THE DUSSELDORF PAPERS

Jere E. Frost

Some Communist rules for revolution were captured by Allied forces in May of 1919 at Dusseldorf, hence, "The Dusseldorf Papers." The contents of these papers become more interesting when it is realized that they still constitute a part of the scheme of the religio-political system called Communism. When viewed beside American society today, and most particularly its youth segment, they are nothing short of stunning and staggering as the long range and once seemingly unreachable objectives of these enemies of truth and righteousness are realized and become a part of the street scenes of our cities and hamlets. Many of the young and not a few of their mod and erratic elders smugly defend and even applaud the rebellious spirit, long hair on boys, unisex, and women’s lib. Most of these are probably unaware of the forces responsible for the open defiance of authority and the revolutionary break from basic and long established codes of moral decency and social decorum; understandably such deny the influence and even the existence of the Dusseldorf papers or any clandestine purposes such as it outlines. Nonetheless, the papers were real. They are real today. I have obtained a photostatic copy of these rules for revolution over the signature of Florida's State Attorney (11th circuit, Dade County, 1953-1956), George A. Brautigam. These rules were also circulated by Florida Congressman (7th district) James A. Haley in his Washington Report of May 23, 1969, of which I also have a photostatic copy. Here are those rules as copied from Attorney General Brautigam's report along with the note he attached and signed.

COMMUNIST RULES FOR REVOLUTION

A. Corrupt the young, get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial, destroy their ruggedness.

B. Get control of all means of publicity and thereby:

1. Get people's minds off their government by focusing attention on athletics, sexy books and plays and other trivialities.
2. Divide the people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.
3. Destroy the people's faith in their natural leaders by holding the latter up to contempt, ridicule and obloquy.
4. Always preach true democracy, but seize power as fast and as ruthlessly as possible.
5. By encouraging government extravagance, destroy its credit, produce fear of inflation with rising prices and general discontent.
6. Foment unnecessary strikes in vital industries, encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of government toward such disorders.
7. By specious argument cause the breakdown of the old moral virtues, honesty, sobriety, continence, faith in the pledged word, ruggedness.

C. Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext, with a view to confiscating them and leaving the population helpless.

NOTE: The above "Rules for Revolution were secured by the State Attorney's Office from a known member of the Communist Party who acknowledged it to be still a part of the Communist program for overthrowing our Government.

My interests focuses on points A and B7. I am not nearly as concerned by the purely political aspects of the other items, though their becoming realities in our country is most striking, to say the least. The battleground of the all-out struggle for the hearts of the young is pretty well described in these points. Let us not ignore the de-emphasis of religion by deification of science and education, and by the social gospel, nor let us fail to see the tides of sensuality and glorification of passion, nor be blind to the sickening effeminacy in the appearance and manners of so many boys and young men. The enemy is at work. These trends cannot be ignored away; they must be
fought back and repulsed by the proper and bold use of the word of God. The Scriptures are not only relevant to today’s issues, but they are actually the only solution and salvation.
MAKING HAVOC OF THE CHURCH

Saul of Tarsus is first introduced to us as an enemy of the cause of Christ. He consented to the death of Stephen and vigorously took part in the great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem. Acts 8:3 describes Saul's actions in these words: "As for Saul, he made havoc of the church, entering into every house, and dragging men and women committed to prison." The ASV renders the verse thusly: "But Saul laid waste the church, entering into every house, and dragging men and women committed to prison."

W.E. Vine's Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words defines the word lumainomai as "to maltreat, outrage."

After Saul was converted at Damascus he preached Christ in the synagogues, "that he was the Son of God." (Acts 9:20). "But all that heard him were amazed, and said: Is not this he that destroyed them which called on this name in Jerusalem..." (Acts 9:21). The ASV says: "And all that heard him were amazed, and said, Is not this he that in Jerusalem made havoc of them that called on this man?"

This word is from portheo, which W.E. Vine defines as "to destroy, ravage, lay waste, is used of the persecution inflicted by Saul of Tarsus on the church in Jerusalem, (Acts 9:21, and Gal. 1:23..." Paul said in Galatians 1:13 that "beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it." In the ASV he said: "beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and made havoc of it."

In Galatians 1:23 those in Judea who knew not Paul by face had heard "that he which persecuted us in times past not preacheth the faith which once he destroyed." KJV. The ASV renders it: "He that once persecuted us now preacheth the faith of which he once made havoc."

What is obviously meant by making havoc of the church is the persecuting or destroying of both the faith (doctrine) and those who believed it. To lay waste is to render to nothing. This was the work of Saul until he came face to face with the Christ whom he sought to destroy.

Individuals in the church now are not maltreated physically as Saul did, but they are spiritually mutilated by grievous wolves in sheep's clothing. Almost every congregation has its own internal agents laboring to make havoc of the church. There are many ways by which havoc is being made of the church today. I mean exactly what the scriptures meant by the words which are translated by "havoc"—destroy, maltreat, outrage, lay waste, and persecute. Many ways are being used to accomplish this goal, but three are prominent in my mind as I write this.

LACK OF SPIRITUALITY

The almost complete lack of spirituality on the part of bishops, preachers, teachers, deacons, saints and all, make it obvious that some force has been at work making havoc of the churches in the land. I lay no claim to having all the answers to this serious problem, but I think I know some of the reasons for it. For ten to fifteen years brethren have been seeking "some new thing"; some gimmick by which to attract numbers and compete with the denominations about them. Little by little the great distance between truth and error has been closing, so that now in many areas there exists no longer a scriptural difference between the people who were the Lord's and the denominational world.

The pseudo-intellectuals are the leaders of the attacks that make havoc of the church. More and more emphasis is being put upon schools and education and less and less upon the nature and function of the church. Although many educators vehemently deny the truth of the Bible, they are very quick to use the Bible when it suits their purpose.

I seldom go to the post office that I do not get some announcement of some "workshop," "forum," "dialogue" or some such meeting for the purpose of finding a compromise among dissenting brethren. These are almost always arranged and directed by schools and educators and their influence has its impact upon those who assemble.

In the absence of inspired apostles who could and did deliver the decrees of the King in heaven, there is not an ounce of authority in the New Testament for such conduct. Paul, Barnabas, Silas, Timothy, Titus, Peter, John and all those of the first century "debated" and "contended for the faith" with all comers, both in the church and out. They spoke boldly the word of truth and cared nothing for the wisdom of this world. They "disputed" in the market places, synagogues, and streets of the towns they entered. They were, for the most part, considered unlearned and ignorant men (Acts 4:13), but those who heard them took note that they had been with Jesus. This makes the difference!

I know a few men who have attained the highest recognition in the educational field, but have always recognized the difference between the wisdom from above and worldly wisdom. On the other hand, I know hundreds who have thrown over the wisdom from God in favor of the wisdom of this world. This is where the spiritual drain originates. Spirituality has been virtually lost in many congregations because the preachers and elders are so enamored with the worldly wisdom and devices of "smart" men that the tricks of drawing a crowd and making them like you are being used to replace the powerful preaching of the pure simple gospel of Christ that makes a sinner realize he is lost and headed for hell.

In case you get the idea that I am opposed to education, let me make this one thing clear: I am certain that God expects every man to prepare himself to the
fullest to do the best work in life he is capable of doing. But this does not mean that education of this world will ever save one sinner from his least sin. It is only important in making a livelihood and serving mankind in some better way.

**NO RESPECT FOR DIVINE AUTHORITY**

The complete lack of respect for divine authority is making havoc of the church. I can well remember within my lifetime when a statement from the word of God usually settled a matter between brethren, but now many do not believe in the verbal inspiration of the scriptures. They even debate that we do not need authority for all that we do. Many even become involved in great projects without ever thinking to inquire whether it is authorized by Christ. This is the reason we have had all the trouble with institutional questions, unauthorized works by the church, and the involvement of the “Christian” schools with the church. The determination of most school men to get the schools into the treasuries of churches (several have now admitted doing this for years, but they have carefully kept it from the brethren), creates one plan after another to get this easy money. As far as I know Florida College and the school at Athens, Alabama are the only ones not now accepting funds from churches. About all the rest are accepting church funds and even soliciting it with the same zeal from churches. About all the rest are accepting funds and even soliciting it with the same zeal as they did a few years ago for orphan homes. Now the men who then strongly denied their belief in church funds and even soliciting it with the same zeal as they did a few years ago for orphan homes. Now the men who then strongly denied their belief in schools being supported by churches are now yielding to the pressures of the great force of these in high authority; and I must say here that these are in authority against Christ.

Another place where this lack of respect for authority shows up is in the organization and function of the church. I am amazed and sickened at the number of churches now who have no elders and do not want them. They make the excuse that they have no one qualified, and I guess this is so in many respects. But I wonder why they did not do something about the preachers and teachers who for years did not and still will not teach the sound doctrine on the need for elders and deacons and try to help men become qualified by being more spiritually minded. Where is the New Testament authority for the “voting” machinery and “committee” systems that have supplanted the scriptural assignment of most of this work to bishops? I am anxious to learn why “sound” churches (when we are talking about institutional problems) ignore divine authority and build a human organization within the church called “The Business Meeting” with all its parliamentary officers and rules. This unscriptural organization functions with the power which often excels anything scriptural for elders, and when one asks for authority, the best I have ever heard is: “How else can we do it?” The same question of the institutional church supported orphan home is asked when they say: “The Lord told the church to do it, but did not tell the how. How else can we do it?” I do not see much difference so far as divine authority is concerned.

If you charge that I am giving aid and comfort to the digressive brethren on the institutional problem, you missed the point. I am in no more sympathy with their disregard for divine authority that before; I am just putting others who have no more respect for God’s authority in the organization of the church in the same class. This is what is making havoc of the church today.

If you ask why brethren are doing this, I know of no better answer than to say that they have more respect for human wisdom than for divine authority.

**CONFORMING TO THE WORLD**

The conformity of the church to the world is complete surrender. Romans 12:2: “And be not conformed to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God.” More and more the language, dress, conduct, principles of right and wrong that are ruled by the prince of the power of the air, the god of this world (Eph. 2:1-3; 2 Cor. 4:4) are being accepted by the professing disciples of Christ. Moral decay is everywhere.

Where is the standard that once branded a liar just what he was and called upon him to repent of it or be disciplined by the church? What happened to the divine principle that children are to obey their parents, and that fathers are to bring up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord (Eph. 6:1-4; Col. 3:20,21)? Now the rules are changing: the church is conforming to the world, and the world is making a mockery of God and His word. When it reaches the point that a Christian cannot be distinguished from those of the immoral world by his speech, dress, habits, company, family life, and religious claims, who can deny that these are making havoc of the church?

It must rest upon the people like you who read these words with interest to do something about it. There must be a strong, strict, scriptural discipline initiated in hundreds of churches who have not known one case of discipline in two or three generations. Those who do not love the Lord and do not want to serve him faithfully must “be put away from among” the church (1 Cor. 5:13); “taken away from among you” (1 Cor. 5:2); “deliver such an one unto Satan...” (1 Cor. 5:5); and “withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly...” (2 Thess. 3:6). Before this can be done effectively done in some places it may be necessary to do something about the cowardly, faint hearted, untaught elders, preachers and church members who are afraid to undertake this obedience to God "because we will lose members" and "just stir up trouble." No member was ever lost or trouble stirred up by obeying God. The trouble was already there and the members were already lost. It must take obedience to God’s will in this regard to save these. They are making havoc of the church and something must be done about it. Everything done in word or deed must be done by the authority of Christ. (Col. 3:17).

**HAVE YOU RENEWED YOUR SUBSCRIPTION?**

**DO IT TODAY!**
QUESTION: Recently quite a disagreement arose among us over the matter of letting little boys make singing particulars in a men's training class. We discussed the differences of singing hymns being worship one time but not being worship another time. Some affirming it to be alright to use an instrumental accompaniment at home while singing hymns and of course others denying this. It is believed by some that if one denies the little ones right to lead singing in the class he must not let him offer thanks at the family meal either. Is it scriptural to sing praises unto God with an instrument at home but unlawful in the church? Perhaps you can draw a summation of the ideas and answer this in the paper. We would appreciate something from you. Thank you very much. — E. E. H.

ANSWER: Worship, like every other requirement of God for which men shall be judged, demands, first of all, accountability. However, not all service unto God is worship. Worship involves homage, praise, and acts of adoration. Worship unto God involves three essentials: 1) The right object (God), 2) the right spirit (attitude), and 3) the right act ("in truth"). This is established by the following: "God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth" (John 4:24).

One can practice and train for both service and worship, but such would not be worship. Worship must not only be "in spirit and in truth," but must also be directed unto the right object, namely, God. One might think, reason, plan, and even memorize a prayer to be offered in worship whereby he leads the whole congregation in prayer. (This is not to endorse prayer by rote.) Such preparatory efforts, however, would not be worship.

In a training class of the church, some member of the church might lead the group in prayer and song. This would be worship. However, everything done thereafter or during the class session might not be worship, depending upon whether or not all three of the essential elements mentioned above were involved in the things done. Some things done might be mere practice or preparatory in nature. Hence, not being offered as worship — not being directed unto God, it would not be worship. Song practice is not worship. Such is a means by which we prepare ourselves to offer acceptable worship in song unto God.

Such training classes should be designed primarily for members of the church as a means of edifying itself. However, younger persons (the unaccountable), in my judgment, might participate on the grounds of such being incidental to the purpose of the class. Such could, no doubt, receive some good commensurate with their ability — with a view to assuming full responsibility when they become accountable. Else, how can we justify their singing in a regular period of worship? I recognize, of course, that, primarily, the responsibility for training such rest upon parents (Eph. 6:4).

Concerning children offering thanks for the family meal, it is my judgment that such is preparatory to worship on their part. It is one way by which the parental responsibility to bring children "up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord" (Eph. 6:4) is fulfilled in part. While the unaccountable child sustains an acceptable relationship (safe, not lost — therefore, not an alien) unto God, this relationship ought not to be confused with accountability and its responsibilities. Such action on the part of the unaccountable child is simply a part of his training. Perhaps the best method to follow in this instance would be for some Christian to offer thanks, then, in addition, let the child offer thanks, as a matter of training.

Concerning singing praise unto God with an instrument of music, it matters not where it is done — whether at home or in the church (assembly), if it is offered unto God — directed unto Him as the object — it becomes an effort to worship. Then, all the essentials of acceptable worship apply. A lack of either would make for vain worship (Matt. 15:9). This, however, does not mean that song practice at home is the best period for practice. Songs may be sung at home for practice or for other reasons, right within them-selves, and such not be worship. In such instances, the essentials of acceptable worship have no application. I'm persuaded that instruments of music may accompany such singing — in some instances it may be a great aid to practice. I realize that caution must be exercised so as to avoid leaving the wrong impression, namely, confusing such with worship. Let no one think, however, that an instrument as an aid to practice argues the case of an instrument as an aid to worship. Aids (expedencies) in worship must first be lawful (I Cor. 10:24). There is such a thing as an unlawful expediency. It might be expedient, from one point of view, for some to observe the Lord's Supper on Wednesday instead of Sunday. If so, it still would not be scriptural — no matter how expedient. Expediencies must be within law, and there is no way to put Wednesday within law, namely the first day of the week (Acts 20:7).

Some people have a deep love for poetry. They can listen to or read poems for hours, and do so with deep joy and appreciation. Some of these poems express spiritual truth, e.g., "CROSSING THE BAR" by Tennyson. This, however, does not preclude their being read or heard except in worship. I believe that such can be read and heard for pure personal enjoyment without such being either worship or sacrifice. Furthermore, setting this poem to music and singing it for the same reason, even to the accompaniment of instrumental music, does not make it worship or sacrifice — not until it is directed by the individual unto God as worship. This poem along with many others have been set to music and are often sung in worship unto God. When so directed, all the essentials of acceptable worship apply, and care should be exercised not to violate any particular.
"HARD QUESTIONS — NO. 5"

Our question for this month has to do with the age-old question of baptism. A number of Baptist preachers have asked this question, so I will not attribute it to only one. The question is, "Since you teach that a child of God can fall from grace, when he returns to be restored, why don't you baptize him a second time since he is still a sinner?"

To the sectarian mind this is a very hard question in that he thinks of salvation in an entirely different way than the child of God. For example, he thinks of salvation as being eternal salvation the moment one believes. He has never differentiated between salvation from past sins and salvation in heaven. I understand why he thinks that consistency demands that we baptize a man the second time if he is in sin. If the Bible had been observed this would be a very simple question. The scriptures make it crystal clear that such passages as Mark 16:15,16 and Acts 2:38 are talking about salvation from past sins and not salvation in heaven. It is true that we have many passages which deal with salvation in heaven but the context always make an easy diagnosis. In Acts 22, when Ananias was sent to Paul he said, "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." It must be observed that he was told to "wash away his sins", not that he was saved in heaven. Later, at the close of Paul's life he said, "I am ready to be offered — Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness" (II Tim. 4:6 -8). It is made very clear that the salvation alluded to in this text is eternal salvation. Therefore, the answer to the above question is obvious. The scriptures teach that the alien sinner is to be baptized only once. If he is baptized according to the scriptures, baptism will never be required again. However, he may sin many times as a child of God and it will be necessary for him to repent and pray. The finest example of this is in Acts 8. Here Simon who had bewitched the people with sorcery was saved and later tried to buy the gift of God with money. Peter told him to repent and pray (Acts 8:22). It will be observed that he was not told to be baptized again but rather to repent and pray. So the answer to the question is that it would be a violation of scripture to baptize a child of God every time he committed sin.

Another case in point is Acts 19. In this text we read of some people at Ephesus who were baptized the second time. Some people object to saying they were baptized the second time. However, since the word "baptize" means to inundate or dip I have no objections to saying they were baptized twice. After all, we have many different baptisms mentioned in the Bible. One must keep in mind that these people at Ephesus had not been baptized correctly and therefore had to do it over. They had been baptized under John's baptism which was not valid at that time. It would not be unscriptural to baptize a man who had been baptized a dozen times if all his former baptisms were not in accord with scripture. I have baptized people who had been immersed three or four times before. Bible baptism demands a scriptural subject — a penitent believer; a scriptural element — water; a scriptural action — immersion; and a scriptural design — for the remission of sins. Gentle reader, it is too important to jeopardize your soul with a man-made baptism.

"KURIAKE HEMERA: "LORD'S DAY" OCCURRENCES"

In one respect, the expression "the Lord's day" is similar to such words as "Bible," and "Christian." Although the word "Bible" is spoken often by Christians, the English word "Bible" does not occur in the Scriptures. The word "Christian" is one of the most common words in the Christian's vocabulary; yet, the word "Christian" occurs only three times in the entire Bible, Acts 11:26; 28:26; I. Pet. 4:16.

Similarly, the expression "Lord's day" is uttered frequently; yet, the expression occurs only one time in the sacred text, Rev. 1:10. However, the term translated "Lord's" (kuriakos) occurs in one other passage, I Cor. 11:20. In this passage the term occurs in the expression "Lord's supper."

KURIAKOS, "LORD'S"

Thayer comments that kuriakos is "an ecclesiastical word." We know now, however, that the term occurs in early, non-Biblical Greek papyri. (See Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, Moulton and Milligan.) The term kuriakos was used commonly in the sense of "imperial" to describe finances, feasts, etc. It even occurs in the phrase "Emperor's (kuriakos) day." Some scholars think that this latter usage may have led to the use of "Lord's day" as opposed to "Emperor's day."

Apparently, the term kuriakos attaches some very singular and peculiar characteristics to whatever it describes.
WHAT DAY IS IT?

The Bible does not say that the "Lord's day" is Sunday. However, many Bible scholars believe that such is the reference. Post-apostolic writers almost without exception refer to Sunday as the "Lord's day."

It is this author's judgment that the "Lord's day" in Revelation 1:10 does, indeed, refer to Sunday. This peculiar reference to Sunday is probably because of the significant episodes that are associated with Sunday.

WHAT HAPPENED ON SUNDAY?

According to the Biblical text, Jesus was resurrected on Sunday. This is expressly affirmed in Mark 16:9. The expression "in the end of the Sabbath" that occurs in several passages (Matt. 28:1, etc.) might literally be translated "the Sabbath just having passed."

It is further evident that the church of the New Testament spoken of by Jesus in Matt. 16:18, etc. was established on earth on a Sunday. This is affirmed in light of this author's view that the Jewish Pentecost always occurred on Sunday.

It is clear from Acts 20:7 that the disciples of Christ came together on Sunday ("the first day of the week") to "break bread"; that is, to observe the Lord's Supper.

The above-mentioned episodes (and possibly other things) make it very fitting that Sunday should be referred to as "the Lord's day."

BRETHREN UNDERSTAND THE TRUTH — OR DO THEY?

The director of the local Boy Scouts of America sent me a copy of an article which appeared in a Scout magazine. The article was entitled, "Scouting among Churches of Christ." It was written by Ira North, minister of the church in Madison, Tennessee. He said:

"We have received many requests for information about Scouting in the Churches of Christ and particularly about the BSA program at the Madison Church."

He then proceeds to praise the Scout organization for offering "one of the greatest opportunities that we have today for developing character in young men." I have no objection to the good work done by the Boy Scout organization. Of course the home and church should have the greatest influence upon the children, especially the children of Christians. Brother North said:

"We believe there is a plan whereby individual members of a congregation of the Church of Christ can have a Scout troop and at the same time violate no principle of scripture or conscience and have the goodwill of the entire congregation and community. The plan simply stated is this: organize, finance, and operate the troop on an independent basis. Have your charter made to a 'Group of citizens of the congregation of the ---------------- Church of Christ.' This is the plan we have used at the Madison church and it has worked beautifully and harmoniously."

I disagree with the expression "congregation of the Church of Christ" for it is redundant and unscriptural. It implies that the universal church is composed of congregations. Isn't a congregation a church? Would it be right to say "a church of the Church of Christ?" If the above expression is correct, why not say that?

I agree with his teaching that all such work should be done on an "independent basis" separate and apart from the church, and that such procedure violates "no principle of scripture or conscience."

"J. L. Hunter, one of our oldest elders, made the point that while we recognize the tremendous good the Scouts do and the need for our boys to participate in Scouting, he did think it should be operated independently by interested citizens and not as a work of the church. He said: '... we do not believe the Scout organization should be tied into the operation of the church, since both are separate organizations — the Scout organization is a human institution while the church is a divine in-
institution. The church being a divine institution, it will admit of no added institutions or auxiliaries. Those interested in the restoration of New Testament Christianity, doctrine and practice can readily understand why Churches of Christ carry on only such programs for which they can give a Bible example (Evangelism, Edification, and Benevolence). However, without the violation of this concept our boys can enjoy the great benefits of Scouting and that under devoted members of the Church of Christ.

It is obvious that brethren North and Hunter can see the difference between individual action and church action, and between the church and a human institution. That's wonderful! I wish that they could get that simple truth across to some preachers and brethren whom I know and try to teach. Wouldn't it be wonderful if these and other brethren would apply these sound principles to the benevolent institutions and similar works which have caused division in the church?

According to the logic and advice of these brethren, if benevolent institutions were operated on a private enterprise basis and independent of the church, such would violate no scripture or conscience — and they are right! It is certainly scriptural for brethren to operate any private institution which is morally right, and if support of "our" benevolent institutions was left to independent and individual action, brethren in congregations would never be forced to violate their conscience. That's exactly what many of us have advocated as a means of operating benevolent and edification institutions scripturally and peaceably.

To apply brother Hunter's teaching, we would see that the church is a divine institution and that all others are of human origin and should not become "added institutions or auxiliaries." He also understands what the work of the church is, and that such social works as Scouting do not come within the purview of its divinely authorized mission.

I truly wish that the article had ended here, but it did not. Notwithstanding what had been said, brother North proceeded to explain that the Madison church had furnished its building and facilities for the activities of a Boy Scout troop, and had used the pulpit to explain and promote the work. He justified such by stating that they had on occasion loaned their building to various civic and labor groups in town who needed to borrow a meeting place. He said that he made the following proposition to the Madison elders: "I will take the responsibility of raising financial support of the Scouts and of securing all the leadership. It will not cost the church treasury a penny, and it would not cost the elders any time or drag them down in any way in details, or take anything away from the program of the church."

I fail to understand how brethren can contend that something is not a work of the church, cannot be financed by the church, nor under the oversight of the elders, yet the church can furnish and maintain its facilities for such work. Will someone explain to me how the church can provide the facilities for something which is not its work, and how such is not a contribution to that work?

That is the same kind of inconsistency which we see in brethren who SAY they oppose church support of colleges while furnishing church facilities for various college activities. We have an example of that here in the Little Rock area. A group of brethren formed a corporation for the purpose of operating a private secular school which is being conducted in the building of the Sylvan Hills church of Christ. The elders of that church, the preacher, and several other preachers who endorse the school have all stated that they oppose church support of schools and colleges. I have called upon them to explain how they can endorse the practice of the church furnishing the facilities for a secular school and oppose the church making a monetary contribution to the same school. I'm still waiting for an answer.

As has been true in so many ways through the years, we need to let our practice catch up with our preaching! History reveals that when such discrepancy is finally recognized, brethren usually change their preaching to fit their practice.

One final statement from brother North: "Thus I explained the program to the congregation from the pulpit. However, I made it clear that the peace and harmony of this great church was more precious and important than any matter of expediency, and if there was any objection we wanted to know it."

That is certainly a commendable attitude. If brethren had followed this principle, instead of insisting upon church contributions to controversial works (which they described as a matter of expediency), many congregations which have been divided would now be working in peace and harmony. "Let us therefore follow after the things which make for peace, and things wherewith one may edify another" (Rom. 14:19).

---

WE CAN ALL HELP BROTHER PHILLIPS

Thomas G. O'Neal

When Searching The Scriptures was first started I was asked to write for it, but I have not written every month. However, every month I have paid for a number of subscriptions to this paper. Others have done likewise.

The editorial in the October issue shows the need for some additional help with the financial burden accumulated over the years in publishing the paper. Each year of its publication I have been aware of its need. Brother Phillips has done a first class job as editor, many have been the compliments to him from many places of the good that paper has and is doing. This paper can be taken out of the "red" and put in the "black" over night, so far as the personal burden on Brother Phillips is concerned. If every person who reads it and has been blessed in any way during its publication would take the time to send just $1 to Brother Phillips when you renew or send in a subscription, to retire the debt of publication, this alone would get the job done.

I do not believe in asking others to do what I am not willing to do. With this article also goes my check. This will work if every person mentioned will send $1 with his subscription or renewal to: H.E. Phillips, P.O. Box 17244, Tampa, Florida 33612. Do it right now before putting this copy of the paper down.
The experience described above was tragic for at least two reasons: most of the students in the class were unable to distinguish between fact and fantasy in the professor's lecture, and the professor himself displayed a woeful ignorance about the patriarchal period of Old Testament history. At least, if he was aware of the amazing accuracy of the Genesis records with respect to customs and practices current in the ancient Near East, he allowed his bias against divine revelation to cloud his presentation of the material.

EVIDENCE FROM THE DUST

Excavations at Ur by Sir Leonard Woolley during the years 1922 to 1934 revealed that an advanced civilization flourished in the southern region of the Tigris-Euphrates rivers at least 2500 B.C. "Ur was a town with a complex system of government and a well-developed system of commerce, one with writing in common use for the issue of receipts, the making of contracts, and many other purposes. They were town drains, streets, two-storied houses, a great temple tower (ziggurat), trade routes joining the town with other great towns to the north and the south, and various other evidences of a highly developed civilization" (J. A. Thompson, The Bible and Archaeology, pp. 15, 16). The Sumerian culture also developed a sophisticated system of mathematics and produced advanced linguistic studies. "Clay tablets have been found which list Sumerian words with their Akkadian equivalents. There were lexicons before Abraham! So Abraham was not at all primitive nor did he live in a primitive society... The problem is now that almost too much antiquity has been studied, and there is so much history to be mastered before Abraham's time" (R. Laird Harris, The Seminary Review, XVI, no. 1 (Fall, 1969), p. 4). Near Eastern archaeological excavations have yielded over one million clay tablets from Mesopotamia. Two ancient sites, Mari and Nuzi, have produced material especially useful for Old Testament background. In the next article some of this material will be discussed. Why should one be constrained to talk about the "myths" and "legends" of Genesis when the events of the patriarchal age fit so beautifully into the cultural period between 2000 to 1700 B.C.? 
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THEM LANDS AND CUSTOMS

Molvin D. Curry, Jr., 299 N. Willowick, Temple Terrace, Fla. 33617
FIGHT AGAINST PORNOGRAPHY
James D. Bales

Something can be done about the flood of pornography which tries to drown both body and soul. What shall it profit America if she has clean air and water, but her soul is polluted by lewd literature? What does it profit to clean up the atmosphere and lose one's own soul? As certainly as good literature can influence people for good, bad literature can influence them for evil. The mind thinks on what the mind feeds on, and as a man thinketh in his heart so is he. Adultery can be committed in the heart as mind feeds on, and as a man thinketh in his heart so is he. Adultery can be committed in the heart as well as with the body (Matt. 5:28; I Cor. 6:15-20).

However, in many cases there are those who do not know what to do to fight against pornography. One can find some helpful suggestions, as well as news concerning what is being done, from Morality in Media, published at 487 Park Ave., N. Y., N. Y. 10022. It is published by people from several different religious bodies and their newsletter costs $1 per year.

Saraland church of Christ, 712 Shelton Beach Rd., Saraland, Ala. 36571 — The church here at Saraland, Ala. (near Mobile) has a tent for sale and would like for you to announce it in Searching the Scriptures if you would. The tent has a seating capacity of about 200. It has only been used in 8 gospel meetings and is in good shape. We are asking $300.00 for it, this includes everything but seats. If anyone is interested in buying this tent they will have to make arrangements for shipping.

J. T. SMITH MOVES

J. T. Smith will be moving from Louisville, Ky. to begin work with the Northside church of Christ in Conway, Arkansas on Feb. 1. Conway is located about 30 miles west of Little Rock on Interstate 40. Anyone passing that way is encouraged to stop and worship with us. The building is located at 1800 Harston Avenue in Conway. The phone number is 329-8735.

Eugene Britnell, Little Rock, Ark. — Thanks to the good Lord, 1971 was a busy and fruitful year for me in the Lord’s work. I preached 187 times (including 16 gospel meetings) and spoke on 161 radio programs (110 of them 30-minute). In addition, I taught classes, answered hundreds of letters from radio listeners, published two monthly papers, and tried to write for two others. Our work at Arch St. church continues to make progress. Brethren, let us heed the Lord’s admonition: "Lift up your eyes, and look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest." I have just returned from a meeting in Berea, Ohio. Brother Tom Hughes, a professional writer and editor of a trade magazine for his company, says that Searching the Scriptures is the best paper published! He said that not only the contents, but the workmanship is excellent. Thought you’d like to know that.

Guy McDaniel, P.O. Box 2364, Muscle Shoals, Ala. 35660 — We are interested in purchasing some used pews to be used in our new classroom addition. If there are any churches in our general area which have used pews for sale, please advise them to contact us.

T. N. Thrasher, P.O. Box 1941, Decatur, Ala. 35601 — Religious Debate: There will be a public discussion between T. N. Thrasher and Richard C. Craft on Jan. 24-25, 1972 in Decatur, Ala. The subjects to be discussed are: first night, number of persons in the Godhead; second night, Holy Spirit baptism. The sessions are scheduled to begin at 7:00 each night in the building of the church of Christ, Old Moulton Road, Decatur, Ala.

Religious Debate: Drew E. Falls will meet Mr. Hugh L. Tubbs of the United Pentecostal Church in public debate on the Godhead and Holy Spirit baptism questions on Feb. 7-8, 10-11, 1972. The first two nights will be in the building of the Hanceville church of Christ, Hanceville, Ala.; the last two nights of the debate will be in Jasper, Ala.

M. E. Strouss, 425 E. Washington, Lisbon, Ohio 44432 — I am in the second year of labor with the church in Lisbon, Ohio and have the following to report on our progress in the Lord’s work here. Despite purchasing a house for the preacher and assuming his full support, we are self-supporting after one year (that is, we are no longer reducing the small reserve fund), have had three gospel meetings with one response (four other baptisms and three restored during this period), have scheduled a singing school for the first of the year, have improved our Bible study program (including home studies and a new-converts class), have had elders selected and appointed, have a weekly newspaper article and a semi-weekly bulletin as additional ways to preach the truth.

3:20-4:00—Irvin Himmel—Unusual Challenges of the Christian’s Life. All are invited to attend these lessons.

J. Edward Nowlin, 3004 Gena Dr., Decatur, Ga. 30032—After 20 years in the Atlanta area and 13 years with Glenwood Hills church, I have resigned, effective Jan. 1, 1972, and am planning to move to Perry, Fla. The church in Perry is small and very much in need of a man to preach the gospel in that town. A liberal element pulled out several years ago and established themselves on the south side of town. Brother Otis Jordan left Perry more than a year ago, and home forces have been carrying on since. They have a small house for the preacher, and can furnish about $50 a week for car and utility expenses. They are now erecting a new building to replace the old frame meeting house at 714 North Calhoun St. and their financial outgo is heavy. However, I believe that the congregation can be made self-supporting again within three years. Since we have a son living in Perry, I have a special interest in that work.

My plan is to obtain time on the local radio station, publish a bulletin, and preach the gospel publicly and privately. I intend to continue circulating a 26-lesson correspondence course on the Bible which I wrote and have been using for 20 years. I believe this program of work will produce results down there.

To do this work, I am doing something I have never done before in attempting to raise my personal support. I shall need about $600 a month from other churches, and am asking that you brethren consider sending me $50 or $100 a month, beginning in January, 1972, and continuing for a maximum of three years if you see fit. I will make a monthly report to all who send to my support.

Most any of the brethren connected with Florida College, Searching the Scriptures, or The Gospel Guardian, and many preachers, as well as the brethren here would know me if you wish to inquire. If you wish, I will visit with you at your convenience on week nights or week ends. Please let me know what you can do as soon as possible. The time is short.

Henry M. Myers, P.O. Box 243, Umatilla, Fla. 32784—I have worked with the church here in Umatilla since last April. We have had four baptisms, three have placed membership, two restored, the attendance has doubled and we are looking forward to greater accomplishments for the Lord in the coming year.

Leslie E. Sloan, 3090 N. Trezevant St., Memphis, Tenn. 38127—In the interest of the work of brother Haven Starr of N. Providence, R.I., I would like to run the following report and request from him:

There is a great need of a faithful gospel preacher in the Northeast. This is truly a mission field with the Lord’s church sparsely settled in this section of our world. We are trying to contact a faithful preacher of the gospel to move to this area to work in God’s Vineyard. If you or some one you know would be interested in moving here and accepting a challenge, please contact Haven Starr, 5 Garabaldi St., No. 8, N. Providence, R. I. 02911. Surely there is someone that will “come over and help us.”

Greensbury Church of Christ, Greensbury, Ky., 42743—Sound gospel preacher needed to work with small congregation. Must be willing to work in the community. Phone 932-4488. Area Code 502.

Edgar C. Walker, 2410 S.W. 14th St., Miami, Fla. 33145—I am now living and working with the Southwest church in this beautiful sunshine state of Florida, in the city of Miami. I left what I believed to have been a real good work in Dayton, Ohio with the Haynes St. congregation in that city, where there were seventy-four responses to the invitation while we were there.

We continue to look each month for the Searching The Scriptures. You are doing a good job. I hope and pray that you will be able to continue this fine work for many years to come.

Michael E. Grushon, Box 275, Hobart, Ind., 46342.

—The Hobart church of Christ conducted a gospel meeting the week of November 1-7, 1971. Jimmy Tuten of Tallmadge, Ohio was the speaker. During the course of the meeting eight souls were baptized into Christ.

Joe F. Nelson, P.O. Box 536, Jasper, Georgia, 30145—A faithful church is now in Jasper, Ga. We are located on Highway 5 just 2 miles out of Jasper. We are another small (in number) congregation that stands for the “ancient order” of New Testament work, worship, and organization. Our time of worship services are as follows: Morning Worship: 11:00 a.m., Evening Worship: 6:00 p.m., Wednesday service: 7:00 p.m. Phone 692-5669 or 692-2573.
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It has been suggested that much of the gullibility of brethren in receiving religious notions without proper Scriptural review is due in part to a failure in understanding the Restoration movement and its principles. While I had much rather emphasize the real problem, which is improper application of the Scripture, I recognize that some problems could be avoided if some were more informed on how these problems have been met in prior decades. One great value of studying Restoration history is letting it show us the ends of the roads we are travelling. I know, for example, of no really new position occupied on any major issue threatening the brethren in the past 20 years that had not been introduced in the decades before. Perhaps in a few cases some new wrinkle on some passage has been presented, but the issues have been the same, the arguments have been basically the same, and the results have been the same that they were a hundred years ago.

It is with pleasure that I have received and accepted the opportunity to present to the readers of this journal, perhaps with some regularity, a view of the fundamental principles of the Restoration movement which are reappearing in our day. I know of no other place to begin than with the basic attitudes of some of the leaders of that movement.

One of the most prominent preachers in the history of the church in Tennessee was Tolbert Fanning, founder of the Gospel Advocate (with William Lipscomb, elder brother of David Lipscomb).

Fanning was not a ruthless type of preacher, lacking love and loving dispute. Some said he preferred his Middle Tennessee farm to religious encounter and working with his cattle or riding his horses to debate which so often ended in personality battles. On one occasion when his opponent clearly referred to him as a "brute," he arose and left the hall not to return at all for the debate. But Fanning loved the truth and he would stand for it whenever and wherever he saw the need.

Sometimes Bible preachers have been categorized as preachers of hate, religious fanatics, or sectarian bigots. On a few occasions the terms have been fitly appropriated. Often, however, they are applied by those who do not appreciate deep love for the Word of God in men who insist that it be followed. Regardless of the love that may fill a man's heart and the desire for unity he may have, others will ridicule him if he is uncompromising and non-denominational in his preaching.

One such case in Tolbert Fanning's experience occurred in the years between 1836 and 1862, when he became troubled at the direction being taken by Robert Milligan, Robert Richardson, and other prominent brethren associated with a paper called the Millennial Harbinger, edited by Alexander Campbell. By that time the American Christian Missionary Society had been instituted and in a few instances the organ was being played in worship.

What Fanning saw in Milligan and the others which alarmed him had been born in the 1830's and 1840's when some Biblical basis was being sought for a proposed missionary society. In articles in the Harbinger, Robert Milligan, a very respected Bible scholar among Disciples, had claimed that the church cannot do the work God gave to it through local congregations. Therefore, he said, it must establish auxiliary societies through which to work. To Fanning the issue was not so much the society itself as the rationalization which allowed it. He saw a terrible danger in Milligan's saying that the New Testament does not present a "thus saith the Lord" for all things believed and practiced by the church. He had begun publication of the Gospel Advocate to allow a free exchange of views on the society question, but to Fanning it had never been questioned that the church could do what God had given it to do.

Milligan also asserted that the Bible is a book of mean-spirited and gotten together with the basic patterns. While he did not intend that this should necessarily be applied outside the subject of congregational cooperation, some of his admirers and students in the College of the Bible at the University of Kentucky took him to be saying that the New Testament was to be obeyed not in the letter but only in the spirit. They took up this chant and it led to complete apostasy by many in terms of the restoration appeal for a return to the Bible for religious patterns.

Fanning was appalled. When he attacked such reasoning he was said to be "ambitious" and without love. He was accused of desiring to lead out a new party. He was to many an exclusive, literalistic, Pharisaic bigot. But he loved the truth, and he loved man enough to warn him not to abandon Biblical patterns.

What Fanning saw in Milligan, Richardson, and the others, we are seeing today. What he experienced, we experience.

First, we are in the same position as was Fanning regarding Institutionalism. We oppose institutions that are church supported which care for either the very young or the very old and we are without love, some say. We oppose cooperative programs of the Herald of Truth type and we are too literalistic.

