught in word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things*. The ones who were being instructed in the precepts of the gospel, or the law of Christ aforementioned, were the *taught* in word as they were indoctrinated; and it was their collective duty to maintain the teachers of the word--in a regular system of teaching, the teachers were to be maintained by the *taught*: *in all good things*, supplying all the temporal needs of the men who were deprived of such resources by reason of having devoted themselves to the cause of teaching or preaching the word.

This *taught* and teacher relation involved all the members, the whole church, and the instruction was therefore collectively applied. To apply this verse *individually* rather than collectively, as an effort is being made to do in relation to verse ten, would relieve the church of all duty to support or pay the preachers, for if the individuals supply all temporal needs of the preacher there would be nothing left for the church to provide ; and if the individuals obeyed the command, anything done by the church would therefore be superfluous. The comparison of verses six and ten demonstrate that these passages have been misused and misapplied in the forced arguments employed by the factionists of the current controversy.

Verse seven: The Galatians should *be not deceived* or misled into a glaring neglect of duty respecting the liberality necessary to maintain the system of teaching

which God had ordained in the churches, for *God is not mocked* or derided by disobedience, or scoffed at by men who ignore his will, or circumvented by any acts and attitudes of any man treating God with contempt in ignoring a duty. In so doing men only deceive themselves, for as in the natural world *whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap*, so it is in the moral realm and spiritual sphere --men reap the kind of seed that is sown. The sowing to the flesh was the neglect of the good works mentioned, in order to self-gratification, from which comes the inevitable reaping of corruption which is the end of all that is fleshly, and nothing else shall be reaped.

Verse eight: The sowing time is now, for the sowing comes before the reaping, hence, *he that soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption*: if the purpose of living is carnal indulgence, it is sowing to the flesh; and the reaping will be the corruption of moral ruin in the result, as blighted wheat and decayed grain. But in *sowing to the spirit*, or planting in the spirit the seeds of knowledge, its course will be the production of fruit in good works here, and the reaping will be *everlasting life* hereafter. We sow here, we reap hereafter ; but if eternal life is possessed now, then the reaping comes too soon--before the sowing has been done. We have eternal life *in promise* here but *in possession* hereafter, as expressly stated by Paul in Titus 1:2: "In hope of eternal life which God, who cannot lie, promised before the world began."

Verse nine: With such good prospects for eternity the Galatian brethren were stimulated to *be not weary in well doing*--that they should not allow their energy and zeal to flag--for *in due season we shall reap*: that is, as in the natural world there is the waiting for the harvest, so the *due season* for this *reaping* is the time to receive the everlasting or eternal life; but it is conditional, on the provision and expressed stipulation that we do not lose heart and quit.

Verse ten: While the season for the sowing lasts it is imperative that all should make useful every favorable juncture of circumstances for the doing of what is good unto all men, without and within the church, but with due priority to them that are in the family of God: *As we have*

therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith. This doing of good unto all men does not refer to the doing of some good deed, as a Boy Scout's one good deed daily motto, but rather the doing of what is good, as the means to an end, in concern for all men. The verse does not specify benevolence and it is not limited to it, but the all inclusive *good*--what is good, in the perspective of attaining certain ends for the salvation of all men. May the church do *anything* for *all men*, temporally or spiritually? If so, what *good* is included or excluded that the church may do? Name it, and separate it, and see that it will embrace any *opportune* thing as a material means to the spiritual end, but with partiality toward the members of the church.

The "saints only" contention that members of the church may not act collectively in the doing of what is good to all men--that is, non-members--in the deeds of benevolence, and that the upper half of this tenth verse is for individual performance, was conceived as a hard pressed strategy to make prohibitive collective contributions for the care of non-member children in an orphanage. But a comparison of other scriptures will expose this fallacy, only one or two of which will be necessary to mention. In 2 Cor. 9 :12-13, we read : "For the administration of this service not only supplieth the want of the saints, but is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God; whiles by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men (or unto all--ASV) ." Here is a liberal distribution made by the Corinthian church unto the saints *and unto all men*. But the ready answer is that the word men in this text is in *italics* in the old text, and is omitted in the American Standard Version--therefore the meaning of the passage is made to mean that this distribution of benevolence was made not only *unto them* (the Judean saints) but *unto all* (the needy saints in other localities). But apply that reasoning to 1 Thess. 5 : 13-15 : "Be at peace among yourselves ... support the weak, be patient toward all men. See that

none render evil for evil unto any man; but ever follow that which is good, both among yourselves and to all men." In this passage the word *men* in verses 13, 14 and 15 is in italics, so according to the specious argument on the Corinthian passage, the phrase "among yourselves, and unto all *men*" could be applied only to yourselves (members of the Thessalonian church) and unto all *men* (members of the church only in other places)--so the instruction to be peaceful, render no evil, and follow what is good, was limited to conduct of members with members, and with the outsiders they could raise a rumpus and do evil! Incidentally, the word *men* in Gal. 6 :10 is in *italics*, and if therefore the phrase "unto all *men*" means only unto all saints, then Paul instructed the Galatians to do good unto all the saints, especially the saints who are in the household of God!

Another example is 1 Thess. 3 :12: "And the Lord make you increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you." Again, in this text the word *men* is in *italics*, and according to the construction placed on the Corinthian passage, the apostolic instruction to the Thessalonians was that their love should abound toward "one another" and toward *all other* one anothers!

Another instance is Rom. 16:19: "For your obedience is come abroad unto all men. I am glad therefore on your behalf." Again, the word *men* in this passage is in *italics*, and the passage would therefore read "unto all." Indicating it meant *all men*, and not *all saints*, verse 20 mentions the persecution which they were about to endure because of the knowledge of this obedience had spread over the empire, and in the resultant persecution God would "bruise Satan" under their feet.