Second, the Lord's people stand where Fanning did on ecumenism. But those who oppose ecumenical movements designed to bring joint action with denominationalism are often ridiculed. We are exclusive sectarians, we are told. That's alright! God never did want his people fraternizing with the daughters of men.

Third, those of us who insist that union without Bible unity is not Biblical oneness are said to be Pharisaic bigots. There always have been, and so it is no surprise that there are several now, movements under way which would attempt to bring those who believe differently on basic Bible doctrines together without uniting them into one mind in
fact. The sophistry used is often persuading, but the father of it is the god of this world, and he knows how to work the men of this world. Paul ran into it at Corinth (1 Cor. 1-2); Fanning experienced it in reading some of Robert Richardson’s articles on philosophy; and we will face it around the next corner if it has not jumped out at us already.

Fanning could see where all their sophisticated reasoning was leading. He predicted very early a complete estrangement between the rivaling parties. Today, those who followed Milligan and other more liberal teachers through the years form the Christian Church Denomination (called a “denomination” by their own choosing). Those who were of the same mind with Fanning became simply Christians and formed themselves into churches of Christ. But another division has come in the churches of Christ during the last 25 years. Does not the former dispute and its results forewarn us concerning the end result of the present disturbance?

WORSHIP IN SONG

Thomas G. O’Neal

In a previous article we have seen the kind of songs to be sung in worship are spiritual in nature. The inner man, II Cor. 4:16, is strengthened by such spiritual worship.

SPIRITUAL WORSHIP

The Lord said, John 4:24, that our worship is to be “in spirit” as well as “in truth.” We understand that for our worship to be “in truth” it must be according to truth, which is the word of God (John 17:7). However, our worship must be “in spirit” which we understand to mean that our heart, the inner most feelings and expressions, are poured out unto the Lord. Each specific period of worship should find us so expressing ourselves to God.

Our worship should never become such that it is a ritual, that we so act toward God without thinking about what we are doing. However, it is easy for us to drift into such an attitude and our worship become not the expression of our heart but the form which we have repeated so many times.

EXAMPLES

In the song “Jesus Is All The World To Me” these words are found: “I trust Him now.” Often this beautiful old song is sung and we sing “I trust Him now” and yet do I really express my heart’s sentiments when I sing this? Do I really trust Jesus?

When a problem comes up in my life, do I trust obedience to the Lord to work it out or do I want to lean on the arm of flesh. If the latter, do I really trust Jesus?

“I will tell the wondrous story” are the words of the second stanza to the song, “I Will Sing Of My Redeemer.” As I sing these words are they really the sentiment of my heart, or have I sung these so often that I do not realize what I am saying?

The song “I Am Praying For You” contains some powerful words that I need to give attention to as I sing. That alien sinner that is in the service time after time, do I really express my heart to God and to him when I sing, “For you I am praying?” Have I prayed for him? As I sing this song, is there a prayer on my heart for his obedience? Or do I just sing without my worship being “in spirit”?

Do the words “Anywhere with Jesus, over land and sea, telling souls in darkness of salvation free” really express my thoughts when I sing them? Are they sung “in spirit”? Or do I sing them but am not interested in talking to one of my neighbors about his soul? If such is the case, then my worship is not “in spirit” is it? What about your worship?

“I love them no more” are the words of part of the second stanza of the song “A New Creature.” These words refer to the “old things” that “are passed” which are the things that allured me before obedience to Christ. Do I really feel this way about them as I sing, or would I still like to engage in the sins of the flesh? Have a drink? Gamble? Do I still love these things?

MELODY IN HEART

With the above examples I need to ask myself if I make melody in my heart (Eph. 5:19) when I sing? Is my heart harmonious with the great truths expressed in the songs? Or do I find a discord note with how I feel and what I am singing? Does my heart overflow with praise and thanksgiving to God for what he has done for me?

CONCLUSION

It is not enough to show others that worship is not to be ritualistic, but when I worship I must do so “in spirit” as well as “in truth” if God is to be pleased with my worship.

OUTLINES OF FLORIDA COLLEGE LECTURES 1968

Detailed outlines of each speech delivered at the 1968 Florida College Lectures, including 3 lectures on The Holy Spirit by Franklin T. Puckett, 3 lectures on the Problem of Human Responsibility and Organization by James W. Adams, 3 lectures on The Church — Its Nature and Structure by Roy E. Cogdill, and 2 lectures on Contemporary Prophetic Cults by Homer Hailey.

Price $2.00
THE CRISIS ON AUTHORITY

Open contempt for authority of all kinds and at all levels is alarmingly and distressingly obvious. The crime rate continues to mount new statistical highs year after year. "Civil disobedience" and "passive resistance" are popular expressions openly promoting disrespect for and rejection of authority, and they aptly describe the deliberate life style of a considerable number of malcontents. Vigorous demonstrations against established law are commonplace. A breakdown of major proportions has taken place in the homes of our land. Divorces for every cause abound. And in many homes where there has not been a divorce the wife and children reject the authority of the father (no "problem," for he does not want it!), the children rebel against both parents and seize a kind of independence, and usually an uneasy truce emerges in an unsteady democratic family state. The marital laws themselves come under attack with "free love" and some bizarre arrangements for cohabiting and child-care being seriously offered as alternatives and improvements. Churches also are undergoing a revolution in the name of relevance, old standards are being stuck down, and a power struggle is under way in several denominations. Even in churches of Christ voices have been heard boasting that we do many things for which we have no authority, and that, we do not necessarily need authority. This is the same voice of anarchy, and a pious face and lip-service to God does not alter the fact. A wave of novel concepts and practices have resulted, issuing in much confusion, division, alienation and aloofness. Authority, in a single word, is under a multi-pronged attack on virtually every front.

What is to be done about the problem? Shaking our heads in dismay, or wringing our hands, or talking about how it used to be and of what we are coming to, will not meet the needs of the hour. Nor will the crisis be met by our running around shouting "law and order" or pleading fervently for "respect for authority." This is what is needed alright but will just saying it to someone who loathes established and legitimate authority be likely to generate respect? Hardly. He who despises his nation's anthem and bows his head when it is played, or who hates the stars and stripes of his homeland and dishonors it by a degrading use, will not be won over by shouts of "love that song" or "love that flag." Reasons must be supplied. Before authority can be expected to be respected, it must be admitted; before it can be admitted, it must be recognized; before it can be recognized, it must be convincingly established. We cannot assume the very point at issue (in this case, authority) and just keep parroting our contention (in this case, that it should be respected) with much reasonable expectation that it will persuade a dissenter. The premise of authority must be reestablished. "Prove all things." (I Thess. 5:21). Most people (even anarchists) acknowledge the wisdom and need of certain laws, but deny that anyone (including God) has the right to tell them what to do. As one put it, "I will not obey a law in the making of which I had no part." Only if I had a part in its making, only if I see its wisdom, only when I agree to it will I obey a law! Arguing the virtues of an individual law is a waste of time with such a person for, even if you succeed, there is still no respect for law itself and the whole matter depending upon a purely personal option can later be as easily rejected. Further, it enthrones human wisdom as the judge of the law rather than rendering law the judge of the man. The whole issue must therefore be settled at its foundation—what is the basis for authority? What is its source and nature? We can meet this crisis on authority by assuming nothing, and by resorting to God's word for the foundation facts and persuasive proofs that enable us to know the what, the where and the why of law and authority. We can thereby go up boldly against all forms of anarchy, and more clearly hold to and plainly preach the lordship of Jesus.
Searching the Scriptures is now in the thirteenth year of service to a large number of readers. During this time H.E. Phillips has admirably edited the paper and has seen it through many tight places, financially speaking, and has not only kept it alive but has greatly improved it. Contrary to the opinion of some, the publishing of such a paper is not a financial gain. A number of friends from the start have helped to make the paper possible but the greatest financial drain has been on H.E. Phillips himself. This he has done because he believes the paper serves a great need. Evidence has accumulated through the years of the great amount of good being done through this effort.

But there is a limit to a man's resources regardless of his devotion to a worthy project. Not only so, but there is also a limit to how much strain one can take physically when financial worries mount. Brother Phillips has always given more of himself in whatever task he put his hand than was good for him physically. He has suffered several heart attacks. I am one of many who believes that Searching the Scriptures deserves to continue and that H.E. Phillips deserves the assistance of grateful brethren who, for years now, have b efitted from the wealth of good material this paper has presented each month for over twelve years. In the 1960's I was a regular contributor to the columns of this paper and counted it a pleasure to send the paper to 36 people each month for several years. My own writing responsibilities with Truth Magazine will not permit time to write much for other papers, but I am still interested in seeing this good paper live and serve. I am also interested in seeing some of the strain lifted from my esteemed friend and brother.

Here are some ways you can help. When you renew your own subscription, why not subscribe for a friend or relative. It makes a fine gift throughout the year. Consider sending the paper to so many a month and have the paper to bill you for the cost. Also, why not write brother Phillips a note of appreciation for his faithful work and sacrifice with the paper and enclose a donation of whatever amount you can afford. Brother Phillips did not ask me to say these things. They have been on my mind for sometime now. Many of us have benefited from his labors. Don't you believe that turnabout is fair play? ********

---
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THE KETCHERSIDE-TURNER EXCHANGE

On Tuesday evening, January 25, 1972, at approximately 10 p.m., following the lectures at Florida College, an overflow crowd assembled at the University church meeting house in Tampa, Florida to hear Carl Ketcherside and Robert Turner speak on the general theme of "fellowship." For the lack of a better word to express what took place I have used the word "exchange" to describe it. It was an arrangement tailored more to the preference of Ketcherside than to Turner. It was a "panel discussion" following a thirty minute speech by Carl Ketcherside and a thirty minute speech by Robert Turner. Other members of the panel were Ferrell Jenkins and Harry Pickup, Jr. Bob F. Owen acted as chairman or moderator as questions were asked from the floor and directed to some member of the panel. All questions were directed to Ketcherside except one which was directed to Ferrell Jenkins.

Perhaps others would approach this review in an entirely different manner, but I ask you to bear with me as I write candidly what my impressions of the meeting were as I saw it, and to say what I must say about the subject. I speak only for myself and am not particularly interested in pleasing anyone but God in this study. (Gal. 1:10)

Here and now I want to commend Carl Ketcherside on his pleasant disposition and congenial personality in presenting his views on fellowship. His kindness in attempting to answer questions and his winning smile overshadowed his dodges and evasions in directly facing up to the questions that were asked. This was certainly true in the minds of some who did not understand his real doctrine and the consequences of it. As a person, I have never met a more pleasant and kind man, nor a more dignified gentleman than Carl Ketcherside. But this does not mean that he is right religiously and to be received as a brother in Christ. His personality and appearance should not allow us to be deceived by his corruptible teaching and the consequences of it. The Holy Spirit said that Satan is transformed into an angel of light. "Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers also be transformed as the ministers of righteousness; whose end shall be according to their works" (2 Cor. 11:15).

I want it clear and explicit from beginning to end that I am not making an attack upon the person of Carl Ketcherside, but am directing my attention in this study to the false doctrine he teaches and practices. Since no error exists apart from some person, it becomes necessary to involve the person who espouses the error when exposing it. He must go down with the error or repent and be separated from it by the blood of Jesus Christ in obeying the truth.

Nearly all of the errors in the views held by Carl Ketcherside are based upon a misunderstanding, misrepresentation and misapplication of the figures used by the Holy Spirit in describing the relationship of the redeemed to God and the Saviour Jesus Christ. Any figure pressed too far or used in a sense that conflicts with other figures and plain statements in the word of God is not an understanding of the truth. Whether done ignorantly or deliberately, the consequences of such misuse of the scriptures has created all sorts of denominations and divisions among students of the Bible. Carl disavows any action or teaching that causes division among brethren, yet the very foundation of his false doctrine is the cause of all divisions: a misapplication of the word of God.

I believe brother Robert Turner hit at the very core of the error when he spoke of Carl's misuse of the figure of family relationship. From the tape of the exchange Robert said: "The family relationship, and, of course, the birth process that goes with it, is a figure of speech. Those who come into an acceptable relationship with God are likened unto a kingdom, and when you are talking about those people in terms of a kingdom, they are citizens. And the language that would go with teaching anything along that line is language that has to do with kingdom language. You are talking about a ruler. In fact, you are emphasizing the rule of God in Christ, and he is king, and so on. But when you are talking about these same people from the standpoint of horticulture, then those people are no longer citizens, they are branches. You don't have a vine with citizens on it. You have a vine with branches on it, because you maintain the use of the figure throughout. And Christ is the vine, just like Christ is the king in the other figure. When you are speaking in terms of an organism or a body, you are talking about the units as members of that body. You wouldn't talk about a body, referring to a head and then having branches, but having members. When you are talking about a building, Christ is the foundation or chief corner stone, and the units are lively stones. Now when you are talking about those same people from the standpoint of horticulture, the birth process that goes with it, is a birth process that goes with horticulture, not religion. But from a practical standpoint, getting right to the bottom of the thing, there is no difference in being a child of God, and a lively stone in the building, and a member of his body, and a branch on the vine, and a citizen in his kingdom."

This is exactly my understanding of the word of God. For a number of years I have discussed with various brethren the abuse of the figure of the family relationship in showing our relationship to God through Christ. Not all of the process of the "new birth can be compared to physical birth. The father-child relationship was never intended by the figure to exactly parallel the human relationship in all points. This is the reason I reject the idea of "once a child of God, always a child of God," just as I reject the idea of "once a branch on the vine, always a branch on the vine." These are all the same people in the same relationship to God, but described under different figures.

FIGURES OF THE CHURCH

The ekklesia of Christ (the "called out" by the gospel) are those people who have been saved, redeemed,
had their sins remitted, reconciled to God, justified, sanctified, purchased unto God, and various other expressions which tell the same thing: That through the merit of the blood of Christ and by obedience to the faith once delivered to the saints, man is delivered from the guilt and eternal consequences of his sins to the freedom from sin and the hope of eternal life with God.

All this is expressed in several different figures to emphasize one or more aspects of this salvation and new relationship to God. This ekklesia of Christ is called a body, a building, a bride, a kingdom, a chosen race, a flock of sheep, and other figures. Any lesson drawn from one of the figures that makes the others non-sense is not a proper use of the figures.

To illustrate allow me to take just one figure and show the limitations of it in the simplest way. We are baptized into Christ (Gal. 3:27). Does this mean that the act of immersion and emersion literally places one into the person of Christ who is at the right hand of God? But we are baptized into one body (1 Cor. 12:13). Does baptism literally put us into the physical or spiritual body of Christ, at the right hand of God? Certainly not! Into Christ means to be put into the relationship with him that provides all the spiritual blessings from God. Into the body means to be put into the relationship of the one "called out" community of people who are all in Christ in the same sense as just stated in the previous sentence.

Baptism is described as a birth. One must be born of water and of the Spirit (John 3:3,5). It is the washing of regeneration (Titus 3:5). It is the washing of water by the word (Eph. 5:26). Obviously, these are figures of a deliverance from one world into another. In literal birth one is delivered from his mother's womb into the world in which we live. Without this physical birth, natural or otherwise, one would never be in this world from his mother's womb. Error is created when this figure is pressed beyond this point. For example, the charge by some denominationalists that if we depend upon baptism to save us, we have water for our mother and claim God for our Father. This is said because physical birth always requires a mother who delivers the child, and if we claim that baptism is the new birth, we must be born of water, which makes water our mother.

CARL KETCHERSIDE'S "BROTHER IN PROSPECT"

At the end of questions from the floor, the panel had ten minutes to discuss the subject of fellowship among themselves. Harry Pickup, Jr. asked Carl Ketcherside the following question: "Do you believe that every conscientious believer in the fact of Christ's divinity, and confessor of the Lordship of Jesus, who is unimmersed, is your brother in prospect?"

Carl answered: "No, I don't think necessarily that everyone such is. I do believe this. I believe that when one is thoroughly convinced of those facts that constitute the good news and the glad tiding, and he repents of his sin upon the basis of this faith, I think he is God's child and my brother. But I think there is a great deal more than just saying, you know, that you believe in Jesus as an intellectual fact."

Harry responded with this question: "Do you not say, and have you not written, that every conscientious believer in the fact of Christ's, divinity, and confessor of the Lordship of Jesus, though unimmersed, is your brother in prospect? Carl replied: "Yes, such an individual is." Harry asked: "He is your brother in prospect?"

Carl answered: "Yes, he is God's child and my brother in prospect."

Harry then read from I John 5 the condition of the one begotten of God to show the predicament of Carl's position. After some statements denying the conclusions that followed from the passages read, Carl responded with the following: I believe with Alexander Campbell that birth, either in the physical or spiritual kingdom, never produces life. You are not born in order to have life; you are born because you do have life. And the purpose of birth is to bring you into a state or relationship where you can enjoy the blessings for which life was intended, and fulfill the responsibilities that are devolving upon it. But I believe that a person is begotten of God by the Spirit through the word, and then this individual develops the place where he is born into the family. But he is begotten of God before. He is not begotten in the water, that is when he is delivered. You are not begotten in the hospital. That is where you are delivered. And so for this reason I think that an individual is begotten of God, and because he is begotten of the same Father who begot me, he is my brother in prospect and God's child in prospect. But still he is not in the family any more than Jerry and Sue were until Nell delivered them. It's just that simple."

Now since Carl has carried this figure to the point of conception and delivery exactly as in the physical family, using his own wife and children to illustrate the point, I wonder if he would explain who the mother is who is carrying this begotten unborn child of God? He said the birth did not produce life, but one was born who already had life. This unborn child of God has life by reason of conception, and Carl said: "He is not begotten in the water, that is when he is delivered." But how can there be a birth without a mother to deliver the unborn child? I wonder who or what the mother of God's children is. His problems stem from his abuse of the figure of family relationship.

ANOTHER FIGURE OF BAPTISM

Baptism is said to be a burial and resurrection (Rom. 6:3-5; Col. 2:12). In this figure we have a conflict with the figure of a birth if either is carried beyond its intended use. One must die before he can be buried and resurrected. But if one dies before he is born, he never has life in this world following the delivery. How do we reconcile this? The obvious truth is that the figure of a birth is only intended to describe the purpose of baptism as bringing into a new life as a family and the corresponding figures would be that of family relationship. All figures in this relationship must agree with the other figures that describe the same people in relationship to God.

The figure of a burial and resurrection is intended to contrast the state of sin and death from which one is delivered and the state of new life in relationship to Christ after he arose from the dead to die no more. This emphasizes life as opposed to death rather than family relationship.

If a relationship can be established, it can be broken. I know of no exception. Marriage is broken by
death. All human physical ties are broken by death. If, as in the time of Christ and the apostles, one had the power to raise the dead, he would reestablish the physical ties that existed before death. But such is not done now, and in the general resurrection we are sown a natural (physical) body and raised a spiritual body. The relationship of physical ties is not restored in the general resurrection at the last day.

I do not believe the Bible teaches the eternal brotherhood of men in Christ regardless of their doctrines and practice. The combination of figures as they are used in the word of God clearly teach that there are conditions upon which one must come into the right relationship to God, and there are conditions upon which that one remains in the right relationship to God. If the conditions of the gospel are essential to one getting into Christ, then the conditions of the New Testament are essential to one staying in Christ.

This is the first of three articles dealing with Carl Ketcherside’s abuse of the figures of relationship to God used by the Holy Spirit. His misuse of these figures has produced his despicable doctrine on Fellowship.

H. E. Phillips

********

Television in general is getting pretty rotten. It is difficult to view any musical or variety program without seeing half-naked women gyrating and jumping around as if they had just escaped from the jungle. But beyond doubt, one of the most vain, immoral and ungodly shows ever seen anywhere is "The Dean Martin Show." Just about every comment the man makes is suggestive and risqué. And he can’t even sing without acting a fool — and sucking a cigarette.

I seldom see any part of his show any more, but a few months ago I saw a part of one. It opened with the naked girls, known as the "Ding-a-ling sisters." Then he hired a girl to stand in for his wife in a vulgar scene. After she did some singing, he said, "Her voice is so sexy the doctor has to look down her throat through a key hole." When time came for a station break, a girl came wriggling out on the stage with the message written on her stomach, and she didn’t have on enough clothes to cover a decent jay bird! After she left, a very ugly girl came out and said to Dean, "Name one thing that she’s got that I haven’t." He said, "I can name two."

Then they played the musical game where the girls each sing a line from a song and then he matches it with one from another song, and each time it ends up being suggestive. And on and on it went, along with all of the jokes about him being a drunkard, which is probably no joke.

Decent citizens should write the NBC Network and all others which are contributing to the moral corruption of our society by showing such filth.

H. E. Phillips

I have known that cigarette smokers are without self-control, but I finally heard of one who will admit it. Leonid I. Brezhnev, of the Soviet Communist Party is trying to stop smoking, and it seems that he is having such a hard time that he has a timed cigarette case which will allow him only a specified number per day. Now I can understand that for a Communist, but a Christian should control himself by such passages as 1 Cor. 6:19,20; 9:25 and II Pet. 1:6.

In an editorial entitled, "The Coming ACC Preacher’s Workshop" (Firm Foundation, Jan. 4, 1972), brother Reuel Lemmons said, "We hold it a self-evident fact that most of the trouble in the brotherhood is preacher-generated. Groups of brethren do not divide from each other unless they are led in that division by preachers. The anti-cooperation
folly would never have wounded the body of Christ had it not been for preachers."

There is some truth in this statement, but he is guilty of the very thing that has caused and which perpetuates much of the division, namely, misrepresentation! He does not know of any "anti-cooperation" brethren. He has spoken out recently against church support of colleges. Would it be fair to accuse him of being "anti-college?" No, for he supports them and is on the board of one and maybe two. He is anti-church-support of colleges. Likewise, we are not anti-cooperation; we are anti-centralization and usurpation! Let us tell the truth about one another, and then we will know what we believe and why.

In a recent letter to brother Yater Tant concerning some churches and instrumental music, Leroy Garrett said, "Since the New Testament scriptures say nothing about instrumental music either way, those brethren concluded that its use was a matter of opinion… It is true that the New Testament says nothing about instrumental music, but all that proves is that the New Testament says nothing about instrumental music. People can differ as to how they interpret silence, and silence does have to be interpreted, and still have mutual respect for the authority of scripture."

Now that's the same fallacious thinking which allowed a large Baptist Church in Texas to serve Coca-Cola on the Lord's table, and a Methodist Church in St. Louis to use hamburgers. The New Testament doesn't say one word about using Coca-Cola and hamburgers on the Lord's table. Does that make it right? According to Garrett it does.

The Old Testament never said one word about a man from the tribe of Juda serving as priest, but the inspired apostle used such silence to show that one could not serve with God's approval (Heb. 7:14).

"He doesn't believe in taking care of orphans." When a statement like that is made and believed, two things are true: the one who makes it is lying, and the one who believes it is incredibly naive and ought to be ashamed. You can't name a person black or white, Christian or atheist — who opposes an orphan child having the necessities of life! These "orphan-haters" are like Campbellites; I've heard much about them but I have never seen one.

In response to one of our radio programs, a lady from Iowa wrote: "Christ will reign on the earth for 1,000 years. That's what I've been taught all of my life, and I believe it. If he does not, then he deserved to be crucified. He should reign on the earth and my dead mother ought to be alive again on the earth some day too. This is what I want to believe." And I imagine she will believe that until she dies. We sent her some material which proves that Christ will not reign on this earth, and she returned it. So, like the majority of the people, she is going to believe what she wants to believe regardless of the facts. Isaiah, Christ, and Paul encountered such people, and they are described in Matthew 13:15. There isn't much you can do for them.

Abolish Sundays? Don't laugh; they may do it! An Associated Press article out of Chicago said: "With Sundays widely used for recreation rather than rest and worship, the Rev. Dr. Leroy C. Hodapp, a Bloomington, Ind., Methodist leader, suggests in the weekly Christian Advocate that the church abandon its weekly worship custom, and substitute ten 'Christ-Days' per year in large centers of worship."

After all, when people cease to worship God as the New Testament authorizes — and they have — what difference does it make whether or not they worship at all? We wonder if the "Rev." has reach such passages as Acts 20:7? The first day of the week — each week — is the true "Christ-day" for true Christians.

**WORSHIP IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH**

*John 4:24*

T. G. O'Neal, 318 Kings Highway, Murfreesboro, Tenn. 37130

**SOME ACTS OF SATAN IN THE CHURCH**

I have before me a booklet, "The Acts of The Holy Spirit in The Church of Christ Today," which is published by the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International in Los Angeles, Calif. It contains 14 articles by the same number of men, all of whom claim to be members of the Church of Christ. They are: Ben Franklin, Dean Dennis, Pat Boone, Forrest H. Wells, Donald R. Hurley, Dwvatt Gant, William R. Epperson, W. L. Wilson, Jim Noblitt, T. C. Wisenbaker, Paul Logue, Curtis Lydic, George Welsh and Lester E. Nicfios.

**THEIR CLAIM**

The claim of these individuals is expressed in the title, they all believe that the Holy Spirit is working now in a miraculous way. Claim is made for Holy Spirit baptism, prophecy, tongues, gifts of healing, faith, wisdom, discernment, etc. now among the Lord's people.

**COMMON DENOMINATOR**

In reading this booklet through twice each of these men have some common ground. That common denominator is error. (1) Each of these men claim to be a member of the Lord's church. However, after reading the articles I would question if they were ever a member. Please note that I am not saying they were not, I am just questioning if they were. Their concept of the church is that it is a denomination. The expressions used in regard to the church reveals their denominational concept. "Our church doctrine" (p. 9), "other denominations" (p. 10), "our denominational bodies" (p. 10), "I had been
the minister of one of the denomination's largest churches in the west, the Northside Church of Christ" (p. 11), "served as pastor to four such churches" (p. 25), "Church of Christ preacher" (p. 26), "overcoming denominational hang-ups" (p. 46), "of our denomination" (p. 49), "we went to our denomination church, Vermont Avenue Church of Christ, near George Peppermine College" (p. 51). "I remember saying to our pastor" (p. 62) are just some of the expressions used in relation to the Lord's church that show that these men look upon the church as a denomination.

(2) Again and again they give their personal "testimony" that what they claim is so. But others could give the same kind of testimony that other acts are of the Holy Spirit. (3) These individuals want to establish the fact that they were "real true church of Christ members" at one time. They give all kinds of evidence, such as, being a "Bible school superintendent, coordinator, youth worker, elder, etc. in large and small congregations" (p. 62), such a church "was started in our home" (p. 65) and "I attended Pepperdine College and while there planted all the shrubs around the Church of Christ building on Vermont Avenue, every one of the trees and the grass" (p. 65).

These men cast the Lord's church in the role of a denomination and evidence their displeasure of preachers who expose denominationalism and draw the line on them where the Bible draws the line.

**HOLY SPIRIT VS. HOLY SPIRIT**

One of the interesting things about this booklet is all of these men claim a miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit in their lives. Yet, they are divided on some fundamental issues about the Holy Spirit. For example, on page 17, one prays for the baptism of the Holy Spirit, but on pages 26-27 one receives Holy Spirit baptism by the laying on of hands by an Episcopal priest. Both claim to have received such in a different way. Another example, one claims, on page 8, "that which is perfect" in I Cor. 13:10 refers to "Christian maturity" but on page 14 we are told it refers to "the perfect state of all things ushered in by the return of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ" and then on page 66 we are told it refers to "Jesus Christ." We have three different answers by three different men, yet each claims Holy Spirit direction. Thus, these men have the Holy Spirit divided if what they say is so.

**TONGUES**

One of the things that is often affirmed of the Holy Spirit in this booklet is that he causes these men and others to speak in tongues. The claim is made he causes men to speak in: "strange words" (p. 8), in "a prayer language" (p. 14), in a "new language" (p. 17 and 27), "when blocked in the English language, I have spoken in this new tongue" (p. 28), "in a new and unknown tongue" (p. 34), "I broke forth in a tongue of praise and prayer in words I had never heard" (p. 35), "heavenly language" (p. 35), in a "complex Indian dialect" (p. 36), "in a language I didn't know" (p. 37), "I spoke in a new language" (p. 48), "a voluble stream of a heavenly language" (p. 53), in a strange tongue" (p. 61), "a strange and utterly amazing tongue which I had never heard" (p. 67), "a new and strange language" (p. 69), and "ecstatic language" (p. 58). One says, "there came a flood of sounds, none of them at all intelligible, lasting for perhaps a minute or two and then stopping, as though by some will other than my own" (p. 58). This one claiming to speak in an "ecstatic language" says the "sounds" were not "intelligible" (p. 58). Does the Holy Spirit give an unintelligible language? The New Testament teaches otherwise (Acts 2:8,8;11). Cf. I Cor. 14:9,19.

**NEW TESTAMENT TEACHING**

Having seen the denominational attitude these men have toward the Bible and the church of the Lord, I want to note some New Testament passages which they fail to understand.

(1) I Cor. 15:8 — Paul said of Christ that "last of all he was seen of me also." If this were understood, one would not read in this booklet of one saying of his claimed experience "I believe it was a vision of the glory of Christ Himself, and I was here given a glimpse of Him, the full image of Deity" (P. 37).

(2) Acts 1:4-8 — This passage is used in the booklet to teach that Holy Spirit baptism is for men today. While it is true that someone in this passage is promised Holy Spirit baptism, it is not men now. Note the context: (1) commandment was given to the apostles, v. 2; (2) to the apostles Christ showed himself, v. 3; (3) Christ was assembled with the apostles and commanded them (the apostles) that they should not depart but wait for the promise of the Father, v. 4; (4) the "ye" of verse 5 that were promised Holy Spirit baptism were the apostles of verse 2. The antecedent of the personal pronouns in verse 3-8 is the noun, apostles, in verse 2. When one understands this, he will not be expecting to be baptized with the Holy Spirit since he is not an apostle. Men are not now the ones to whom the Lord made the promise of Acts 1:5,8, so men now have no right to expect the fulfillment of the promise.

(3) John 14:16-17 — Use is made of this passage to show that "gifts of the Holy Spirit are promised in the Bible" for men today. The context of the chapter will show otherwise. In John 13:5, it is learned that Jesus was with his disciples; he told them that "one of you shall betray me" (13:21); chapter 15:16 shows Jesus still is speaking to the disciples when he said, "I have chosen you." In these chapters in which this passage is found, the names of some of the apostles are given in conversation with Christ. The "you" of this passage the context shows is the apostles; not men today. In these passages all these men miss a fundamental rule of understanding, that is, when some are specifically addressed, no one else understands this, he will not be expecting to be baptized with the Holy Spirit since he is not an apostle. Men are not now the ones to whom the Lord made the promise of Acts 1:5,8, so men now have no right to expect the fulfillment of the promise.

(4) I Cor. 13:8-10 — It is admitted (p. 7) that this passage is one "which even hinted that anything of the miraculous would cease at some time." It is observed in the article that the reason the miraculous continues is because v. 8 'states that 'prophecies,' not 'prophecy' would cease.' That is real wisdom. If 'prophecies ceased it would be because 'prophecy' ceased. If 'prophecy' continued there.
would be 'prophecies' continued. This is just a play on words, but is not a real argument.

I Cor. 12:8-10 names the miraculous gifts of the Spirit. I Cor. 12:14-31 shows they were for edifying the body. I Cor. 13:1-7 shows the need for love even with miraculous gifts. I Cor. 13:8-13 shows that miraculous gifts would cease. "Prophecies shall fail" "tongues shall cease and knowledge shall vanish away." How could language be plainer? But such plain language means nothing to one who wants, intends to have, and thinks he has spiritual gifts. He is right and the New Testament is in error. Paul says "now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity" (I Cor. 13:13). These men whose articles are in the booklet would say, "now abideth tongues, prophecy, and Holy Spirit baptism."

Much more could be said about this neat printed booklet filled with error. I trust that this will help someone into whose hands this book of false doctrine falls.

PROBLEM PERIODS IN OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY

THE PERIOD OF THE PATRIARCHS (2)

The consensus of scholarship has come around to a more conservative attitude toward the Genesis account of the patriarchal period. William F. Albright affirms that "aside from a few diehards among older scholars, there is scarcely a single biblical historian who has not been impressed by the rapid accumulation of data supporting the substantial historicity of patriarchal tradition" (The Biblical Period, p. 3). Nelson Glueck goes so far as to say, "Either the Age of Abraham coincides with the Middle Bronze I period between the twenty-first and nineteenth centuries B.C. or the entire saga dealing with the Patriarch must be dismissed, so far as its historical value is concerned, from scientific consideration" (Rivers in the Desert, p. 68). The period between the twentieth and sixteenth centuries B.C., the age of the Patriarchs, continues Albright, "was unusually well adapted for such movements as those described in the Book of Genesis" (op. cit., p. 4).

MIDDLE BRONZE AGE

Archaeologists call this period the Middle Bronze Age (2000 -1500 B.C.). In Babylonia it was the time of Hammurabi, king of the Amorites, a nation of people frequently mentioned in the Book of Genesis (Gen. 10:16; 14:7; 15:16,21; 48:22). It was also the time of the Hyksos invasion of Egypt (late eighteenth century); while at Nuzi the Hurrians (Biblical Horites, Gen. 14:6; 36:25,21,29) were in power. During the Middle Bronze Age Palestine was divided into little city states according to the Hyksos sources and the Amarna letters.

These Canaanite city states dotted the Mediterranean coast and the rich valleys of Palestine, a fact that helps to explain why Abraham traveled through the hill country and settled in the South. Albright makes quite a point of this: "In this period, moreover, towns were scattered thinly through the hill country and sedentary occupation was largely restricted to the coastal plains and the broad alluvial valleys of Jezreel and the Jordan. The wanderings of the Patriarchs are thus correctly limited by tradition to the hill country and the desert Negeb; not a single city of the coastal plains or the broad valleys of the interior is mentioned (except in the extreme south)" (Ibid., p. 5).

Furthermore, as George Ernest Wright observes:
Abraham is associated with Mamre (Gen. 13:18), Isaac with Beersheba (Gen. 26:23; 28:10), and Jacob with Bethel, Shechem and Dothan (Gen. 33:18; 35:1; 37:17). Wright then states that "archaeological evidence confirms that these towns were the main settlements in the area between 2000 and 17000 B.C." (Biblical Archaeology, abridged ed., p. 29). So the Patriarchs avoided the heavily fortified areas of the hill country and Negeb. Notice the subtle accuracy of the Genesis account in this whole matter.

**MARÍ**

Mari, located on the bend of the Euphrates northwest of Babylon, has yielded 20,000 to 30,000 clay tablets dating back to the eighteenth century B.C. Names like Nahor, Haran, Segur, Terah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Benjamin, and Hamor are not unknown in these texts. One is even tempted to associate the term "Habiru" in the Mari letters with the designation "Hebrew" ascribed to Abraham in Genesis 14:13, although such an association presents some difficulties, for the term "Habiru" is certainly not restricted in its application to Abraham's immediate family.

**THE REAL ISSUE**

There is no reason to doubt the accuracy of the Genesis record in respect to historical matters. The critic's real problem has to do with his unwillingness to believe in miracles, but the issue often is shifted to other questions.

**INSTITUTIONALISM—WHY I CHANGED**

One of the most difficult decisions I ever made in my life was my decision to take a stand against institutionalism. I believed, as perhaps many of you who read this article believe, that the support of human institutions (such as orphan's homes, colleges, hospitals, etc.) should come from the church's treasury because of the good they were doing. I based this solely on the emotional appeal that was being made for those who were orphans, the sick, etc., and on human reasoning rather than Scriptural facts. Yet, my desire to be right forced me to take a stand against church support of human institutions. Jesus said, "If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed." (John 8:31). I knew all along I must abide in the doctrine of Christ, in order to be His disciple. "He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." (2 John 9).

I want each one who reads this article to know that I understand your problems and the pressures that are being placed on you by institutional brethren, for I faced the same sort of problem.

I was living in Chattanooga, Tennessee at the time I made the change. I had been troubled about my stand for several months. Yet, I was not about to allow myself to be labeled an "anti" unless I was absolutely sure I was right. I had several questions that were asked by several of my preaching brethren who were opposed to human institutions, that I was unable to answer. I began to ask many of my preacher friends, elders, and others (who believed as I did) to help me find the answers to these problems that I had encountered. Some refused to discuss the matter, and others made attempts to answer, and yet the answers were not Scriptural answers. For Example:

1. Where in the Bible, did one church ever send money to another church to preach the gospel? No answer was given!!
2. Where is Scriptural authority for a church making a donation to any kind of a human institution? No answer was given!!
3. Where is Bible authority for elders overseeing any work except that "which is among them" (I Pet. 5:2)? No answer was given!!
4. Where is the authority for the church engaging in and providing for suppers, parties, or entertainment for anyone? No answer was given!!

If any effort was ever made to answer these, it was usually James 1:27 or Gal. 6:10. Actually, the more I heard these passages used by my brethren to support these practices of taking money from the Church's treasury to support human institutions, the more convinced I was that I was wrong. It is really an insult to any person's intelligence to quote the above passages to try to prove church action, when the passages themselves are giving instructions to the individual Christian and his living the Christian life. Read them and see for yourselves.

But, as I said, I know of your problems. When I took a stand against these "church splitting innovations," one of my dearest friends, who was a gospel preacher said, "I hope and pray J.T. quits preaching." Not only this, but I was told by the congregation where I was preaching one Sunday morning, that that would be my last day. I was left without any means of supporting my family; I was then faced with being in opposition to many of my dearest friends and many in my own family. I immediately became an "orphan hater" to hear my friends (?) tell it. Yet, I was confronted by the fact that regardless of what people call you, God is right!! "In hope of eternal life, which God, that cannot lie, promised before the world began" (Titus 1:2). I also knew that God said, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you" (matt. 6:33). That is why I changed — Jesus said I must!! "And a man's foes shall be those of his own household. He that loveth father or mother more than me is not worthy of me. And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me is not worthy of..."
me" (Matt. 10:36-38). In the light of this, I could not allow friends or family to stand in the way of my being right. Yes, I lost much but I gained much more. I gained a position that I can support by the Bible. I can give Scriptural authority (command, example necessary inference) for my teaching and practice. I am not now afraid to try to defend what I believe. All institutional preachers are!! I know why they won't defend it. They can't. I know, because I tried! I wanted to be able to defend it as much as anyone ever did. It grieved me much to have my friends turn their backs on me.

All of you who read this publication, or who have read my writings in the past, know that I am still trying to obtain the answers to the questions that I stated earlier in this article. It would be a happy day in my life if I could call those who are so bitterly opposed to me, and join hands and hearts with them again. Yes, with all the pleas I have made for Bible authority for these things, few have even tried to give me Scriptural authority for these things. - and those who did, gave Scriptures that have nothing to do with the questions that were asked. Therefore, I will have to continue to speak out against institutionalism and those who espouse it as much as I dislike being in opposition to my brethren. Paul said, "And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprouse them" (Eph. 5:11). Thus, I must do this to be pleasing to God. If I preach anything that was not received from God, His curses will rest upon me (Gal. 1:8-9). And, if I do not abide in the doctrine of Christ, I cannot have God (2 John 9).

So, as you can well see, I can sympathize with your situation, and feel sorry for you. I know it will be hard, but you too must take your stand against institutionalism and against anything for which you cannot find Bible authority. I beg of you—please stand up against these innovations; or else give me Scriptural authority for your practices so that I may stand with you!

(The article has been in tract form for a number of years. At this writing, over 50,000 copies have been printed and distributed. They may still be obtained at one cent per copy simply by writing to J.T. Smith, 1320 Gardiner Lane, Louisville, Kentucky, 40213.)

"THE CHURCH TREASURY"

Within the last few years the "church treasury" has come in for more than its share of criticism. Perhaps some of this criticism is justified and some of it is entirely without Bible backing. It is a well known fact that the name "church treasury" is not found in the New Testament writings. However, it cannot be denied that a collection of money was gathered by Christians on the first day of the week (I Cor. 16:1-2). I suppose one could call this collection by a number of names and still be within the confines of biblical description. It is not my purpose in this article to argue for the name "church treasury" or any other specific terminology but to establish Bible authority for such a collection and its scriptural use.