Still another reference is Eph. 3:8-9 where Paul mentioned his divine commission to "preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery." Connected with the word "all" here is the word *men* which is in *italics*, and according to the forced interpretation of the Corinthian verse,

Paul was guilty of an unlettered redundancy in saying that he was sent to preach to the Gentiles *and to all Gentiles!*

Surely these references are sufficient to show the fallacy of the interpreters of the misused Corinthian and Galatian passages and the futility of the effort to maintain the "saints only" theory of benevolence--which we repeat has been incubated in the mental hatchery of a group of factionists bent on binding their anti-orphan-home hobby on the brotherhood to the point of the bayonet of division in every congregation into which they force entrance either in person or through the printed mediums of their parrot papers. In all of the passages cited, and numerous others not cited, the word "all" in connection with the word men is from the same Greek word; and to show its reference is general in juxtaposition (placed side by side) with the special (that is, the saints and all *men*) Bagster's Englishman's Greek Concordance inserts the word "men" in brackets in all of these verses. In 1 Thess. 5 :15 "yourselves and all men" by no stretch of imagination could be made to mean "yourselves and all yourselves" ; in 1 Thess. 3 :12 "love toward one another and toward all men" by no imaginative exaggeration could be revised to read "toward one another and all one anothers"; and Eph. 9 :8-9 Paul's commission to preach Christ "among the Gentiles ... and all men" by no reach of reason could be manipulated to mean to preach "among the Gentiles and all Gentiles"; in Gal. 6:10 the command to "do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith" by no rational arrangement could be transposed in translation to imply that Paul urged the Galatian churches to "do good unto all saints, especially the saints in the church"--but if it is admitted that "all men" in the examples adduced as parallels it follows with all the force of the scriptures cited that in 2 Cor. 9 :12-13 the Corinthian administration of benevolence to the Jerusalem saints "and unto all men" affords no Proof for the "saints only" doctrine of benevolence. Why the *one exception* in the application of the phrase "all men"? There is but one answer--the need of a passage of scripture to accommodate the crudely concocted *saints only* doctrine of congregational beneficence.

In the premises of these comparisons there can be but one conclusion respecting Gal. 6:10: that the command to “do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith” is a *collective* duty and that it is not limited to *saints only*. The tone and tenor of the entire sixth chapter of Galatians pertains to collective duties and responsibilities. It is both reasonable and scriptural that when a case of benevolence is no more the obligation of one individual than another the duty becomes collective and the obligation is collectively discharged.

In 1 Cor. 21:27 the apostle said to a disunited church: “now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular” --that is, members *individually*, which carries the full implication and the necessary inference that individual duties of the members of *the body* are to be collectively performed. The view of the composite body of Christ presented by Paul in Rom. 12:4-8 comprehends the same principle: “For we have many members in one body, and all members have not the same office : so we, being many, are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another. Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophecy, according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering: or he that teacheth, on teaching ; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity ; he that ruleth, with diligence ; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness.”

These verses summarize the duties assigned the several members in the church, individually apportioned but collectively accomplished as a body composite. The allotted gifts embraced the sum of its congregational functions: ministry of the word in preaching ; teaching in the private and public instruction of the members ; presiding over the body as ruling elders with prudence ; showing mercy to the poor and the needy with cheer; and administering the finances of the church with liberality and impartiality. In these offices the benevolent spirit of the gospel is exemplified, even to the care of strangers incorporated in the teaching of Christ in Matt. 25:35-44. The assertion that these things were mentioned only as individual acts vitiates

both the mission and the function of the church, viewed in Rom. 12:4-8 as the composite body, classifying in it the functional and operational services all of the things mentioned. They were indeed single and individual assignments but were nonetheless in all of the aspects and perspectives of the text the collective and congregational performances of that composite body--the church.

Reverting now to the Galatian text of chapter six: if the effort to reduce the duty of doing good unto all men to the individual basis by the singular references to a man has any appearance of plausibility, by the same token it is reversed in the plural use of *we* and *us* of verses nine and ten--let *us* not be weary in well doing, but as *we* have opportunity, let *us* do good unto all men. The plural pronouns carry in it the evidence of individual duties collectively performed.

Concerning the issue of congregational assistance, a labored effort has been made to maintain the assertion that one church may not contribute money to another church for either benevolence or evangelism, which action in their definitions would constitute the *cooperation of churches*. Several related scripture quotations will clarify this point and eliminate it as an issue.

The first passage for reading and review is Rom. 15:25-26: "But now I go unto Jerusalem to minister unto the saints. For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a certain contribution for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem." In the American Standard Version the phrase "for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem" reads: "for the poor among the saints that are at Jerusalem." As these poor were *among* the saints, how could the far-away *individual* contributor know the name and address of the *individual recipient*--to whom were the contributions sent? Surely not to each individual beneficiary from each individual benefactor. There is the necessary inference for either an elder or non-elder intermediary agency--now, which would it scripturally be? If it is said that Paul was himself the agency, the answer is that Paul was only the carrier of the contributions from the point of origination to the place of its terminus, and it is not feasible that Paul

personally delivered these contributions to the individual poor among the saints in Jerusalem and all over Judea--and if Paul himself could have been the intermediary between the contributors and the recipients, what principle could bar the elders of the churches from performing such service? And that is exactly what the related scripture passages state and clearly show.

The connecting citations are 2 Cor. 8:19, 2 Cor. 9:2 and Acts 11:29-30. The first reference mentions that Paul "was chosen of the churches" to be the carrier of the contributions; and the forward readiness manifested by "them of Macedonia," which Paul commended in (2 Cor. 9:2) the second citation, had reference to the *sending churches* of the first passage (2 Cor. 8 : 19) ; and the intermediate receivers of the contributions from the *churches* of the Corinthian reference were the *elders* of the churches mentioned in the third citation (Acts 11:29-30) in the places where the poor brethren dwelt *among* the saints at Jerusalem and in Judea. As the phrase "them of Macedonia" in 2 Cor. 9:2 meant the sending *churches* mentioned in the preceding passage of chapter 8:19, so the Antioch disciples simply meant the Antioch church--and here is therefore the solid examples of churches sending money to churches for the work of benevolence in the various places where the needs existed, and from this conclusion there is no escape. The churches of Macedonia, Achaia and Antioch (Rom. 15 :25-26; 2 Cor. 8 :19-9 :2) sent contributions of money to the several elders of the numerous churches of Judea where the poverty prevailed--the terminal end of that cooperative endeavor. That is the very thing the leaders of the entitled anti-movement have all unanimously and relentlessly decreed that churches cannot do--but the New Testament affirms and thus confirms that they did it !

And behold now, the spectacle of retreat--in order to escape the consequences of complete encirclement and rather than surrender to the truth and cease the sowing of the seeds of dissension, discord and division, some of the notable extremists have introduced the alternative extremism of denying that benevolence in any form, to any extent, for

anyone is a work of the church. Verily, a strong delusion descends upon men who receive not the love of the truth.

Let me again say here with accentuated emphasis--that there is no discrepancy or disharmony between what I am now writing and that which I have before written in correct context and application. As remotely as the nineteen-thirties, and later, I personally published in the *Gospel Advocate*, and other mediums, articles of previous mention, in which reference was made to the permission of one church making a financial contribution to another church where this other church existed and where the elders had the right to oversee it. Passing through other mediums and some dishonest hands these and other articles were altered and diverted, by an editor who even placed a period in the middle of a sentence to force an opposite meaning, and I have been made to say in the past that one church may not contribute money to another church--a thing I have never believed and have never purposely penned, and which I could not consistently say in the face of the proof to the contrary produced herein by chapter and verse citation: and if in the past anything quoted from my pen could bear any construction opposite to the scripturally verified views of the present postulation, it must either be construed agreeably with the later presentations or else be disowned and disavowed, which no honest man should hesitate to do if the necessity were laid upon him.

Looking at this whole agitation movement, their *party principles* are based on such unwarranted conclusions without an appearance of scriptural premises that they are unworthy to be classified with intelligence much less with the claim for scriptural authority.

Third: The proposition that the requirements of James 1:27 necessary to adequate provision for fatherless children and ill-fortunate widows is solely an individual obligation, in which the church has no collective responsibility, is a postulation inconsistent with the contextual analysis of the chapter and the textual environment of the twenty-seventh verse.

This best known benevolent passage reads as follows: "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is

this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world.”

The epistle of James was addressed to the Jewish Christians of the dispersion, scattered throughout the Roman world in Gentile provinces. The exordium “to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greetings,” was the apostolic manner of addressing the whole church in a scattered state--hence, a general epistle addressed to all members of the church individually and collectively wherever found, and not to a single congregation. The “twelve” tribes in the Old Testament represented the whole of fleshly Israel ; and “the twelve tribes” in the New Testament is a designation for the whole of spiritual Israel--the true Israel of God now--the whole church of God, as applied by Paul in Gal. 6:16. This use of the “twelve tribes” is also adapted by Jesus in Matt. 19:28 when he advanced notice to his apostles-to-be that in the regeneration (the gospel dispensation) while he occupies the throne of his glory (in heaven) the apostles would occupy twelve thrones (of authority) judging (by apostolic teaching) the twelve tribes of Israel (the whole church of the spiritual Israel).

The sympathetic appeal of the apostle in behalf of the helpless fatherless or afflicted widow was not a mandatory order, inclusive or exclusive, in regard to the building of an *orphanage* or a *widowage* as such, scattered as they were in a foreign world and among alien people ; but it was an authoritative directive of general procedure, either individual or collective, requiring adequate provision for the wants of any in their society. To aver that this instruction was applicable to individuals only, having no relevancy to the church is an unwarrantable and unreasonable assertion. There are many instances when provision for the poor and orphaned is no more the obligation of one than of all. When the obligation is solely the individual's, so is the responsibility, and the duty should be individually discharged ; but when the obligation is collective, the responsibility is general and it should be collectively performed, which in this connection means as a body or congregation. “Now ye are the body of Christ, and members in particular” --members individually--1 Cor. 12 :27. Consonant there-

with is the truth previously pronounced, that some individual duties which the New Testament binds are collectively observed, examples of which are the observance of the Lord's Supper, the first day of the week contribution, and numerous other individual duties, actions and services rendered *en masse*, in assembly. (1 Cor. 11:28,34; 1 Cor. 16 :2; Col. 3 :15-16).

In the preceding discussion of the sixth chapter of Galatians these passages were shown to be pertinent to the principles involved and to be relevant illustrations of their definitions, and with due regard for them the controversial twenty-seventh verse, through an analysis of the chapter which it concludes, will disclose to the view of a casual reader of the context that James 1:27 does not specifically serve the present controversy.

The general term "the fatherless and widows" is a *synecdoche* (syn-ec-do-ky) , a form of speech in the New Testament which is so often used to put the part for the whole, and in this passage it is representative of a proverbial class, comprehensive of anyone in need, and therefore an exhortation to mutual dependence and assistance which was so imperative in exile conditions, inclusive of either individual or collective responsibility and duty but assuredly not exclusive of either. These facets of the chapter will unfold with an expository approach to the debated text.

Verses one to eight: The apostle James addresses his epistle to the church in its dispersed and scattered state in every part of the foreign world, in order to reconcile them to their conditions, exhorting them to be joyful in the midst of hostile heathen surroundings because happiness should not be placed in prosperity, but rather true joy could be found in experiences of trials, in the proving of faith by persecution, and in the resignation from which other virtues flow (verses 1-3) ; that such patience in its perfect work would be the source of a variety of virtues essential to that entire perfection in character which would enable them to withstand all opposition, lacking nothing in the qualities that such faith always imparts (verse 4) ; that if any among them felt destitute of the necessary wisdom to make effective

use of these conditions of affliction, through the possession of the spiritual gifts imparted they should seek divine guidance, for God knew their wants and would empower rather than upbraid in the weaknesses to which circumstances of the dispersion had made them liable--but the quality of patience in unrestrained and full operation would complete in them the virtues already possessed, and through prayer enable them to exercise discretion and to deal discerningly with all social and religious problems incident to their exile (verse 5) ; but all petitions to God should be offered in fidelity and trust, not with uncertainty and irresolution comparable to wind-driven waves of a storm-tossed sea--with the formalism of a faithless uttering of the words of a man whose mind is so changeable in purposes and actions that his course of conduct is dubious, for a man of such vacillating attitude toward God in the afflictions of exile cannot expect any response from the Lord to remove its miseries (verses 6-8).