When Paul told the Corinthian brethren to make this collection he used a military term "As I have given order." He said, "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 must be observed in this text that this order was not for Corinth only. He had given a uniform order for all the churches in regard to this collection. It must also be observed that it was to be done on the first day of the week. I insist that this verse authorizes Christians to give as they have been prospered, upon the first day of the week and that this collection belongs to a local congregation and that said money is to be used for whatever God has authorized a local congregation to do. I maintain, from other texts, we can find that a local congregation used such funds for preaching the gospel (II Cor. 11:8) and for helping poor saints (I Cor. 16:1-2).

I would now like to notice some objections to the church treasury as it is used by many brethren. First, we have some who scoff at the idea of a treasury at all. They insist that I Cor. 16 was a special contribution and that there is no authority for a church treasury today. However, these critics involve themselves in difficulties from which they cannot escape. They all agree that churches supported Paul in preaching the gospel but they cannot consistently tell where these churches received the money. They all agree that the CHURCHES supported the widows indeed (I Tim. 5) but they can’t tell us where the CHURCHES got the money! If they admit that some sort of collection was made they have surrendered their argument because a treasury comes into existence. It must be observed that in
both of the above cases the text says CHURCHES or a church supported both Paul and the widow indeed. Some might try to argue that what the individual does the church is doing but on this he is in great difficulty. In I Tim. 5:16, Paul says, "If any man or woman (individuals) that believe have widows, let them relive them, and let not the church be charged." It is true that the church is made up of individuals, but neighbor, there has to be a difference in the individual and the church or Paul made an inspirational blunder. Paul tells us in this text that when an individual is taking care of a widow this is NOT the CHURCH doing it!

There are others who insist that this collection of I Cor. 16 was for poor saints and that under no circumstance should this money be used for preaching the gospel. It cannot be denied that Paul makes specific reference to this collection being for poor saints. The text bears this out. However, we must remember the Bible says CHURCHES supported Paul and our problem is WHERE DID THEY GET THE MONEY? Some have implied that the churches might have had TWO treasuries, one for evangelism and the other for benevolence. This is not only absurd but without Bible authority. Since I Cor. 16 is the only Bible example on how churches RAISED money, it must be established as an exclusive pattern for any congregation raising money. The SPENDING of that money is found in other texts. If one argues that preaching the gospel is not mentioned in I Cor. 16, I would remind him that "The cup" is not mentioned with the "bread" in Acts 2:42 where the Lord's supper is mentioned. I would also remind the critic that the entire plan of salvation (faith, repentance, confession and baptism) are not mentioned in any ONE verse in the Bible! One does not have to establish Bible authority for something by finding all the essentials crammed in ONE verse.

Sabbatarians criticize the church treasury in a different way. Burt F. Marrs, whom I met in debate several years ago, argued that the first day of the week was not the Lord's day but the first day of the week. He insisted that the laying by in store was fruit such as grapes, figs and apples. He said the people at Corinth went out into the fields on the first day of the week and gathered this fruit so it could be sent to the poor saints at Jerusalem. I asked him why they could do this only on Sunday and he never did reply. I also pointed out that II Cor. 9:2 tells us that the church at Corinth had been "ready a year ago." This means that all "fruit" had been laid up for a year. It would be rather absurd to think they could gather fruit the year around, in all seasons, and that it could be preserved for an entire year!

Yes, we have critics of the church treasury but the fact remains that the Bible teaches that a collection was made by churches; that churches supported preachers and poor saints; and that the collections were made on every first day of the week. These facts cannot be denied.

---

**HAVE YOU RENEWED YOUR SUBSCRIPTION?**
**DO IT TODAY!**

---

**PREACHING BRETHREN**

W.C. Hinton, Jr.

I love my preaching brethren and only wish that there were more, but you know, these same brethren can be the most frustrating and exasperating people in the world! I suppose, the class that irritates me the most are those that "say at" something, but never seem to get it clearly said, just imply. If something needs saying someone should say it, if not he shouldn't even bring the matter up. I have little patience with those preachers who come to "hold a meeting" and in the process "throw out" several questions for the brethren to "think on" and these usually are something he has been thinking and developing that in order to do proper justice would take examination and explanation, rather than simply statement. Usually he is misunderstood, or doesn't even understand himself and the poor local preacher has to spend months quieting down an unnecessary rattle that was subsequently raised.

In the December 1971 issue of Searching The Scriptures, brother L.A. Mott, Jr. exemplifies part of this as he "thinks out loud" and that in print! I certainly share his feelings on the need for care and in sending men that are qualified into any field, foreign or not. It is so easy for us to sit back here at home, among the familiar surroundings of our heritage, ease under the typewriter and take a few "pot-shots" at other brethren trying to do what he that shot in "should be doing." I take exception to his unethical, unwise, untimely and highly uncalled for statement relative to "someone" recently gone abroad. Brother Mott, you go into great detail about the funds, appeal, needs presented, but fail to name a single man! AND by not naming any, you have inadvertently (I hope) cast a shadow of doubt on every brother who recently went abroad.

Come on now, who is this undeserving rascal who has "conned" the whole brotherhood? Was it Connie Adams, Ron Chaffin, Charles Gentry, Fred Melton, Carl McCullough, J.T. Smith or some other? Maybe you meant me, when I returned to Japan in September of last year for about three weeks? Surely you can remember his name, for you know him so intimately that you can stand up and declare without reservation or qualification that "he has shown himself to be unworthy of the confidence and support of brethren in every work he has so far undertaken."

In the very next breath you hasten to say that you do not want to hinder any gospel effort in the world. But saying so wasn't enough, for now all recent men in the field can be and maybe are being thought of as this "someone" you mentioned. Thus, some elderships may decline sending any support for fear that they will be aiding that rogue of a fellow that you know! Playing the "Johnny-come-lately" game is of no advantage to anyone. Why, now, all of a sudden, you are perturbed enough to "lock the barn door?" The time for you to have spoken most loudly was while he was trying to get the necessary support. This "someone" must have had confidence in some areas or he never would have gotten the support.
The only "out" that you have now is to retract your implication or state the man's name with documented proof concerning every work he engaged in (for you said all were failures) so that the brethren may know who it is, cease their support, and pray for God's forgiveness. Are you willing to just "say at" or state clearly? We will wait.

5966 Park Place
Hammond, Indiana
46320

Donald G. Collins, 2005 Wisconsin Ave., Joplin, Mo., 64801 — I helped a small group of Christians start a congregation in Elm Springs, Arkansas about ten years ago, and have helped as I could through the years. It was the first conservative congregation to start in northwest Arkansas after the division over institutionalism. They are now of a mind to obtain a preacher to work with them full time. They can provide fifty dollars ($50.00) per week of his support, and the rest will have to come from other sources.

Elm Springs is a small town in the northwest corner of the state, about five miles west of Springdale, which is growing in that direction. Northwest Arkansas is, I believe, making more progress than any other part of the state.

The congregation is made up of about fifteen members who stand for the truth. I believe now is an opportune time for them to make good progress in the cause of the Master, if they can get some help. They, as all small groups in starting, have bad their share of troubles in trying to stand for the truth.

If any preacher is interested in this work, or a congregation that would like to help support a preacher in this area, get in touch with John Hayes, Box 191, Elm Springs, Ark., 72728, or phone (501) 235-2885.

PREACHER WANTED

Preacher needed at the church in Charlotte, N.C. Self supporting, new preacher home is being built.
Contact: Alton R. Watts, 3308 Denson Pl., Charlotte, N.C. 28215. Phone 535-0393 or David Haga, 7133 Star Valley Drive, Charlotte, N.C. Phone 523-6938 if interested.

PREACHER WANTED

R.L. Craig, 410 Lightsey Rd., Austin, Texas — I have just finished a meeting with the church in Rockdale, Texas. They have just gotten into a house of their own and seem to be ready to do a good work. They have a small but zealous membership and would like to get a man to work with them regularly. They can pay part of his support and can arrange for most of the rest of it. For further information contact Carroll D. Holt, Box 107, Rockdale, Texas 76567.

MILLER-WOODS DEBATE

Guy N. Woods and James P. Miller will engage in a three night debate in Montgomery, Ala. February 28, 29 and March 1. The discussion will be conducted in the Cleveland Avenue meeting house at 4214 Cleveland Avenue just one block off the southern by pass at Collinswood.

PROPOSITIONS:

February 28 — It is in harmony with the scriptures for churches of Christ to build and maintain benevolent organizations for the care of the needy, such as Boles Home, Tipton Home, Tennessee Orphan Home, Childhaven, and other orphan homes and homes for the aged that are among us.

Guy N. Woods — Affirms
James P. Miller — Denies

February 29 — It is not in harmony with the scriptures for churches of Christ to build and maintain benevolent organizations for the care of the needy, such as Boles Home, Tipton Home, Tennessee Orphan Home, Childhaven, and other orphan homes and homes for the aged that are among us.

James P. Miller — Affirms
Guy N. Woods — Denies

March 1 — Such an arrangement and cooperative effort on the part of churches of Christ for the gospel as the Herald of Truth is preaching of the gospel as the Herald of Truth is without scriptural authority.

James P. Miller — Affirms
Guy N. Woods — Denies

Time for the discussion is 7:30 each night.
Brother Miller will be endorsed by the Gay Meadows congregation and all questions, letters, calls and etc. should be addressed to Carroll Puckett, 2527 Montreat Drive, Montgomery, Ala. 36111

EVANGELIST NEEDED

We are a small congregation in the Gulf Coast area that needs a preacher immediately. The church needs a man who has had experience working with small congregations and who can not only preach effectively from the pulpit but can guide and participate in strong personal evangelism efforts. The congregation is able to provide only part of his support. Interested individuals may contact church of Christ, P.O. Box 1821, Gulfport, Miss., 39501, % Leroy Henry.

J. Edward Nowlin — I am now laboring with the Perry church of Christ in Perry, Florida. Please note my new address: 109 Cedar Road, Perry, Fla. 32347.
BENJAMIN LEE FUDGE IS DEAD

I received the shocking news Saturday night, Feb. 5, near midnight that my long time friend and brother Benjamin Lee Fudge had suddenly passed from this life as the result of a cardiac arrest at about 6:45 p.m. in the hospital in Athens, Alabama. His good wife, Sybil, was with him when he died. He arrived home from Florida College Lectures with a severe case of the flu to which was added pneumonia. We will have more to say about this in the next issue of the paper. — Editor

HIGHERS-GRIDER DEBATE

A debate between Alan E. Highers and A.C. Grider will be conducted at the high school auditorium in Central City, Kentucky. Sessions will begin each evening at 7:30. The date is March 6-10, 1972.

PROPOSITIONS FOR DEBATE:

1. It is in harmony with the scriptures for churches of Christ to contribute from their treasuries to the support of destitute children who are not saints (Christians).

   Alan E. Highers - Affirms
   A.C. Grider - Denies

2. In benevolent work churches of Christ are limited by the scriptures to extending help only to needy saints (Christians).

   A.C. Grider - Affirms
   Alan E. Highers - Denies

3. It is in harmony with the scriptures for churches of Christ to contribute from their treasuries to benevolent institutions such as Potter, Southern Christian Home, and others of like nature.

   Alan E. Highers - Affirms
   A.C. Grider — Denies

4. Such cooperative efforts in evangelism as practiced in World Radio, Herald of Truth, and the Houston Music Hall Meeting are without scriptural authority.

   A.C. Grider — Affirms
   Alan E. Highers - Denies

5. Such cooperative efforts in evangelism as practiced in World Radio, Herald of Truth, and the Houston Music Hall Meeting are in harmony with the scriptures.

   Alan E. Highers - Affirms
   A.C. Grider — Denies

AGREEMENT FOR DEBATE:

1. One evening session shall be given to the discussion of each proposition in Central City, Kentucky, at a mutually agreed time and place.

2. Each speaker shall have three alternating twenty-minute speeches each evening, beginning with the affirmative.

3. Each speaker shall select a moderator whose duty it shall be to keep time and to maintain order.

4. The affirmative speaker shall define the terms of the proposition and bear the burden of proof; no new material shall be introduced into the last negative speech on any proposition.

DEBATE WITH BAPTIST IN LOUISVILLE

Connie W. Adams
4724 E. Manslick Rd.
Louisville, Ky. 40219

Weldon E. Warnock of Paden City, West Virginia will meet H.C. Vanderpool of Louisville, Kentucky in a debate in Louisville March 13, 14, 16 and 17. The discussion will be held in the Iroquois High School auditorium at 4615 Taylor Blvd. just south of Watters- son Expressway.

The first two nights Mr. Vanderpool will affirm salvation through faith before water baptism. The last two nights brother Wamock will affirm that water baptism is essential to salvation.

These men met in debate in Bowling Green, Kentucky about two years ago at which time agreement was made for a debate to be held in Louisville. The Manslick Road church in Louisville will endorse and support brother Wamock in the discussion. Mr. Vanderpool preaches for the Lyons Chapel Baptist Church in Louisville and they will support him. Both men are experienced in religious debate. W.T. Russell will moderate for Mr. Vanderpool and the writer will serve as moderator for brother Wamock.

A limited number of places to stay may be provided for out of town visitors. Write me at the above address. The debate will begin at 7:30 each night.

J.M. Kennedy, Rt. 3, Box 1-B1, Rogersville, Ala., 35652 — I have resigned my work at the West Rogersville, Ala. church of Christ, and desire to locate with some other conservative congregation. I am 43 years old, married, and have four children. I have been preaching for 25 years and doing located work for 20 years. I can move anytime and will be glad to correspond with any interested congregation. If you care to call, my number is 205—247-0378.

E.C. Poland, 516 N. Freedom, Alliance, Ohio, 44601 — A new congregation of the church of Christ is now meeting in a building recently purchased and is known as the Homeworth Road church of Christ, Alliance, Ohio.

Doug Black, P.O. Box 317, Trilby, Fla. 33593 — I am available for part-time preaching work in the central Florida area on a fill-in or regular basis.

Ward Hogland, Box 166, Greenville, Tex., 75401 — Thirty were baptized into Christ here at Walnut Street in 1971. Meetings for 72 include work with Bobby K. Thompson, Miami, Fla.; Ted Beaver, Okla. City; Rufus R. Clifford, Franklin, Tenn.; Charles Bland, Houston, Miss.; Rayford Petty, Haynesville, La.; Franklin Williams, Lawrenceburg, Tenn.; Kenneth Keller, Weiner, Ark.; Weldon Warnock, Paden City, West Va. We look forward to our meeting with Robert Jackson of Nashville, Tenn.
THE FOUNDATION OF AUTHORITY

The beginning place, the source, the sure foundation of all authority, is God. All legitimate authority ultimately comes to rest upon the fact of his existence and the nature of his very person. Apart from God, there is no legitimate authority. The whole issue and crisis of our generation regarding authority, both as to its existence and our attitude toward it, is dependent upon our effectiveness in clearly and forcefully pressing this fundamental fact. Let us now define a few terms and hasten to the proof and significance of the above.

Authority is defined as legal power, or the right to make law or to command another. There are only two kinds of authority in the world, namely, (1) inherent or intrinsic authority, and (2) delegated authority. Inherent means that which is natural, an inseparable quality of, an indwelling essence or characteristic; intrinsic means that which is within, an essential and internal part of a being or thing, and is often used as a synonym for inherent. Delegated means to be appointed by another to possess certain powers or rights. Now to the application of these terms.

God possesses inherent authority. It is intrinsically his. Where did he get it? Nowhere! Who gave it to him? No One! How did it come to be? It didn’t! He has authority simply and solely because of who and what he is. The very fact that he is God, that he is (1) the creator (Gen. 1:1), (2) owner (Psalm 50:10-12) and (3) sustainer (Acts 17:25-28) of the universe, eloquently and irrefutably declares that lordship over all that is or that has been or that shall be, is his. "In the beginning God created." The creator does not need to obtain his rights from the things he has created. "Every beast of the forest is mine, and the cattle upon a thousand hills... If I were hungry, I would not tell thee: for the world is mine, and the fullness thereof." The absolute owner has no need of permission, nor anyone from whom to obtain it; all is his. "In him we live, and move, and have our being." The Self-Existent One’s authority is evidenced by both his position and power. The whole universe is dependent upon and answerable to him. In turn, he is neither dependent upon or answerable to anyone (except to himself and his own immutable integrity). The question that is sometimes impudently asked, "Who gave God the right to tell man what to do?" is therefore one of galling ignorance that fails to comprehend the inherent qualities and intrinsic rights of the living God. There is no one who could give God authority. There is no one who can deny him his authority. No rock, or bird, or man, can give or deny God rule over any portion or particle of his creation. In a word, authority is inherently his. He simply has because he is who he is.

All authority that resides in men has been delegated. Men do not possess any inherent authority. Think a moment. What authority do men possess in any relationship or at any level of society, that has not been given to them by God? It is submitted to you that parents do not have inherent authority over their children, that they do not have an intrinsic right simply because they are bigger, stronger or wiser. No, they rather have rule over their children because God gave them the authority. He delegated the authority (Eph. 6:4; Titus 2:5). Therefore parents do have the right to tell their children what to do — God gave them the right. Civil government possesses no intrinsic right to exist or to command its citizenry. It does not obtain the right through the royalty of blood or the voice of a consenting multitude, for no created things (men) inhere any authority to give to one another. But civil government has the right to exist
and rule, for God has decreed it (Rom. 13:1f). It may be unwise and even immoral, even as parents may sometimes be, but still it has rule over its citizenry by the authority delegated to it by God. The authority of elders in the church is accordingly a delegated one, and they have rule only to the extent God has conferred it (Heb. 13:7, 17; I Peter 5:2). Any child who disobeys his parents disobeys God, for in rejecting their delegated authority they reject the intrinsic authority of him who delegated theirs in the first place. Thus it is that God, in every other relationship and upon every other level, is at the foundation of all authority.

Mentally remove God from the picture and watch the crumbling collapse of all law and authority. If there is no God, upon what basis do a group of men get together and decide they (or one of them) shall have a right to rule over everybody else? If there is no God, there is no absolute basis for law, and the rebellion of children or citizens is not to be censured as wrong, but is merely the exercise of their natural role of not being under authority to anyone. But, God be thanked. God is. And God has delegated certain rights and authority to men, and has authorized enforcement of certain statutes, and no man can deny it without denying the person of God himself. He is the source and sure foundation of all legitimate authority, the cornerstone of an orderly society, the architect of righteousness and justice, and our hope of eternal life.
The second and third in the series of three articles dealing with the Ketcherside-Turner Exchange in Tampa on January 25, 1972 will be delayed a month or two by doctor's orders. I had been taking on more than was good for me and the firm orders of Dr. Wayne Mitchell amounted to the modern expression: "Cool it!" He ordered the delay in two meetings scheduled for April of this year in Ohio: one in Akron and the other in Toronto. I hope to re-schedule these for a later date.

There is no serious problem with my health at the present. These orders from the doctor are in my best interest and to prevent another attack which may be more serious than the last one. I have committed the care of my body to him, and if I am to profit I must follow his instructions.

Dr. Mitchell has the full approval and assistance of the two fine elders at Forest Hills where I preach: Melvin F. Neel and Harold W. White. These two bishops have shown a very personal interest in my physical condition. They have taken some of the load of work which I would normally do and have insisted that I keep my schedule of meetings and other work within the bounds of my physical ability until I have recovered enough to resume full work. My love and respect for these men compel me to hear them obediently.

It is not our general practice to publish articles that appear in other journals or bulletins, but occasionally there are exceptions because of the nature of the article and the present need of people in general. The following article by Irvin Himmel appeared in Truth Magazine of March 16, 1972. I asked brother Himmel for permission to reprint the article in Searching The Scriptures, which he gladly gave. Brother Himmel has some knowledge of the problems of publishing a religious journal, having edited and published Apostolic Doctrine for over ten years.

—Editor.

The history of the church of Christ in America is closely linked to publications in which brethren have expressed thought, preached their convictions, waged battles, explored questions, reported the news, and left a fluent record of their actions and attitudes.

Hundreds of magazines and papers have come and gone. A few have had tremendous influence in shaping thought. In the early days of the Restoration Movement in this country, A. Campbell's papers, the Christian Baptist and the Millennial Harbinger, along with B. W. Stone's Christian Messenger, were unusually potent. In the next generation of journalism, Ben Franklin's American Christian Review, Isaac Errett's Christian Standard, and David Lipscomb's Gospel Advocate wielded great power. Moses Lard's Quarterly, though of short duration, made its mark.

Most religious publications have experienced financial problems. The few that are hoary with age have survived hard times, and most of the ones which have died were killed by the same plague — lack of money.

Only God knows how many periodicals were commenced to propagate someone's peculiar views. When a faction arises, a paper will soon be started to voice the heresy. Other papers may be started to counter the influence of that one. As long as brethren take up with false doctrines and promote parties, this trend will continue.

Some brethren are "down" on all religious papers because many of them are not worth the price of the ink with which they are printed. Such a reaction is not justifiable. Shall we downgrade all elders because some are not worthy to be called elders? Shall we refuse to hear anyone preach because some
preachers are plain sorry? Shall we refuse to be associated with a local church because many congregations are digressive? Not all religious journals are bad. Like people, they have their faults. The best of papers cannot offer perfection in every issue. The men who write, edit, and publish the papers make them what they are. The folks who have "soured" on gospel papers are doing themselves a disservice by not reading at least some of the excellent material that is being offered.

Every year new periodicals make their appearance and others reach their demise. I think it will be of interest to the readers of this magazine to see a list of some of the papers circulated among members of churches of Christ during the past year, and to know how widely (or narrowly) they were distributed.

Circulation figures were formerly a deep, dark secret carefully guarded by the publishers. Postal laws governing second-class publications have changed that. Brethren who take it for granted that Goodpasture's Gospel Advocate must have at least 100,000 subscribers are in for a surprise. It is a big and powerful paper, to be sure, but not really as powerful as some suppose.

A few years ago (1965) the Christian Chronicle was printing 37,883 copies each week. In 1971 it became a bi-weekly, printing 6,029 copies. Its circulation has dropped to one-sixth the 1965 level and it appears only half as often. We wonder if this represents a reaction to its more liberal stance?

Searching the Scriptures enjoyed the largest circulation of the papers published by conservative brethren during 1971. The combined circulation of Searching the Scriptures, Truth Magazine, Gospel Guardian, and the Preceptor was 16,787. It is obvious that many of us are much too "conservative" when it comes to spending money on subscriptions for good papers! That figure should be at least 50,000.

The circulation figures reported are the total number of copies printed on the average for a twelve-month period as published in the different papers in accordance with postal laws and regulations. Most of the figures were compiled and submitted in Oct. of 1971.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Editor</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Circulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20th Century Christian</td>
<td>M. Norvel Young</td>
<td>Nashville, Tenn.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>46,028*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel Advocate</td>
<td>B. C. Goodpasture</td>
<td>Nashville, Tenn.</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>38,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Bible Teacher</td>
<td>Bill Patterson</td>
<td>Abilene, Tex.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>27,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm Foundation</td>
<td>Reuel Lemmons</td>
<td>Austin, Tex.</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>24,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice of Freedom</td>
<td>P. D. Wilmeth</td>
<td>Nashville, Tenn.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>9,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Woman</td>
<td>Ona Belknap</td>
<td>Austin, Tex.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>8,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Messenger</td>
<td>W. Carl Ketcherside</td>
<td>St. Louis, Mo.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>7,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching the Scriptures</td>
<td>H. E. Phillips</td>
<td>Tampa, Fla.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>6,555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Chronicle</td>
<td>John Allen Chalk</td>
<td>Austin, Tex.</td>
<td>Bi-weekly</td>
<td>6,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truth Magazine</td>
<td>Cecil Willis</td>
<td>Marion, Ind.</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>4,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Roy Bowen Ward</td>
<td>Abilene, Tex.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>3,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel Guardian</td>
<td>William E. Wallace</td>
<td>Lufkin, Tex.</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>3,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister's Monthly</td>
<td>Frank L. Cox</td>
<td>Nashville, Tenn.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>3,220*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Worker</td>
<td>Bill E. Freeze</td>
<td>Wichita, Kans.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceptor</td>
<td>Stanley J. Lovett</td>
<td>Beaumont, Tex.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>2,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word and Work</td>
<td>Gordon R. Linscott</td>
<td>Louisville, Ky.</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>1,360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*B 1970 circulation

BIBLE ANSWERS
Gene Frost
A handy book of "Bible Answers" to a variety of Bible subjects as they originally appeared in the syndicated newspaper column by Gene Frost. Beautiful red cloth with gold lettering. This book has both a subject index and cross-reference index.

Price $2.25

CRUDEN'S COMPLETE CONCORDANCE
by Alexander Cruden

Over 200,000 references to both the Old and New Testaments. Explanatory notes, proper names, and the concordance listings are under one alphabetical arrangement for easy reference. 783 pages.

Price $4.95
QUESTION: We recently had a rather warm discussion in a Bible class about whether or not one may swear under any conditions. Did Jesus condemn all oaths in Matt. 5:33-37? Please give special notice to the phrase, "Swear not at all;..." Also comment on James 5:12. — E.B.

ANSWER: When I first began writing this column (over eleven years ago), I wrote an article on the above subject matter answering a similar question. Since we have hundreds of new readers since then, and since the former article thoroughly answers the above, I am submitting it, except for slight modifications for the sake of greater clarity and brevity.

"Again, ye have heard that it hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths: But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; nor by the earth; nor by Jerusalem; nor by thy father; nor by thy mother; nor by thy brother; nor by thy sister; nor by thy brother's wife; nor by thy daughter; nor by thy son; nor by thy daughter's husband; nor by thy son's wife; nor by thy ox; nor by thy ass; nor by thy sheep: But let your communica -

"But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by heaven, neither by the earth, neither by any other oath: but let your yea be yea; and your nay, nay; lest ye fall into condemnation" (James 5:12).

In the Sermon on the Mount our Lord corrects many perversions advocated by the scribes and Pharisees and generally received by the Jews. The contrast was primarily between their perverted and traditional views and the law in its purity. Thus, the Sermon on the Mount may well be regarded as a recall to the righteousness of God and Foundation principles upon which His kingdom was to stand. Notice that Jesus continually referred to what they had heard "said by them of old" — not what Moses said. For example, they quoted Moses in matters of judicial law (Matt. 5:38; Lev. 24:20) to be used by the elders in the administration of justice and made individual application so as to justify revenge. Jesus corrects this abuse and sets forth the truth so far as individual application is concerned, which teaching harmonizes wonderfully with the law of Moses (Lev. 19:16-18).

The same train of thought prevails concerning His teaching on oaths. God's original law on swearing forbade perjury (forswearing) — i.e., swearing falsely (Lev. 19:12). Every oath was to be performed unto the Lord (Matt. 5:33). That the scribes and Pharisees perverted this law is evident from Matt. 23:16-22. These verses show that they had coined a number of oaths, used in common conversation, which did not involve directly the name of God. These they considered as "nothing." Hence, according to their view they could swear by these things — heaven, earth, temple, Jerusalem, head, etc. — without serious regard and without such oaths being unto God. This abuse Jesus condemns severely and shows that such things ultimately involve God. Hence, Jesus says "Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne; nor by earth; for it is his footstool; neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great king."

Concerning this prohibition The Expositor's Greek Testament calls special attention to the Greek conjunction "mete" translated "neither" and emphasizes the fact that it is not "mede." The former is used "to connect these different evasive oaths as forming a homogeneous group... the latter add negation to negation, while the former divide a single negation into parts." Hence, it follows that the prohibition "Swear not at all" refers only to the kind of oaths identified by the parts that follow. Such did not include judicial oaths — only the evasive oaths of the Jews which were used in common conversation. Thus, our Lord condemned their perversion and abuse of God's original law on swearing. Such use of oaths is forbidden altogether!

J. W. McGarvey says, "The universal prohibition, 'swear not at all,' is distributed by the specification of these four forms of oaths, and is, therefore, most strictly interpreted as including only such oaths... What we style the judicial oaths of the law of Moses, then, were not included in the prohibition."

An oath is a solemn affirmation with an appeal to God for its truthfulness and imprecating his vengeance if it be untrue.

If Christ condemned judicial oaths and those made on solemn and important occasions, I find it impossible to reconcile such with the following facts: 1) Jesus answered under oath in Matt. 26:63. Whether or not he answered using the particular expression "I swear" has nothing to do with the fact that he answered under oath — that with -

2) God swore by Himself (Gen. 22:16,17; Heb. 6:13-18; 7,21). 3) Paul often called God to witness the truthfulness of his statements, which is what is meant by an oath (II Cor. 1:23; Rom. 1:9; Gal. 1:20; Phil. 1:8).

James 5:12 may be regarded as a parallel passage and the above observations apply with equal force. When James says, "lest ye fall into condemnation" he would have them know that swearing by the things mentioned ultimately involved God; that he who engages in such, thinking "it is nothing," and who swear falsely is guilty of perjury and brings himself under condemnation.

Swearing is a solemn, serious thing. All oaths are in reality unto God. He who at any time makes oath lightly or uses one in common conversation is in violation of the New Testament prohibition. The Christian's life and conduct should be such that a
simple "yes" or "no" should suffice in order for him to be believed. If more than this is required "it cometh of evil" — it is because of untruthfulness on the part of a world full of falsehood. Then, it may be necessary to make oath, but only on solemn and important occasions. All oaths are unto the Lord and imprecate His vengeance if what we affirm be false.

In a recent issue of this paper, I called attention to an unscriptural expression which we often see and hear among brethren these days. I'm glad to note that others are expressing concern about it. For example, in the FIRM FOUNDATION of February 22, 1972, M. Norvel Young said:

"One gets a distinctly denominational ring out of the expression, 'Congregations of the Church of Christ.' The New Testament does not use such an expression. I fear the use of this grows out of a sectarian view of the Church. Some sincere people have never grasped the Scriptural concept of the non-denominational nature of the Bride of Christ. They contend for the church as the 'true' sect or denomination — the right denomination; the correct party."

"Scientists say earth's moon doesn't fit usual pattern." So reads the heading of a recent article out of San Diego. The sub-heading says, "They feel our planet may have lacked it at the start." There was a difference of about one day between the time of separation of the dry land from the seas and the creating of the "lesser light," but that is certainly not what they were speaking of. The article says:

"Two University of California at San Diego professors reported Tuesday they had worked out a 'normal' pattern of evolution of planets and their satellites — and that the earth's moon doesn't fit the pattern."

Their problem is a typical one for all evolutionists and other unbelievers. Notice that they didn't say that the moon doesn't fit into God's pattern as revealed in the Bible, but rather that it doesn't fit the pattern "they had worked out." To many people, baptism doesn't fit into the pattern of salvation, but it is because they, like the scientists, refuse to believe the Bible!

How was the moon formed? How did it get into its present position? According to the article, they don't know! And yet they scoff at the faith of a Christian.

A brief news item in the newspaper said, "Oral Roberts, the evangelist, said at Los Angeles that after seeing a production of the rock opera 'Jesus Christ, Superstar,' he approved of about 70 per cent of it."

So what? I would be willing to eat 70 per cent of the ingredients of most rat poison. But the balance of it is rough!

Oral has changed positions many times, and it now seems that he is about to join the hippies. You can say one thing, he has made more money than the average hippie.

A brief news item in the newspaper said, "Oral Roberts, the evangelist, said at Los Angeles that after seeing a production of the rock opera 'Jesus Christ, Superstar,' he approved of about 70 per cent of it."

So what? I would be willing to eat 70 per cent of the ingredients of most rat poison. But the balance of it is rough!

Oral has changed positions many times, and it now seems that he is about to join the hippies. You can say one thing, he has made more money than the average hippie.

According to the television commercials, a sure cure for America's divorce problem is to let all women take Geritol. In every case they show, the man whose wife takes the tonic says, "I think I'll keep her."
"THE ONLY ONES SAVED"

It comes from here, it comes from there and it comes from everywhere. The same old cry, "I just can't stand the Church of Christ because they think they are the only ones who will go to heaven." We may not want to admit it but many minds have been closed to the truth because they have heard this old song. The statement itself makes all of us sound egoistical, belligerent, arrogant and self centered. The statement has made it impossible to even start a Bible discussion with some people. My experience is that sooner or later most sectarians will get around to this question. They sneak up and in a subtle way say, "Is it true that you folks in the Church of Christ think you are the only ones who will make it?"

What is the Bible answer to this question? Is this what we really believe the Bible teaches? Is the wording correct? Or do we have a problem in the field of semantics? I want to go on record saying that I do not believe or teach the above affirmation. Now, if the question were worded another way I could concur. For example, if one were to say, "Do you teach that one has to be in the church of the Bible in order to have hope of going to heaven?" I would say amen! That I do believe and teach, but all the sting and bite has been removed from the question. However, to say that I believe the only ones who will go to heaven are in the Church of Christ — I do not believe. Let us analyze the question.

First, the question implies that everyone in the Church of Christ will go to heaven. Nothing could be further from the truth. Jesus said, he would take out all that offend and do iniquity. The Bible is filled with examples of people who have fallen from grace such as Simon and Demas (Acts 8: 2 Tim. 4:10). The average sectarian who has been told this fabrication, actually believes we teach that one has to get into a little clan called the Church of Christ and presto, he has it made to heaven. I know that is what they believe because they have told me. We need to correct this by saying we do not believe such a thing.

My second reason for denying the above charge is in name "Church of Christ." Just what does the average person mean by the term "Church of Christ?" Well, it is a little group on a certain street in a certain town with the name "Church of Christ" stuck on their building! First, it takes more than some paint and the ability to spell, Church of Christ to make a group scriptural. When I was a boy up in Oklahoma, a certain man wanted to be an elder and another brother told him publicly that the only qualification he had for elder was the "desire." I feel the same way about some congregations over the land—the only scriptural qualification they have of being the New Testament church is the name on their building! Brethren, in the past, we have had people with the name Church of Christ on their buildings who have used instruments of music, taught Premillennialism and tolerated all kinds of ungodliness. What does the sectarian mean when he asks the above question? I insist he means the group in his town or another town who wear the name. I maintain that many who wear the name will be lost.

Pardon a personal experience. I walked into a home a few weeks ago to discuss the Bible. After I had made a few opening remarks to the woman of the house, her husband, a large husky sort of a fellow walked through the door with a grin on his face. He said, in tones which could be heard next door, "preacher I want to ask you one question." I replied, "that is fine what is it?" He said, "I have heard all my life, as a matter of fact my mother told me this when I was a small boy, that you in the Church of Christ teach that you are the only ones who will go to heaven. Nothing could be further from the truth." The smile left his face and he looked puzzled. He then said, "Well I am glad to hear you say that because all the members of your church with whom I have talked say they are the only ones who will make it." I replied, "Friend, I've got news for you, many of us will never make it!" I went on to say, "I believe you and I are agreed on this saved business because I believe that the only people who will be saved are the ones who obey the Bible, isn't that what you believe?" He replied, "Yes sir, preacher I will go along with you on that." This seemed to ease the tension and we got down to business in discussing what the Bible actually teaches on certain subjects. Oh yes, I baptized his wife last week and he has promised to visit us soon.

Gentle reader, the time has come for us to remove this yoke from our backs. I have heard my brethren stutter and stumble when asked this embarrassing question. I cannot speak for the brotherhood; but I say without reservation that I do not believe or accept the above charge. If the question were worded something like this, "Do you believe there is only one church in the Bible?" I would say, yes sir! But now the burden of proof is on the Bible and not on personalities. It doesn't have the egoistical ring that the other question embodies. Most of the time when the question is asked the Bible is left out. Even if it were worded in this manner, "Do you believe the Bible teaches that the group today known as the Church of Christ are the only ones who will be saved?" I could still say NO! Because many wear the name but do not practice Bible doctrine.

Brethren, I admit that this question in times past gave me no little trouble in the flesh. But a new day has dawned. I now find that a negative answer actually opens up many opportunities to teach on other matters. Some fear that if they answer in the negative, people will think they endorse the doctrine of saved in all churches. This might be assumed by your querist but is just another opportunity to teach. I recall several years ago a Baptist preacher who lived in Oklahoma challenged me for a debate. The proposition he wanted me to sign was unique. He brought
the proposition to my office and it read as follows: "The scriptures teach that the only people who will make it to heaven are in the Church of Christ." He handed me the proposition and insisted that I sign it. He then began to chide me and say "that is what you teach all over the country isn't it?" Now, why don't you sign?" I turned around in my chair and said "No that is not what I teach, but I tell you what I will do; I will sign that proposition if you will sign the one I have here that you teach all over the country. He said, "What is that?" I said, "The scriptures teach that a man who is saved can join the church of his choice, live by their doctrine and will go to heaven when he dies." I handed it to him and said, "Sign!" His face turned as pale as bleached flour, and he replied, "No sir." I then chided him and said, "Isn't that what you teach all over the country?" He said, "Yes, but I couldn't afford to sign that." I said, "It is strange indeed that you were so intent on getting me to sign what you thought I believed and you won't even sign what you admit you believe." You know, that was fifteen years ago, and I haven't seen that Baptist preacher since.

ABOUT THE REPRINT OF VOLUME ONE OF THE GOSPEL GUARDIAN

Brother Robert L. (Bob) Craig of Austin, Texas plans the expensive and time-consuming task of reproducing the first volume of the Gospel Guardian. If enough interest is manifested in the project brother Craig intends to bring back into print the first five volumes.

The Gospel Guardian began as a weekly on May 5, 1949. The change from The Bible Banner, edited by Foy E. Wallace, Jr., to the first issue of The Gospel Guardian closed with the April, 1949 issue of The Bible Banner carrying a format of the front page of the new Gospel Guardian. The issues that were necessarily dealt with by able men from the beginning of the Gospel Guardian will provide valuable material for young preachers and sincere students of the Bible. I have the full set from the first issue and would not sell them.

While I do not share the view that present day writers of religious journals are inferior in quality to the writers of the early years of The Gospel Guardian, I do believe the issue of church supported colleges and other related issues that developed later were dealt with more directly and forcefully than present day writers. Perhaps one reason is the lack of men today who will attempt to defend their unscriptural positions on such issue. The material on these issues alone will be worth your money for this pre-publication price of this first volume of The Gospel Guardian. I urge you to order your copy at once. You will never regret it. You may order from brother Craig at Dixie Printers, 410 Lightsey Rd., Austin, Tex. 78704, or order from Phillips Publications, P.O. Box 17244, Tampa, Fla. 33612. We would appreciate your order. Send your check or money order for the pre-publication price of $7.50 and your copy will be mailed to you immediately upon release from the printers.

H. E. Phillips
SINGING IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH

This is an area in which most of us have been guilty of emphasizing the negative to the almost utter neglect of any positive exhortation. Our teaching on singing has been primarily against the unauthorized use of mechanical instruments of music. In this article we shall examine some positive instruction from God’s word on this subject.

WHAT'S THE TRUTH ABOUT SINGING IN WORSHIP?

1. The New Testament reveals who is to sing in worship. Ephesians 5:19 says, “Speaking to yourselves in psalms, hymns, and spiritual songs...” This doesn’t mean that each person is to speak to himself, but that we all are to speak to each other. The ASV brings out this more clearly. Also Col. 3:16 commands us to teach and admonish one another in singing.

So all are to sing. He who opposes instrumental music in worship because it is unauthorized, and yet fails to do what is authorized and commanded is in an inconsistent and precarious position.

Some seek to be excused on the ground that they “can’t sing.” What does one mean by such a statement? Does he mean that he can’t sing like Bing Crosby or Frank Sinatra? Does he mean that he can’t sing like George Beverly Shea? Does he mean that he can’t sing like Earnest Tubb or Roy Acuff? Does he mean that he can’t sing like Grandpa Jones or Stringbean? Ability to sing is a relative thing. God doesn’t tell us to sing like someone else. He does command us to sing.