Verses nine to twelve: The poor among the exiled brethren were encouraged to endure the more than ordinary hardships with a commensurate forbearance, knowing that in the lowliness of exile he has the exalted dignity of an heir of God (verse 9) ; but the rich who had exulted in a state of opulence should avoid depression over their humiliation in exile, for as the grass of the earth is by its substance fugitive, and the flower of it in essence is fleeting, so the accumulations of wealth are transient and the rich man himself in the nature of his material affluence is accordingly transitory in his way of life--the common vicissitudes of corporeal existence with all its exigent misfortunes combine to pale the grandeur of riches, and his estate vanishes (verses 10-11) ; therefore the poor and the rich alike would be more than recompensed for all of the losses experienced in the dispersion, if they would remain firm in faith by the endurance of the trials of exile and the temptations of heathenism, for they would thus attain the blessing of an approved standing with God whose promise to all who love him, more than mundane emoluments, would be the reward of life as his crown (verse 12).

Verses thirteen to seventeen: The critics among the

exiles in cynical distrust were disposed to blame God for their exiled surroundings and consequent subjection to the temptation of the lusts of the heathen life, but God's holiness made impossible the evil of seduction in any form under any circumstances (verse 13) ; rather, the sins committed in yielding to the sensual influences of the heathen world were voluntary actions as when a man is enticed to sin by the allurements of a harlot-in that similitude it is in the embraces of lust that sin is conceived and borne, as a birth which is the offspring of eternal death (verses 14-15) ; to conclude therefore that God is the author of sin is a deceiving error, for the source of all good in every realm, physical and spiritual, temporal and eternal, is above all that is terrestrial, and descends upon us all from God the Father in whom there can be no variant reflections of light and darkness cast by rotation, for God is only Light and in him the variations produced by modifications or change cannot occur (verses 16-17).

Verses eighteen to twenty-six: The Jews of the dispersion were the firstfruits of the gospel, being the first ones to be begotten by the word of truth, rather than the seed of their fleshly Israelism (verse 18) ; since all were thus regenerated by the gospel, one should be swift or ready to hear it, slow or hesitant to speak until he understands it, and to not willingly become the cause or occasion for increased persecution proceeding from the wrath of the enemies of true religion-for the wrath thus created among the heathen persecutors of the church could not work in them or others the faith in the gospel that is necessary to the righteousness or salvation which the gospel reveals (verses 19-20) ; of necessity therefore they should divest themselves of everything in thought, word and deed, in the nature of mischief that would accentuate persecution, and with spiritual poise accept the implanting of that word that had been preached by the apostles of Christ as a scion or graft in their hearts for the propagation of salvation (verse 21) ; but none should become victim to the deception of thinking that salvation could result from mere knowledge through the hearing of the word only, for that would compare with the man who viewed his face in a mirror and turned away

without any intention of ridding his countenance of the blemishes and who ignored his facial defects as though the spots did not exist (verses 22-24) ; rather should a man look into the perfect word of God in order to find the errors in his ways, and continue in God's perfect law as the only means for the correction of his deviations from it, not forgetting the word in the doing of the work that the word enjoins, for only in so doing can the blessings of obedience be received (verse 25) ; so in the teaching of the word which had been so profitably heard, the tongue must be always bridled by the word itself, for as the bridle is made for a guide and a means of control, so the teacher or the preacher must have his tongue bridled by the word of God, lest his erroneous teaching should be productive of false religion, which in God's sight is vain religion and therefore the teacher of it was in no way superior to religious heathen among whom they were exiled.

Verse 27: The essence of pure religion is intrinsic and unalloyed, not having been defiled by extraneous contamination of the heathen world, and the peremptory obligation upon all exiles who had embraced it was twofold--to continue sanctification in life in a heathen society and maintain the kind offices of benevolence in relieving the afflictions of all the poor and needy--and the doing of this pure religion will be the emulation of God who is the Father of all.

The meaning of James 1:27 has been missed and some uses made of it have been a misfire. The instruction to "visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction" had no reference to the orphan and the widow as such, but is a *synecdoche*--a figure of speech by which the part is put for the whole. The exhortation to visit one another in *affliction* cannot be restricted to the usual application. The fatherless are not *per se* orphans, and if so may not need shelter, clothing and food, which may have been fully provided, but may be very much in need of careful guidance, proper companions, with "the nurture and admonition of the Lord" (Eph. 6 :4) which the fathers were commanded to provide for his children--and this passage would apply there. The widow comparably may not need material

assistance or pecuniary aid--she may have neither a housing nor a financial affliction, yet she may need association, consolation and counsel--and this would be the application of the passage to her. Furthermore, the proportions of the need may of necessity as a compelling cause require congregational response. To contradict this conclusion would be a concession that the church may provide relief for every affliction of the fatherless or the widow--except money. Blessed money, hallowed money, sacramental money --the Lord's money, spend it on the preachers, their houses and their lawns, their comforts, vacations and cars-but not on the orphans!

Considering the passage in its contextual objectives it was an exhortation for mutual help in whatever needs existed in their dispersed state of Gentile surroundings in a heathen world, and the phraseology of "the fatherless and widows" was that figure of speech as common in our language now as it was in New Testament usage then--a form of rhetoric in which the part stands for the whole. The illustrations for this art of expression are so abundant that it is not a matter of searching but of selection. The verb *sail* is used as a noun for a whole fleet of ships. The folk word *fireside* connotes the home where one lives with its comforts, intimacy and privacy. The nutritive terms *bread* and *meat* are frequently used in the scriptures to denote food as a whole, or complete sustenance. (Matt. 4:4; 2 Thess. 3 :8--Matt. 6:25; Jno. 4:34; Acts 2 :46) In Matthew 25 Jesus used the figurative terminology of *hungry* and *thirsty* and *naked* and *sick* when the obvious meaning was provision for any existing need, as figuratively used in 1 Cor. 4:11 also. The substantive *hunger* in Prov. 19:15 and the verb *hunger* in Rom. 12:20 put the part for the whole; and Paul employs the limited term *flesh* in Rom. 3:20 to designate mankind. After the same manner of speech the diction of James 1:27 in the beneficent behest to "visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction" simply stood for a typical class of the distressed and the practical manifestation of unadulterated religion in meeting the emergencies of need. It is folly to affirm that obedience to this mandate was restricted to individuals

and that the church *as such* is therefore now restrained from any participation in the benevolence which the command enjoins. The entire setting for the apostle's concern for the indigent among the exiles, whatever the character of need or classification of want, was their interrelated social responsibility projected beyond individual duty into a general condition requiring a type of benevolent endeavor no more the interest of one person than another, the facilitation of which was therefore by a collective body, or *the church*, the operational and functional details of which not being prescribed cannot be legislated.

The existence and operation of orphanages for this reason cannot in themselves comprise a valid issue and have never been and should never become a cause for cleavage in the one body of the church. Nevertheless, guided by radical extremists some otherwise good and godly people have become disciples of discord, rallying around a group of "aginner" who verily by that description have distinguished themselves as *antis*, a stigmatic title which their personal conduct has earned.

But in the paths blazed by the pioneers of the true restoration movement on this continent we have invested too much of our own lives in effort and energy in the building of the church to let it be torn apart by a few unreasoning radicals in their personal ambitions for partisan position and power, and who have displayed a bad attitude and bitter antagonism toward the church, inventing issues in religion as a demagogue pleads patriotism in politics for personal aggrandizement and private gain. In so doing they have smeared the name and besmirched the dignity of the church all over the nation, wherever the seeds of discord have been sown or which the winds of division have blown. In the role of patriots pioneering a new restoration as guardians of the gospel and preservers of its principles, yet not one issue which they have espoused or expounded is representative of the real restoration movement, and no indictment which they have charged against the church has the character of doctrinal deviation or congregational corruption. They are totally devoid of a valid issue and they do

not possess and cannot propagate one distinctive restoration principle of which they blatantly boast.

The real restoration principles consist in the elements which the pioneers and patriots of the church were preaching before extremists were begotten and their extremisms conceived--in the apt words of the Psalmist, "conceived in mischief and brought forth in falsehood." The apparent severity of these strictures does not imply any purpose to castigate the conscientious people who have been inveigled into the whirlpool of this imposture under the specious cognomen of *a new restoration movement*. It is rather with sincere design to reclaim them from "these who separate themselves" from the church, and to retrieve youthful preachers "as firebrands plucked out of the burning," and in this dutiful attempt to also rescue "some who are in doubt. . . . snatching them out of the fire." It is a faithful and fervent plea, an impassioned personal appeal to turn from this direction of inevitable ruin, renounce the lordly leadership of these party-heads, and return to the church.

These dissenters appear to be dissatisfied that the body of the church has grown greater in its proportions than the group within the circles of their own prominence and to forestall the loss of prestige and escape obscurity in the jealousy for position they have formed a faction proportional to their leadership and commensurable with their command, and their whims rule the roost.

VII. CONCERNING PREVIOUS PUBLICATIONS

Under the caption "A Compendium Of Issues," Number Two of my monthly periodical *Torch* in 1950 was devoted to the discussion of these current topics of discussion. There have been quotations and misquotations of this treatise, omissions and deletions, applications and misapplications, and an unauthorized reproduction and distribution of it by some unethical individuals who will stoop to any low level and employ any unmoral method of chicanery as a means of falsely associating me with the current defection and to thus further their evil end of local discord and division. The seeds of this insurgent confederation of factionists

had not headed when *Torch* was issued, and the *Compendium Of Issues* was not published with any motive of lending aid to such a development, and no one knows this fact more surely than the designing men who attempt to so use it. The purpose of the *Compendium* in the *Torch* was rather to serve as a restraint, a checkrein, on certain projects and promotions in which there were and yet are existent potential perils to the church, a thing recognized and granted by men of reputation in the church who were never identified with nor have ever had any respect for the radicalism. Similar editorials were penned by me in the *Gospel Advocate* twenty years before these later articles were written, all of which had the indorsements mentioned, and not until the factious party was formed was there any attempt made to classify my editorials and treatises with the current defection.

An example of what my attitude toward orphan homes has been through the years is clearly evident in editorial statements such as the following, which appeared in the *Gospel Advocate* in October 1932, entitled, *Concerning The Potter Orphan Home*.

The statement inserted below appeared in a recent issue of the *Christian Leader* in criticism of an article in the *Gospel Advocate* which was intended to be a commendation of the Potter Orphan Home. We do not think the writer meant any reflection on the good men who have formerly managed the Potter Home, and certainly the *Gospel Advocate* did not intend such in the publication of it. We took the brother's statement, not as a criticism of the men who have superintended the home in the past, but as an opinion that preachers generally are better fitted to preach than to run such institutions. But since the publisher of the *Christian Leader* has construed the statement as carrying a reflection, we gladly insert his correction and make it ours by an unreserved indorsement of all that he says of the good men who were the predecessors of the present superintendent of the Potter Home.

The Potter Home ranks as one of the best-managed institutions of its kind anywhere. Everything about it is apparently as near to the ideal as such an institution could approach. The home atmosphere; the tender interest and

affection and training the children receive ; the substantial, homelike buildings and beautiful grounds--in fact, everything about it is beautiful; and to observe these children would remind us that the children of *some* parents we know would not be *unfortunate* in a home like this.

There are many good people in the land who have not been so fortunate as some of us, in that no children have blessed their union, and who, perhaps, for valid reasons do not find it expedient to adopt children. What better thing could such people do than "adopt" one or more of these children by paying for their shelter, clothing, food and training, just as they would have done for one of their own? To do so will be a threefold blessing. It will bless those who do the good deed; it will bless the child who is the recipient; it will help to lift the heavy burden from the shoulders of those who have unselfishly made themselves responsible for the care of homeless children.

Through this home, and others like it, the opportunity is afforded good people who cannot take children into their homes to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord"--by proxy. Thus we justify the existence of such institutions as an adjunct of the family--an auxiliary of the home--supplementing the work of parents. They are not "church institutions," but "home institutions," and all good people should be interested in them.

The foregoing insertion, with numerous other articles available, are in evidence that I have never in the *Gospel Advocate* of earlier years or the *Bible Banner* of later years classed an orphan home with the Missionary Society, and no one can successfully do so. My references to comparing a benevolent board with a Missionary board, as has been explained herein, applied to the Christian Church Board Of Benevolence--a general organization to which churches contribute, the funds of which the board apportions to the various institutions of their denomination. This general board is thus between the churches and the fields. No such thing nor anything like it exists among the churches. There is no board that so functions. The home itself *is the field*--there is no second destination or third party involved--the contribution is made to the place or field where the need is existent.