2. We are also told what to sing: "Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs" (Eph. 5:19, Col. 3:16).

In order then, for a song to be suitable for worship, it must contain a scriptural and spiritual message. We should not be primarily interested in the melody and parts. This is secondary. We should place our greatest interest in the message.

Some songs contain doctrinal errors and should not be used in worship. Most of the songs in our books, however, contain wonderful and powerful messages.

3. When should we sing? We should certainly engage in singing when we assemble, for here we have opportunity to “speak to one another in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs” (Col. 3:16). Worshipping God in song, however, should not be limited to the assembly. James wrote: “Is any merry? let him sing psalms” (Jas. 5:13). Paul and Silas sang at midnight in the inner prison (Acts 16:25).

SINGING IN SPIRIT

1. Determination to do our best: The offering of the best is a basic principle of true worship. Under the Old Testament economy, a Jew was not to sacrifice an animal that was no good for anything else, and keep the finest for himself. When it comes to singing, our best may not be much sometimes, but it’s all God requires.

2. Recognition of Spiritual Blessings: “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ.”

Many do not sing with fervency because they have no appreciation for the reasons, he probably has no reasons.

3. Appreciation of Purpose: The purpose of singing is two-fold. By it we worship God and edify each other.

As an avenue of worship, singing praises is unsurpassed by any other. Words can create feelings, but when music is added to words the force is multiplied. Advertisers learned long ago the value of melody, rhythm and harmony in selling a product. God, in His infinite wisdom put singing in the church.

Singing can be and should be an instructive exercise. Children learn the names of the apostles by a little song. Many know such passages as 2 Timothy 1:12, Col. 3:17, and Isa. 1:18 through songs that contain these passages.

THINGS THAT WILL HELP

1. Acceptance By Church Members: By the very nature of true Christian worship, we must accept the fact that we’re not going to have music that will meet professional standards. Obviously, no congregation will sound like Fred Waring and the Pennsylvanians. Neither is congregational singing going to sound like a well balanced and polished denominational choir.

In denominational circles there are professional ministers of music whose exclusive job is to develop the musical programs. They go from group to group, often even from denomination to denomination.

I feel that we should realize that like other elements of scriptural worship, our singing will never have a great appeal to those who demand worldly standards. This is not to say that most of us cannot vastly improve.

2. Participation By Members: All need to be concerned about the quality of singing. We should sing, not mumble and whisper. We should sing out — make a joyful noise! Our singing would improve about 100% if people would start making a noise.

We should take advantage of opportunities to learn to sing better. When special services or classes are arranged, take part.

3. Emphasis By Church Leaders: Elders in the churches do not need to be song birds themselves to recognize the importance of good congregational singing and do some planning and execution of plans to effect improvement. Talent should be encouraged and used and further trained.

Money spent in special classes and training is not money wasted, but wisely invested.

HAVE YOU RENEWED YOUR SUBSCRIPTION?

DO IT TODAY!
MILLER-WOODS DEBATE

James P. Miller of Bowling Green, Kentucky and Guy N. Woods of Memphis, Tennessee met in a three nights discussion at the Cleveland Avenue building in Montgomery, Alabama February 28, 29 and March 1, 1972. The first two nights Miller affirmed the unscripturalness of human organizations supported by the church for child care and other benevolence to be done by the church. The last night Woods affirmed the scripturalness of the Herald of Truth Radio and T.V. Program.

Brother Carrol Puckett, preacher for the Gay Meadows church who endorsed brother Miller in the debate, is to write a report of the debate for a later issue of this paper. Brother Miller had a prepared statement which was read in his first speech, setting forth the issue and how it developed. Several hundred copies were prepared and handed to all who wanted one. We hope to run this in part or in full in James P. Miller's column soon.

KETCHERSIDE-TURNER EXCHANGE

Tapes of the nearly three hour panel type answers to questions from the floor following two 30 minute speeches by Ketcherside and Turner is available for any who may want them. The 7" and 5" LP open reel tapes are $5.25 each. One reel contains the entire program. Cassette tapes are $4.95 each and it will take two tapes for the full program. 8-Track cartridge tapes are also available at $4.95 each and it will take three for the full program.

Send your orders to: Phillips Publications, P. O. Box 17244, Tampa Fla. 33612.

Glenn L. Shaver, P. O. Box 2052, Gary, Ind. 46409. I'm leaving the Calumet Area after preaching here for 13 years of my 29 years of public preaching. I have resigned the work of preaching with the church at Portage, Indiana, effective the end of June this year. We desire to move farther south. Our daughter, Glenna, will be enrolled in Florida College this fall, and we desire to move "South" and work with a church by the end of June this year. My telephone is (219) 884-2678.

Tom Wheeler, 371 West Main St., Greenwood, Ind. — I recently moved here from Poteau, Oklahoma. The work here looks very encouraging. The brethren have a mind to work. Two meetings are planned for this year. Del Wininger will be with us April 17-23 and Johnie Edwards will be with us Sept. 25-Oct.1. Several here are active in personal work. If you know of someone moving to this area, write me and they will be contacted. Our meeting place is two blocks off U. S. 31 just South of Indianapolis. A building program is planned for this year.

SABBATH-DAY DEBATE

Lake Wales, Fla.— May 1-4, 1972
7:30 each evening Lake Wales church building — Wetmore Street

Propositions

1. RESOLVED: "The scriptures teach that the first day of the week commonly called Sunday, is the day to be observed through worship by Christians."

Affirms: Don R. Taaffe
Denies: Isaac N. Cramer

2. RESOLVED: "The scriptures teach that the seventh day of the week, commonly called Saturday is the only weekly Sabbath that Christians should observe as a special day of worship today.

Affirms: Isaac N. Cramer
Denies: Don R. Taaffe

ON MOVING EXPENSES

From time to time, as gospel preachers move from one place to another in the work of the Lord, both they and the churches involved are interested in the subject of moving expenses. Perhaps to these, and even others, the following report will be of some value.

Probe, monthly publication" of "Consumer United Program", Wichita, Kansas, included a notable tip in its issue for Feb., 1972. Responding to an earlier article, a reader offered: "Your article on moving men failed to mention the use of 'Car Loaders' (listed in the Yellow Pages, sometimes under 'Freight Handling'). They are commercial shippers who load whole carloads full of merchandise and ship them by railway cross-country very inexpensively. The drawback is that you have to put all your belongings into cartons, but we recently made our seventh cross country move — from Indiana to California — and a whole household of furniture, books, china, etc., cost well under $300."

Having recently moved from California to Missouri by moving van, as well as having experienced two previous moves by the "U-Haul" route, I can certainly say the above cost report compares better than favorably. Such being the case, it seemed worthy of being passed on to others.

Calvin C. Essary
300 N. E. 83rd Terrace
Kansas City, Mo. 64118

HAVE YOU RENEWED YOUR SUBSCRIPTION?
DO IT TODAY!
Bennie Lee Fudge is dead! It is hard for me to believe that he is gone. Only ten days before his death we had lunch together and discussed some of our business affairs for nearly two hours. For nearly a quarter of a century I have had business dealings with brother Fudge and his good wife in the publication and sale of books. Not once through these years has there been the slightest evidence of dishonesty or unfairness. I remember no unkind word or discord of any kind that passed between us during these years that our friendship and brotherly love for each other grew to be one of the finest I have ever known. My personal respect for him as a man, a writer, a teacher and preacher, and a personal friend is the highest.

On Thursday, the last day of the lectures at Florida College, Bennie Lee and I ate lunch together and made some arrangements about publishing some books and selling some already in print. He assured me that full arrangements would be made upon his arrival home. I shook his hand and told him goodbye for the last time.

I received a note from sister Fudge on Friday, February 4, probably written on Wednesday before, telling me that he had been quite ill with influenza which he had developed upon leaving Florida. She said he would write when he got better. His condition grew worse until he was hospitalized with double pneumonia. He was placed under oxygen and seemed to be improving when he suddenly passed away about 6:45 p.m. Saturday evening as the result of a cardiac arrest. His wife was at his bedside when the end came. Near midnight I received a call telling me of his death a few hours before.

Brother Fudge was a man of great energy, and most of it was directed in serving the Lord by the printed page, radio, and in public preaching. He was instrumental in establishing the Athens Bible School and was on the board of directors at the time of his death. He built a large publishing business and wrote many workbooks used all over the nation.

His funeral was conducted at 2 p.m. at the meeting house of the Eastside church in Athens on Monday, February 7. Sewell Hall, Irven Lee, A. J. Rollings, R. L. Andrews and Doyle Banta conducted the services. There was congregational singing at his request, made sometime before his death.

I personally feel the loss and share the sorrow of his beloved family. I am sure I speak for the entire staff of Searching The Scriptures and many thousands of its readers when I extend heartfelt sympathy to his wife, Sibil, his five sons: Edward, Henry, Robert, Benjamin and Paul, and his daughter, Nancy. We also rejoice with them in the hope we have in Christ Jesus our Lord.

H. E. Phillips

---

A TREAT FOR THE MEMPHIS AREA

Don Bassett

There is no idea more welcome than one "whose time has come," and none such better received than when articulated by just the right man.

James R. Cope recently spent three days with the East Memphis church of Christ presenting his series of lessons on family living. He was, indubitably, the right man with the right idea—in its time.

Brethren from northern Mississippi, eastern Arkansas, and all points in Tennessee came to share with us who live and worship in the Memphis area in this fine series.

Young parents, of whom this writer is one, were especially grateful for the very helpful and practical exposition of God's word on family responsibilities. But all who came, young and old, left each session with greater determination to seek and pursue our Father's way in our homes.

Brother Cope is a gospel preacher of wide experience, a father of three fine young people whose lives have been a great source of encouragement in a very personal sense to this writer, a successful college administrator and teacher, and an able writer of gospel-centered literature. Above all, his fruits have borne testimony to a sincere desire to do what is right and go to heaven someday. The right man—with the right idea—well presented.

Connie W. Adams, 4724 E. Manslick Rd., Louisville, Kentucky, 40219 — In my report of the Smith-Lacuata debate held in M'land, Cotabato, Philippines, I made this statement: "The American 'missionaries' deserted him. They came to M'lang the week before the debate and then returned the day after we left, but they did not come to give Lacuata support. They are unwilling themselves to engage in such debate."

I have learned only recently that a part of this statement is in error and therefore wish to make a correction in the interest of truth. It is true that they were in M'lang the week before the debate and preached in
the public plaza. They were not there the week of the debate as I reported. But I have learned that they did not return to M'lang the day after the debate. They had the permit to conduct meetings in the plaza the day after we left. This was common knowledge in M'lang and was discussed by various ones during the week of the debate. We left assuming they were coming back, as planned, to use the permit they had obtained.

I have now been told in a letter from Eusebio M. Lacuata that "because of the rain" he advised them to go on back to Manila and they left for Manila before the debate began. I don't know how he knew it was going to rain the day after we left (so that he could prophesy the weather a week ahead of time), but anyhow that is what he said. The cause of the liberal brethren is in bad enough shape without anyone having to misrepresent them. I hope this clarifies this matter.

* * * * * * * *

DONALD R. GIVENS TO CANADA

Dear brethren in Christ:

The Lord willing, my family and I are moving to VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA, CANADA. We are going to preach the gospel, sow the seed of the kingdom, and try to win souls to Christ. In company with Connard Estes family (presently of Bridge City, Texas) we will be starting a congregation of the Lord "from scratch."

Canada offers much opportunity to preach Christ. There are very few Christians in all of Canada. We anxiously desire to teach and preach Christ to the many lost souls in British Columbia. Bro. Connard Estes and I will be working together in teaching and preaching, publicly and "from house to house." We will start a church with just our two families and then diligently sow the gospel seed and water it, and leave the increase to God (I Cor. 3:6-9).

I ask for your financial help. We will need moving expenses to British Columbia and MONTHLY SUPPORT while in the Vancouver area. Can you brethren (individually or collectively) fellowship us "in the matter of giving and receiving" (Phil. 4:15)? Can you help us, in any amount, with our travel expenses or monthly support? Living costs are slightly higher in B.C., Canada than they are in Texas. We will have to supply everything including: our own house or apartment, utilities, car expense (which there will be much of in starting a brand new congregation), rent on a worship hall, advertising, correspondence courses, tracts (we will need plenty of these items in starting a new work), teaching supplies, Bible class materials, and everything else essential in a new field — these expenses will all come out of our pockets.

Why should I go? To answer that good question, let me give a few facts concerning myself: I am 30 years of age, and have been preaching continually for ten years. I started preaching in Canada in 1961, and have been thoroughly familiar with gospel work there since that time, having gone back several times to preach and visit. My wife is a Canadian; born and raised in Ontario, Canada; and her people still live in Canada. Therefore, I already have experience in Canada and am familiar with their good way of life and customs, etc. I would like to return to Canada and preach the saving gospel in this much neglected field.

The apostle John wrote "thou wilt do well to set forward on their journey worthily of God: because that for the sake of the Name they went forth" (3 Jno. 6-7). This will be our primary purpose in going to Canada: TO SAVE SOULS.

For personal references, you may contact the following men who know me: Connie Adams, Hoyt Houchen, Homer Hailey, Marshall Patton, Harry Pickup, Jr., Robert F. Turner, Lowell D. Williams, James W. Adams, and in Canada: G. A. Corbett, Jondon, Ontario.

OUR GREATEST NEED IS REGULAR MONTHLY SUPPORT. Can you help ... any amount? If you cannot promise monthly support, can you contribute a "one-time lump sum" to our travel expenses? (Any amount we might receive over necessary travel expenses would be applied to a working fund.)

Our tentative departure date is JULY 1, 1972. Please give our needs consideration, now.

May the grace of God be with you. Pray for us.

In Christ,

Donald R. Givens

4349 Vassar

Port Arthur, Texas 77640

Wayne Earnest, 1916 Rockford Lane, Louisville, Ky. 40216 — I was recently in a gospel meeting with the 13th and Main St. church in Blytheville, Ark. Feb. 7-15 and we baptized 14 and saw 3 restored. Olin Kern of Blytheville, Ark. is to be with the Shively Church here in Louisville in a gospel meeting April 24-30.

I’m to be in a meeting with the Hardinsburg, Ky. church Mar. 20-26 and at Roundhill, Ky. April 16-21.

A.W. Goff, 1007 Chestnut, Morrilton, Ark. 72110 — A small group of brethren have put up a nice building at 1218 West Childress St., Morrilton, Ark. built and paid for without begging for outside help, and I have been employed to do the preaching.

Momilton is located on I-40, between Little Rock and Fort Smith. For the benefit of travelers, we would appreciate it if you would put this announcement in Searching the Scriptures.
WORSHIP IN PRAYER

Prayer is the avenue through which the children of God talk with the One who rules the universe. In the midst of great tribulation the prayers of saints come before God on the throne of the universe (Rev. 8:4). If one could talk to the head of his nation at any hour, he would consider it a great privilege. The Ruler of the universe can be approached by any of his subjects any hour of the day. What a great privilege that we so often take for granted.

CHURCH PRAYS

Acts 4 records how the apostles, Peter and John, were threatened and when they were let go to their own company, they prayed unto God. Their prayer was that God would give them boldness to speak the word of God (v. 29). If these apostles needed to pray for such then, surely the church needs to pray for all those that preach the word today to have that same boldness today to speak the word.

In time of persecution a disciple was killed by a ruler (Acts 12:1-2). Herod sought the life of Peter but during the passover the church was making prayer on his behalf "without ceasing" (Acts 12:5). The result was the deliverance of Peter (vs. 7-17). The same God that heard fervent prayer then of his children will hear us today when we pray.

PRAYERS UNTO GOD

Prayer is our thanksgiving and requests directed to God (Matt. 6:6). Prayer is not directed to someone in the audience to impress them, to "tell them off" or to preach a sermon. We need to understand the purpose of prayer.

Prayer is not only directed to God, but it is addressed through Jesus Christ. Paul affirmed that there is "one God" unto whom we pray and that there is "one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all" (I Tim. 2:5-6). From this passage we learn several lessons: (1) there is one mediator, not many mediators. (2) The mediator is between God and man, not between Jesus Christ and man. (3) This mediator is a man, not a woman or a dead saint. (4) Our mediator Christ Jesus was able to become such after he gave his life a ransom for man; thus, those who have not died for men can not be man's mediator. Therefore, our prayer is to be directed unto God in the name of Christ or through Christ Jesus our mediator.

FOR WHOM SHOULD WE PRAY?

The New Testament teaches that we should pray for many individuals in different circumstances. Let us note some of them. (1) Paul prayed for his lost kin (Rom. 10:1). (2) Timothy was instructed to pray "for kings, and for all that are in authority" (I Tim. 2:1-3). (3) Jesus taught us to pray for our enemies (Matt. 5:44). (4) Paul encourages the Roman saints to pray for him (Rom. 15:30). We should likewise pray for gospel preachers today. (5) Paul prayed for the brethren (Phil. 1:9-10) then and we should pray for our brethren now. (6) Paul admonished the Colossians to pray for the work of the Lord in general to the end that opportunity would be given to preach the gospel (Col. 4:2-4). (7) We are reminded by James to pray for the sick (James 5:14-15). (8) Jesus taught that we should pray for ourselves (Matt. 6:11-13).

FERVENT PRAYER

The power of fervent prayer is seen in James 5:17-18. Elias prayed earnestly for it not to rain, and it did not. He then prayed for rain, and God sent the rain. Prayer from such a righteous person avails with God.

As we pray we need to be as fervent as Elias. I believe that Brother Homer Hailey has circulated among brethren enough to know what he is saying when he says that generally one of the great faults of the church is that we do not pray fervently enough. When some brother leads in prayer, that prayer should be made the sentiments of my heart. Prayer should not be just a ritual with God's people.

When things confront us as the people of God, we should fervently pray to God instead of leaning so much on the "arm of flesh."

Since Paul said to "pray without ceasing" (I Thes. 5:17) now that we have finished this article, let us stop and pray fervently.

FERVENT PRAYER

The power of fervent prayer is seen in James 5:17-18. Elias prayed earnestly for it not to rain, and it did not. He then prayed for rain, and God sent the rain. Prayer from such a righteous person avails with God.
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When things confront us as the people of God, we should fervently pray to God instead of leaning so much on the "arm of flesh."
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NIGERIA — A CLOSED OR OPEN COUNTRY — WHICH?

Fred A. Shewmaker

In a recent letter to brother Wayne Payne in Nigeria I wrote, "It is my understanding that the Nigerian government is now allowing short visits by gospel preachers. Does it look like they will in the future allow preachers to enter for longer periods?

In reply to this inquiry brother Payne wrote, "It does seem that the immigration may be losing the strings a little on visas, but just what the future holds on resident permits I don't know. I wish that someone could try to come through and see what the action will be. We will be coming home in June if all goes as planned. I wish that someone could be here before the year is out but nothing in sight."

It may be that the Nigerian government will not yet issue a resident permit but unless one is request-ed it is certain that none will be issued. Who will "try...and see what the action will be?" ********
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RESPECT FOR AUTHORITY — HOW IT IS WON
Jere E. Frost

"Fear ye not me? saith the Lord: will ye not tremble at my presence, which have placed the sand for the bound of the sea by a perpetual decree, that it cannot pass it: and though the waves thereof toss themselves, yet can they not prevail; though they roar, yet can they not pass over it? But this people hath a revolting and a rebellious heart; they are revolted and gone. Neither say they in their heart, Let us now fear the Lord our God . . ." (Jeremiah 5:22-24).

The prophet speaks of an incredible condition and attitude. God in his majesty and might controls all the forces of nature, and upon his mercy the very existence and well-being of puny man depends. But they do not fear. They do not tremble at his presence. Israel instead, as it were, yawned indifferently in the Almighty's face, disdained His person, rejected His statutes, trusted in their own wisdom, and declared that they were righteous and justified in so doing. Their swift destruction and calamitous consequences at the hands of the Babylonians are not a surprise. But our own generation evidences this same galling disrespect for divine authority, and much of the contempt in Israel then can be seen in the church now. It is one thing for authority to exist. It is quite another thing for authority to be respected. But rather than emptily jawbone about the obvious problem in this area, or spend our energies in establishing the rightfulness of authority (which we have already done), let us move on in our deliberations to consider how to solve the problem and to win respect for duly established authority.

ESSENTIALS OF THE AUTHORITARIAN

There are certain fundamental and vital qualities that must be possessed by one who exercises authority, be it God or man, if respect is to be won. All of these qualities are possessed to the superlative degree by God, but men in authority can and often do bring authority itself into contempt because of their disregard for the principles that win respect. (1) There must be competence, the ability to understand and discharge the responsibilities and functions required of the position occupied. For example, the government that literally cannot conduct the affairs of state will neither have the respect of its citizenry nor long survive. It may have had a right to exist, but it is doomed to be disregarded and to fail if it is impotent and incapable. (2) There must be character, particularly in the context of self-respect (not pride, but the respecting of one's own laws and rules). Let us now use parents as an illustration. They may not be perfect (and in fact are not) but they must be fair and honorable in the making of rules and in their own respect for those rules if they would win Johnny's and Susie's respect. They cannot forbid swearing and vulgarity if they themselves speak profanely and obscenely; they cannot forbid smoking if they themselves are servants to tobacco; they can scarcely criticize the taking of marijuana and hallucinogens if they themselves imbibe alcohol. No, if they would win respect, they must have the character to genuinely respect their own principles and rules. This implies that their rules have been issued from conviction and integrity, and not from an arbitrary desire to restrict and dominate the child. Hypocrisy cannot be respected, not even in one who has an authority, and will produce ultimately a resentment against both the person in authority and the authority itself that he represents. Character is essential to winning respect. (3) Enforcement, including both the ability and necessary will, is imperative. "Because sentence against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the hearts of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil" (Eccl. 8:11). Permissiveness on the
part of government or parents is therefore not a persuasive deterrent. It is rather an exhibition of weakness of conviction. It declares that the authoritarian does not really respect the law himself, and hence it should not have been a law in the first place. Or else he is unable to enforce it because of a lack of ability, wisdom or will. In the nation or in the home, when this condition prevails, "the hearts of the sons of men is fully set in them to do evil," and authority is despised rather than respected. The same principles can be applied with equal force and parallel results to discipline in the church.

One of the reasons the authority of God is not more generally respected is that many of us who possess small measures of authority on lower levels have brought authority itself into a kind of dispute. We present obstacles. Let us therefore resolve, as parents, to not simply declare our rights to rule but to take the steps necessary to win respect. Let us, as citizens, evaluate honesty in office above political posture, and urge the just enforcement of law. Let us, as lights in the world, preach the righteousness and wisdom of our God, and warn men that God will judge the world. He will not be mocked. "I will recompense." "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God."

"THE BED IS TOO SHORT — THE BLANKET IS TOO SMALL" (Isa. 28:20)

Elvis Bozarth

In Greek mythology we can read of a giant named Procrustes. He was a very hospitable fellow, but he had a strange way of taking care of the needs of his guests. He welcomed all travellers and offered shelter to all who needed it. But, he fitted his guest to the size of his bed! If the guest was too short for the bed, he just stretched him out to fit it, -if the guest was too long, he just cut off his legs!

When I first read this some years ago I immediately thought of a sermon I had heard Brother C.R. Nichol preach several times as I was growing up. It was based on our text, Isaiah 28:20: "The bed is too short on which to stretch out, And the blanket is too small to wrap oneself in" (NASB). He made the historical background of the people of God trusting in their own wisdom and cunning to protect them from their enemies apply very clearly to the disposition of various denominations to reject the counsel of God and follow their own wisdom in seeking to please God. He showed that the "bed" --any denomination or lodge -- was too short because they did not measure up to the divine standard. He showed also that the "blanket" - safety and salvation offered by human religious bodies - was too small to cover the sins of mankind.

As the years have passed I have noticed that most of my brethren have made the same mistake of the children of God in Isaiah's day, and of the various denominations of modern times. They have rejected the authority of God, i.e., "there is no pattern," — "we do many things for which we have no authority" — and have sought safety in their own wisdom and vain reasonings. They disregard some scriptures as if they were not in the Bible at all, and they pervert others by removing them from their contexts. They are making strange and new arguments on familiar passages to sustain positions already assumed.

To cite just a few examples of this behavior we can note the claim that no pattern exists to show the arrangements by which congregations may cooperate in preaching the gospel and in providing for the needy; the building and maintaining of human institutions through which churches may do their work; the promotion and support of fun, frolic, and social life from the churches' treasuries; and taking scriptures commanding individual activities and applying them to work of the collective, the church. Like Procrustes, they stretch them out or cut them off to fit their theological beds of digression.

*********
When we look at the problems that face us, no informed man will deny that the church of our Lord has been torn asunder and lies bleeding before the world in 1972. Division is upon every hand and the prayer for unity entered by Christ in John 17 goes unheeded. This terrible state is not the fault of the Lord nor of his New Testament, for only perfection can be found in them. The blame must be placed upon one or both has brought brother Wood's New Testament Church was restored to mankind. A God's sight. It was upon these principles that the history of the restoration. It stems from a liberal outgrowth of an attitude that began long ago in the gospel is not the main issue. These things are the outgrowth of an attitude that began long ago in the history of the past is, that they are looking for, and trying to make out of some-thing unknown to the whole New Testament. They overlook the simple, easy and common-sense arrangement of the scriptures and the doctrine of divine silence would avail. Indeed, one of the principal reasons why this question of organization has perplexed the minds of so many is, that they are looking for, and trying to make new laws for the church where the Scriptures are silent. "Nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the church; or be made a tenet on communion amongst Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament." This cry was sounded from the housetops that WE SPEAK WHERE THE BIBLE SPEAKS AND ARE SILENT WHERE THE BIBLE IS SILENT and upon its noble sentiments the blood-bought church was restored. (Page 150, The Disciples of Christ, Garrison and De Groot).

The support of institutions from the treasury of the church or the pooling of resources to preach the gospel is not the main issue. These things are the outgrowth of an attitude that began long ago in the history of the past is, that they are looking for, and trying to make new laws for the church where the Scriptures are silent. "Nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the church; or be made a tenet on communion amongst Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament." This cry was sounded from the housetops that WE SPEAK WHERE THE BIBLE SPEAKS AND ARE SILENT WHERE THE BIBLE IS SILENT and upon its noble sentiments the blood-bought church was restored. (Page 150, The Disciples of Christ, Garrison and De Groot).

The support of institutions from the treasury of the church or the pooling of resources to preach the gospel is not the main issue. These things are the outgrowth of an attitude that began long ago in the history of the past is, that they are looking for, and trying to make new laws for the church where the Scriptures are silent. "Nothing ought to be received into the faith or worship of the church; or be made a tenet on communion amongst Christians, that is not as old as the New Testament." This cry was sounded from the housetops that WE SPEAK WHERE THE BIBLE SPEAKS AND ARE SILENT WHERE THE BIBLE IS SILENT and upon its noble sentiments the blood-bought church was restored. (Page 150, The Disciples of Christ, Garrison and De Groot).
called anti-orphan because they did not want to support a human institution from the church treasury, and anti-television because they would not support the unscriptural arrangement of Highland and the Herald of Truth, and every kind of misrepresentation that could be devised and charged with emotionalism was put upon them. The institutional brethren were wedded to their idols and meant to have them at all cost. They represented the conservative brethren as dead when they had not attended the funeral or even signed the book at the funeral home. Brother Woods in a letter published in the Philippian Christian, written just last year, September 9, 1971, had these shameful things to say to Eusebio M. Lacuata.

"You, too, have experienced what all of us in this country long ago learned, that the "Antis" are wholly undependable, using misrepresentation without compunction. I have been the target of such for years. Long ago, I learned it is useless to appeal to them on the basis of truth and fairness since they have no respect for either.

"The situation here is this: Some years ago, when the anti-movement was sweeping the land, many churches and preachers were disturbed. I was in the midst of the fight, engaging in more debates than all the other brethren combined in refuting their hobbies. In so doing, I met all of their representative men, some of them several times. Some of these debates were published, and are yet available. Eventually, the issues were crystallized and known to all. As the result of our debates, the anti-movement, in this country, is not only dormant, its own followers are confused and fighting among themselves. Seldom do I hear of any agitation in faithful churches thereon. One reason they have gone to your land is because they have virtually lost their ability to disturb churches here.

"Occasionally, one of them challenges for a debate yet. The purpose is to obtain an audience which they cannot get otherwise. The last discussion I conducted with them, they had a little handful of anti preachers sitting in one corner, and those who stood with me filled the house. The church that sponsored the debate (for the antis) had perhaps less than 35 or 40 members. Under such circumstances they would be willing to be "walloped" every night in order to get an audience they cannot possibly assemble otherwise. We met them fully when the need existed. The arguments still stand. It is absurd for them to contend that any of us are afraid of them. Afraid of a pygmy? The idea is absurd. They know this; but they noisily write about it to impress their readers."

We not only challenge the truthfulness of these statements, but for the sake of thousands of churches and hundreds of able preachers, raise some questions. Was it this debate in Montgomery in 1966 to which he makes reference? If it were, he knew better than to write such statements as "a little handful of anti preachers sitting in one corner." Most of you were present and can bear witness that a host of sound preachers were present from all over America. When he says we have no respect for truth or fairness, he implicates the motive of every sound brother in the world.

How can he expect even reasonable treatment after such statements as made in his letter? The fact that we are outdoing the liberals in the Philippines gives forever the death-knell to the idea it takes unscriptural machinery to do the work of evangelism, whether it be on the radio or in the field. The truth, tonight, is that brother Woods' position and those who stand with him are in great jeopardy. They are finding out that they cannot have the institutional orphan home and the Herald of Truth, but that they have let down the door to everything else. He has already spent one week this month at the lectures of Freed-Hardeman trying to save what he can out of the mess his position has brought him to. The subject of the lectures was THE BIBLE VS. LIBERALISM. Educated at the feet of the sectarian teachers, or by those who were taught by sectarian professors, the young men of the liberal movement today have little in common with him. In a class at Harding Graduate School, it was reported by one present that when a new student asked about brother Woods' commentary on James, a good part of the class was heard to snicker out loud. Brother Woods is out of step with these younger liberals to which he gave birth by his lack of respect for the authority and silence of the scripture. Many of these young men are opposed to anything and everything established. They could care less about the institutions he is here to defend. They do not want the meeting house for it has been there too long and represents the formal past. The organization of the church means nothing to them for they want to meet in small groups on the river bank, hold hands and dance around a hollow tree with a candle in it and have a dialogue with Jesus. Although he may deny it, he is bewildered tonight by this turn of events. The brotherhood of which he is a part is divided over things not clearly defined. Without an accepted standard with which to judge their actions at sea. What man among the liberals would admit he was not sound on the Holy Spirit, speaking in tongues, or the necessity of formal church membership. Yet, these are their problems, all brought about by the wrong attitude toward the Word of God.

Their big splurge is over. The city-wide meetings, merging of churches to make a big congregation, the ballyhoo and fanfare of great accomplishments, etc. has run its course just as it did 125 years ago.

I am not here to tell this intelligent audience that the brethren with whom I stand have not had problems. We have difficulty converting an indifferent world, but in even the county seat a new start has
been made. Congregations dedicated to the all-sufficiency of the scriptures can be found everywhere. To say that we are dead and of no consequence, is to make him look foolish this week. If I am a "pygmy" and the cause I represent "is dead and I have no respect either for truth or fairness," he is beating a dead horse, ridden by a midget he should have destroyed six years ago, representing brethren who do not exist.

Brethren, the lesson is clear, brother Woods and those who stand with him, are not only wrong on the propositions before us in this debate; but have, unconsciously perhaps, spawned the giant of modernism which they now seek to destroy. History alone will tell what can be salvaged from their cause. It would have been far better just to sound the words of Thomas Campbell again: "We speak where the Bible speaks, and are silent where the Bible is silent."

"I HAVE DREAMED, I HAVE DREAMED"

L. A. Mott, Jr.

Some people claim that God has spoken to them in a dream. Such claims are not "a new thing under the sun." Jeremiah ran across such folk in his day. Thus runs Jer. 23:25-28:

I have heard what the prophets have said, that prophesy lies in my name, saying, I have dreamed, I have dreamed. How long shall this be in the heart of the prophets that prophesy lies, even the prophets of the deceit of their own heart? that think to cause my people to forget my name by their dreams which they tell every man to his neighbor, as their fathers forgat my name for Baal. The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the straw to the wheat? saith Jehovah. Which is to say: If you have a dream and want to tell it, go ahead. But do not pretend it is a revelation from God. Tell the folk, "Now this is just a dream; it is not the word of God. It is only straw, not the wheat. In fact, compared to the wheat (God's word), my dream is only chaff, and entirely worth-less. Come to think of it, it was not worth telling in the first place. Just forget it."

That is the way you will have to tell your dream ... if indeed you must tell it!

Box 155
Romulus, Mich. 48174

QUESTION: Was John the Baptist the Elijah of Mal. 4:5? If so, why did he deny it before the priests and Levites of Jerusalem (John 1:21)? Can his denial be made to harmonize with our Lord's statements in Matt. 11:14; 17:10-13? — R. L.

ANSWER: Before attempting to answer the above questions let us read the verses cited above.

"Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord" (Mal. 4:5).

"And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No" (John 1:21).

"And if ye will receive it, this is Elias, which was for to come" (Matt. 11:14). "And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the scribes that Elias must first come? And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly shall first come, and restore all things. But I say unto you, That Elias is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them. Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist" (Matt. 17:10-13).

John the Baptist was the Elijah of Mal. 4:5. The apparent contradiction between John and Jesus grows out of a failure to distinguish between a literal and a figurative application of the prophecy. Since Elijah had long since passed from the earth at the time of Malachi's prophecy, the use of his name should have been understood by the Jews in the light of prophetic language — as symbolizing one who in some way would be similar to the literal Elijah.

That this is the true meaning of the prophecy is evident from the statement of the Angel Gabriel in announcing to Zacharias that he was to have a son: "But the angel said unto him, Fear not, Zacharias: for thy prayer is heard; and thy wife Elisabeth shall bear thee a son, and thou shalt call his name John. And thou shalt have joy and gladness; and many shall rejoice at his birth. And many of the children of Israel shall he turn to the Lord their God. And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of Elias, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; to make ready a people prepared for the Lord" (Luke 1:13-17). Notice the angel explained that "he shall go before him in the spirit and power
of Elijah." Elias (Greek form), or Elijah (Hebrew form) perhaps did more to call the people of God to repentance in perilous times than any other prophet of Old Testament fame. John's work as well as the day of his preaching was beautifully prefigured by Elijah and his time. The Pharisees, priests, and Levites of our Lord's day had missed the true meaning of Malachi's prophecy. They were expecting Elijah in person.

John's denial (John 1:21), in answer to the question of the Jews, was from their point of view. He was not Elijah in person, hence, he told the truth when he said in answer to their question, "I am not." Furthermore, he told the truth again when he gave a negative answer to their question, "Art thou that prophet?" No doubt, they referred to the prophecy of Deut. 18:18,19: "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not harken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him." It seems that the identity of this prophet was not clear to some. However, John must have understood that it referred to the Messiah, which is the correct interpretation, according to Peter's application in Acts 3:20-23. John knew he was not the Messiah, hence his negative answer.

Our Lord made his comments (Matt. 11:14; 17:10-13) from the viewpoint, of truth, namely, that John had come "in the spirit and power of Elias." Thus, the harmony between the statements of John and Jesus is to be found in recognizing the different viewpoints from which they answered the question under consideration.

THE WEATHER IN PALESTINE

A general rule to follow with regard to the weather in Palestine is that as one moves from north to south and from west to east the rain decreases and the temperature increases. Westerly winds prevail in this region throughout most of the year. During the winter months they bring rain clouds in from the Mediterranean Sea and drop moisture along the western slopes of the Central Highlands. During the summertime the northwesterly winds are cool but bring no rain. As the winds pass through the Jordan Valley they once again become laden with moisture that in turn is dropped on the western slopes of the hills of Trans-jordan. In other words, the sea is the predominant influence on the western side of the mountain and the desert on the eastern side.

Palestine has an annual rainfall as great as that of many other places. For instance, Accho's rainfall (24"-26") compares favorably with London's (23.5") and Upper Galilee's (47") with that of New York City (41.6"). The chief difference, however, is that in Palestine all the rain falls during one brief season.

In fact, it may be said that Palestine has only two seasons: the rainy season (including the "early" and the "later" rains) and the dry season (from the middle of May to the middle of October). The farmers eagerly await the "early" rain in October that makes it possible, to plow their fields and sow them in November before the heavy rains come between December and February. The rains cause the grain to grow and ripen for the harvest in May and June. The two crucial periods are between April and May and between September and October when the humidity is the lowest. It is in the latter period especially that the terrifying "sirocco" (east wind) threatens the land with famine (Psalms 103:16; Ezek. 17:10; 27:26; Isa. 27:8; Hos. 13:15). Eight major periods of famine are recorded in the Old Testament (Gen. 12:10; 26:1; 37:4; 25:3). Palestine frequently is called the "land of milk and honey" (see Exod. 3:8; Deut. 6:3), a land that receives abundant rain from heaven (Deut. 11:10-12), but actually it is precariously balanced between fruitfulness and famine. The Bible makes it clear that Jehovah providentially controlled the rain in relation to Israel's faithfulness to His covenant (Deut. 11:13-17). Thus periods of famine are sometimes recorded as acts of divine judgment (I Kings 17:1; 18:1).
The famous Gezer Calendar, probably nothing more than a schoolboy’s exercise for learning the seasons of the year, was found in 1908 by R. A. S. Macalister during the excavations at Gezer. The type of writing is in the form of good biblical Hebrew and dates back to the tenth century B.C. It reads as follows:

   His two months are (olive) harvest,
   His two months are planting (grain),
   His two months are late planting;
   His month is hoeing up of flax,
   His month is harvest of barley,
   His month is harvest and feasting;
   His two months are vine-tending,
   His month is summer fruit.

This little mnemonic ditty follows the pattern described above for the seasons of the year, for planting and harvesting.

---

Paul said, “Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years. I am afraid of you, lest by any means I have bestowed labor upon you in vain” (Gal. 4:10, 11). We might make a modern paraphrase of this by saying, “Ye observe Christmas, and Easter, and Lent, I am afraid of you, lest by any means I have bestowed labor upon you in vain.”

Easter is supposed to be the beginning of the Jewish passover, but this is the thing that Easter does not do. The year 1825 is the last time Easter fell on the first day of the passover. The two dates will not coincide again until after the year 2000. The observance of Christmas and Easter was begun by the Roman Catholic Church, and a few years later some of the denomination churches began to observe this pagan holiday. But what puzzles me, how anyone can observe anything that was begun by the Pope of Rome who in years past has claimed to be God on earth.

There is nothing in the Bible that would give a man excuse for using the name of a pagan goddess in speaking of the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. As men are known by their gods, so the character of their religion is maintained by their festivals, and these festivals had their beginning in a corrupt age of the Catholic Church. The Encyclopedia Brittanica says, “There is no indication that the observance of Easter is found in the New Testament, or in the writings of the apostolic fathers. The idea was absent from the minds of the first Christians” (Vol. VIII, P. 828; 14th ed.). The same authority says, “The Lord nor his apostles enjoined the keeping of this or any other festival.” We have fallen away from the Living God, Lent, Easter, and Christmas, then, are evident tokens of apostasy.

In the early days only a few observed these pagan days, but now the Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, and most all observe the pagan holidays vigorously. But like Lot who pitched his tent too close to Sodom, these religious bodies have camped too close to the gates of Roman Catholicism. Consequently, they are drifting back into the ways of the Mother of Harlots. And so-called protestants practice that which they claim to protest, they may as well make complete surrender to the devil. As a matter of fact, all churches are coming closer and closer to the teaching of the Mother of Harlots.

There are members of the church of Christ who are falling into the same rut. It is time that Elders withdraw from them. Paul told Timothy: “Them that sin reprove in the sight of all” (1 Tim. 5:20).
There are also ungodly preachers in many churches today. Elders, Paul told us what to do, withdraw from them. Don't ship him off to some other church with a letter of recommendation. Withdraw from him.