Supervision is not an issue. If the church contributes to the need of children of a private home, the parents or

guardians stand between the church and the needy--the principle of *structure* or supervision is the same.

The term institutionalism as used in my own writing was then applied to the college-in-the-budget of the churches --and a clear distinction was made at the start between an orphan home and a college, for the reason that should be apparent to all--that secular education is not within the work of the church, whereas benevolence is a requirement. And as observed there is no parallel between the Missionary Society and an orphan home, nor in the Christian Church Board of Benevolence and the orphanage. Both the Board of Missions and the Board of Benevolence stand between the contributing churches and the field, or places, where the funds are apportioned by the respective denominational boards. But the orphan home does not stand between the churches and the field--*the home is the field, the place or destination of the contribution, where the orphan is*, and there is no board of apportionment to another second or third field. Certainly no issue could be made of the supervision of the home, whether private or public. The supervisors or directors of the home are no more an issue than the structure of a private home, for in either case *the home is the end*, and therefore the field itself.

In my writings I have stood in consistent opposition to the colleges in the budgets of the churches and have signalled existing dangers and potential deviations posed by certain projects and promotions, but in the whole course of opposition to these abuses I have never opposed an orphan home or their public or private support. It is not I but my critics who have changed.

The previous articles and editorials in the *Gospel Advocate* of 1930, of the *Bible Banner* from 1938 through 1940's, and in *Torch* of 1950-51 have not been disowned, but the right to apply them is claimed, with the reaffirmation of their basic truth, and with the disclamation of any intended aid to an *anti-party*, and with the disavowal of any concession to its doctrines. In reference to the much publicized 1950 issue of *Torch*, the following observations are in order as a statement of facts:

1. It was plainly stated, that one or more churches may send money to another church where there is need of assistance in benevolence or in the preaching of the gospel.

2. The joint-efforts of churches in gospel meetings, in which the writer himself has been the preacher, was plainly indorsed and reaffirmed as a scriptural evangelistic endeavor ; and it was mentioned, as having a bearing on this point, that in the New Testament in some instances reference is made to *the church* in an area by the use of the singular term.

3. The long time practice of all-day singing and preaching services, attended by providing tables of food on the premises, either outside or inside the buildings according to convenience, after the order of the old-fashioned "dinner on the ground," was approved, somewhat with nostalgia--a longing for the old times! And there was not a word or a syllable in the treatise in favor of the dedication of church buildings, or the making of money or material property sacramental.

4. The treatise nowhere condemned the practice of general benevolence to needy non-members of the church within the opportunity for good in the Gal. 6:10 reference. There was no indorsement of "the saints only" doctrine.

5. There was no condemnation of orphan homes--it was not an *anti-orphanage* treatise, and there was no opposition to the necessary care of children in homes for orphans, a thing which in the past the author has always defended and supported.

6. Both the individual and the collective duty and responsibility of the members of the church, according to the circumstances and the nature of the obligation, were fully recognized.

7. The criticisms of *institutionalism* were directed at increasing dangers of college domination and control of the churches through budgetary encroachments and various demands made upon the churches--and against the general concept of church-owned-and-operated institutions--but

the distinction has always been made by this author, from his earliest writings, between the orphan home and the college, the former being a work of benevolence which is a work of the church; the latter being a business of secular education which is not the work of the church.

8. The whole point of caution was, is and shall continue to be, against the involvement of the churches in the ownership and operation of secular enterprises, organizations and businesses--and to warn them against the over-shadowing and dominating influence of the colleges over the churches. Therein lies the danger--and such a potential danger has never existed in the whole history of an orphan home.

9. The *Torch* issue of 1950 was a statement of general principles, intended as a word of warning against all promotions and projects and programs getting out of bounds, a danger that is yet a reality. But the present lately organized "anti-orphan-home party" did not then exist--it had not been spawned--and the *Torch* which was published nearly twenty years ago, cannot honestly be claimed or adapted by them. To do so is an act of dishonesty.

With renewed emphasis we repeat now that the colleges (including the college-institution of the "antis" themselves) are the real and actual institutional danger--not the orphans. Present developments justify past fears. Their right to exist has not been denied, a thing repeatedly affirmed--but the apparent movement to bring the teaching and practice of the preachers and the churches within the domination and control of the college professors through the agencies and departments of the colleges is a threat to the churches.

A casual or cursory review of that *Torch* issue will show that the whole and sole purpose was to alert brethren generally to potential dangers in extremes of certain promotions and projects--potentialities which yet exist, but which do not offer cause or excuse for the opposite extremes or for the existence of the radical party.

It is plain and easily seen by any one not looking the other way that there was no condemnation of orphan homes and no parallel drawn between an orphanage and

a missionary society, as efforts have been made to do. It has been repeatedly stated in every medium that I have ever published or employed that they are not the same. The same is true respecting the issue of the colleges in the budgets of the churches--each and every time that issue has been forced from 1935 until now it was rejected--and as all informed people know, we opposed it and are still opposed to it--but we also showed that the college question and the orphan issue are not the same.

The orphanage is a *home* institution as previously shown. That it has a *structure* is not denied--but so does any home--private or public--have a structure, and could not exist without it. But *supervision*, or even *structure*, is not a perceptible issue. On the principle that a church may expediently contribute to a needy private home, it would at the least be assuming a tedious task to affirm that the same church could not contribute to an orphan home.

VIII. RESTORATION MOVEMENT AND PARTY FACTIONS-- PRINCIPLES VERSUS WHIMSEYS.

At the turn of the eighteenth century there was originated a latent movement that was destined to shake the foundations of both Roman Catholicism and Orthodox Protestantism on the American continent. It had incipience in the work of Barton W. Stone at Cane Ridge, Kentucky, as early as 1790, and was augmented by Alexander Campbell at Washington, Pennsylvania and Bethany, Virginia in the early 1800's; and by his intellect and energies within a few years "the restoration movement" grew in unparalleled proportions--within fifty years to an estimated body of a million members, and in the next century well over three million people had accepted its aims and purposes and openly espoused its principles, being designated as churches of Christ and known only as Christians or as Christians only.

In the path of the progress of this mighty movement there were many obstacles to overcome in the form of prejudices and oppositions from without, but the greatest hindrances to its overwhelming success have stemmed from

factional divisions within its ranks, consisting of digressive innovations on one hand to radical whimses on the other--the former resulting in the development of the separate body denominationally known as The Christian Church alias The Disciples Of Christ, and the latter in various factions bearing the stigma *antis* in the defections of the anti-Sunday School, the anti-college and the anti-orphanage segments, all of which factious varieties flourished, faded, and flopped. Between these extremes of liberal digressions and radical anti-isms the church itself has maintained an equilibrium--a state of balance between opposing forces and influences. As a result the exodus of the Christian Church evolved into a superfluous Protestant denomination, without distinctive principles to warrant its existence, and the intermittent internal factional "movements" which have been periodically flaunted, temporarily flourished, but one after another floundered--the inevitable end of factions within the church.

In this succession of so-called movements, from Somerism down to the current anti-isms, in the North and East and in the South and West, they have contrived to capitalize on "the restoration plea," but in every successive episode from the first to the last they have all alike been unable to distinguish between constituent elements of the restoration plea and the notional individual whims of the party agitators--and the issues have been reduced to distinctions between *principles versus whimses*.

The principles consist in a set of ten scriptural propositions: (1) The all-sufficiency of the Bible as the rule of faith and practice as the basic truth; (2) the deity of Jesus as the only begotten, virgin-born, Son of God ; (3) that faith in Christ, as the Messiah of the Old Testament and the Saviour of the New Testament, together with obedience to all gospel commands, constitute the full conditions of pardon or salvation from sin ; (4) that baptism, or immersion in water, of penitent believers in (into) the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit is for (in order to) the remission of sins ; (5) that in conversion the Holy Spirit operates only through the truth, the Word of God, never without it--a proposition sustained by

every recorded case of conversion ; (6) that the formation and government of the church must be in accordance with the divine pattern set forth in the inspired models ; (7) the proper observance of the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week assembly of the church ; (8) the refusal of any element of worship, such as incense, candles, organs, mechanical instruments--that every element of worship is specified in the New Testament and has not been left to human judgment or uninspired expediency; (9) the rejection of all sectarian names on the scriptural ground that the Bible *only* makes Christians *only*; (10) the repudiation of all denominational and party creeds, accepting the New Testament alone as the only divine creed. To these principles we stedfastly adhere without exception or deviation, deferring to no man, conceding to no set of men a greater degree of devotion, allowing none a higher claim of allegiance, fealty or fidelity to these inherent and distinctive truths of the real restoration movement.

The present-day modernism consists in the Neo-Orthodox Movement being sponsored in England and America respectively by the World Council Of Churches and the National Council Of Churches and being implemented respectively by the New English Bible and the Revised Standard Version. These organizations and their versions are representative of the latest modern Higher Criticism, which was signally fought to the finish in the earlier days by J. W. McGarvey, the echoes of which battle resound even yet in his writings in this field in such available books as *Biblical Criticism*. The emboldened audacity of the late Higher Critics of these perversions in the guise of new versions is observed in the desperate effort of the translators to discredit the authorship of the New Testament books and to thus destroy the integrity of the text and the basic doctrine of the verbal inspiration of its autographs. This effort was confined largely to the books of the Old Testament, and on this battlefield J. W. McGarvey received world recognition in his devastation of the old modernism of the same school of Higher Critics; but the late effort has centered on a destruction of the New Testament by the recent translators of the new versions, such as Dodd and Goodspeed, whose repudia-

tion of the books of the Old and New testaments and denials of their authenticity are in the record of their writings, by book, chapter and line.

The book entitled *The Authority Of The Bible*, by C. H. Dodd, contains the statements of the author himself that parts of the Bible are pernicious ; that God is not the author of the Bible; that Moses was a legendary figure who never actually lived; that the vicarious death of Jesus is not rational ; that Jno. 3 :16 is mythological --the expression "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son" is not real, but *anthropomorphic* and mythological--and this man Dodd was the head of the translating committee of the *New English Bible* and represents the views of all the translators.

The dominant influence on the translating committee of the *Revised Standard Version* was Edgar J. Goodspeed, and in his treatises entitled *Translations To The Reader* and *Introduction To The New Testament* he dogmatizes: that the epistles of Paul were not written by him but composed by anonymous writers long after the death of Paul: that the epistles of Peter were pseudonymous, written only in his name by someone else after his death; that James may have been merely suggested by someone as having been the author of his epistle and that his name was attached to that book by someone else for a pen name and to give it prestige; that the epistles of John were not written by the apostle John at all but by an unknown elder and that second and third John have little or no meaning that could merit their preservation or survival; that the books of Timothy and Titus were not written by Paul but by a man named Marcion who wrote them in Paul's name from mere scraps of Paul's hand after the death of Paul, and that both the author and the recipients of these *pastoral epistles* (Timothy and Titus) were assumed. He pens the positive assertion that the book of Matthew was composed by an unknown author who appropriated the name of Matthew ; that Mark need not have been written at all, and that Luke did not write either the book of Luke or the book of Acts--and in these statements Goodspeed reflected the views of the entire committee of translators of the Revised Standard Version. This is Higher Criti-

cism at its worst, and the enigma of it is that its product--the Revised Standard Version--has been accepted by so many of our own college professors in Bible Departments and adopted and required as the Bible text.

Thus the leaven of this iniquity doth already work and has recently been observed in public utterances and signed statements of some of our college professors that Isa. 7: 14, which the new version changed from *virgin* to *young woman* was not a prophecy of Christ anyway, and had its fulfillment in some "contemporary" event in the Old Testament time--yet Matthew 1:22 quotes this prophecy with the declaration *that it might be fulfilled* in the birth of Jesus. It is said that Matthew referred to it only as an illustration--but Matthew did not merely refer to it, he *quoted* it and pointed out its fulfillment in the words *that it might be fulfilled*, then it *had not been* fulfilled, and the word *that* it might be fulfilled expresses the condition of its fulfillment in the *virgin* birth of Jesus the Christ.

On the same principle the Higher Critics have claimed that Jesus used the reference to Jonah in Matt. 12:39-40, not as a reference for indorsement but only as an illustration, and by that token every quotation of a prophetic event quoted from the Old Testament in the New Testament can be divested of meaning and robbed of its fulfillment--and that is exactly the aims of Higher Criticism, and this is a sample of its incipient inroads in our colleges among some of the Bible teachers.