The only thing that Christians are told to do is to meet around the Lord’s table on the First day of the week and remember his death until he comes again. But one thing we can be sure of, He will destroy evil in every high place of idolatry both in denomination-alism and Catholicism.

For any man to be his very best self, and to do his work with the greatest effectiveness, he needs a good family. Failure on man's part in meeting the responsibilities that are his by virtue of his being the head of the home is a serious and shameful failure. Success at home is basic to success elsewhere. He is responsible for the family's good order and well being, and their godliness upholds him in his worthy endeavors elsewhere. Whoso findeth a wife findeth a good thing. If she is a virtuous woman her price is far above rubies. Children are an heritage of the Lord (Prov. 18:22; 19:14; 31:10; Ps. 127:3-5).

"A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife." (I Tim. 3:2). There is a negative to this. He is not to be a polygamist, nor a man whose earlier marriage or marriages ended in divorce. But is it not also taught here that he needs a good wife if he is to undertake the great work of an elder? How could he be "the husband of one wife" if he is unmarried? He, especially in this great work, will need a wife meet for him. He is to have but one wife, but he is to have one wife. It is not good that this man should be alone.

Any member of the church should remember that his or her conduct reflects honor or dishonor to the holy name and the cause of truth. This would certainly be true of women whose husbands are elders. They should be honorable, temperate, trustworthy, and serious minded (See I Tim. 3:11). An unworthy wife can disqualify a man for this good work.

Many religious leaders of our day ignore the Bible on many points where clear instruction abounds. This grows out of the modernistic break down of faith on the part of some who claim to be leaders among Christians. Such church leaders may select some woman as an elder or bishop. Even the idea of age or maturity inherent in the word elder may be ignored. Character traits listed and skill in teaching may also be lacking. People who respect the Bible as the revelation of God's will know that, in the age of woman's liberation movement, or in any other age, the elder is to be "the husband of one wife."

One would think the Roman Catholic church would pay some attention to Titus 1 and I Timothy 3 in their sharp contention over the question of marriage for their church officials. Their practice and doctrine in this regard are exactly opposite to the instruction for bishops in the Lord's church. This is just one example of their conflict with the scriptures.

Every man who is a Christian is to bring his children up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord. Since an elder is to be an example to all of us, he is to be "one that ruleth his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity." His children are "not accused of riot or unruly." In driving this truth home the inspired man asked the question: "For if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?" His home failures are demonstrations of his inability to be a successful overseer in the Lord's church. It is also true that his failures would be called to his attention every time he first would seek to counsel others. Let elders take their work seriously because they must give account to God. In like manner their wives and children should be assets and not liabilities. The welfare of the kingdom and the righteousness of God are far above our selfish and worldly desires.

An elder is to have faithful children. His children are to be in subjection with all gravity. Does the word children, as used in the Bible, necessarily require more than one child? It is the plural form of the word child, and many excellent people earnestly contend that an elder must have two or more children. Is the plural form of the word child (children) used in the Bible in reference to one or more, or does it always refer to two or more in the Bible? Faithful Christians would always like to agree with the Lord.

"And Abraham was a hundred years old, when his son Isaac was born unto him. And Sarah said, God hath made me to laugh, so that all that hear will laugh with me. And she said, who would have said unto Abraham, that Sarah should have given children suck? for I have borne him a son in his old age" (Gen. 21:5-7).

Then Sarah did give children suck, did she not? Is that what she was talking about? She had only one son.

"Then came to him certain of the Sadducees, which deny that there is any resurrection: and they asked him, saying, Master, Moses wrote unto us, If any man's brother die, having a wife, and he die without children, that his brother should take his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother" (Luke 20:27, 28). If there had been one child before the man's death, would he have had children in the Bible sense in regard to this counsel? Did the Sadducees misquote the passage? The Old Testament passage that deals with this matter is Deut. 25:5, 6: "If brethren dwell together, and one of them die, and have no child, the wife of the dead shall not marry..." (I Tim. 3:2). 

This grows out of the modernistic break down of faith on the part of some who claim to be leaders among Christians. Such church leaders may select some woman as an elder or bishop. Even the idea of
without unto a stranger: her husband’s brother shall go in unto her, and take her to him to wife, and perform the duty of a husband’s brother unto her. And it shall be, that the first born which she beareth shall succeed in the name of his brother who is dead, that his name not be put out of Israel.” It seems obvious that the plural form of this word is used in the Bible in referring to one or more.

In the listing of genealogies in I Chronicles the plural of son (sons) is used to refer to one or more. Notice such verses as I Chron. 1:41a; 2:7,8. We are all aware, of course, that instruction to children concerning obedience to parents applies when there is only one child, and a father is to bring one or more up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord. Parents of one child should say yes if the census taker asks: Do you have children? the number and other details can then be given.

Those who understand the Bible uses the plural form of the word child (children) to refer to one or more certainly should not disturb, disrupt, and destroy a congregation in demanding that a man be an elder who has only one child. The unity is precious, and he cannot lead if they are unwilling to follow. This is written in the interest of truth. The Bible is right.

There is an ever increasing problem that is plaguing the Lord’s church in this century. It is the problem of hatred and bitterness between brethren.

The problem centers around various issues in the church. It has become more of a name calling, mudslinging and slander battle rather than a search for truth. . . . No one seems to be interested in studying the Word (II Tim. 2:15). That is a little too old fashioned for some. Have you ever bothered to see if you are correct on the particular issue you are studying? You might be wrong (II Cor. 13:5)!

No one should ever compromise truth, but that does not give a license to you for personal hatred or bitterness toward your brother. Why did Paul condemn these attitudes (Eph. 4:28-32)? He condemned them because all they do is cause strife and division in a local church.

In the midst of our spiritual battles we cannot afford to become bitter and hateful. If we develop this attitude God says we are no better off than a murderer (I John 3:15-18).

Let’s plug this gap and fight the good fight of faith that we might lay hold on eternal life. We need to work and serve God with an humble mind so that we do not develop these soul plaguing attitudes.

We need to stand firm against the devil and his allies, but we should not become bitter or hateful toward brethren or anyone for that matter (Luke 6:27; Rom. 13:10).

1110 Simpson Tupelo, Miss. 38801
DOING BIBLE THINGS IN BIBLE WAYS WITH EMPHASIS ON DOING

Kenneth Thomas, Brooksville, Fla.

For years now this writer has listened to "great" men of God parrot the statement which serves as the title of this article and report. The sad fact is that not a few of God's people "say and do not." We often talk a good fight and pray a good work for the Lord and fail to put into practice that for which we pray and about which we speak. Brethren, for the Lord and fail to put into practice that for which we pray and about which we speak. Brethren, these things ought not so to be!

The church is the pillar and support of the truth (1 Tim. 3:15; Matt. 28:20). We must spread the gospel to those who know it not and the church is the organization with which this responsibility lies (Phil. 4:15-16; Thess. 1:7-8 etc.). Likewise individuals who make up the Lord's church have personal responsibilities along this line to bear the "good News" of the gospel to others (Acts 8:4; Heb. 5:12-14; 2 Tim. 2:2; Eph. 4:15-16).

With such understanding of their responsibilities as Christians and as congregations, recently there was an outstanding effort begun which indicates to me that finally more Christians and congregations are awakening to the fact that we can, and must do what we have been preaching for years: "Do Bible things in Bible ways," but above all DO!

Several who saw the need for a congregation in the nearby city of Inverness, Fla. began to talk to others of this need. These included preachers, elders and saints of God, as to the possibility of doing such a work. Immediately the response to that end was good and enthusiastic and the word spread like wild fire from Florida to Illinois. There were discussions on the matter in business meetings of churches and among individuals from various places as to what each could do.

Several congregations simply supported "their" preacher to come and labor with us who were committed to the task of preaching the gospel during the two weeks from January 23rd to February 6th. The place of the meeting was the women's club building in Inverness, Florida.

Two congregations from Illinois sent "their" preachers who labored for over a week with us in door to door invitations and passing out literature. Each of us preached on the local radio station and publicly in the parking lot of the plaza shopping center over a P.A. system. With the P.A. system we also drove up the streets and through the sub-divisions encouraging people to come to the meeting.

The preachers from Illinois were Jeff Kingry from Kirkland, Illinois and Dennis Shaver from Rochelle, Illinois.

The radio program which was aired for 15 minutes daily from January 17th to February 6th was paid for by the Trilacoochee congregation where Jim Daniel preaches regularly. The literature, newspaper aids, P.A. system, etc. as well as this writer's expenses were paid for by the Broad Street church in Brooksville. Each congregation took care of the expenses of the men whom they sent to labor with us in this gospel effort.

The church on Silver Blvd. in Ocala, Florida where brother Colin Williamson preaches supplied the new congregation with a communion set and song books (brown back) in good shape. Sister Smallridge prepared the communion service during the meeting and we picked it up at their house on the way to the services. This writer opened the meeting on the first Sunday and closed on the last Sunday. We had visitors for all but about two services during the two weeks. By visitors I mean those not members of the church of Christ. At present there are about twelve who live in the immediate area of Inverness who may or may not become a part of this church. We have not tried to proselyte members for this congregation, but have asked those who were Christians living in the area to decide for themselves whether or not they wish to become a part of this church. Sadly we report that some who indicate a desire for a church closer to where they live, have been discouraged from working permanently in the new congregation by those of other congregations of the Lord's people. This I cannot understand. You would think all would be happy for a city the size of Inverness to have a congregation where the need is so great and the area is growing so fast.

Brother Ray Smallridge who is the preacher for the Cove Bend congregation near Floral City, Florida is presently laboring with the new congregation as well as his regular work at Cove Bend. He preaches Sunday evenings in Inverness and teaches the Mid-week Bible class. The Cove Bend church have changed their Bible study period to Thursday and they meet with the brethren at Inverness for Bible study, as many as are able to go. On the Lord's day in the A.M. different preachers are filling the pulpit. So far since the meeting these include brother Dug Black from Trilby, Florida, and Colin Williamson. Others have said they would help also.

We should mention also that in the course of the meeting brother Williamson preached one evening as did Steve Hudgins, each of these men are from Ocala presently. Brother Williamson is with the Church on Silver Springs Blvd. and brother Hudgins the Pine Street church there.

Several congregations of the Lord's people were represented throughout the meeting and we appreciated this so much. We were blessed also with several capable song leaders who did a fine job in leading the singing from night to night. These included brothers Jim Johnson from the Trilacoochee congregation, Jack Hill from Silver Springs Blvd.
congregation and Jeff Thomas the son of this writer. Also it was necessary for brother Dennis Shaver, Jim Daniel and I to lead one night each in the course of the meeting.

The rent on the woman's club building was paid for by brother Charles Phillips, a member of the Lord’s church at Brooksville. A member of the newly formed congregation has accepted the responsibility of the treasury and we understand that a sign is being prepared by another of the members there which will soon be displayed in the lawn of the meeting place. It looks as if the contribution will be sufficient to pay the expenses that will be incurred as they continue to meet. This is also encouraging.

While the preachers from other areas and out of state were in our home we were aided by several other Christians with monetary contributions which took the shock off of the Thomas' budget. We had a wonderful time together day and night. We sat up until 3:30 A.M. on occasions talking and visiting. We made two trips daily to Inverness, during the day to work and teach, and each evening to the services from January 23rd through February 6th. Brothers Jim Daniel, Ray Smallridge and I intend to continue working in the area as time permits in teaching those of the community and helping the new congregation with teaching, etc.

In a business meeting this week, the Broad St. church where this writer preaches have decided that they will have fellowship with the new Inverness church of Christ in helping to support the preacher who is decided upon to come labor with them. This would be subject to their approval of the man, certainly. We hope and pray that those of you who read this will be moved to do whatever you have the ability to do to cooperate in this effort until such time as the Inverness church of Christ may become self-supporting.

If you desire more information, we will be happy to put you in contact with the brethren there, or you may contact brothers Jim Daniel, Ray Smallridge or myself. We are aware that some people are interested in this situation. There is a dire need for this city to have someone able and willing to preach and teach publicly and from house to house. This is the county seat of Citrus county and is the third fastest growing county in Florida according to the information I have received.

Brethren, here is a golden opportunity, here is another "Macedonian call." What will you do, or the congregation where you labor? (James 4:17)

DEBATE

Harold V. Trimble, 19404 S.E. 196th, Renton, Wash. 98055 — I will meet Don Comish, a physicist, on the following propositions: Resolved: "That the theory of Evolution as originally enunciated by Darwin, and modified and held by many scientists of today, is true." Resolved: "That the Biblical accounts of the creation of the earth are hot true." He is in the affirmative all four nights and I shall have the negative. There will be two thirty-minute speeches each night and the debate will be held in our building located at 2527 N.E. Twelfth St., Renton, Wash., May 8th through 11th. It will be at 7:30 each evening. Both the church and my personal phone number are the same, A.L. 5-3440.

Len Spencer, P.O. Box 16113, Houston, Texas 77022 — A new congregation was formed to serve the suburban areas along the North Freeway. We leave Greenwood Village with the good will and best wishes of the brethren there.

The congregation in Greenwood Village is small and the five families living in the North Freeway area are all that could be spared for this work. So we are starting with few in number. Among us, though, are abilities to preach, to teach classes (both publicly and in homes), and to lead singing. And we do have a will to work. We hope that others of like mind who live in the general area will soon cast their lot with us.

On February 13, we begin meeting at the Field Inn, North, in the Heritage Room. This is at the intersection of the North Freeway and FM 525-Alpine Bender on the west side of the Freeway. Lord's Day Bible class begins at 9:30 a.m.; worship at 10:30 and 6:00. The midweek meeting will be at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday. This will perhaps encourage brethren and others to visit with us who could not otherwise do so.

For further information about the work or to tell us of someone we may contact, please call any of the following: Len Spencer, 694-9795; John Fertig, 448-0442; Mike Murphy, 447-0855; Jack Brooks, 448-7782.

William C. Sexton, 2804 Lafayette, St. Joseph, Mo. 64507—After 5 years with the 10th and Lincoln Street congregation in St. Joseph, Missouri, I resigned my full-time relationship with them effective September 1, 1971. There was no dissatisfaction, I just thought that a new man could move them a little better than I. My expectations have been fulfilled. Brother Mike Rogcas moved to work with them, October 1, and attendance has increased, along with the contribution. Also, we have put a new roof on the building, put a new ceiling in, and panted the auditorium. Mike has done a commendable job.

When I resigned, I fully intended to move to work with another congregation on a full-time basis. I was in touch with several congregations to that end, and I even made an appointment to speak at the Stilwell, Indiana, congregation. However, my family began to persuade me to stay in St. Joseph until my daughter, Geneva, finished high school in June of 1973. Even though I wanted to continue my full-time work, I consented to stay and seek work in the secular field and preach part time until she finished school. So, I am working for Rockwell Manufacturing Company in Atchison, Kansas, taking 12 hours of schooling at Missouri Western College, and preaching three Sundays a month at North, Mo.; Gilman City, Mo., and Barnard, Mo. The other Sunday, I teach an adult class at 10th and Lincoln.

However, I do plan to re-enter the field of full-time preaching in JUNE of '73! I would like to work with a congregation that is self-supporting and has as many teaching opportunities as possible, perhaps
a radio program, a bulletin, and several classes to teach as well as a good personal work program. Yet, I'd be glad to talk to brethren with less systematic activities but ample opportunities.

Bob McClung

It is with deep regret that we make known the death of our brother in Christ, Bob McClung. Brother McClung was found dead in his apartment in Louisville, Kentucky, where he resided, on Friday, March 10, 1972. For a number of years he preached in Texas and Louisiana. However, in later years he had been working with an insurance firm in Houston, Texas. He was one of my dearest friends and a faithful member of the Gardner Lane Church of Christ in Louisville, where he preached the Sunday before his death. He will be missed by all who knew him. Our sympathy to his good family. — J. T. Smith

Preacher Needed

Small congregation in North Carolina needs full-time preacher. Support is arranged. Contact Eugene Edwards, P.O. Box 936, Aberdeen, N.C. 28315, or call collect 944-1315 during the day, and 944-1409 at night.

DEBATE

Dick Blackford, representing the Willow Glen Church of Christ, Central City, Ky., and Robert Daugherty, representing the Apostolic Church of the Lord Jesus Christ, Central City, Ky., will discuss: Water Baptism Formula, Holy Ghost Baptism, The Duration of Miracles, on May 17-19, 1972. The debate will take place at the Apostolic Church of The Lord Jesus Christ, Central City, Ky.

Ken Green, Louisville, Ky., and Edgar Tetrick, Jeffersontown, Ky., will moderate.

Preacher Available

I am available for part-time or full-time preaching work, preferably in Alabama or Tennessee. Contact Barry Hudson, P.O. Box 209, Florida College, Temple Terrace, Fla. 33617.

David Pratte, 5415 South Hanna, Lot 18, Ft. Wayne, Ind. 46806 — I have a brother-in-law stationed at DaNang, Viet Nam. I would appreciate very much knowing of any other faithful Christians who might also be stationed there that he might work and worship with. If anyone has friends or relatives they know of stationed at DaNang, please send the names and addresses to David Pratte, 5415 South Hanna, Lot 18, Ft. Wayne, Indiana.

Clarence R. Johnson, Springhill, La. — This is to inform you that the Lord's church that meets at 405 South Minnesota, Springhill, La., has had approximately 60 in attendance each Sunday morning. The church has approximately 60 members. The services are held at 7:30 a.m. I would appreciate it if you would pass this information on to Searching the Scriptures readers.

West Knoxville Church of Christ seeks a full-time minister to work for the spread of the kingdom in this area. Though few in number, the saints here have a great love for God. For further information contact Nelson Roark, 804 Chateaugay Road, Knoxville, Tenn. 37919.

L. Bruce Taylor, 23 Margaret St., Joliet, Ill. 60436 — On Sunday, April 2, 1972, thirty-three who were formerly members of the Margaret Street congregation began meeting in Lockport, Ill., some approximately ten miles northeast of Joliet on state route 171. This effort has been in the minds of some for a couple of years and definite planning began last summer. The present meeting place will be Ludwig grade school in Lockport. Please address all correspondence and information to either: Elmer Gunchin, 115 S. Washington St., Lockport, Ill., or Kenneth Tolbert, 415 Scott Dr., Lockport, Ill. 60441.

These brethren have the best wishes and complete encouragement from the Margaret St. congregation. There is no strife, contention, or lack of cooperation among us now that is causing a so-called "split." We believe that this is a field ripe unto harvest and that the laborers should look unto the work. The Lockport, Romeoville, Bolingbrook area has been called the fastest growing in the state of Illinois and we feel a need to see Christ established in this community that the church may flourish.

We ask your prayers for these brethren in their endeavors ahead and that you encourage them by your presence when you are in the area and have the opportunity. Pray for us all that our labors might bring forth fruit for the Master's sake.

A CANADIAN NEWS REPORT AND A PLEA FOR PREACHERS

Dave Bradford

Three and one-half years ago my family and I moved to Calgary, Alberta, Canada to establish a congregation in this city of 400,000 people. Prior to this time, the one church in the city was drifting more and more into a liberal way of thinking and this was leading to things being done which some were questioning, but not energetically. Though we had in mind starting with just my family and felt we would likely be alone for quite some time before conversions would lead to much increase, our coming presented the opportunity to some open-minded brethren to see the local situation in light of a brotherhood trend that had digressed much farther. We met with immediate opposition from others and after futility attempting to promote brotherly discussions of these problems, several families felt compelled to leave the congregation where a trend to liberalism was becoming more prominent and where opposition to the truth was tolerated and upheld.

During the passage of time a few have been baptized, a few have come here from other places in Canada to worship with us, and we presently have approximately 60 in attendance each Sunday morning.

We began by having our services in a Community Centre and in our home, but after one year the
church bought a residence which with some remodeling served as our place of meeting for another 1⅔ years. After this, we began renting a building that we were able to buy six months later. We rejoice that as of last fall the church now owns its own building, but we rejoice even more in a recent baptism and the recent increase in opportunities to teach the gospel in home Bible studies.

Since my coming here I have been supported in this work by four (presently three) churches in Alabama and one church in Florida. This arrangement continues, but the local church has completely borne the burden of making the financial arrangements for purchase of the building.

Calgary is in the province of Alberta in Western Canada, just north of the state of Montana. 140 miles to the south is Lethbridge, a progressive city of 40,000 people with a recently opened university, and 180 miles to the southeast (100 miles east of Lethbridge) is Medicine Hat, a city of 27,000 people which is enjoying a recent flourish financially in connection with a newly opened Jr. College and other development. These are the only two cities in the province with churches that are opposed to the innovations related to church support of human organizations and sponsoring church arrangements. There are probably only five other churches of Christ in Alberta, a province about the size of Texas in land area and having a population of approximately 1⅔ million.

The church in Lethbridge has an attendance of about 30, owns a very comfortable building and a nice four-bedroom house which they would furnish to a preacher. Since last fall they do not have a preacher working with them, but they are doing quite well as the men (including 3 teenage boys) have been preparing and presenting the lessons. I feel that with good sound preaching and energetic personal work, several restorations could be made in a short time that would lead to the attendance running 40 or better. Someone is needed as soon as possible and I believe that a capable preacher would find this a rewarding work because of the fine character of the brethren you could begin working with.

The church in Medicine Hat has an attendance of about 25, rents an I.O.O.F. hall for a meeting place, and presently has Marvin Noble working with them as a preacher. One difficulty here is that a division took place a few years ago and the few that would not stand for the truth on the issues mentioned above, retained the building, and this evident division in a city of this size is some hindrance. Marvin Noble, after working with the church about four years, has reluctantly but definitely made the decision to move from Medicine Hat, feeling that both the work there and he and his family can profit by a change. Therefore, a preacher is needed in Medicine Hat as well. The brethren there have put forth some effort toward securing a permanent meeting place, both by searching for and saving financially toward an initial payment on a building. I believe the purchase of or building of a permanent meeting place should be a matter of top priority in view of their local situation.

Is it possible that a capable preacher reading this article would be interested in moving into this much needed field of labor? If two preachers whose families were close friends could plan to come at the same time to each of these cities, they could be a source of encouragement to each other. Or perhaps a long lost friend of mine would consider coming?

In a field of this nature, the distances of 140 and 180 miles are very small, and we could find many occasions to encourage each other in the work.

Let me briefly add that this is not the frozen northland that some might picture it. While winter is longer and colder than in my home state of Alabama, because of the moderating influence of the warm "Chinook" winds in the winter, the climate is milder than in many places in the states further south. Both myself and my family have found this to be a beautiful and enjoyable place to live and a great part of this enjoyment comes from the wide variety of winter sports that characterize the area. The Canadian Rockies just west of both Calgary and Lethbridge offer a unique, rugged beauty and excellent recreation for both the summer and winter vacationer as well as the resident who desires to "get away just for a day."

It takes approximately 3 months after filing application with the Canadian Government to receive the approval for moving to Canada. However, one can visit here without even securing a passport. If you are interested in this work, you may contact me for further information or write to: Mr. Oliver Nerland

918 8th Avenue South 23 Colter Crescent N.W.
Lethbridge, Alberta Medicine Hat, Alberta
Canada Canada

These men could also direct preachers to churches that would be likely sources of support for this work. Are YOU interested? — Dave Bradford, 4804 Niven Road N.W., Calgary 47, Alberta, CANADA

Richard W. Terry — There will be a public religious Discussion with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and the church of Christ. The Discussion will take place on April 18, 1972, at the Grandview church of Christ building. Participants will be Mr. William H. Day, president of the Kentucky-Tennessee Missions of the church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and Richard W. Terry, minister of the Grandview church of Christ. The time will be at 7:30 p.m. Everyone is invited to attend. Brother Thomas G. O'Neil of the North Meadows church of Christ in Murfreesboro, Tennessee has consented to moderate for me.

A ONE TIME OFFER ON ECONOMY CASSETTES

These are not Living Voice tapes. Good for recording sermons, lectures and other such programs. When this supply is gone there will be no more.

Packed in blue and white mailing carton.
One dozen (12) C-60 (1 hr. playing time)........ $7.00
One dozen (12) C-90 (1 ½ hrs. playing time) .... $10.00

Include 5% for packing and postage
Fortunately!

No, I'm not one of today's rebels ranting against the "Establishment" (euphemism for society). Nor am I presently concerned about these. I am writing about the Nov. 8, 1971 vote in the United States House of Representatives which brought about the (temporary) defeat of the so-called "prayer amendment."

The "establishment clause" of the First Amendment to our marvelous Constitution reads, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;"

House Joint Resolution 191 (the "prayer amendment") reads, "Nothing contained in this Constitution shall abridge the right of persons lawfully assembled in any public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds, to participate in non-denominational prayer."

Many have been needlessly confused over the Supreme Court decisions of 1SS2 and 1963 concerning prayers in public schools, believing prayers have been forbidden. This did not happen; rather, they did prohibit required prayer, and any prayer directed by government officials. Since that time, various groups have foolishly pressed for "the right of prayer in public schools" as if this right no longer existed. It does! Among the most vocal and effective has been the "CITIZENS FOR PUBLIC PRAYER," a Roman Catholic front group led for the last eight years by Roman Catholic priest Robert H. Howes. The "prayer amendment" was sponsored by Rep. Chalmers P. Wylie of Ohio. After being successfully bottled up in committee for a long time, it was finally forced out for floor action by a Petition of Discharge (which requires 218 signatures of House members). Due to a fortunate combination of holidays and House of Representatives rules on when bills petitioned out of committee may be considered, it did not come up for a vote until Monday, Nov. 8, 1971. This was fortunate because it gave to those who love freedom of worship and were willing to do something to save it time in which to marshal the opposition. Since the bill was a proposed amendment to the United States Constitution, its passage required a two-third's rather than a simple majority. It was stopped by 28 votes. Close! Close!

Examination of two portions of this innocently-sounding resolution will show the very great danger to the freedom we love. Notice, "... public building which is supported in whole or in part through the expenditure of public funds ..." and "... non-denominational prayer." Any building which accepts direct or indirect subsidy from any governmental unit (including church buildings provided police and fire protection without payment of taxes or an equivalent for such protection) would fall under the control of public officials to the extent of requiring "non-denominational prayer" be allowed in it. It would take the courts some years to produce a clear-cut decision as to what this meant, but the ultimate would be that prayer determined to be "non-denominational" by the controlling public official in a particular place would be the authorized and required one. Elders, preachers, saints, are you ready to have some public official tell you what prayer you can, and even more importantly, what you cannot within the four walls of your building? This is establishment of religion! And I'll give you one guess as to which religion swings enough political "clout" to have the deciding voice in what is, and what is not "non-denominational prayer."

Brethren, I have correspondence from national legislators openly proclaiming their support for this, or a subsequent effort to authorized "non-denominational prayer" in "public buildings." It has been said that all that is required for evil men to triumph is for good men to do nothing. This is especially true as far as this "prayer amendment" is concerned. I am not saying our representatives and senators are evil, but willingly or otherwise, many are submitting to political pressure from men who are.

I am not urging churches to involve themselves in politics, but individual Christians in some circumstances must. As long as we are in the world,
though not of the world, we need to do what we can to keep this old ball livable. Peter twice (Acts 4 and 5) indicated the only limitation to a Christian's obedience to government was when such placed one in opposition to God. Paul, in Romans 13 said government was for our protection. In Matthew 22 Christ told us to render to Caesar (civil government) that which is Caesar's. This specifically applied to paying taxes but in principle teaches us we have an obligation to the government under which we live, to help it maintain its God-ordained course and purpose.

Do not think because this attempt has been beaten back Roman Catholicism will give up. This group is extremely persistent, sometimes devoting centuries to achieve its ends. It will not stop trying to take away our precious freedom of worship, our legal right to serve God after the New Testament order until it is made so clear that Catholicism cannot fail to understand we will not put up with it. I suggest a strong letter to your congressman and two senators would go a long way toward helping them resist the pressure of the emissaries of Rome. I have no objection to Roman Catholicism requiring its own prayers in its own facilities of its own people. I have severe Scriptural objections to it imposing such on others, especially on me and mine.

I am appalled little or nothing has been said or written among brethren on this obvious danger to our privilege of worshipping God unmolested in spirit and truth. If we are not careful, we may someday find this taken from us or our children, and going the route of Northern Ireland to Spain, wondering all the time, "What happened?" If we value what we have, we need to wake up, and soon.

Or perhaps, judging from the unconcern of so many indicated by lack of devotion (failing to assemble, etc.), the loss of such freedom might be exactly what we need to shake us out of our apathy. Historically, the church has always prospered spiritually during persecution, and this might be the very thing for us now. How about it, is this the goad for us? If not, if you are already spiritual, better get with the letter writing.

John 4:24 will never be so precious to us as when we are forbidden by law from doing it.
I AM GRATEFUL

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to all of you who have sent financial aid in helping clear up some of the accumulated indebtedness of twelve years publishing Searching The Scriptures. Nearly 14 of this debt was cleared by the generosity of many of you who have shown an interest in our efforts to spread the word of God. By the grace of God and your continued help in sending subscriptions we shall continue to spread the gospel of Christ and smite error wherever it may be found.

Several young men have prepared good material to be published and offered the profit, if any, to aid in publishing Searching The Scriptures. Others have promised to send one new subscription each month. This is of great help.

By the purchase of literature, Bibles, books, song books and other equipment and supplies used by churches you can help us continue with this good work. The sale of tapes of debates, lectures, sermons and the New Testament also provides necessary funds to meet the ever climbing cost of publishing Searching The Scriptures.

DO THIS ONE THING FOR US

Many have written and asked, "What can I do to help?" There is one easy job that you can do with little cost and effort: Send just one subscription to a friend or relative. This will accomplish two things at the same time: help the one to whom the paper is sent, and help us in doing a better job in sending forth the truth. We need your help. Why not do this today?

Again, I sincerely thank each of you for your financial help and encouragement over the past three months.

H. E. Phillips

AN EXPOSITORY DICTIONARY OF NEW TESTAMENT WORDS
by W. E. Vine

This standard work originally appeared in four volumes, but now available in one volume. A valuable aid to any serious student of the New Testament. Price $13.95

"PAUL'S TRIP TO CORINTH"

On the nights of October 25th and 26th of 1971, it was my privilege to meet F. I. Stanley in a debate at the DeSota congregation in the Dallas area. The discussion was motivated by the divergent views of brethren within the confines of the congregation. Brethren of what is commonly called the liberal persuasion asked F. I. Stanley of Houston, Texas, to represent their position and brethren who are sometimes known as conservative asked me to represent them. It was a rather informal type discussion. Many preachers and brethren from the Dallas area attended.

I would like to take up the main points of controversy in this short discussion: Brother Stanley took the position that since both evangelism and benevolence came out of the same treasury based on I Cor. 16:1-2, that the principle governing them is the same. He, therefore, pointed out that since churches sent to churches for benevolence the same could be done for evangelism and thus the sponsoring church concept. This was refuted by showing that acts of worship are found in Acts 2:45 — apostles' doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread and prayers. That according to the logic of brother Stanley since all of these acts are in one verse and have to do with worship, the principle governing them would be the same. If that be so, we could eat the Lord's Supper on Thursday night since we can pray at that time! This seemed to upset Brother Stanley, since his main argument was predicated on the above principle. No attempt was made to refute the Acts' two arguments.

Brother Stanley also took the position that the Greek words "eis logon-dosis" and "lepsis" in Phil. 4:15 sorta put the church at Philippi into the bookkeeping business. That they took money from other churches and paid Paul. I replied by quoting from Vincent in the I.C.C. When he said, "The matter is expressed in a mercantile metaphor." He means that the question of money given and received did not enter into his relations with any other church. The Philippians, by their contribution, had opened an account with him. Others like Lightfoot dismiss the metaphor and render eis logon as "regards" or "with reference to." This has classical but not N.T. precedence" Page 148. He then quoted Thayer who said, "Here Paul, by a pleasant euphemism, refers to the pecuniary gifts, which the church bestowing them enters in the account of expenses, but he himself
in the account of receipts" (Page 157). These quotations from Vincent and Thayer seemed to disturb brother Stanley even more. He replied in his next speech that some of the scholars like Thayer were prejudiced in their rendering of words and could not always be accepted. He remarked on how few people understood the Greek and that it was best to stay with the English. I pointed out that it was Stanley and not Hogland who introduced the Greek.

Brother Stanley also took the position that the Greek words hote ekselthon which are rendered "when I departed from Macedonia" meant that Paul had left Macedonia and arrived all the way down at Corinth in Acaia. He then tried to join II Cor. 11:8 "I robbed other churches" to Phil. 4:15-16 and came up with the incredible idea that a number of churches were sending to Philippi and Philippi in turn sent money to Corinth and Corinth in turn paid Paul! I replied by pointing out that brother Stanley had at least three assumptions in his affirmation. First, that Philippi collected money from other churches. Second, that Philippi sent to Corinth. Third, that Corinth paid Paul. I then told the people that brother Stanley would make a fine debater if we would let him get away with assumptions. I also pointed out that scholars were divided over hote ekselthon, that some felt he was still in Macedonia and others felt he might have left. I emphasized that even if Paul had left one couldn't get him down at Corinth from this text to save his life.

I tried to impress on the audience that no man has the authority to tie the two above scriptures together without some Bible evidence to do so.

Brother Stanley also asserted that in sending direct to a preacher, a preacher could become a church boss and dictator. He said according to Hogland, E. R. Harper could have collected several million dollars for a television program himself. This assertion was turned into a tail-spin by going to Phil. 4:15-16 and pointing out that a preacher didn't have the right to collect one dime from a church except for his needs. Paul called this need wages. It was pointed out that a television program was the need of the church and not the need of the preacher.

This is not intended as a complete review of the debate, but it does cover the main points discussed.

HEARTFELT RELIGION

Many have accused those of us who just claim to be Christians, nothing more than Christians, of not believing in heartfelt religion. It seems that the reason this is true is because we do not believe in a bench-jumping, floor-rolling, hysterical type of service. The truth of the matter is, we DO believe in heartfelt religion — but we also believe in doing things decently and in order, as per I Cor. 14:40.

FROM ONE EXTREME TO ANOTHER

Many churches of Christ today are involved in "meeting, eating" (the Lord's Supper) and going home to live their lives of rushing about until time for them to stop the rush for a few minutes the next week to meet, eat, and start the vicious circle all over again. Seemingly, they could care less about the fact that God is not in their lives, in the services etc. that they engage in. Many times they are so tired from all of the rushing, trying to get all of the material wealth and worldly comforts they can acquire, they sleep through the lesson. Then one day, their conscience begins to bother them and they get all excited because they have not been worshipping God as they should, they begin to blame everyone else because there is no "spirit" in the services and do as Pat Boone and others have done, go off the deep end in the other direction, to the other extreme — casting away "truth" in favor of "spirit". The thing we need to remember is that Jesus included BOTH "truth" and "spirit" in John 4:24. "God is a Spirit: and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." In this study we want to deal with four aspects of the Bible heart. (1) What is the heart. (2) The character of the heart. (3) The exercise of the heart. (4) The change of heart.

WHAT IS THE HEART?

The Bible "heart" is not the little, throbbing muscle located on the left side of the chest whose function it is to push the blood through the body. The heart, morally and religiously speaking, is the affections of the mind. In Matt. 6:20-21 we read, "But lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal: for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." Of the Greek word kardia, that is here translated "heart", Mr. Thayer says, "the soul or mind,
as it is the fountain and seat of the thoughts, passions, desires, appetite, affections, purposes, endeavors" (Thayer's Greek-Lexicon, Page 325). Hence, Jesus said, though we must live here, our affections are to be in heaven. We are, in fact, so commanded by God. "Set your affections on things above, and not on things of the earth. For ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God." It was said of Absalom that he stole the "hearts" of the people. We see immediately that he stole their affections, cf. II Sam. 15:6.

The word "heart" is also used in a more comprehensive sense. It means, "the mind, the understanding, the whole moral, inner man." Cf. Luke 24:38; Rom. 10:10.

THE CHARACTER OF THE HEART

The Bible draws a very dark picture of the unconverted heart. In Jer. 17:9 we read, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" And, Jesus said in Matt. 15:18-19 "But those things which proceed out of the mouth come forth from the heart; and they defile the man. For out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." Hence the character of the heart is exhibited in the conduct of a person. In Matt. 12:34-35 Jesus said, "O generation of vipers, how can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. A good man out of the good treasures of the heart bringeth forth good things: and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things." This teaching of Jesus was demonstrated in the case of Simon the Sorcer in Acts 8. When Simon thought he could buy the gift of God with money we learn that he was told that he had "neither part nor lot in this matter: for thy heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent therefore of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee" (v. 21-22). Thus, the words of our mouth tells others what is in our heart. If we fill our hearts with good things, good things will come forth. If we fill our hearts with evil things, evil things will come forth. Therefore the character of the heart is demonstrated by the words of our mouths. (Next month, The Exercise of the Heart.)

"FORSAKING THE ASSEMBLING OF OURSELVES"

In the early days of Christianity, the inspired apostles had to exhort brethren to assemble and rebuke those who were negligent.

"And let us consider one another to provoke unto love and to good works: Not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is; but exhorting one another: and so much the more, as ye see the day approaching" (Heb. 10:24,25).

What are some of the sins and dangers involved — directly and indirectly — in forsaking the assemblies of the saints?

1. You disobey a divine commandment. Brethren should be less concerned about what "the day" was (whether the destruction of Jerusalem, the Lord's day, or the judgment) and more concerned about what the apostle enjoined upon them. I've known some who were very concerned about the "day" mentioned in the verse, and yet they were not too concerned about assembling on any day! The command, stated negatively, was to assemble with the saints. And the word is not assembly, as having reference to one particular service, but the "assembling of ourselves together."

2. You fail to meet your appointment with the Lord. "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. 18:20).

3. You disrespect the Lord's will that you break bread on the Lord's day (Matt. 26:26,27; Acts 20:7).


5. You fail to engage in other items of scriptural worship (John 4:23,24).

6. Generally speaking, those who forsake the assemblies fail to contribute as they have prospered (I Cor. 16:2).

7. You fail to assist the church in its great mission.

8. You fail to stay prepared to meet Christ should he come or should you die (Matt. 24:44; Heb. 9:27).

9. You may lead others astray by the influence you have over their lives (Matt. 5:13-16).

10. You "crucify the son of God afresh, and put him to open shame" (Heb. 6:6).

11. You count the blood of the covenant whereby you were sanctified an unholy thing (Heb. 10:29). (Note this verse in context and how it is
connected with the line of thought which began in verse 23.)

12. You are on the road to complete apostasy as described by Peter: "For if after they have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, they are entangled therein, and overcome, the latter end is worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than, after they have known it, to turn from the holy commandment delivered unto them" (II Peter 2:20,21).

I have often suggested that an effective safeguard against such apostasy is to study the Bible daily, pray to God often, and attend all services of the church. When a Christian begins to neglect any of these, he is in danger of spiritual death.

THE LORD WAS THERE, WERE YOU?

"I came to the services Sunday. I walked up and down the aisle; I noticed your seat was vacant."

Said the Master, with a smile.

"Yes, I was at home," I answered, "Some folks from up the way, drove down for a week-end visit, so we stayed in the house all day."

Or, "I had an awful headache."

Or, "I had a mast in the pan."

Or, "We overslept that morning, but we go whenever we can."

"I went to the morning service not over two months ago, but so much work must wait till Sunday, there's no time for church, you know."

Looking upon me sadly, the Master began to speak,

"My child, are there not six other days in the week? If all the other children should treat me the same as you, the assembly would be deserted, then what would lost sinners do?"