Another example is in the labored effort to eliminate the sacred words *only begotten* from the reference to Son of God in Jno. 3:16. We are told that the word *begotten* refers to a human act and cannot be applied to deity, or a direct act of God. But in order to be physically born it was necessary for Jesus to have a physical begettal to exactly the same degree as a physical conception ; and the simple fact is that the God who created two persons (Adam and Eve) and placed within the two *persons* the potentiality of reproduction exercised that same power to plant in one person (the virgin Mary) that same potentiality or power. In the Greek word *monogenes* (mono-genes, only begotten) this direct implantation was expressed. But we are now told that the

use of the word *monogenes* (only begotten) is a mistake, so the new translators divide the word mono-genes, retain the first half of it (only) and throw the last half (genes) out the window! The one-hundred-forty-eight of the world's greatest scholars in England and America retained the word *monogenes* of the Greek text and translated it in both the old versions *only begotten*. There is no later scholarship that can offset it, and the result of such an effort by our college professors can only result in destroying the confidence of many thousands of people in the integrity of our Bible text. When the Christian Church preachers attempted to bring instrumental music into the church on the use of the Greek verb *psallo*, with devastating effect we reminded them, and all who heard and read the discussions, that *the one hundred forty eight* translated the *psallo* in the New Testament to sing. Comes now some within our ranks who would defend the modern school of Higher Critics in the effort to eliminate *only begotten* from the text of Jno. 3 :16. The translators of the *Amplified Bible* substitute the word *unique* for the phrase *only begotten*, yet they claim that Joseph was the physical father of Jesus and that he was conceived out of wedlock--which strikes me as not being very unique according to modern statistics! At the best, which is also the worst, it insults Mary and blasphemes our Lord Jesus Christ. It is worthy of note at this point that this same *Amplified Bible* which substitutes the word *unique* for *monogenes* (only begotten) connects the mechanical instruments with the *psalloying* in Eph. 5:19. And this "new Bible" is being recommended to the members of the churches of Christ! The brethren need to be awakened from complacency and excited to action in a situation that has an effect on their student-children similar to the teaching of the doctrine of theistic evolution.

For fifty-five years I have preached Jno. 3 : 16, and I yet believe and still preach that "God so loved the world that he gave his *only begotten Son*" and it will take more than the late Higher Critics of the new versions with any help they may muster from Bible professors on the faculties of our colleges to deprive me of that blessed declaration--and by the elimination of Jno. 3 :16, as it reads, the preaching of

any man claiming to be a preacher of the gospel of the Son of God will be so impoverished as to be destitute in its consequences of the saving power embodied in the golden text of the Bible. If we must begin all over again to teach the children that the golden text has been wrong, they must learn it anew; and if *only begotten* must be taken from the golden text, the same word must be ripped from all other similar passages of which there are several--in so doing in the process of removing the heart of the golden text we will have mutilated the New Testament and emasculated the gospel of Christ.

The sayings of the recent Bible professors on the faculties of our colleges on these points have the sound of a repeating by rote like a parrot the writings of the Higher Critics who have authored the new books falsely called new bibles. It is enigmatic indeed, beyond all that can be explicated, that our college men can descry the scientific errors of the evolutionary hypothesis in contradistinction with revelation as destructive of faith in God, but have failed for some reason to recognize the Destructive Criticism of the Neo-Orthodox modernists embodied in the text of the new versions of our Bible. A further limited discussion of these perversions will be included in the last chapter of *The Gospel For Today*, and in a forthcoming book on the perversions of the new versions entitled *A Review Of The Revised Versions* many passages will be placed side by side in proof of the charge that they are destructive of the Word of God, and that old reliable passages which have long been used in defence of the truth against the multiple errors of denominational dogmas have been destroyed in the rewritten forms of these mistranslations, misnamed versions.

Now the foregoing excursus is the embodiment of the modernism confronting the churches of Christ, which is not in apposition with but opposition to the restoration plea. But the whimseys of this *radical restoration* (of Sommerism) consists in the four points of whimsical absurdities that have been aforementioned and listed. It is sheer nonsense for these agitators to traverse the continent shouting *modernist* at every one and *liberalism* at every church that will not accept their extremisms and embrace their whim-

seys. The fact that the things that are now called *the issues* by them are only the same things that have been in operation among the churches since the real restoration movement has lived, moved and had its being on this continent--things in which these party leaders and agitators themselves participated until recently, and not until this new party movement was planned were these things even thought of as issues. Therein lies the *primie facie* proof of the deliberate design to form a new party--only a few years ago not one of their leaders believed what they propagate now--and they are in the way, a major hindrance to our efforts to stop the incipience of modernism in the brotherhood. The men of this party have changed, their college changed, its president changed, its professors changed, its board of trustees changed, their editors have changed and their papers change with every issue and their debaters change from one debate to another--but as diversionary tactics, as a smokescreen to cloud their own changes, they charge that the rest of us have changed! They declare as mission fields the municipalities where the churches have ever been and yet are the bulwarks of the truth against denominational error, areas that have been the battlefields of the century for the restoration principles--and with a combination of outside sources in cooperative efforts they pour money into such presumptuous operations, all the time loudly declaiming against *cooperation*, yet doing all that they condemn, from the domination of their own college over the churches within the range of its influence to their own methods of cooperation in their campaigns of agitation. "Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the same things."

It is regrettable that liberalism in various phases and forms, grades and degrees, has edged into some colleges and churches among us, but the radical party is not a solution to this problem--it is an obstacle in the way. The men of the *anti-movement* are a hindrance to the protection of the churches against modernism--the unreasonable extremists

obstruct sensible efforts to resist modern innovations and their clamorous conduct lends aid to liberalism.

The ominous conditions encircling society are no less menacing to the church. It is no time now for dissensions and separations--the plea for a united front is imperative, calling the phalanx of young preachers and all reasonable people to lay aside the temperamental whims of shallow and superficial issues, reject the dissident defectors, abandon their disruptive defections, repudiate their party, and "let no man deceive you" or lead you away. "This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men." (Tit. 3:8)