I saw I had grieved my Master, as slowly he turned away, and I vowed He'd not find me absent again on His holy day. —Author Unknown

AN AD HOMINUM ARGUMENT DEDICATED TO THE 'BRILLIANT, CONSECRATED, QUESTIONING' STUDENTS OF FLORIDA COLLEGE WHO MAY ADMIRE BROTHER KETCHERSIDE

When I picked up my mail last week, much to my surprise, there was a gift volume from brother Carl Ketcherside, plus the April 1972 issue of Mission Messenger. I surmised correctly that the single issue must contain a report of his recent visit to Florida, and since I was away when he spoke at the invitation of the congregation where I worship, being given the opportunity both to state his views and to be criticized by brother Robert Turner and others, I read the article "Florida Lectureship" (pp. 61, 62) with interest. My surprise was quickly transformed into indignant rage when I read impersonal descriptions of myself (I must have been included since no exceptions were made) as a "dogmatic" preacher and instructor, a "legalistic" ethicist whose morals are determined by "financial rope-holders," a teacher of "casuistry," a compromiser of conscience, a contester for the "like precious prejudice," and so on. Soon, however, reason took control of my emotions, while brother Ketcherside let Harry Pickup Jr. "have it" (under the impersonal designation "the brother"), accusing him of using the "'guilt by association' technique" in his lecture. Brother Ketcherside says, "He equated my position with neo-orthodoxy, existentialism and situation ethics, linking my rather obscure name with such important figures as Charles Clayton Morrison and Karl Barth."

Then I recalled Paul's words, "Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself" (Rom. 2:21)? Hurriedly I scanned the article again and noticed some interesting "guilt by association" techniques used by brother Ketcherside himself. He equated my positions (supposedly mine, since again he made no exceptions) with partisanship, factionalism, dogmatism, racism, legalism, monasticism, lack of conscience, and casuistry. I do not know all the intricacies of logic, although I have taught it before, but all of the catch-words used by brother Ketcherside represent a fairly clear example of sophistical reasoning. At least I trust, since the future of Florida College, according to brother Ketcherside, "lies not with the administration or faculty but with the students, some of whom are brilliant, consecrated, questioning, and fed up with the casuistry essential to maintain any monastic-type structure," that these brilliant young people know enough
logic to detect loaded words that seem to imply "guilt by association."

There is something else I should add. It is true that many of the rules enforced by Florida College are those that appear to be acceptable and desirable to the majority of the parents of our students, i.e., to the brothers and sisters who are the "financial rope-holders" of the institution. I see no shame in this; in fact, God help us when our brethren no longer influence our code of conduct on campus, for then we will have betrayed their trust.

Brother Ketcherside concludes with this open-door policy, "Since the only kind of brethren I have on earth are 'brethren in error' I intend to go among all of them — regardless of variety." Just what is he implying here? I doubt that he means to say that everyone else is in error except himself, since he has so much "love" and "humility." If all brethren are in error, then certainly his own teaching on fellowship is worthy of cautious examination as a possible error. As for myself, I might go among all my brethren — regardless of variety, but quite obviously conscience (I pray God mine is not seared yet!) demands that I go for many different reasons: sometimes I go to exhort and encourage them; among others I go to take issue, even in debate if necessary; or else I go among them to learn their point of view. My conscience, despite the many compromises brother Ketcherside seems to think I make as a teacher at Florida College, not only will not permit me to participate in many things which some brethren call worship or which they engage in as the Lord's work, but also incites me not to associate myself with them when such matters are pressed. If by taking this stand I am linked with a "sect" which is everywhere spoken against as being narrow-minded, then so be it.

SEND A CLUB TODAY!
Three Subscriptions For $10.00

Living Voice Tapes of
THE KETCHERSIDE-TURNER EXCHANGE
in Tampa, Florida
January 25, 1972

The full exchange between Carl Ketcherside and Robert Turner and the panel discussion including Ferrell Jenkins and Harry Pickup, Jr. with questions from the floor which lasted nearly three hours are now available on open reel, cassette or 8-track tapes.

7" or 5" reels are $5.25 each for the full discussion on one reel.

Cassettes are $4.95 each and two tapes contain the full discussion. Total price for cassettes: $9.90.

8-track cartridges are $4.95 each and it takes three for the full discussion. Total price for 8-track cartridges: $14.85.

THE LORD'S SUPPER

One of the acts of worship that is peculiar to the New Testament and to the New Testament church is the eating of the Lord's Supper.

INSTITUTED BY CHRIST

Jesus instituted his supper at the passover feast (Mt. 26:17-30). At that feast "as they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Mt. 26:26-28; see also Mk. 14:22-25; Lk. 22:17-20). When the passover was observed, leaven was not to be found in their houses (Ex. 12:14-15). The bread used by Jesus was therefore unleaven bread, and thus the reason for unleavened bread on the Lord's table today. He used "the fruit of the vine" (Mk. 14:25) also. The "fruit of the vine" is also called "the cup" (I Cor. 11:25).

BY REVELATION

Paul "received of the Lord" that which he delivered unto the Corinthians (I Cor. 11:23). When we eat the Lord's Supper we (1) remember Christ, I Cor. 11:25; (2) show the Lord's death till he comes again, I Cor. 11:26; (3) examine ourselves, I Cor. 11:28; (4) discern the Lord's body, I Cor. 11:29, and (5) eat when we "come together" I Cor. 11:33. These matters were delivered to Paul (I Cor. 11:23) and he revealed them to Corinth and we are to follow them also.

FIRST DAY

We learn the time the Lord's Supper is to be eaten from the approved apostolic example of the brethren in Troas (Acts 20:7), the time being the "first day of the week". Other passages tell us concerning other matters as they relate to the Lord's Supper but we rely entirely on one approved example for the time of eating. Brethren have recognized this important point and taught it through the years.

Brother Roy E. Cogdill said, "We have in the scriptures an express command for its observance, for Jesus said, "This do in remembrance of me." I Cor. 11:23, 24. He did not expressly stipulate, though, in the record given to us, the specific day, if any, upon which this institution was to be, or is to be, observed. We learn that from the practice of
a congregation assembling for such worship in the New Testament. Acts: chapter 20 and verse 7—

"And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread ..." Here we have the church at Troas assembling to break bread, observe the Lord's Supper, on the first day of the week. Paul was present and took part in that worship. This is New Testament example. The church of our Lord under apostolic approval and guidance assembled on the first day of the week to break bread. There is no example of them ever assembling upon any other day of the week for this purpose. They assembled only upon the first day of the week to break bread. Hence, we learn that breaking bread in the assembly of the saints, in the worship of God, can be done with divine approval only upon the first day of the week." (Cogdill-Woods Debate, pages 14-15.)

Brother N. B. Hardeman, said in some sermons in the Ryman Auditorium, from Oct. 16-31, 1938, "Brethren, does the Bible teach Christians to observe the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week? You answer, 'Yes.' Now, have you stopped to think just how that is done, and how the Bible teaches it? Christ told the disciples, and so did Paul, 'Take and eat' and thus we are commanded by direct statement to eat of the bread and to drink of the fruit of the vine. But I just want to ask some of you 'old-timers' where did Christ ever say, 'Eat of the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week?" Had you ever stopped, brethren, to meditate upon a thing like that? Where is the command to partake of it on the first day of the week? I can find you a command to eat of it, and to drink of the fruit of the vine, but where is the direct statement to do that on the first day of the week? And do you know that the fellow that knows where that is not present tonight and has not been here and is not going to come? Now why? Because there is no such statement in the Bible, and I trust none of you brethren, will get shaky over Brother Hardeman's announcement of the fact. Yet, the Bible teaches — mark it — the Bible teaches the observance of the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week. But how does it teach it? Now here is the way: By giving us an approved example of the brethren at Troas meeting on the first day of the week to break bread. Therefore, that example of their doing it under the direction of the Holy Spirit comes with all authority. Now, if I would meet with God's approval, as did they, I will do likewise, and on the first day of the week partake of the supper of the Lord. What is my authority? A heaven-inspired example!" (Harde- man's Tabernacle Sermons, Vol. 4, pages 53-54)

Brother Gus Nichols said in 1950, "Likewise, there are approved examples authorizing certain things for which there are no commands. There is no command, as such, for Christians to observe the Lord's Supper ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK; but we have approved examples of the early Christians doing this (Acts 20:7; 2:42). These examples have all of the authority of a divine command; for whatever the early Christians did by apostolic sanction or authority, is equal to a command." (Sermons by Gus Nichols, Vol. 3, page 79)

By necessary inference from this approved example we learn that we may eat the Lord's Supper at any time on the Lord's Day. The sum total of New Testament teaching is that it was eaten only on the Lord's Day and this becomes the exclusive pattern for the church on when to eat the Lord's Supper. Recently, we have heard of those eating on days other than the first day of the week. Such is disobedience and does not constitute the Lord's Supper since it is not eaten with his approval on any other day than the Lord's Day.

FAILURE TO EAT

To fail to eat the Lord's Supper results in (1) some being weak; (2) in others being sick; and (3) still others being asle ep or dead spiritually (1 Cor. 11:30). For this cause every Christian should arrange to be present every Lord's Day to eat the Lord's Supper unless hindered beyond his control. A Christian will not plan to absent himself from the assembly of the saints to eat the Lord's Supper in order to engage in his own desires and pleasures.
JUST A MAN

"And as Peter was coming in, Comelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, "Stand up; I myself also am a man" (Acts 10:25,26).

It has always been customary to heap praise and honor upon certain men. Within limitations, this is right. The word teaches that some should be honored for their work or office. But we must never lose sight of the fact that men are just men.

1. Government Leaders are Just Men: We must render to them their dues (Matt. 22, Rom. 13:7). We must be subject to them to be subject to God (Rom. 13:1-5). But they are men. They do not constitute the ultimate authority.

Herod Agrippa I received with gratification the sycophantic shout of the people, "It is the voice of a god, and not of a man." As result, he was smitten by the angel of the Lord and gave up the ghost (Acts 12:22,23). In the most dramatic manner possible, it was demonstrated that he was just a man.

When the apostles in Jerusalem were given the ultimatum "not to speak at all nor teach in the name of Jesus," Peter and John boldly answered, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." And later, "We ought to obey God rather than men" (Acts 4:10,19; 5:29).

2. Scientists, Philosophers, Educators are Just Men: C. S. Lewis wrote in a 1967 article (published posthumously) "Faulting the Bible Critics"... "while I respect the learning of the great biblical critics, I am not yet persuaded that their judgment is equally to be respected."

In every area of learning, one will find if he investigates, that a great many conclusions are based on presuppositions, not on real evidence. And since the modern mind tends to leave God out of the presuppositions, it usually winds up leaving Him out of the conclusions. But these men are just men.

Francis A. Schaeffer expressed it well in his recent book, "The Church At The End of The 20th Century": "The problem is that you cannot trust the scientist just because he wears a white coat. It is as simple as that. Inside the coat he is still a man. And he is still a fallen man."

Jeremiah expressed it best: "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself; It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps" (10:23).

Science may represent man's search for objective reality ... and philosophy his quest for metaphysical truth ... but scientists and philosophers are just men. Let's not forget it.

3. Parents, Husbands, Wives — Are Human: We must honor our parents but obey them in the Lord (Eph. 6:1-4). Wives are to submit to their husbands but when conflict arises, we must obey God rather than men.

To follow loved ones into error and sin is not to honor them or their memory. True honor and concern demands that we do what we know is right and then beckon them to follow the more noble example.

4. Preachers are just men: That is the lesson that Peter taught Cornelius. That is what Paul and Barnabas cried out in the city of Lystra when men were attempting to honor them as gods (Acts 14:15).

False teachers are men. One may possess the gift of gab and be described as "A super-salesman for the Lord" but if he does not speak as the oracles of God, he is a minister of Satan. He is a man, and a blind leader of the blind (Matt. 15:13,14).

True preachers and teachers are just men. Paul asked, "Who then is Paul, and who is Apollo, but ministers (servants) by whom ye believed ..." and again "... learn in us not to think of men above that which is written ..." (I Cor. 3:5; 4:6). Gospel preachers are men. They are not infallible. They may err in many ways. They may become discouraged. They may be overtaken in faults. They may fall away.

When this happens, they who have their eyes on the preacher will likely fall away too. In every area of life, let's keep our eyes on God and remember that men are just men.
George E. Smysor, Mulvane, Kansas — The Mulvane, Kansas, Church of Christ will have a change of ministers effective June 1, 1972. Brother Ross O. Spears, who has faithfully served as minister for the past four and a half years, is taking a short rest from active regular preaching to recuperate from recent illness, after which he will resume regular work again. Brother Richard A. Holloway, who has been with the church in McAlester, Okla., is moving to Mulvane to serve the church there.

H. L. Bruce, Colorado Springs — Four were recently baptized at Northeast in Colorado Springs. There is a real fine dedicated couple here who would like to adopt a child. If any of you readers know of one that is now, or, that soon will be available for adoption you can contact me at P.O. Box 9071, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80909. Phone (303) 597-6375. I will put you in touch with the couple who wants to adopt the child.

Robert W. LaCoste, Cooper, Texas — The church in Cooper, Texas is happy to report that within a week 28 souls were restored to the Lord. These 28 had become lukewarm and indifferent like the church at Laodicea. We are grateful to God for the power of His gospel. When in Cooper, worship with us.

Herbert L. White, elders Eastside church of Christ, 2930 Avon Road, Louisville, Ky. 40220 — We are a new congregation of about 125 people and growing. We would like to contact a preacher of a few years experience to work with us. Address correspondence to the above address.

DO YOU WANT TO HELP A GOSPEL PREACHER IN MEXICO?

I am needing "Visualized Bible Study Series" (personal work film-strips) by Jule Miller, Spanish edition. Also Spanish sound recordings or manual and projector. Can any church or individual help me? Please write in English or Spanish to: Amando Ortega Mata, Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz No. 1905, Chihuahua, Chih, Mexico.

Donald G. Collins, 2005 Wisconsin Ave., Joplin, Mo. 64801 — The new congregation in Sheldon, Missouri is progressing in a fine way. The brethren are planning to have a gospel meeting May 8-14, and I am to do the preaching. We would like to take this opportunity to invite all in driving distance of Sheldon to come and be with us in this gospel effort. Your presence and encouragement will be greatly appreciated by those brethren.

James Lynch is working with this congregation and doing an excellent job. He is in need of about two hundred dollars ($200.00), a month's support. If you are in a financial condition and disposition to help in this difficult area, it would be money well spent in the Master's Cause, and it would be greatly appreciated. You may contact: James Lynch, Rt. 1, Sheldon, Mo. 64784. Phone 884-5272.

Earl Gene Bailey, Johnson City, Tenn.— The members of the congregation here are presently looking for a man to work full time. We are desperately in need of leadership and have a will to work and grow. We are self-supporting and have approximately 70 in attendance. Our present preacher, brother Joe Flemming, is having to relocate for reasons of bad health. He will be leaving about May 1.

If there is any way you might help us, due to your vast circulation, in finding someone we would deeply appreciate it. We will look forward to hearing from you.

THE LORD'S WORK IN JAPAN

Charles Gentry
C.P.O. Box 179
Nagoya, Japan 450

The work here continues to be encouraging. The Japanese people continue to show an interest in learning the truth. Our Bible classes are progressing both...
in attendance and interest. In the month of January we had five visitors. Four of them had never heard a lesson taught from God's Word. Our Bible study in Osaka has been most encouraging. This month there were eight present. Four of these were university students who desire to study the Bible. The next Sunday there were eleven present at the worship service in Osaka. This number included four men, three women, two children and two university students; one of these heard her first lesson from God's Word the evening before.

We want to express our sincere appreciation for your continued help and interest in the Lord's work in Japan. Your many cards and letters of encouragement continue to come. Some of those sent by sea mail in early December are just now arriving, if you are wondering why you have not received a reply. We continue to solicit your prayers.

__RELIGIOUS DEBATE__

There will be a debate between brethren Joseph Cox of Louisville, Kentucky and J. T. Smith of Conway, Arkansas. It will be held in the Iroquois High School Auditorium in Louisville on May 22, 23, 25, 26, at 7:30 each evening. These brethren will be discussing the scripturalness of the local church materiality helping those who are non-members. Brother Smith will affirm that the local church may materially help only those who are saints. Brother Cox will affirm that the local church may materially help saints and others. For those coming from out of town, the Iroquois High School is located on Taylor Blvd. south of Watterson Expressway.

__PREACHER NEEDED__

Blue Ash, Ohio

We will be in need of a gospel preacher 1st of July. Anyone interested please call 1-513-791-3527 or write to Church of Christ, 4667 Cooper Road, Cincinnati, Ohio 45242.

__HIGH LIGHTS OF THE BONNER-GAGE DEBATE__

Jesse G. Jenkins

David Bonner, preacher for the 6th and Meredith congregation in Dumas, Texas and Ralph Gage, of El Dorado, Arkansas, met in public discussion on the nights of February 28, 29 and March 2 and 3. The debate was in Dumas, with two nights in the 6th and Meredith building and two nights in the 14th and Meredith building. The subject of Bible classes and women teachers was discussed the first two nights, and the subject of congregational benevolence was discussed the last two.

**The Class Question**

Bonner had the first affirmative speech on the class question. Recognizing that the basic error of the anti-class folk is to believe that Bible authority is derived by command, example, and necessary inference; and that Bible authority comes to us in one of two forms — specific or generic. Bonner then argued that anything the church can support a man to do, the church can do; in fact is doing, as the church acts through its oversight, treasury, and agents. He pointed out that the church supported Paul to teach the word both publicly and from house to house, then concluded that the church was teaching the word both in the assembly and out of the assembly. He then pointed out that relative to assembly teaching he and Gage were pretty much agreed, but that Gage made a mistake in trying to apply assembly regulations to teaching situations out of the assembly. He showed that the classes as used by 4th and Meredith were private, informal, out of the assembly teaching arrangements.

Bonner showed that the term *teach* includes a teacher, student, material, time, place, and arrangement. He pointed out that God has bound the teacher (a Christian), the student (mankind), and the material (the gospel) but that He has not bound the time, place, or arrangement. He concluded that God had generically authorized the church to select the time, the place, and arrangements for its teaching. He showed that there is authority for a gospel meeting, a bulletin, a debate, a radio program, or a Bible class in the teaching work of the church.

In response, Gage argued that the church can only teach in the assembly. He denied that the teaching was in "congregational capacity" if not in the assembly. He even said that if elders, acting as elders, went to the home of negligent members to admonish them, it would not be "congregational capacity." However, he said the church could teach the word over radio. When Bonner pointed out that radio preaching was not "in the assembly," Gage came up with a corker. He argued that radio teaching was "assembly" teaching. He said that the assembly was called by turning the radio on and tuning in the station, and that there was one man speaking to one great radio assembly. He compared radio preaching to an overflow crowd, with some in cars on the parking lot listening over a loud speaker. Bonner then asked him if the Lord's Supper could be taken in the "radio assembly" if it was on Sunday. Gage said that it could not, as it was not "that kind of an assembly." Bonner then pointed out that his radio preaching was not parallel to his overflow crowd, for Gage would admit the Lord's Supper could be taken by the overflow crowd! Gage never would give up this silly argument, but I don't think even his fellows believed it.

**Women Teachers**

In Bonner's second affirmative he dealt with women teachers in some of the classes. He showed that the work women were doing in the classes was first a work that God had authorized a local church to do, and second that it was a work God had authorized a woman to do. He used teaching younger women to illustrate. Since God has authorized both a church and a woman to teach younger women, it is right for the church to use a woman in this work.

Bonner showed that 1 Cor. 14:35 teaches "it is a shame for a woman to speak in the assembly," and pointed out that he and Gage were agreed on that. He insisted that we are as strict as Gage on woman's
part in the assembly of the whole church come together. Bonner then introduced I Tim. 2:11-12, showing that it teaches a woman to be subject to a man in any Bible teaching situation. He pointed out that woman could not usurp authority over man even in a private, home Bible study.

In response, Gage argued that Bible class teaching is "congregational capacity," and that in "congregational capacity" women are to be silent. Bonner agreed that the Bible classes are congregational action, but pointed out that they are private, group arrangements and not "assembly" teaching. He tried to show Gage his inconsistency in maintaining that the only "congregational capacity" teaching is in the assembly, yet trying to make private, group arrangements "congregational capacity" teaching. It seemed clear enough, but I think prejudice kept Gage from ever seeing the point. Relative to I Tim. 2:12 Gage argued that "I suffer not a woman to teach" meant in the "assembly," and that "nor to usurp authority over the man" meant anywhere. He could not explain how he determined that half of the verse was specific (limited to the assembly) and half was generic (applicable anywhere). He tried to draw a parallel by changing two words in I Tim. 2:11-12, making it read as follows: "Let the women ride in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to drive, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." He then said: "Does that mean she can drive anywhere except over a man? That means she can not drive anywhere." Bonner then pointed out that Gage's "parallel" taught more than Gage was willing to accept. If the sentences were indeed parallel in meaning, and if Gage's sentence meant that a woman "can not drive anywhere," then Paul's statement meant that a woman can not teach anywhere. Gage did not recover from this. Of course, the sentences are not parallel in meaning, as there is not the same relation between "drive" and "subjection" as there is between "teach" and "subjection." Then too, there is the conjunction "nor" (Oude) which is of great importance in determining the meaning of I Tim. 2:11-12, that is not even a factor in Gage's sentence.

**Benevolence**

Gage affirmed that the church has obligation to help all the needy people in the world as it has opportunity and ability. But he used about one half of his time in his affirmative speeches talking about the class proposition of the previous night. When he did get to his proposition on benevolence, he started by saying he never had studied the subject "until two days ago." And, believe me, it was evident that he was telling the truth. In his first speech he hurriedly mentioned Matt. 5:44-45, Luke 10:30-35, Romans 12:20-21, James 1:27, and Galatians 6:10. In Bonner's first negative, he showed that none of these passages touched on the subject of church benevolence. Gage must have got the point, for he pretty well left them alone for the rest of the debate. Nine minutes before Gage's second affirmative was over he finally mentioned the first scripture on congregational benevolence. He read II Cor. 9:13, and argued that the contribution was for the poor saints in Jerusalem and for all men other than saints who were in need. Bonner showed that in connection with this relief Paul stated seven times that it was for the poor saints at Jerusalem. Therefore, to have used the funds for any other purpose, no matter how worthy, would be misappropriation. He pointed out that the funds from Gentiles were "not only to fill up the measure of the wants of the saints" (poor Jewish saints), but beyond mere carnal relief to poor Jewish saints, "is abundant also by many thanksgivings unto God" on the part of "all" Jewish saints for the Gentiles' "professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ." Simplified, he showed that the money was raised for poor Jewish saints, sent to poor Jewish saints, and that this exhausted the use made of the physical funds. But that in addition to relieving the poor Jewish saints, the other Jewish saints were also befitted in that the relief created good will and thanksgiving on their part for the Gentiles who had taken thought of the poor Jewish brethren. He concluded that only in this manner could it be understood that the gift went to any other than poor Jewish saints.

In his affirmative on the benevolent question, Bonner read the nine passages in the New Testament on the subject, showing that in each passage saints were the object of the relief and that the local church administered the relief. Needless to say, Gage was not able to deal with his arguments.

One of Gage's most glaring inconsistencies was the fact that he argued the first two nights that no action was "congregational capacity" unless in the assembly, but the last two nights he argued that benevolence was "congregational capacity" if one man picked up food out of the store room and took it to a needy family. Bonner pointed out that if the church can act through its agent in relief work, it can act through its agent in teaching; therefore, some teaching out of the assembly can be congregational action. But Gage never would admit the point.

**Conduct During The Debate**

The conduct of both disputants was the best. I moderated for Bonner, and Gage's brother moderated for him. Neither of us had to call a single point of order. On the class question, Gage was about as good as any man they have. This was his 25th debate on that subject. But on the benevolent question, he was very weak.

Attendance was good with crowds ranging from about 200 to 300: There were 24 gospel preachers who came to stand with Bonner on the issues discussed.

**Will There Be More Debates?**

Gage stated that either he, one of his two sons, his brother, or his son would meet anyone in debate on these subjects where endorsements could be had by both disputants. He was invited to come to Denton with or without endorsement from the anti-class people, but refused. He then asked him to invite me to come to El Dorado and assured him I would come whether I got endorsement from some congregation there or not. But he evidently is not too interested in debating at home; at least no invitation
was extended. But if any of you preachers are in a town where there is a congregation that will endorse Gage and want to engage him in debate, you might contact him.

1813 Carlton Denton, Texas 76201

Olen Holderby sent the following poem which was composed by a 14-year-old girl who has spent many of her recent days in a hospital bed or days of recovery at home.

THINKING

I was lying around,
In the stillness of the night,
 Thinking of the Saviour I've found,
 Even though He is out of sight.

I know all about Him,
To me He shines very bright,
To non-Christians He is very dim,
But, for Him I shall fight.

I was thinking of the creation,
And of the judgment,
All the things for me He has done,
To be the Saviour of the world He was meant.

Thinking of Jesus' wonderful love,
To me He has shown,
The Father I am reminded of,
My heart and soul He does own.

I want Christ in me,
Every day of the week, all seven,
I want the key from Thee,
To the Kingdom of Heaven.

Susan Garvin

Our society is based upon free enterprise. A man can obtain as much material wealth as he has the ability and opportunity. There are those in the world that look upon a prosperous man as a successful man. It is as though the words successful and wealthy are synonymous. People find it hard to understand how one without great material wealth can be considered successful.

Christians need to be careful concerning their views toward material abundance. There is certainly nothing sinful in being wealthy, but there is the possibility of being led away following after riches. The wise man Solomon said in Eccl. 5:10 "He that loveth silver shall not be satisfied with silver; nor he that loveth abundance with increase: this also is vanity."

What Solomon said then applies now, and will always be applicable. The more we have, the more we want. We are Never Satisfied! Paul in his writing to Timothy gave this warning to those that would desire wealth "But they that will be rich fall into temptation and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in perdition" (I Tim. 6:9). Then in verse 10 Paul declares: "For the love of money is the root of all evil: which while some coveted after, they have ERRED from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." It is easy to err from the faith if riches is foremost in our minds.

In this area we need to be very careful and guard our thoughts. Desiring material abundance must not be foremost in our thoughts and actions. If it is, we cannot be pleasing to God (cf. I John 2:15-17). Children of God cannot love the world. Love of God and the keeping of His commandments is number one in every Christian's life; it must be to a Christian! Paul said, concerning his material welfare: "Not that I speak in respect of want: for I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content" (Phil. 4:11). Paul is simply telling us, that no matter what our material status, we should be content, happy, with it, understanding that whatever we have is the gift of God. In the next verse, verse 12, Paul says: "I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound..." Too many of us know only how to abound. When we see financial problems, our service to God is hindered. We worry about material things instead of serving Him. Again we can gain knowledge from the writings of Paul. "I can do all things through Christ which strengthened me." Whatever may beset us, we can count on the strength that Christ can give.

Paul counted himself as privileged to have been selected, and able, to proclaim the gospel of Christ. Although he had before been a persecutor, when he obeyed the gospel he gave his life to serve Christ. He completely understood that material wealth is unimportant. Paul, by his life, shows us the true meaning of Matt. 6:33: "But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and His righteousness; and all these things shall be added unto you."

Let us as children of God remember the things that are important. Those spiritual gifts from God that make us truly wealthy. Let your light shine so that we may show the world that spiritual blessings in Christ are far more rewarding than all the material possessions of the world. We need to give more of our material possessions to God, that we might not covet that which we have. It will help us to be more spiritually minded, and work harder in His kingdom. Remember, the things we have been given of God are given to us as stewards. There will come a day of reckoning, and then you and I must give an accounting for everything we have done with that which has been entrusted to us. If Christ were to come this very instant, would He say to you, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

Route 3, Box 49
Rochelle, Ill. 61068

HAVE YOU CHECKED YOUR EXPIRATION DATE?
RENEW TODAY
WHO RESPECTS AUTHORITY?

The authority of God would be universally respected and admired if the only conditions necessary were the qualifications of the lawgiver. After all, God possesses all of the needed attributes to the superlative degree. As creator, sustainer, and the absolute owner of the earth and all the universe (Gen. 1:1; Col. 1:16-17; Psalm 50:10-12) he has an undeniable and unchallengeable right to rule. He epitomizes excellence of wisdom and competence, purity of character and integrity, and justice of enforcement and punishment. As the power and position of God declare his right to rule, so his wisdom, goodness and fairness declare that all men ought to love and respect his authority.

But God is not universally respected, and certainly many of the earthly authorities he has delegated are despised. Therefore something besides his rights and qualifications are involved. Indeed, we who are subject to law must possess certain qualifications in order to properly evaluate and appreciate legitimate authority, whether it be exercised by men (as delegated by God in the home or nation etc.) or directly by God through specific statutes in the New Testament. Respect for authority is as dependent upon the subject being what he ought to be as it is upon the lawgiver.

Two fundamentals the subject must have are (1) recognition of the rights and position of the lawgiver, and (2) humility to accept his place as one under the rule of another. Recognition involves the right intellectual understanding. Humility describes the proper emotional response, the right attitude. Unless one knows what is right, and has the right attitude toward what he knows, he cannot be right or have a correct relationship with authority. Thus the word of God has much to say about hearing and knowing the truth, and voluntarily humbling one's self to it.

Recognition of authority is not an inborn quality of infants. They are utterly unacquainted with the idea of authority, much less with an idea of who possesses it. Respect must be learned. And since respect is ultimately based upon the rights and legitimacy of the lawgiver, that must be learned too. Parental control is their introduction to authority, and the knowledge of God is an early need for it is the cornerstone to a perpetuated respect for parental (and all other) authority in the heart of the developing juvenile who begins to question the values and standards applied to his life. This knowledge of God's role as creator and owner of the universe, and of his righteous laws and certain judgment, not only generates greater respect for authority but also supplies meaning and hope to life. These is no substitute for knowledge, that is, for Bible knowledge. God's nature and person is not revealed in the study of any physical science, but only by divine revelation in the word of God (Rom. 10:17; Jer. 10:23; I Cor. 2:10-11). If a man does not recognize God's position and rights it is impossible for him to appreciate God's authority, and it will be difficult for him to genuinely or long appreciate any human authority. He will likely rebel against authority at the point of law with which he disagrees.

Humility is a voluntary surrendering and submission of one's will to what it recognizes as the rights of another. Man needs a full view of the majestic rights and prerogatives of the Almighty in order to completely humble himself in respectful obedience. But many they are who know enough yet who will not humble themselves, rather challenging and defying some laws of both God and man. (And these often boast of their humility.) True humility is an uncommon quality, and its test and proof is seen on points of law where it is unpleasant to submit, where the law contradicts one's own sense of pleasure or propriety, or where one's own understanding per-
ceives a way it esteems wiser and better. In such cases it is hard to submit. But humility does. It does not insist on its own wisdom or way.

Who respects authority? He who recognizes the fact of God's superiority and right to rule, thereby understands the legitimacy of authority in men as delegated by God, and empties himself of stubborn pride so as to humbly submit. If we have knowledge and character we cannot but respect authority.

Unthinking and uncritical brethren in great numbers have swallowed the notion that it is merely the job of the sheep to give money; that what is done with that money is the responsibility of the shepherds (elders); that the sheep cannot be held responsible for unscriptural uses to which the money is put.

That view is a hollow delusion, and the comfort derived therefrom is baseless. Nowhere is its groundlessness made more apparent than in connection with the story of Abimelech's usurpation in Judges, chapter 9.

When the people of Shechem agreed to accept Abimelech as king they gave him 70 pieces of silver from the temple treasury of their idol. Abimelech used the money to hire an army of rascals and exterminated his imagined competitors for the rule in Israel, the sons of Gideon, except Jotham (vv. 4f.). When Jotham made his speech to the men of Shechem he charged them with the act of murdering his brothers (v. 18). "Jotham imputes the slaying of his brothers to the citizens of Shechem, as a crime which they themselves had committed (ver. 18), because they had given Abimelech money out of their temple of Baal to carry out his designs against the sons of Jerubbaal (ver. 4)" (Keil).

In the judgment of God the blood of Gideon's sons was laid not only upon Abimelech "who slew them," but also "upon the men of Shechem, who strengthened his hands to slay his brethren" (v. 24).

One could hardly fail to recognize the general principle underlying this case, but let me make it impossible by stating it plainly: When you supply the means of doing wrong you yourself are responsible for the wrongdoing.

No one will be able to excuse himself at the judgment of God by shifting the responsibility to the devil, a false teacher, or the elders. Not Eve. Not Flip Wilson. And not you!

Box 155
Romulus, Michigan 48174
"THE CHURCH TREASURY AGAIN"

Several weeks ago I wrote an article called "The Church Treasury." As usual, I have received some comment on this subject. I insisted in my first article that the New Testament teaches congregations to have one church treasury and out of that one treasury all the work enjoined upon a congregation of God's people is to be accomplished.

I received a letter from a Christian lady, who raised some questions about a church treasury. Since her position is espoused by a number of brethren I thought it appropriate to publish her letter with a reply. May I say that I enjoy receiving mail from brethren. This stimulates our thinking and causes all of us to keep on our toes. The letter is nice and self explanatory. I received permission to publish her letter but agreed not to use her name. Here is the letter:

Dear Brother Hogland:

Have enjoyed your articles in Searching the Scriptures. Am writing concerning February's article, "The Church Treasury." I have no disagreement with you as to what church money is used for. But can you prove to me there should be a church treasury when there is no need? In I Cor. 16, there was a need — supporting needy saints. Paul said "Let everyone of you lay by him in store" — sounding as though they hadn't done it before, and were doing it now for this special purpose. The same would be true with all the other churches he had given order to.

As to Paul's support, can you prove that a collection was not made just for Paul's support? I don't mean a separate treasury as you pointed out some believe. But knowing Paul needed support, why couldn't they have done the same as they did in I Cor. 16? What I am getting at is this: What makes you so sure they laid by in store on the first day of the week when there was no need? It looks to me like they laid by in store when it was needed whether for needy saints, supporting a preacher, or a widow indeed. I see nothing wrong with giving every Lord's day when we come together, but can we make it a binding law of the Lord? If I give to the church when there is a need (we have no preacher to support, needy saints, widows indeed, or building to rent or maintain), and if I individually help my friends, neighbors, widows, brethren, etc., as the need arises, I believe I am in accordance with God's word. But I would be very happy to hear any further comments you have on the subject.

In Christ,

This is the type of letter I enjoy answering. It is plain, written with a fine attitude and the person seems to be desiring the truth on the subject. First, if you are interested you might review my first article on this subject. By doing this it will not be necessary for me to repeat some arguments made at that time. Since this lady requested that I not use her name I will refer to her as sister X. You will note in her letter she did not believe in a dual treasury. That is, she did not believe that a congregation was to have one treasury for benevolence and another one for evangelism. So this point will not have to be established.

Now to her first question. She said, "But can you prove to me there should be a church treasury when there is no need?" This question assumes the point to be discussed. Notice the word "NEED." I believe that I can prove a church treasury at all time because I have never known a time when a church did not have a NEED! For example, sister X says she believes preaching and benevolence are to come out of the same treasury. Has there ever been a time since the inception of the church on Pentecost that we have not NEEDED to preach the gospel? If so, at what time? Jesus said, "The harvest is truly plenteous but the laborers are few" (Matt. 9:37). Would anyone argue that gospel preaching is NEEDED more at one time than another? If so, by what authority? The need of preaching the old Jerusalem gospel is constantly with us. It doesn't make any difference whether the congregation has four members or four hundred. The need is there. If the congregation is large enough to support a local preacher in its midst, then let it help to preach the gospel in hard places. This is what churches did in apostolic times (II Cor. 11:8). Sometimes people in small congregations do not feel the need to contribute into the treasury to preach the gospel. Why should this be? Do people in large congregations have a greater responsibility than people in small ones?

Sister X says she feels that she is in accordance with God's will if she helps her friends and neighbors as the need arises. May I say such is fine and the Bible teaches us to do this in Gal. 6:10. However, this is not all the Bible teaches us as individuals to do. It teaches us to support the local congregation so it (the church) can do its work of preaching the gospel. The key which unlocks the door is in the word NEED. Notice the number of times it was used in the letter. The word NEED is a relative term and depends on who and how a person might look at it. For example, one person might look at a congregation and feel it had no NEED and another might look at the same congregation and feel it has a DIRE NEED. So who is right? Does God leave our giving to OUR judgment of a congregation? Certainly not. If he left such matters to our judgment, one congregation might have an abundance of money and another could not pay its light bill! The truth of the
matter is God settled it when he said we are to give "as we have been prospered." This includes every Christian on the face of the earth whether he is a member of a small congregation or a large one. God is no respecter of persons but he would be if we could decide personally whether a congregation has a need. Some might think a very large congregation had no need because it was large and another might think a small one had no need because it was small. I say this to show you that one could rationalize and come up with the fantastic idea that NO congregation has NEED.

Another thing, elders are to rule over the flock (I Pet. 5:1-4), but suppose in the opinion of all the members, the church had no NEED. If they all felt this way there would be no contribution, no work could be done by the congregation. There is a difference in what an individual does and what a congregation does (I Tim. 5).

Sister X said she felt like the contribution of I Cor. 16 was just started by Paul and they were not doing it before. This could be so, but remember everything commanded for us had to get started sometime! The faith (Jude 3-5) had not been completed at this time. However, I know this contribution had been going on for a year at Achaia. Paul said, "For which I boast of you to them of Macedonia, that Achaia was ready a year ago" (II Cor. 9:2). Thus, after he had given the command they continued to do this for a year. It is true that a congregation might not have as much benevolence at one time as they do at another. But remember as Sister X says, both benevolence and evangelism come out of the same treasury and there is ALWAYS a need for preaching the word of the Lord. The NEED is always with us and therefore our giving into the treasury should not be erratic but constant as the Bible says "On the first day of the week." And there is a first day in EVERY week!

---

**Living Voice Tapes of THE KETCHERSIDE-TURNER EXCHANGE**

in Tampa, Florida

January 25, 1972

The full exchange between Carl Ketcherside and Robert Turner and the panel discussion including Ferrell Jenkins and Harry Pickup, Jr. with questions from the floor which lasted nearly three hours are now available on open reel, cassette or 8-track tapes.

7" or 5" reels are $5.25 each for the full discussion on one reel.

Cassettes are $4.95 each and two tapes contain the full discussion. Total price for cassettes: $9.90.

8-track cartridges are $4.95 each and it takes three for the full discussion. Total price for 8-track cartridges: $14.85.

---

**SHORT SWORD SWIPES**

I have just finished reading Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Of course I had read these gospels many times, but this time I read them with a different goal — to see how many times Christ quoted from the Old Testament. I found that he quoted directly from the Old Testament at least thirty times, and from the following books: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Deuteronomy, I Samuel, I Kings, Psalms, Isaiah, Daniel and Jonah. In addition to these specific references, we have such statements as these: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me" (John 5:39). "These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me" (Luke 24:44). This proves that Jesus believed in rightly dividing the Scriptures; that we can make application of them to our time; that they were written by holy men of God who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit."

According to a recent article by the Associated Press, we have these statistics concerning a social "disease" which results from using the "choicest product of the brewer's art":

"There are 9 million people in the United States with a serious drinking problem, or about one of every 22 persons, whose annual costs to the nation include $10 billion, half of all arrests, and 25,000 highway deaths ... An estimated 200,000 new cases develop each year."

"Wine is a mocker, strong drink is raging: and whosoever is deceived thereby is not wise" (Prov. 20:1).

Speaking of drinking, a recent survey during the evening hours in Little Rock revealed that "one in every 25 cars on the road in Pulaski County is driven by a drunk person, and one in every eight cars is driven by someone whose driving ability has been impaired by alcohol." And yet they tell those of us who have to drive the streets that it's none of our business if they drive. When a drunk aims an automobile at me, I figure it is some of my business!

Another interesting result of the survey was that 50.6 per cent of those who were driving under the influence of alcohol were Baptists. Do you suppose they were just practicing what they preach? Their
preachers tell them that it doesn't make any difference how they live; that once they are saved there isn't anything they can do, say or think that would cause them to be lost. I'm not charging that they deliberately encourage sin, but any honest person knows that such is the result of the doctrine.

Of all the appropriate words we have used to describe these hairy hippies, we can now add another one — lousy! A recent headline out of Washington, D.C. was the following question: "Nationwide body lice epidemic?" The article says that body lice were discovered on several children in schools in Maryland, and warns that there may be a nationwide epidemic. They attribute the problem to "the birth of the hippie and the death of DDT." Come to think of it, I don't see how lice could live on some of them.

In commenting on the recent Methodist conference in Atlanta, Dr. Alfred Knox, editor of Arkansas Methodist and Louisiana Methodist magazines, said, "Starting within the framework of belief in Jesus Christ, the new statement (one adopted in the conference, EB) sets up fourfold guides for judging doctrinal matters: 1. Considering what the Scriptures say. 2. Looking to our Christian tradition. 3. Considering one's personal experience. 4. The use of reason and logic."

The last three have not one thing to do with ascertaining the will of God! Jesus condemned any appeal to tradition (Mark 7:7-9), and Paul took care of experience and human reasoning (I Cor. 1; Acts 17). If they want to please God, why not stop with number one? If they did, there would be no Methodist Church!

James D. Bales' book, "MODERNISM Trojan Horse In The Church" is worth reading. In the introduction, there is an interesting quote from Carl F. H. Henry:

"Jesus Christ alone is Head of the church. He has no favored puppets, any more than he has a first-lieutenant in Rome. And Jesus Christ assesses the Christian community with scrupulous honesty. He still walks among the churches, threatening to remove lamps from their candlesticks. If he can endure the compromises of modern American Christianity no more than those of ancient Asia Minor, all these lights that we consider so indispensable soon could be blown out."

There is much difference between the attitude and conduct of the faithful Israelites and the modern Christians. One of the real problems and spiritual dangers to many in the church today is hedonism. With the shorter work weeks and the longer week ends, all some people can think about is pleasure. Instead of working for the Lord, or doing something else of a constructive nature, they take off to the mountains, lakes, or other places of pleasure and relaxation to have a good time. Absenteeism is a serious problem in the Bible classes and worship services.

But what about the Israelites? An interesting statement is made concerning them in connection with the increased burdens placed upon them by Pharaoh:

"And the tale of the bricks, which they did make heretofore, ye shall lay upon them; ye shall not diminish ought thereof: for they be idle; therefore they cry, saying, Let us go and sacrifice to our God" (Exodus 5:8).

So when the faithful Israelite got off from work he wanted to go worship God, but when many Christians get off a few hours or days they want to go play. The difference is in attitude toward life, this world, and duty to God. And remember, when the unfaithful Israelites could consider nothing but eating, drinking and playing, Paul called it idolatry (I Cor. 10:7). Is it any less so today?

According to a recent news report, some high schools in California are offering courses or classes in pre-natal and maternal care. This became necessary due to the percentage of the students who were pregnant. Isn't that ridiculous? That's the fruit of the permissiveness and "new morality" of our time. And according to the liberals in all walks of life, we must not correct or condemn these young people, for they must be left free to "do their own thing."
PRAYING IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH

Communion with God is a two-way street. God communicates to us through His revealed Word. We are privileged to speak to Him in prayer.

What does the word of faith teach on this important subject of prayer? What does it mean to pray in spirit and in truth?

I. In Truth: This implies that there may be some false doctrines believed and practiced in regard to prayer, and in fact this is the case.

A) We need to know and believe the truth on WHO can pray acceptably. The popular notion is that everyone enjoys the privilege of prayer . . . that regardless of how wicked and unrighteous a person may be, he needs only to get into a bind and he may call on the Lord to aid him.

The Bible teaches that God is pleased to hear prayers only from those who are pleased to hear His words. In the model prayer of Luke 11, Jesus instructed His disciples to address God as their Father in Heaven. Quite obviously, a child of the Devil could not properly do this (John 8:44; Rom. 8:14).

Cornelius was not a child of God and there is no indication that he prayed as such. But he was desirous of Divine instruction and his prayers served as a memorial before Jehovah (Acts 10:4,31).

"For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his ears are open unto their prayers: but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil" (I Pet. 3:12).

B) Avoid Cliches.

We need to be cognizant of WHEN we should pray. The children's song says "It isn't any trouble just to P-R-A-Y, pray. So whenever you're in trouble, it will vanish like a bubble, if you'll only take the trouble just to P-R-A-Y, pray."

There isn't anything wrong with the song, but that's not all of it. We are not to pray just when we're in trouble.

I Thess. 5:17 says "Pray without ceasing." That doesn't mean to pray all the time. I don't believe that it means to always have a prayerful attitude, though such is certainly a worthy objective. It means to pray regularly. Pray when it is easy and when it is difficult. We need to have regular intervals of prayer.

We should pray when we need something and know it, and when we feel no urgent needs. Sometimes our prayer will be in the form of petitions — and at other times they will consist mostly of thanksgiving. We need to keep on praying.

It should be noted that the Christian may have an audience with the Father for as long as he desires. God is never too busy. It would probably be impossible for me to get an audience with the President. It would not be easy to get one with the Governor of my state. But the God of the universe has literally all the time in the world!

I read of Daniel who bowed three times daily before the God of Heaven. When the going got rough, the rough got going and he kept on praying! He prayed without ceasing.

David prayed in the morning when he arose, in midday and at nightfall.

The Christian can pray anywhere he happens to be whether in a church building, a factory, a car, bus, or airplane, or anywhere else.

C) Why should we pray?

1) God tells us to. That's enough for the faithful child of God. If it were no more than a command and if no blessings were connected with it, this would be sufficient reason.

2) It is a glorious privilege. In prayer we commune with God. With the saints of ages past and present and with the Heavenly host we are privileged to praise His matchless name.

3) Prayer provides the opportunity to give thanks. If we feel gratitude for the gracious, bountiful hand of God, we should be anxious to say, "I thank thee, Father." We should desire to thank God for our physical sustenance, His providential care and for fellow Christians who encourage us.

II. Praying In Spirit:

This is an area in which we fall short. Especially is this true in our public prayers. Not often do we hear real fervency expressed in our assemblies. You and I can take steps to remedy this poor situation.

The first step is to recognize the need, the second is to become more fervent in our prayers. Here are three suggestions:

a) Pray to God. When leading in prayer, we should strive to do just that. There are matters about which one might pray in the privacy of his closet that would not be appropriate in the assembly. We should speak loudly and clearly enough for others to hear and say "amen." But we should not forget that God is the object of our prayer, not man.

b) Avoid Cliches. We should strive for more freshness and originality of expression. It's not that there is anything unscriptural about such phrases as, "Guide, guard and direct us"; "If we have been found faithful"; "Go with us to our respective places of abode"; "Bless those for whom it's our duty to pray"; etc. but these phrases have become so repetitious that they tend to attract attention to themselves rather than the concepts they represent. They tend to make our prayers empty and boresome instead of fresh, edifying and uplifting.

A good rule to follow is to just be sincere and natural when praying.

c) Live a godly life. This is the secret of true fervency. The reason some cannot offer public prayers is because they don't pray in private. They can't pray fervently that the work of the church go for-
ward, because they're not concerned enough about it to help it go forward.

If we're really involved in the work, it will be easy to pray in spirit as well as in truth. Jesus said, "Where your treasure is, there is your heart also."

There is a great need for circumspect, godly living. Obviously, one must live "soberly, righteously, and godly" for the sake of his own soul, (Titus 2:11; Heb. 12:14), but Scripture abounds with indirect inferences and immediate statements which clearly show that our behavior may lead to the salvation of others, or at least it will influence their regard for the gospel. Perhaps the best known verse is Mt. 5:16, "Let your light so shine before men; that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven."

THE WIFE

"Likewise, ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands; that, if any obey not the word, they also may without the word be won by the conversation of the wives; While they behold your chaste conversation coupled with fear" (I Peter 3:1,2). A wife will not win her husband by faithful attendance to church services alone. She must reverently live in pure behavior, subject to her husband. Impatience, bitterness, vengeance, and anger are sins which the wife may be led into by a worldly minded mate, but she must restrain her impulses and refrain from "returning evil for evil. Women with husbands who are not Christians should, above all people, plead before the throne of grace for wisdom, patience, and discretion in word and deed.

PAUL'S EXHORTATIONS

Paul's writings are lined and laced with demands for purity before unbelievers. "But we exhort you, brethren,...that ye may walk becomingly toward them that are without" (I Thess. 4:10,12). "Walk in wisdom toward them that are without, redeeming the time" (Col. 4:5). "See then that ye walk circumspectly, not as fools, but as wise, Redeeming the time, because the days are evil" (Eph. 5:15,16). These words ought to cause Christians to consider their degree of conformity to this world. Our behavior reflects the gospel. If there was a greater awareness of this fact, our words and deeds would be kinder, our dress more modest. The jokes I tell or laugh at, the places I frequent, and the clothes I wear (or do not wear) affect someone's view of the gospel. Take heed to thyself. Consider your habits, personality, and general behavior before the lost with whom you associate. Strive to live a life that will "adorn the doctrine of God our Saviour in all things" (Titus 2:10). "Only let your conversation be as it becometh the gospel of Christ" (Phil. 1:27).

*******

HEARTFELT RELIGION #2

In our last article on this subject we pointed out that the Bible Heart that we are writing about is the affections of the mind (Matt. 6:20-21). Also that the character of the heart is exhibited in one's conduct. Our heart is either good or bad. The words of our mouth tells what is in our heart (Matt. 12:34). In this lesson we want to examine the:

FUNCTION OF THE HEART

The Bible heart described above undergoes quite a number of functions or exercises in obeying the gospel of Christ. Some of the things that are said of the heart in the New Testament are: (1) we think with the heart (Matt. 9:4); (2) we reason with our heart (Mark 2:8); (3) we meditate in our heart (Ps. 19:14); (4) we imagine in the heart (Gen. 8:21); (5) we purpose in our hearts (II Cor. 9:7). All of these things are attributes of the heart, and in accepting the religion of Jesus, which is preeminent a religion of the heart, we must exercise the heart.

UNDERSTAND. BELIEVE. OBEY. LOVE

All of the above expressions are carried out by the Bible heart. Jesus said in Matt. 13:15 that men "should see with their eyes, hear with their ears and understand with their hearts, and should be converted and I should heal them." According to this passage one must understand what he is doing (with a heart which thinks and reasons) before he can be converted. Jesus said, "No man can come to me except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the prophets, and they shall be all taught from God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father cometh unto me" (John 6:44-45). So, we hear, we learn, we understand — the Bible heart being involved in all of these. For a person to say he is converted but doesn't know why or how, is a violation of heartfelt religion.

We believe with the heart. Paul said in Rom. 10:10, "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." In Acts 8:37 we see this very point exemplified in the conversion of the man from Ethiopia. Philip told him (after he had reasoned with him about Jesus, and the man said he wanted to be baptized) "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest." Even though we are accused of not believ-
ing in heartfelt religion (because we don't get down on the floor and roll or show an uncontrollable amount of emotions in shouting, etc.) the person who understands, who believes, is the person who DOES HAVE heartfelt religion.

We also obey with the heart. Paul told the Romans in Rom. 6:17-18, "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered unto you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." Obedience came about as a result of the Bible heart believing and obeying. In fact, Christ became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him (Heb. 5:8-9).

We are to love with our hearts. Jesus said in Mark 12:30, "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment." The word "heart" and "mind" are both -used in this passage. However, Mr. Henry Thayer in his Greek-English Lexicon says of this passage that the word "heart" is here used of things done "from the heart, i.e., cordially or sincerely, truly (without simulation or pretense)" (Page 325).

True Love always expresses itself in an action. John 3:16, with which we are all familiar, expresses this. God's love expressed itself in giving His Son. We also are to make our love known as it expresses itself in an action. Remembering that love is an action of the Bible heart, we see an excellent illustration of this in Luke 6:27-28. Jesus said, "Love your enemies." How is this to be done? Do we simply say we love them? Jesus explains how this is done. (1) "Do good to those who hate you; (2) Bless those who curse you; (3) Pray for those who mistreat you." Christ's love is exemplified in Eph. 5:25, "Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it". A way is also expressed in the Bible as to how we may show our love for Him. "If ye love me, keep my commandments" (John 14:15). Christians, in the practice of Christianity, enjoy much with the heart. They enjoy its pleasures, its comforts, and its rewards. Next, The Change of Heart.

Clothing today is different in color, material, and styles to those worn in ancient times. In fact, styles change for both men and women each decade, or shall we say, each year. Men make more gradual changes, probably, but they do make changes in their clothing. Men of today would be unusual and striking in appearance on our streets even in this period of confusion, in the high stiff collar, shoe string tie, and the coat with long forked tail.

Changes in dress are not necessarily sinful. The Lord has not bound any certain customs of dress upon His people. It is amazing how little is told in the New Testament about how the men were dressed or how the women were dressed. By a study of secular history of Roman life we might come to have a sort of educated guess as to how people dressed in the day of the apostles. We would not be more righteous if we used the materials, color (or lack of color), and styles of garments of that day. Preachers of today would be less effective as gospel preachers if they stood in the pulpits in the dress of the 1870s or in the styles of days of the early church. It seems that conformity in some things is a matter of becoming all things to all men rather than sinful conformity.

Many things can be shown by the way we dress. Those who are in rebellion can demonstrate their rebellion by killing, burning, looting, but they can also show rebellion by non-conformity in dress. Men may wear beads, make-up, wild mismatched colors, and clothes that do not fit them. They may decide not to wear shoes. They do the opposite to the expected from head to foot. They are in rebellion and it is written all over them. The man at the bank, the personnel officer at the factory, or the decent young lady can, in one look, see that one who is thus dressed is out of tune with, and in rebellion against, society. He likely would show little respect for the law, the foreman, the property of others, or for the highest officials of government. Young man, if you do not want to be treated as a rebel who respects neither man nor God, then do not dress so as to look like one.

The Bible does not bind the styles of one generation upon another, but this good book does make it clear that immoral people may advertise their lack of character by their dress. Tamar knew how to dress so as to leave the impression that she was immoral. Judah, when he saw her, had no doubt that she was a harlot (See Genesis 38). It does not describe her appearance in detail, but it seems she was covered
beyond recognition. That would be different in our day, but ungodly women can still indicate that they are harlots by the way they dress. Would any deny this?

The ungodly woman of Proverbs 7 was dressed in the "attire of a harlot" when she met the foolish young man who came to her door. How was she dressed? We do not know, except that those who saw her in that generation knew her character by her dress. The New Testament indicates that modesty or immodesty, discretion or indiscretion can be shown by attire (See I Tim. 2:9, 10; I Peter 3:1-5). Young lady, do you want to be considered to be a harlot by those you meet on the street? Then do not dress like one.

The indecent often set styles. Christians should not be slaves to the suggestions of these immoral people. Television commercials, and ungodly entertainers, have brought indecent attitude and conduct into the living rooms in America. The style makers admit that certain garments are designed to have sex appeal. Many seem to forget that this means they must dress so as to provoke lust (See Matthew 5:28). This is sin. It is lascivious attire. Wise, discreet children of God are taught to flee fornication (I Tim. 5:28). This is sin. It is lascivious attire. Wise, discreet children of God are taught to flee fornication (I Tim. 5:28).

There are many ways to be decent, and there are many ways to be indecent. Then, why, oh, why, do not all good women dress so as to leave the impression that they are good women? Why should any good woman object to dressing modestly?

Good people do not always fully agree as to the appropriateness of certain garments. The more we study the Bible, pray, and meditate on what the Bible says and what it does not say, the closer we can get to perfect agreement. This unity is based upon a desire to do His will and an understanding of His will. All people, young or old, men or women, should hunger and thirst after righteousness. The difference in judgment as to what is appropriate in clothing is not so much a difference in age as it is a difference in concern for God's will. Television-trained people know little or nothing of chastity and discretion which older women should be teaching younger women (Titus 2:3-5). The so-called generation gap is a gap in training. Older women have not given the young the principles by which they are to measure styles. This failure is doing much to destroy homes and morals, which means the loss of souls in hell. The failure is conspicuous and alarming. Women receive more instruction in the Bible concerning dress than do men. God knows that her dress or lack of dress has more influence for good or evil than man's attire. The high standard suggested for women are for the good of the human race. Fathers and husbands, as heads of the homes, should demand decency and forbid lasciviousness. Men should, of course, be wise and decent in dress, also.

Hair styles may be signboards to advertise one's emphasis or character, just as clothing may indicate one's quality of character. The proud, ungodly women of ancient times were given to the elaborate and extravagant hair styles. This extravagance and gaudiness are forbidden (See I Tim. 2:9; I Peter 3:3). It seems evident that men and women are to have different hair styles. Think of these words: "Doth not even nature itself teach you, that, if a man have long hair, it is a shame unto him? but if a woman have long hair, it is glory to her: for her hair is given her for a covering" (Read I Cor. 11:1-16). Why is there not more consideration of and respect for this passage? Should not woman at least allow her hair to grow until it is definitely long as compared with man's short hair? Should not man have his hair cut until his is definitely short when compared with her long hair? It is unfortunate that the so-called pictures of Christ have long hair. There is no picture of Christ. The paintings of Christ that have been given wide circulation were painted during another "long haired" generation. Women with long hair may sin in their extravagant arrangements and ornamentation as suggested in I Timothy 2 and I Peter 3.

Neatness and cleanliness are nowhere forbidden. The slovenly, uncouth appearance is nowhere commended. One may be out of place by conspicuous dress regardless of why it is conspicuous. The modest woman who is beautiful is as God made her, and has no reason to be ashamed. Immodesty has no excuse, but beauty is its own excuse for being.

Long ago, in the law of Moses, God said: "The woman shall not wear that which pertaineth unto a man, neither shall a man put on a woman's garment: for all that do so are abomination unto the Lord thy God" (Deut. 22:5). We do not live under the law of Moses, so this is not binding on Christians because it is the Jewish law. It is true that it is an unrighteous thing for a man to be effeminate or womanish (I Cor. 6:9, 10). The difference in hair length was mentioned in I Cor. 11. Why would man desire to be a sissy? Why would woman desire to be mannish? It is sometimes next to impossible to identify one on the street. Is IT a boy? Is IT a girl? The unisex movement is for infidels and atheists. It is certainly not for Christians.

May women ever be dressed decently other than in a skirt? Have good women always dressed as good women did a few years ago? Have those patterns been bound forever? Get your concordance and look up the references to the word skirt or skirts. Be impressed that in Old Testament times men's skirts are mentioned more often than women's skirts. They evidently were different, according to the law (Deut. 22:5), but both he and she wore skirts. Do you want to hunt in the Bible with the help of your concordance for men's trousers, britches, or pants as outer garments? Let us not make laws where God has not. If men and women had skirts in Old Testament times and were not at all dressed alike, is it not evident that men and women might have pants suits and be very different? Could she find feminine suits while her husband finds remarkably...
different masculine suits? Styles are not bound, but modesty, decency, and sobriety are bound.

Some good people suggest that if women wear pant suits they will soon be in the stretch pants or tights. Some do not wear them. Women who would wear vulgar pant suits would wear the very indecent mini-skirts if they were in dresses. People who are interested in unholy and sinful lasciviousness (called sex appeal) will find a way, whatever the styles. Many, even among the careless better women, appear in public in dresses that look like tops for decent pants suits. It looks as if they just failed to put on one of the main garments. Can any one honestly say that mini-skirts are better? Obviously not.

This is not written to say that all good women should go to pants suits. Let good women who are in the habit of wearing modest dresses continue to do so if they desire. We all will respect them highly. Let us face the fact however that coming generations may make radical changes in the styles. The Bible does not forbid. But good women will always be able to dress neatly and discreetly, and ungodly women will always be able to show their brazen inability to blush (Jer. 6:15) by appearing in the attire of a harlot.

Entertainment centers may be found where players appear in the nude with no more shame than the brute beast. This is sinful with condemnation from God as for adultery and fornication (Read I Cor. 6:9, 10, 18; Gal. 5:19-21; Col. 3:5; Rev. 21:8). Please notice that the sex sins are almost always listed first in any Bible list of soul destroying sins. How much better is the bikini bathing suit than nudity? Modern bathing suits are indecent for any to use in public. Is it not amazing how many people, even church members, appear almost nude in public? What has happened to discretion? Morals will not rise, and homes will not be more stable until people begin putting on more clothing in public. When mothers put on their very small halters and shorts and go to the public pool with the children, who will teach modesty?

"In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly array; but (which belongeth women professing godliness) with good works" (I Tim. 2:9, 10). Mr. W. E. Vines, in his Dictionary of New Testament Words tells us that the word translated "modest" in this passage means "orderly, well-arranged, decent, modest." The word is sometimes used to refer to the idea of being orderly or of good behavior in other particulars than clothing. Many have pointed out that pearls and costly array are referred to by this word, and they certainly are not the decent, well arranged, and orderly attire for the Christian according to this passage. Extravagance and gaudiness are condemned. Do lasciviousness and indecent exposure go uncondemned? Any indecent attire is immodest. That which tends toward lewdness is condemned. Is there no lust provoked by modern customs of dress? Let none soothe your conscience by tuning your minds only to the costly array of I Tim. 2:9. What about the shamefaced-
Even though the word "mature" is not found in the New Testament, many synonyms are. The writer of the Hebrew epistle employed a word which is tantamount to the English word "mature", "But strong meat belongeth to them that are of FULL AGE..." (Heb. 5:14). The word which is herein translated "of full age" is the Greek word "teleiou" which, according to Mr. Vine, means maturity (W. E. Vine's Expository Dictionary, page 174). The same word that is rendered "of full age" in Hebrews five, verse fourteen is also found in a host of other passages. "Brethren, be not children in understanding", Paul exhorts the Corinthians, "howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men" (I Cor. 14:20). In this passage the word "teleiou" is translated "men". Thus, in both of the foregoing passages, adulthood or maturity is enjoined. Yet, in view of this simple teaching; that is, that Christians are to be mature and adult, we have not a few who have been members for years and years who seemingly never grow! In fact, I would suggest that infantilism is one of the greatest hindrances and impediments the church is presently encountering. Thus it behooves every Christian who has had time to develop (Heb. 5:12) to ask himself, am I a mature Christian? Dear ones, child of God who has had time to develop. Paul exhorts the Corinthians, "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves — he is making application to himself. The infantile member, who has not resolved now to be, nor to be, is out encouraging others rather than having to be constantly encouraged himself.

TEACHES OTHERS

The New Testament is replete with teaching concerning the necessity of the Christian teaching others the gospel. Luke in his letter to Theophilus said thus relative to the Christians in Jerusalem, "Therefore they that were scattered abroad went every where preaching the word (Acts 8:4). Christians are not only commanded to teach aliens but also one another. In the language of Paul we are told, "... Warn them that are unruly, comfort the feeble minded, support the weak, be patient toward all members the way of rectitude and right.

EXAMINES SELF

It is your writer's belief that one of the greatest needs in the church today is self-examination. Many good, rich lessons delivered from the pulpit are often ineffective simply because the hearers do not make personal application. We need to heed the teaching of Paul to the Corinthians, "Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your own selves..." (II Cor. 13:5). The adult Christian is not bored when he attends services, as the infantile member frequently is, because he is involved in the lesson he is making application to himself.

CONCLUSION

It is the writer's prayer that the foregoing will enable us to determine whether or not we are mature Christians. If, in view of the above description, you find that you are not an adult Christian, why not resolve now to be.

WANTED

Any authentic material on the "Jesus People" movement or other related movements. Please send it to me with invoice.

H. E. Phillips
P. O. Box 17244
Tampa, Fla. 33612
SOUTH CAROLINA
by Owen H. Thomas

The state of South Carolina is virtually a mission field so far as the conservative element of the Lord's church is concerned. To my knowledge there are only two congregations in the state that are self-supporting. Both of these have fewer than sixty members. Only five churches have full time preachers, but they outnumber the conservatives by a wide margin. Some of the liberal churches in Nashville, Tennessee have been surveying the state and are making plans to send liberal churches in Nashville, Tennessee have been surveying the entire state that could be considered conservative and most of these have less than twenty-five members. There are several towns of moderate size that have no churches of Christ in them.

The liberal churches are not as strong here as in many other places but they outnumber the conservatives by a wide margin. Some of the liberal churches in Nashville, Tennessee have been surveying the state and are making plans to send liberal preachers into South Carolina for the purpose of starting more liberal churches.

Columbia, which is the state capitol, has four liberal churches but until about a year ago there were no conservative churches. However, there are two small conservative groups meeting there now. One of these began over a year ago and they now have about fifteen members. They are known as the North Columbia Church of Christ and meet at 928 Columbia College Drive. Brother Bill Brittenham, who was recently discharged from the army, is working with them. He is trying to raise support so that he may continue to work with this small group. They are trying to support him until he can find support but they will not be able to continue this for very long. Bro. Brittenham needs help and he needs it NOW. The other group started in January of this year when about five or six families were kicked out of the liberal Eastside church. They have about fifty in attendance and are known as the Brandon Avenue Church of Christ. They have made arrangements for brother Gary White to begin working with them about August. I understand he will also be needing support.

The church here in Camden is small. We have about fifty-six members. At the present time we are sending $335.00 per month to help support four other preachers besides carrying on our local work. Thus, we are not able to answer these other calls for help. We would, if we could. But I know there are other churches who can help these men. Will you do it? I believe these men deserve help. South Carolina needs these men. Columbia being the capitol offers the best opportunities for the spreading of the gospel in the state. If you can help or are interested in more information I suggest you contact Bill Brittenham at 3028 Exmoor, Columbia, S.C. 29203 or Harold Taylor, 1021 Heaven Drive, Columbia, S.C. 29203.

NEW CHURCH IN BRISTOW, OKLAHOMA
Olen Holderby

The church in San Pablo, Calif, sent me, during the month of April, to Bristow, Okla., in an effort to get a sound church started. I arrived in Bristow on April 10. After about two weeks of intensive home Bible studies, we began meeting April 23. Twenty-three people were present for the morning service and twenty-two for the evening service. At present the new group is meeting in the American Legion Bldg., which has very nice quarters. The brethren at the East Central church in Tulsa are much interested in this new work and have promised to pursue the effort further, with needed assistance and effort. Bro. James Watts, the East Central preacher, was with me almost all the time and proved to be a real source of encouragement and help. The East Central elders are kind enough to permit Bro. Watts to speak for the new group for a while. Along with the East Central brethren we are doing considerable follow-up on additional contacts. We ask your prayers on behalf of this new work.

DEBATE IN HOUSTON AREA

The subject of this discussion is "The Kingdom (Its Establishment and Destiny)." It will be conducted in the Deer Park High School Auditorium. Each session will begin at 7:30 each evening.

The disputants are Glenn R. Burt who is working with the College Park church of Christ in Deer Park, Texas, and Don Newcomer, who is a member of the Berean Christadelphians in Houston, Texas.

Propositions:
June 12 & 13 — The Kingdom was established on the first Pentecost after the resurrection of Jesus and its destiny is Eternity in Heaven with Jesus.
  Affirming: Glenn R. Burt
  Denying: Don Newcomer

June 15 & 16 — The Kingdom of God will be re-established at the second coming of Jesus and its destiny is Eternity on Earth with Jesus.
  Affirming: Don Newcomer
  Denying: Glenn R. Burt

PREACHER NEEDED


The church of Christ in Thomaston, Maine assembled for the first time on April 16, 1972 in the Weymouth Grange Hall on Beechwood Street off U.S. 1. The attendance is now in the teens. The membership at present is 12. There are over 40,000 people in a 15-mile radius to draw from and the nearest church
is 40 miles. We will be moving into that area when schools are out in June. Our present need is support! Any church or Christian who wants to have fellowship with us in this great work may contact me at this address. John W. Pitman, P.O. Box 186, Milbridge, Maine 04658. The need is great! Who will help?

Do you want to translate your books to Spanish language?
Write to:
Amando Ortega Mata
Sor Juana Ines de la Cruz No. 1905
Chihuahua, Chihuahua, Mex.

Tom Swilley, 1713 South 6th, Monroe, Louisiana 71201 — This is to advise that the Southside Church in Monroe has now moved into a new and permanent meeting house. We met for three weeks in the home of one of the Christians and then moved to a rented warehouse where we had been until buying property and building at 506 S. 6th Street. We moved into our building and began our spring gospel meeting on March 26 with Bro. Bob Buchanon of Pekin, Ind. Our new meeting house has a very comfortable auditorium and four classrooms. Our attendance continues to grow. We averaged 54 for each service during the gospel meeting. On Tuesday and Wednesday nights, a couple of the students from White’s Ferry Road School of Preaching were in attendance and stayed around after services to discuss the institutional question. Bro. Buchanon and I tried to answer every question and feel much good was accomplished as a result. Monroe holds much bitterness so we hope this is a step in the direction of removing some of the animosity that exists. If ever in the Monroe area, be sure to look us up. If you know of any contact in this area, please call me at (318) 323-2278 or 322-3541.

"AWAKE OUT OF SLEEP"
Donald R. Givens

Many congregations of God’s people, though far from dead, are doing much less effective gospel work than they should be doing with their talent and resources. Why is this? What is the reason for so little spiritual and numerical growth? Among other answers this must be one: Because the very reason for which the church exists — the proclamation of the saving gospel — is being done so feebly by too many. There are exceptions to this of course (thank the Lord), but generally speaking, in our modern materialistic society, too few of God’s people are diligently and constantly proclaiming the gospel to too few of the devil’s people.

There needs to be a much closer connection between "study" and "evangelism" between preaching and practice; between knowledge and conduct; between "personal faith," and "personal work." We are saved—to save others. We are loved—to love others. We are taught—to teach others. Remember: it is not just "the preacher’s job." It is "the faithful man’s job (2 Tim. 2:2).

The gospel and the communication of the gospel are two different things. We must study, learn, and know the blessed gospel; but we must also tell it to others. Yet, in many local churches (individually and collectively) the communication of the Good News is so inadequate that the greater part of our neighbors fail to get any real awareness of the Christ’s power in our lives. Life goes on, for the most part, in our secular age, as if the Lord had never died on the cross and as if His church did not exist.

Not all people will hear and heed the Good News when you tell them; not all heard and heeded Jesus. But if Christians will be busy sowing the seed with untiring devotion—it has with it such compelling force (power—Romans 1:16) that some will listen...some hearts will heed...some lives will be touched...some souls will be saved!


The proclamation of the gospel is being in our time so feebly done. May we never be content to "drag along" just doing things "fairly well" and "holding our own." God forbid.

...already it is time for you to awake out of sleep: for now is salvation nearer to us than when we first believed. The night is far spent, and the day is at hand: let us therefore cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armor of light."(Rom. 13:11,12)

"Awake to soberness righteously, and sin not; for some have no knowledge of God. I speak this to move you to shame." (I Cor. 15:34)

"Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall shine upon thee." (Eph. 5:14)
THE EFFECTS OF RESPECT FOR AUTHORITY

Respect for authority is the exact equivalent of respect for God. He who thinks he respects authority but does not believe in God, or professes to believe in God but despises law, declares therein a crass ignorance. God is the source of all authority and even human authorities are ultimately dependent upon him for their right to exercise rule. It is impossible to genuinely respect God without respecting to an equal degree all legitimate authority. It is impossible to respect legitimate authority without respecting God, for authority is dependent upon God and without him all authority ceases to be legitimate and is but the arbitrary exercise of power by men. Based upon such a recognition of God as the source, and the possession of humility to accept the fact by submissive compliance, respect necessarily requires and reflects an enlightenment of understanding and personal character. The effects are most wholesome and discernible.

All laws immediately become important. They are not regarded for their own individual merit. They are not dependent upon their "relevance" to current notions or needs. They are important because they are the law. The son who admires and respects his father does not await an explanation for everything he is told to do. He does not have to lose an argument before he admits that he should do what he has been told. Commensurate with his respect for his father, a requirement is important because it is a requirement. How much more is this true in a man's relationship to the God whose wisdom and laws he acknowledges beforehand to be perfect? All of his words are wise and his statutes just, good and necessary.

Non-essential commands cease to exist. Denominationalism despises certain commandments (baptism for the remission of sins, for example). Unable to deny that baptism is commanded (Acts 10:48) a weak smile and shrugged shoulder often accompanies the common dodge, "It's a command; but it's a non-essential command"; "You don't have to do it!" Not even a spoiled child could speak to indulgent, permissive parents like that and be said by the excuse-making parents to respect them. This is rather the essence of impudence, the robes of piety to the contrary notwithstanding. Any denial of the necessity of the law is a denial and affront against him from whom the law came in the first place. Genuine respect does not play this self-deluding game; it esteems that there is no such thing as a non-essential word or command from God. He is God! Therefore what he says is right, good, important and necessary.

Obeydience is another effect. Obedience inheres in the very nature of respect. Respect for authority consists, in part, of the humility that submits, and that is what obedience is. Thus the person who disobeys cannot correctly argue that he respects God. He may admire, but he does not respect. He has rather arrogated his own will and declared his independence. Respect submits in dutiful deference even on points that are personally unpleasant.

Character and self-discipline are produced. When a man obeys God out of a deep conviction and profound respect, purity of life in body and mind results. He learns to drive and restrain himself by a deliberate determination to obey the law. He has become, in the process, the kind of person with strength of character that it would have been impossible to become without respect for authority. This respect has in fact permitted God to remake and conform him into something according to the divine will. See Romans 12:1,2 and Col. 3:10. In a word, he really becomes somebody!

Eternal rewards should also be mentioned among the effects of respect. The riches of heaven are for those who keep his commandments, who are good
and faithful servants that did what their duty was to do (Rev. 22:14; Matt. 25:21; Luke 17:10). However, our interest in this article is upon the present practical effects in the life of a person, though the eternal reward is real and is the ultimate goal, being the dwelling place of the God whom we respect and love.

Respect for authority makes all the difference. It is the difference between purity and depravity, character and dissipation, obedience and rebellion, peace of heart and anguish of soul, life and death, and heaven and hell. Truly the believer, the selfless soul who is willing to conform himself in respectful submission to the divine will, has the best of two worlds — the world that now is, and the world that is to come.
Some people will listen to the word of God — to a degree. When Paul was defending himself in Jerusalem, he recited the story of his life. His Jewish audience listened patiently as he told of his Jewish origin, his education in the very center of Judaism, Jerusalem, his zeal for the law of Moses, his persistent persecution of Christians — yes, even of his amazing conversion to Christ. But then he made one big mistake — he mentioned that Christ had now sent him forth "unto the Gentiles" (Acts 22:21). That did it! The very mention of the name "Gentiles" closed the doors of those Jewish minds. It "tumed them off" immediately. Whatever listening they had done earlier was now wasted. Luke states, "They gave him audience unto this word . . . " (Acts 22:22). The New American Standard renders the passage, "They listened to him up to this statement. . . . " Then they began to declare Paul unfit to live on the earth!

UP TO A POINT

Several groups are mentioned in the book of Acts who were willing to listen to the gospel of Christ — up to a point! (1) The Jews mentioned above were willing to listen up until the preacher made favorable mention of a group of people they hated — the Gentiles. Their prejudice was blinding; they would hear no more. (2) The Athenians in Acts 17:32 were quite interested in hearing Paul's discourse — up to a point! When he began to advocate a certain doctrine which they did not believe — the resurrection of the dead, the curtain was down for many of them. They had heard all they wanted to hear. (3) The Jews in Acts 7 listened to a long discourse by Stephen on the development of God's purposes in Abraham's posterity — up to a point. But when Stephen made the application of his lesson to them personally, accusing them of being sinners, their ears were suddenly closed and their hearts were filled with rage (Acts 7:54).

PRIDE AND PREJUDICE

Two things accounted for much of the attitude of the people above: (1) pride, or their great vanity over fleshly birth and traditions; and (2) prejudice, or resentment of any teaching contrary to what they already believed. Many ears have been closed to the gospel in modern times by the same unreasonable conditions. This is manifested by people yet in the world and also by some within the body of Christ.

SOME EXAMPLES

It is not uncommon for members of various denominations to appear to be quite interested in gospel preaching — that is, until some mention is made of the particular name or the specific doctrine in which they take such pride, and about which they have such strong prejudice. They listen, in other words, up to a point. A religious neighbor may listen to the Bible teaching about the church and the plan of salvation with seeming interest up until "one body . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism . . . " are mentioned (Eph. 4:4,5). Though the teaching is sound and scriptural, they may insist that they want to hear no more of it. Another may listen gladly to what is said about baptism up until it is pointed out that baptism is essential to salvation in Jesus Christ (Acts 2:38; 22:16; Rom. 6:3,4). Pride is one's present religious condition and prejudice against something that is contrary to present belief are hard obstacles for some people to overcome.

It is almost as common for members of the Lord's church to listen in the same way — only up to a point. Some really like "brother Preacher" very fine — up until the day he gets up and begins teaching on their own pet sins. After that they hear nothing he says. Pride is closing their ears to the need of repentance.

Then there are those in the church who have embraced the liberal practices of institutionalism and coordination of the work of many churches under a "sponsoring eldership." These people, so often, will listen to faithful brethren preach only up to a point. They willingly listen while he shows that there is no Bible authority for churches of the Lord to build and maintain a human institution to do the churches' work of gospel preaching. (Somehow they have the idea that this would be a "Missionary Society" like the Christian Church developed many years ago.) But when the same faithful brethren show that there is no Bible authority for churches of the Lord to build and maintain a human institution to do the churches' work of edification (schools, educational societies) or the churches' work of relieving the needy (beneficent societies, "homes" or asylums), some will listen no further!

Such pride can be engendered by the "GREAT" things the "brotherhood" is doing that men will refuse to listen to calls for a return to the simple, New Testament pattern. Such prejudice can be stirred up against those who call for Bible authority ("antis," "legalists," "hobbyists") that misguided brethren will absolutely close their ears to the truth.

THE ONLY SOLUTION

"Only ONE THING will cause men to stop this "listening . . . up to a point." Only one thing will impel men to go all the way with truth. That thing is a genuine desire for and love for the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. When one WANTS the truth — all of the truth, he will search for it. He will listen to what he hears — not gullibly, but critically — trying to determine whether it is the very truth of God's word. Paul preached to people in Berea who were ready to listen, and anxious to investigate the Scriptures to see if what they had
been taught was the truth (Acts 17:11). They were not full of human pride and vicious prejudice. They were willing to hear Paul out. Nearly 3,000 on Pentecost laid aside pride and prejudice and "gladly received his word" (Acts 2:41). If they had stopped listening, the story would have been different.

How dangerous it is to the human soul for one not to receive "the LOVE OF THE TRUTH" (II Thess. 2:10). Without real love for truth there is no way to be saved. It ought to be obvious that if one does not LOVE truth, he will not listen to it. And even if he condescends to listen, he will not believe and obey it.

The extent to which people will listen to the word of God will determine their eternal destiny. If they listen only "up to a point," they will be condemned in that great day of judgment, for only those who listen obediently will escape hell (II Thess. 1:7-9). If they listen "all the way," and then obey from the heart what they have heard, they will become servants of righteousness and have the hope of life eternal (Rom. 6:17, 18; I Peter 1:3-5).

Just how willing are we to listen?

---

QUESTION: Please answer me if Isaiah 29 and Ezekiel 37:16-28 really have to do with the Book of Mormon? — A.O.M.

ANSWER: Concerning the prophecy of Isaiah 29, Latter Day Saints affirm "the coming forth of the Book of Mormon" to be the fulfillment. Their line of reasoning is rather extended and involved. However, the primary points may be summarized as follows:

Verses 1 and 2: A comparison is drawn between "Ariel" (which they admit refers to Jerusalem) and another place which was to be unto God "as Ariel." Hence, they talk of an old and new Ariel. This new Ariel is further identified as "the land shadowing with wings" (Isa. 18:1), which is North and South America.

Verse 4: The expression "and shall speak out of the ground" refers to the Book of Mormon which contains a history of the new Ariel. This history was written on brass and golden plates found and translated by Joseph Smith.

Verses 11-14: The "book that is sealed" represents the Book of Mormon. Joseph Smith copied some of the characters from the plates and had them submitted by Martin Harris to Professor Anthon of New York for translation. Anthon explained that he could not translate them, but might if he had the plates. When it was explained that "part of the plates were sealed," he replied "I cannot read a sealed book." Hence, the "learned" could not translate the plates, so it was left to the "unlearned" to do, namely, Joseph Smith, which he did by use of divine instruments. Thus, was Isaiah's prophecy of "a marvelous work and a wonder" fulfilled.

In reply to the above, let it be pointed out that Mormonism is one of the most self contradictory systems of religion ever propagated. Their teaching on Isa. 29 is one good example.

Joseph Smith's "Inspired Translation" makes these verses refer conclusively and exclusively to literal Jerusalem (I.T. Isa. 29:1-4). No other place is mentioned or permitted according to this translation. Yet, Mormonism depends upon the "new Ariel" (the American continent) concept of this passage. If the "Inspired Translation" be true, then there is no way to make Isa. 29 apply to America, the Mormon plates, the Book of Mormon, and the people involved in its history. A choice must be made between the two. Both cannot be correct.

Furthermore, the Book of Mormon affirms that the Mormon plates were written in a language un-
known to any people on earth, hence, a means was prepared for their interpretation (Mormon 9:32,34; 1 Nephi 1:2). Yet, Joseph Smith quotes Martin Harris as saying that Anthon of New York assured him "The translation was correct, more so than any he had before seen translated from the Egyptian... He gave me a certificate certifying to the people of Palmyra that they were true characters, and that the translation of such of them as had been translated was also correct" (P. of G.P., "J.S." 2:64, p. 55). Question: How could Anthon give such assurance when the Book of Mormon says no one knew the language? Why did Smith need the divine instruments for interpretation? Why not let Anthon do it?

The truth of the matter is, the "woe" of Isa. 29 was against literal Jerusalem, "the city where David dwelt," and cannot possibly refer to anything in America. The expression "as Ariel" (v. 2) tells why "the city where David dwelt" is called "Ariel" in this prophecy. The word "Ariel" is from a Hebrew word translated "altar" in Ezek. 43:15. Hence, Jerusalem was to be unto God as an altar. It was to be a place of slain victims (not animals, but people in Salem), and cannot possibly refer to anything in America. The expression "as Ariel" (v. 2) tells why the prophecy was against literal Jerusalem, "the city where David dwelt," and cannot possibly refer to anything in America. The expression "as Ariel" (v. 2) tells why the prophecy was against "Ariel" (Jerusalem) or against "mount Zion" (Jerusalem). These verses cannot possibly refer to nations that warred against one another on the American continent.

Subsequent history of God's people shows that every detail of this prophecy was fulfilled in the destruction of Jerusalem and the captivity of its people by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon.

That Jerusalem is the place of the fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecy is evident from the whole context of the book itself. Notice, first, Isa. 1:1: "The vision of Isaiah, the son of Amoz, which he saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem in the days of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah." Now notice the immediate context of the prophecy under study: "Wherfore hear the word of the Lord, ye scomful men, that rule this people which is in Jerusalem... For the Lord shall rise up as in mount Perazim, he shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that he may do his work, his strange work; and bring to pass his act, his strange act" (Isa. 28:14, 21). This "strange work" is the same "marvelous work and a wonder" of Isa. 29:14. Notice that the wrath of God or the "woe" of our text was to be upon them that "rule this people which is in Jerusalem," and "the city where David dwelt."

From the prophecy of Isa. 29:1-5, we learn that the "woe" involved "the city where David dwelt," that "the multitude of thy strangers" was to "camp against thee, round about;" that they were to "raise forts against thee," and those who were the object of the "woe" were to be "brought down" so as to "whisper out of the dust" — the latter statement symbolizing the humiliation and low state to which they were to be reduced. For an accurate fulfillment of every minute detail of this prophecy, one has only to read the subsequent history of Jerusalem as set forth in II Kings 25:

"And it came to pass in the ninth year of his reign, in the tenth month, in the tenth day of the month, that Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came, he, and all his host, against Jerusalem, and pitched against it; and they built forts against it round about. And the city was besieged unto the eleventh year of king Zedekiah. And on the ninth day of the fourth month the famine prevailed in the city, and there was no bread for the people of the land. And the city was broken up, and all the men of war fled by night by the way of the gate between two walls, which is by the king's garden: (now the Chaldees were against the city round about) and the king went the way toward the plain. And the army of the Chaldees pursued after the king, and overtook him in the plains of Jericho: and all his army were scattered from him... And in the fifth month, on the seventh day of the month, which is the nineteenth year of king Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, came Nebuzaradan, captain of the guard, a servant of the king of Babylon, unto Jerusalem: And he burnt the house of the Lord, and the king's house, and all the houses of Jerusalem, and every great man's house burnt he with fire. And all the army of the Chaldees, that were with the captain of the guard, brake down the walls of Jerusalem round about. Now the rest of the people that were left in the city, and the fugitives that fell away to the king of Babylon, with the remnant of the multitude, did Nebuzaradan the captain of the guard carry away... So Judah was carried away out of their land" (II Kings 25:1-4, 8-11; 21).

The evidence and conclusion is corroborated several times over by other scriptures and prophecies, especially from Jeremiah. Space limit, however, forbids such examination here.

Isaiah 29:7,8 picture in prophetical language the overthrow of Babylon and others who fought against Jerusalem. While Babylon's triumph over Jerusalem seemed real and lasting, it was only as a dream. It was enjoyed for a moment, then she herself was overthrown. Her subsequent history confirms this. Notice that these verses refer to nations that fought against "Ariel" (Jerusalem) or against "mount Zion" (Jerusalem). These verses cannot possibly refer to nations that warred against one another on the American continent.

Isaiah 29:11-14 picture the condition of Jerusalem and Judah immediately prior to and during their destruction. Because of sin, the people are pictured as one overcome with "deep sleep," blind, drunk, staggering on to destruction. They no more discern God's revelation through prophets and seers than a learned man could discern the contents of a sealed book, or an unlearned man could read the same book with the seal broken. Both pose impossible situations. Because of their blind spiritual stupor, God wrought "a marvelous work and a wonder" in bringing about the destruction of Jerusalem — a seemingly impossible task in view of its apparent power, might and security. (Continued next issue with an examination of Ezek. 37.)
THE SABBATH TODAY

This is the second in a series on the sabbath question. It is alleged by most Sabbatarians that the ten commandments were not given on shaking Sinai but in the garden of Eden. In a discussion with Burt F. Marrs, I asked "With whom could Eve have committed adultery since Adam was the only man on earth?" He replied that she could have committed adultery with the devil. Of course, this was nonsense since the devil is a spiritual being but Eve was physical. It is argued from Gen. 26:5 that since Abraham kept the statutes and laws of the Lord that it must have included the Sabbath. However, one might as well argue that Abraham had been baptized for the remission of sins and observed the Lord's Supper, since they are commands of the Lord. Sabbatarians need to be reminded that Abraham also kept the law of circumcision (Gen. 17:10-14) and also offered animal sacrifices (Gen. 22:13). Would this mean that Christians are to keep these today?

Mr. Roy B. Thurman, in his little book uses Isaiah 56:5 which mentions the "sons of the stranger" as keeping the sabbath. What Mr. Thurman failed to tell his readers is that the same STRANGER was told to observe the law of circumcision for the same reason as keeping the sabbath. God said, "And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover of the Lord, let all his males be circumcised ... for no uncircumcised person shall eat thereof (Exo. 12:48)." Does he practice circumcision? The Bible makes it clear what the "sons of the stranger" in Isa. 56:6 had to do in order to be eligible for sabbath keeping and entering God's house. The Lord said, "No stranger, uncircumcised in heart, nor uncircumcised in the flesh, shall enter into my sanctuary, of any stranger that is among the children of Israel" (Ezek. 44:9). When these Gentiles joined themselves to the Lord, they ceased to be Gentiles and became proselytes to the Jewish religion. In Exodus 20:10 God tells the stranger WITHIN THY GATES to keep the sabbath command. If the sabbath is universal as the Sabbatarian claims then why speak of the stranger WITHIN AND WITHOUT the gate, since there would be no STRANGERS.

Sometimes it is argued by Sabbatarians that the standard of right and wrong is found in the ten commandments. However, we must remember that the death penalty is found in other commands. The sons of Kohath were told not to touch any holy thing lest they die (Nun. 4:15). This would also have to be a standard of right and wrong. It was not part of the ten commandments. Even wizards were to be put to death (Lev. 20:7). So it must be observed that many standards of right and wrong were found outside the Ten Commandments. In Amos 8:5 the Jews asked two important questions, "When will the new moon be gone, that we may sell com, and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?" The Jews' wanted to know when the sabbath would be gone. Sabbatarians argue that it will never be gone but God says it would. In verse nine God answers their questions, "And it shall come to pass in that day saith the Lord God that I will cause the sun to go down at noon, and I will darken the earth in a clear day." In Mark 15:33 we read that the sun went down at noon and darkness covered the earth and remained for three hours. Thus, according to God, this ended the sabbath. Burt F. Marrs claimed that this could not be true because the Jews wanted to cheat. It can be granted that many of the Jews wanted to cheat God, but remember, gentle reader, it was God who thundered back his reply by saying the sabbath would end when the sun went down at noon. The cheating of the Jews had nothing to do with the answer of the Lord. The stubborn fact remains that God said the sabbath would end when the sun went down at noon.
"WHAT IS TRUTH?"

This is the question which old Pilate asked Jesus a long time ago (John 18:38). There has been much discussion of the subject in the religious world, and many answers to the question. To the average sectarian, including preachers, there is no such thing as truth. Oh, I know that they don't think they believe that, but they do. Any time one argues that anything one wants to believe and practice is right (just so he is honest) he is saying that there can be no wrong. And if there is no wrong, then there is no standard by which we determine that there is truth.

Let me illustrate what I mean by examining some statements which I have heard and read recently.

A local newspaper reported an interview between a staff writer and the vice president of a local Baptist seminary. The Baptist official stated that in many ways Billy Graham was too liberal for them. He said, "we differ on the subject of the church and its importance in evangelism. We believe here that the commission of evangelism to the world was given to the church as a local group. I could not in good conscience tell a new convert to go out and join the church of his choice."

It is refreshing to hear a denominational preacher deny the old "join the church of your choice" argument. And he is right in saying that evangelism (and any other work) was given to the church in the local rather than the universal sense. Many people need to learn that lesson. Of course Baptists deny that the Bible speaks of the church in the universal sense, but it does (Matt. 16:18; Eph. 1:22,23).

I now quote from the newspaper article:

"Owen said he and others at the seminary consider the Missionary Baptist churches to be some of the true New Testament churches today,' but he added: "That is not to say we are the only true church. But it has been my observation that most of the true New Testament churches in America today go under some kind of Baptist name."

Now you never read more double talk than that, yet such is typical of sectarian preachers. This is right, but something different is not wrong. How absurd.

The gentleman believes that the truth of the Bible authorizes the Baptist church and that it teaches the truth. Yet he said they are SOME of the true churches today. If that be true, then there are churches which do not wear the Baptist name nor teach Baptist doctrine which are also true. But if those churches can believe and teach something which is different from the Baptists (which he believes to be true) and be right, then error is as good as truth. So to them, there is no standard of truth. and that is what I said in the beginning.

Notice that he said that they are not the only true church, but that MOST of the true church wear the Baptist name, Now by what standard can one determine that it is right to wear the Baptist name but it is also right to wear some other name? Not by truth, for it doesn't contradict itself nor teach conflicting doctrines.

On a recent radio program, I heard a Baptist preacher discussing Revelation 5:9 which says, "Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation." In his comments, he applied the word "nation" to denominations (which is par for the course for him) and then concluded that there were saved people in all churches. He said that he expected to meet Martin Luther in heaven, even though Luther was not a Baptist and was wrong on baptism, I'm not the judge of Luther's salvation, but I can detect the fallacy of the Baptist preacher's argument.

He believes the Bible (truth) teaches one to be a Baptist, and that immersin is scriptural baptism. Yet he believes one will be saved who was not a Baptist, was not immersed, and did not believe and teach it. If they both make it to heaven, it will prove that God has no standard of authority concerning baptism and church membership. So anything and any way would be acceptable, and where there is no error there can be no standard of truth. I pointed this out on our program the following Sunday (on the same station) and asked how many other points a man could be wrong on and still be saved, or if he could be wrong on everything. If so, what is truth?

While we are speaking of Baptists and have mentioned Billy Graham, we may as well make a day of it. In his newspaper column someone asked him about the clothing one should wear, and what this had to do with being a Christian. Here is his reply:

"Nothing! We are not saved because of what we wear or don't wear, or even what we do, or don't do, 'By grace we are saved, and it is not of ourselves.' It is not what we do, or wear, or the way we act, but what God has done in Christ. The Bible does teach us that we are to dress modestly."

How about that for some more double talk? He would have us believe that the Bible (truth) teaches us to dress modestly, but one can go naked and still be saved! It is all- up to God and Christ. We can do wrongly, dress immodestly and act unrighteously and still be saved. If we are not saved by what we do, why such statements as those found in Matthew 7:21; Luke 6:46; James 1:22 and Revelation 22:14?

According to Graham, it is the truth that one should dress modestly, but one may dress immodestly and still be saved. Therefore, wrong is as good as right and error is as acceptable as truth.

In closing, I believe two questions are now in order: What is truth? What is the purpose of it?
I RECEIVED THE "PHILIPPINE CHRISTIAN" AWARD

In a special issue of the Philippine Christian (Sept.-Dec. 1971) the new editor, brother Douglas LaCroy, devoted the entire issue to the benevolent question. He also devoted two pages of the above mentioned issue to J. T. Smith and his position(s) on the benevolent issue. The article was written in an effort to try to destroy the work that brother Connie Adams and I did in the Philippines in May 1971. While we were in the Philippines I engaged brother Eusebio M. Laquata in a debate on the benevolent question and the sponsoring church arrangement in M'Lang Cotabato; and since that time many Filipino people and preachers have given up, as I did, a position that cannot be successfully defended. Not only that, but the debate has been put in book form and over 1500 copies have already been shipped to the Philippines. Thus the "liberals" in the Philippines are beginning to "hurt" as is obvious from the articles printed in the Philippine Christian. The truth of the matter is, at no time when Americans have been in the Philippines will the Americans who are connected with the "liberal" school in Bagio City attend any of the services. Dudley Spears and Jim Needham were in Bagio City in April of this year, and the "American liberals" brought some of the Filipino preachers by and "dropped them off" at the services. The purpose of those who attended seemed to be to disrupt the services during the question and answer period. The Americans in the Philippines are too cowardly to appear before the Filipino people and try to defend what they teach and practice. No! I guess I am mistaken about that. They are too smart to try to defend what they teach and practice. They know they would lose more brethren to the truth than they already have. I challenge any or all of the Americans in the Philippines, or anyone they would get to represent their position from the United States, to meet me in two debates — one to be held in Bagio City and the other one anywhere the brethren can agree upon on the island of Mindanao. They know their doctrine cannot be successfully defended. Hence, they are not going to try it.

Now, about the "award" I received from brother LaCroy and the brethren in charge of the Philippine Christian. They tried to discredit the work I did in the Philippines by pointing out how unstable I am in doctrinal matters. They printed an article in the Philippine Christian that I sent to the Gospel Guardian in 1960 after coming to the conclusion that the orphan homes and the sponsoring church arrangements were O.K. I came to this conclusion because I did as many of the people are doing today. I listened to what a preacher had to say and was led into error because I had confidence in a man, Basil Overton, and not because I could go to the Bible and defend what I believed. Brother Overton's "logic" sounded great — until I began to try to defend the position myself. I found that I could not defend it by the Bible, and thus after much study I came to the conclusion that my first position had been correct. By the way, I would be happy to meet Basil Overton in a debate in the Philippines on the subject of benevolence if the brethren connected with the school in Bagio City would be willing to endorse him. So, the great award I received was the "waving coat of many colors."

Well, who knows, perhaps brother LaCroy or brother Overton might present a position in favor of orphan homes that would cause me to change my mind again, if I am so unstable. Think what that would mean if one changed during a debate in the Philippines. Yes, I have changed. Any time that someone presents a position that I am convinced is a Scriptural one on the benevolent or any other question, I will hold that position until I am persuaded that it cannot be defended — then I will change. I do not believe a person is honest with himself or with God who will do otherwise. However, since 1962 when I was pushed off of the benevolent and sponsoring church questions because I could not successfully defend them by the Bible, I have not heard a single argument that I thought presented Scriptural proof in favor of church support of human institutions or the sponsoring church arrangement. So, the Philippine Christian crowd can ridicule and belittle me personally all they want while they are 8,000 miles away. I am sure they feel very safe and secure in so doing. However, let them say what they will, when all is said and done I still have a position that I am willing to affirm as being Scriptural in an open debate with any reputable brother in any city in the United States and/or the Philippine Islands. How about you and yours, brother LaCroy? Will you defend the position you hold?

As you read this article, prepositions have already been sent to the Philippine Christian brethren challenging them to defend what they believe. I would not advise, however, holding your breath until it comes about. We will keep you informed IF and WHEN we hear anything.
Most Bible students are familiar with the story of Christ's baptism, related in the three synoptic Gospels (Matt. 3:13-17; Mk. 1:9-11; Lk. 3:21-22) and referred to in the fourth (John 1:32-33). But when asked the "why" of it, or the significance for the Christian and his salvation, many can say but little. Some religious folk speak of being baptized "after the example of Jesus," or of "following Him in baptism," as though the purpose of His baptism was solely exemplary. Others respond with the phrase found in Matthew, that Jesus was baptized "to fulfill all righteousness." When asked what that means, the conversation often stops.

In this article we will ask two questions: (1) Why was Jesus baptized, or, what was the significance of His baptism so far as He was concerned? (2) What is the significance of His baptism so far as we are concerned, or, how does His baptism relate to ours? In reporting Jesus' remark that His baptism was "to fulfill all righteousness," Matt. (3:15) does not use the word which refers to a specific commandment or righteous deed (dikaioma), but the more general word which describes the state or condition of acceptability to God in the broadest sense (dikaiosyne). We are not to think, then, that Jesus' baptism was simply one more commandment to be obeyed. It was to "fill up" or "complete" the over-all purpose of God for Christ, and it was directly related to His divine mission on earth — of saving men from their sins. Let us begin by suggesting an answer to our first question. We will then trace five lines of evidence which point to this answer. Here is the thesis: Jesus was baptized by John to publicly identify Him as the one in whom the Old Testament lines of prophecy concerning a Suffering Servant and a Triumphant Son would both be fulfilled, and to consecrate and commit Him to the tasks that those terms implied.

I. THE DETAILS OF CHRIST'S BAPTISM

When Jesus was baptized by John, three things happened. The heavens opened, the Spirit descended, and the Father spoke. Let us look at these one by one.

The latter chapters of Isaiah are heavily Messianic, prophetic of the Anointed One to come and the effects of His work. In the passage 63:7-64:12, the prophet speaks on behalf of the people, calling on God to save. He speaks first of God's past acts of salvation for Israel (63:7-14). Next he describes the people's present need for such divine deliverance (63:15-19). Finally he calls on God to come and save His people as before, and ends his prayer with confession of unworthiness and dependence on God (64:1-12). In this context the prophecy prays for salvation in these words: "O that Thou wouldst rend the heavens and come down" (64:1). As Jesus enters on His ministry of salvation, in fulfillment of Isaiah's prophecies, God does rend the heavens as a sign of what is to follow. Mark's Gospel includes another informative bit of evidence at this point, for the word he uses of the heavens opening is the very strong word meaning to rip or tear (schizo, 1:10). Furthermore, the only other time Mark uses this word is at 15:38, where God's salvation is symbolically testified at Christ's death by the tearing of the Temple veil from top to bottom.

The descent of the Holy Spirit is also significant in the light of prophecy. In introducing the Suffering Servant who would bear the sins of others, Isaiah spoke these words for God: "Behold, My Servant, whom I uphold; . . . I have put My Spirit upon Him; He will bring forth justice to the nations" (42:1). We will notice this verse later in another connection, but for now simply note that the Servant will be given God's Spirit for His work (see also Isaiah 61:1ff; 66:1ff). At His baptism, Jesus is identified as God's Servant by the descent of the Holy Spirit in the bodily form of a dove resting on Him.

The voice of the Father from heaven involves a double quotation from the Old Testament Scriptures. "Thou art my Son" (Matthew has the third person "this is") comes from the Psalms (2:7). "My Beloved . . . in whom/in you I am well pleased" comes from Isaiah (42:1). The Second Psalm speaks of the triumphant Son. He is the anointed of God (vs. 2), the king (vs. 6), the avenging heir (vss. 8-9); yet He is a stronghold for those who trust in Him (vs. 12). Isaiah pictures quite another figure, as men would imagine it, one who suffers and is despised and dies in silence. God had known all the while that both would be fulfilled in Jesus Christ, but the apparent conflict greatly troubled many Jews for whom it was a stumbling-block. At His baptism, Jesus was presented by the Father as the one who would be first the Suffering Servant, but would finally be seen as Triumphant Son. Here Jesus enters on His ministry. As the waters of Jordan clear from His eyes, He sees already by faith the dark and rugged cross looming ahead. More than that, Jesus sees the throne, and the crown, and the ultimate satisfaction His death will accomplish. The Father announces the dual role, but Jesus accepts it. "He humbled Himself by becoming obedient to the point of death. Therefore God also highly exalted Him" (Phil. 2:8-9).

II. THE TESTIMONY OF JOHN THE BAPTIST

Following Jesus' baptism, John the Immerser saw Him approaching and said, "Behold, the Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world" (John 1:29,36) But in the same conversation John says, "I have seen, and have borne witness that this is the Son of God" (vs. 34). The same conflict already noted between the ideas of Son and Servant is again apparent. Jesus is the Son, but also the Lamb! And how did John know that Christ was both? "I did not recognize Him," he tells us, "but He who sent me to baptize in water said to me, 'He upon whom you see the Spirit descending and remaining upon Him, this is the one . . .'" (vs. 33). John learned that Jesus was both Son and Lamb (Servant) when He was baptized!
Jesus Himself saw His death not only as necessary in the will of God but in terms of His earlier baptism by John and the work He assumed at that time. "I have come to cast fire upon the earth; and how I wish it were already kindled! But I have a baptism to undergo, and how distressed I am until it is accomplished" (Lk. 12:49-50). He is speaking of His "baptism" (submerging, plunging) in death. When James and John seek choice seats in the Kingdom, Christ responds in similar terminology (Mk. 10:38-39). Christ viewed His own death, then (1) as necessary in the will of God for the work He came to do, and (2) as a final parenthesis on His ministry, complementing the first parenthesis which was His baptism by John. What began there in His baptism of water is ended in His baptism of death.

IV. THE RELATION OF THE TEMPTATION TO THE BAPTISM

We can not here discuss this point in detail, but it may be observed that all three synoptic Gospels tell of Jesus' temptation immediately after His baptism. In His baptism, Jesus takes on the role and work of the Servant-Son, with all that the terms involve; in His temptation, Jesus is subjected (unsuccessfully, for which we may literally be eternally grateful) to Satan's attempts to turn Him from this divinely-given work, this "fulfilling of all righteousness," to a kind of "success" and "glory" that is based on Satan's will and not God's. We may better understand the baptism and the temptation each because of the other.

V. A POST-PENTECOST TESTIMONY

Long after Jesus had been baptized and crucified, after churches are appearing in response to the gospel proclamation, John the Apostle speaks of Him who is both Jesus of history and Christ of faith in these words: "This is the one who came by water and blood, Jesus Christ; not with the water only, but with the water and with the blood" (I John 5:6). Jesus was not some kind of phantom on whom the "Christ" came at His baptism only to leave again before His death, as certain false teachers of the day were saying. The faith that overcomes the world is that which believes that Jesus is the Son of God — and in the sense John and the other apostles had announced (5:5). Jesus "came" by water, at the beginning of His saving ministry of obedience and suffering! He "came" by blood, at the close of that same work. Our faith is in the real man Jesus who was at once truly God — and who is now Lord and Christ!

Christ was baptized in water in view of His future death. We are baptized in view of the same death now past. By His baptism He identified with sinful man, taking on Himself the sins He would bear in death. By our baptism we identify with the sinless Christ, personally laying our sins on Him and taking on ourselves His perfect righteousness by faith. At His baptism, Jesus was committing Himself to the will of God, trusting Him to raise Him" from the death the baptism foreshadowed. At our baptism, we commit ourselves fully to the will of God for us, trusting God to raise us from baptism cleansed and pure, and, finally, to be with Christ forever.

Happiness is a goal of every human individual, regardless of age, nationality, sex or religious belief! It is happiness which makes life worth living, but the absence of this intangible, practically undefinable object makes life quite unbearable. More people have taken their lives, wrecked their homes and in general "missed life and living" due to the loss of happiness. Surely all would agree this is a necessity of life!

Numerous books, some serious, many more humorous have been published striving to pin-point this item which like "love" to many remains a mystery. People through the ages have begged, borrowed and stolen in an all out effort to find happiness.

I would strongly suggest that happiness will not be found in carnal, earthly objects. Money it has been said brings happiness, yet those who believe this idea know too well that even money will not "buy back your youth when you are old" nor keep one from the grave! Some have thought LOVE was the only intangible object which could produce another intangible object. In other words LOVE plus LIFE equals happiness. This, however, is too vague a formula as far as God is concerned! The apostle Peter becomes more specific when he says, "For he that will love life and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil and his lips that they speak no guile: let him eschew evil and do good; let him seek peace and ensue it" (I Pet. 3:10-11).

There is not much question from those who have tried it that this is indeed the perfect formula for happiness. Peter is not saying that if you do this you will be sinless! Neither is he advocating that you will never be persecuted or scorned by the world. What he is saying, however, is simply, "to love life (love here the intangible item) plus refraining from evil and doing good (good another item, as love, hard to describe) plus seeking peace will bring happiness. Now the word happy or happiness is not used, but by obvious inference it is produced!"

A question: How are we to know good from evil? God's word is the only answer! It by words of inspiration describes both and the warfare that has existed between them since the beginning of time! Through it we may discern good from evil! (Heb. 5:14).

If we are desirous of living with happiness, let's try God's way. It will work. We will glorify God and save our souls! (James 1:21-22).
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THE BLACKFORD-DAUGHERTY DEBATE

On May 17, 18, and 19, Brother Dick Blackford and Mr. Robert Daugherty of the Apostolic Church discussed some of the doctrinal matters upon which they disagree. This debate took place in Central City, Ky., where both men live and preach.

The first night, Brother Blackford affirmed that it is right to use the words, "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" in administering water baptism. In defining the terms of the proposition, he made it clear that by "right" he meant permissible. He was not affirming that one MUST use these words or any words. There is no fixed formula to be repeated. Jesus does not tell us what to SAY in baptism, but what to DO.

Jesus does not demand that one use these words or any words. By "right" he meant permissible. He was not affirming that one MUST use these words or any words. Jesus does not give us a list of words to use. He says that one MUST use these words or any words. There is no fixed formula to be repeated. Jesus does not tell us what to SAY in baptism, but what to DO.

The scriptural proof upon which Bro. Blackford based his affirmation was Matt. 28:18,19. He asked a series of questions based upon this verse: (1) Is it wrong to DO what Jesus said? (2) Is it wrong to SAY what Jesus said? (3) Is it wrong to say what you're doing? (4) If it's wrong to say "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," who misleads me? (5) Where is the scripture for baptism in the name of Jesus only?

Only one of these questions was answered by Mr. Daugherty and that, not in a negative speech, but from his seat while Bro. Blackford was speaking. In fact, it became necessary for this writer, who served as moderator for Bro. Blackford, to arise to a point of order and demand that Mr. Daugherty remain quiet until it became his time to speak. In the one question he answered, he said that it was wrong to say what Jesus said. Dick showed that if so, Jesus was wrong, because He said it.

It became clear in the first night of his discussion that Mr. Daugherty had no conception of the duties of the negative speaker. He ignored the questions. He replied to none of the affirmative arguments. He attempted to introduce new arguments in his final speech which is an infraction of the rules of honorable debate and of the agreement signed by both disputants. When a point of order was called on this, he tried to shout out the moderator down. Apparently he was later straightened out by some of his fellows for his conduct improved the last two nights of the discussion.

On the second night, Mr. Daugherty affirmed that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is for all Christians and continues until he present time. He relied principally upon the prophecy of Joel in 2:28 and its fulfillment in Acts 2:16f. He tried to prove that the "all" of Acts 2:1 is the 120 of Acts 1:15 and that the "gift of the Holy Ghost" of 2:38 was the Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

In reply, Bro. Blackford pointed out that the antecedent of "all" in Acts 2:1 is not the 120, but the 12 apostles of 1:26. They were the only ones on that occasion to receive Holy Ghost baptism. He pointed out that Daugherty saw "baptism" every-
time the scriptures mentioned Holy Ghost but that this did not prove his proposition.

Daugherty also made an argument on "all flesh" of Acts 2:16,17. He said that "all" meant "all." But it was proved that Daugherty does not really believe that absolutely "all flesh" has received the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

The final night, Bro. Blackford affirmed that miraculous healing and other miracles were limited to the first century. He analyzed I Cor. 13:8-10 to prove the proposition. Mr. Daugherty depended primarily upon testimonies from those who claim to have been healed.

Dick said that he could produce the same kind of testimony from Catholics, Mormons, and followers of Oral Roberts whom Daugherty claims is a fraud. The Apostolic Church will not accept their testimonies. Why then, should we accept their? What people claim does not prove what the Bible teaches.

The debate was well attended by local people. A friendly spirit prevailed. The audience was well behaved with but a few exceptions. Brother Blackford did a commendable job.

I'm convinced that great good can be accomplished by debates of this nature in which local men who are known and respected by local people agree to discuss their differences in an orderly fashion.

— Ken Green
4001 Taylor Blvd.
Louisville, Ky. 40215

MARK'S GOSPEL IN DEAD SEA SCROLL?

Popular press and wire-service reports have made much of the claim by a Spanish scholar to have found a portion of Mark's Gospel on a fragment of papyrus discovered in one of the Dead Sea caves. In the current issue of FACTS FOR FAITH, Edward Fudge discusses the actual facts in the case, based on technical articles written by the men involved, as well as on popular press reports. A copy of this issue of FACTS FOR FAITH is available from the editor upon receipt of $25 to cover handling. Address: Gordon Wilson, 6316 Pernod, St. Louis, Missouri 63139. Supply is limited.

A NEW CONGREGATION IN DENVER

For several months, the elders here at Boston street in Aurora have been formulating plans for a new congregation on the west side of Denver. Several families who attend Boston Street live in that area, so because of convenience for those who have to travel so far across Denver, and because of the great opportunity in that area, a congregation on the west side is needed.

Brother Carl Allen of Lufkin, Texas, has agreed to come and do the preaching for this new work. Boston Street plans to contribute $200 per month
toward the support of brother Allen. Lord willing, the new congregation is to begin August 6, 1972.

Temporarily, the brethren will be meeting in the Maple Grove Grange Hall #154 on the corner of 32nd Avenue and Youngfield, just off I-70 west in Lakewood. We wish these brethren well and pray for the success of the new work.

Our work at 1297 Boston Street in Aurora is most encouraging. Attendance at all services is good and a fine spirit and interest are being manifested. Our Sunday morning attendance is near the 200 mark and contributions are averaging well over $700 per week. We are having many visitors from all over the nation.

We just closed a very successful Vacation Bible School for five nights, classes for all ages. We reached a high attendance of 186 and averaged 171 for the week. Brother James R. Cope of Temple Terrace, Fla., is to be with us July 28-30 for a series of lessons on the Home and the Family. When in Colorado, we shall be happy to have you visit with us at Boston Street in Aurora.

— Hoyt H. Houchen 12528 E. Alaska Place Aurora, Colorado 80010

A. D. Puterbaugh, 212 E. Oakhill, Fort Walton Beach, Fla. 32548 — I can not find one family in Frankfurt who has worshipped with a sound group in the States. These are the words of Dale Martin and wife, 2267-BR Heugel Housing Area, work phone, Frankfurt Military 6319. Have Christians in Frankfurt contact Dale Martin or send names and addresses to him at HQ ESR, Box 297, APO N.Y. 09101 or to me, at above address.

Bill Brittenham, 3028 Exmoor Rd., Columbia, S.C. 29204 — We would appreciate hearing from anyone who has friends or relatives in the Columbia area who might be interested in worshipping or studying with us. We would also welcome the opportunity to meet with sons, brothers, or husbands who are stationed at Ft. Jackson. We can also provide transportation to worship services. Please write or call. North Columbia church of Christ, 928 Columbia College Drive, Columbia, S.C. 29203. Phone: 803-782-5381.

Cecil Belcher, 630 E. Ash Place, Griffith, Indiana 46319 — I moved to work with the Griffith, Indiana church Sept. 1, 1969. I have enjoyed my work with the church here. I will be moving to South Bend, Ind. to work with the Caroline & Calvert Street church July 15, 1972. To my knowledge this is the only sound church in the north central part of the state of Indiana. All who will be traveling, visiting or moving to that area of Indiana are invited and encouraged to visit and worship with us there.

Brother Bob Neely will be with us in a gospel meeting the last of August. I have two meetings scheduled, I will be with the church in Monticello, Ky. July 31 through Aug. 6. Brother E. Lacy Porter is the preacher there. I will be with the Willow Glen church near Central City, Ky. Oct. 2-8. Brother Dicky Blackford is the preacher there.

J. W. Evans, Annandale, Va. — After 7 1/2 years with the Annandale church of Christ I will terminate my work here effective June 30. I have accepted the work with the Eastside church of Christ, 2930 Avon Dr., Louisville, Ky. 40220, beginning July 1, 1972.

Having had a part from the very beginning of the Annandale church unto its present status of a sound congregation of approximately 95 members, occupying its own building, organized after the N.T. order, and self-supporting in meeting a weekly budget of $570, it is with grateful contentment therewith that I end my longest tenure of work at any one place. I humbly feel myself fortunate, grateful to God and brethren (elsewhere as well as here), and happy to have had a part in "rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem" of a sound church in this area of our Nation's Capitol. The brethren here are in the process of looking for a preacher for this work.

I am looking forward to my work with the Eastside church, and the association with the host of gospel preachers in the Louisville area. Friends and "bulletin exchanges" please note my change of address after June 30: 3743 Essex Road, Louisville, Ky. 40220.

Vestal Chaffin, 200 Carrington Way, Marietta, Ga. 30060 — On July 31, I will complete two years and one month of work with the Powers Ferry Road church. On the second Sunday in August, I will begin work with the church in Paden City, West Virginia. After July 31, my address will be: 217 S. First Avenue, Paden City, W. Va. 26159.

Larry R. DeVore — After three years' work with the Caroline St. church in South Bend, Indiana, I am moving July 1 to work with the Russell St. church in Portage, Indiana. Bro. Cecil Belcher of Griffith, Indiana, will move to South Bend the middle of July. I will hold a gospel meeting for the Portage church July 16-23. My address after July 1 will be: 388 Raritan Drive, Valparaiso, Ind. 46383.
Recently I heard the following story: a man who was a "religious fanatic," had his boss tell him, "... I have respect for all religions, but leave your religion at the gate, please, when you come in here to work." I listened to another story, too: one who was a member of the --------- church and sang in the choir, also ran a service station, and at his place of business he would curse and rave and carry on unseemingly. One Monday morning his attention was called to the inconsistency between his religious profession and his conduct on the job. He responded: "How can a man go straight out here among all these crooks.

It doesn't take much character to be good among the "good," or to be a Christian among "Christians." The test comes when one is in the company of the sinning people of the world. Here one must excel (Cf. Matt. 5:20). If one's faith and ideology cannot control him at all times, in the trying and hostile world situations, then his religion is of no lasting value. Instead of being a foundation on which he STANDS, it is only a crutch on which he leans; instead of being a true disciple, he is only a pretender.

There is a sense, however, in which a man should leave his religion at the gate. That is its advocacy. Some take up company time advocating their religious views, many times setting off time-consuming discussions, and even creating hostile feelings among workers which hinder production. Such persons are, in effect, asking the company to pay them while they advocate their religion and at the same time provide them with an audience and even pay them to listen. Such is not Christian conduct, good human relations, nor wise strategy. Such, I believe, indeed, should be left at the gate.

Although one should leave its advocacy at the gate, nevertheless, the practice of his religious tenets must be taken with him through every gate, behind every door and wall, into every activity. He must be governed by honesty and purity, both on and off the job. He cannot lie, steal, nor cheat, even though there probably is much of this being done in his presence. He must be governed in his speech, thoughts, and actions by the tenet of purity (Cf. Eph. 4:29; James 1:26-27).

Religion has come into disrepute mainly because persons conduct themselves contrary to the tenets of their religious profession. Filthy language, lying, shifting of responsibility and shirking of one's duty by those who profess to be religious, has caused many to conclude that all religious persons are hypocrites. Beloved, I know whereof I speak. I have worked on jobs with religious persons, some who call themselves PREACHERS, who have so acted. So, beloved, for your own good and the influence you may have on the eternal salvation of others, don't leave your religious tenets at the gate, rather, practice them everywhere you go on THE JOB! But don't expect your employer to pay you and provide you with an audience to which you can advocate your religious dogma. Be a Christian in conduct, and you'll exert a powerful influence, sending a message that will clearly reveal your identity.

— 2804 Lafayette S.
Joseph, Mo. 64507
PARENTS—DO YOU LOVE YOUR CHILD?

John J. Miller Jr.

What a strange question to ask especially of those that are Christians. Some might even become offended that anyone would dare to question the love that they have for the children that they brought into this world. You see, we continue to prove our love for our children by seeing that they have all the things that are necessary to physical growth and mental development. We make many sacrifices toward this end, wanting only what is best for them. A proper diet, that the body might be sound. Warm clothing, that will enable them to be comfortable and to help maintain that body. A proper education, that they may be well equipped to enter society prepared to make their own way. Love and discipline, that they will be emotionally well balanced. In other words, most parents believe that they do indeed love their children and I would in no way deny this truth. Yet I ask the question, Do You Love Your Child?

What is the most important thing that you, as parents, can give your children? Is it a well-balanced meal or spiritual instruction? Is it warm clothing to protect them from the cold winter winds, or to instill in them a genuine love for tin souls of mankind? Is it a well-rounded education in the things of the world or a saving knowledge of the Word of God? As parents where have we placed (or mis-placed) the emphasis?

Our children don't inherit our religious beliefs, they do not automatically fill the place in the Lord's church after we have quit the walks of this life. Nor is it the churches responsibility to see to it that your child has the religious training necessary to guide him or her around the many obstacles and through the many trials of this life. Those of us who have weathered the many storms of life and who have overcome the many trials and tests of our faith should have by now, a keener insight, a greater compassion, and that precious gift of wisdom, that we can see and do know what is so desperately needed by those who are following in our footsteps.

The wise man said in Proverbs 22:6, "Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it." This is a general statement and there are exceptions to it, yet generally true. It is not written to the church but to the one with children. Train them. The passage doesn't simply say, "tell them," but rather train them. It implies that more is involved than simply telling them what is right and what is wrong, it certainly includes telling but is more involved. Tell a child not to lie (this is good) but should he see you continue to use "little white lies" in dealing with people the child will also (generally) lie. In the way he should go. There are only two ways a child can go (as he/she grows into adulthood) one, the way of the world (led by Satan) and the other, the way of the Lord. So what the wise man is saying is that we parents must not only tell the child but we must also show the child. It is good to tell our children that sin is bad and righteousness is good but how much better to let them see in our lives the true and lasting rewards of living a life of righteousness before the Lord God of heaven. Tell a child that the church (bought by the blood of Jesus, our savior) is the most important thing in the world (and this is good) but don't attend, don't support, don't pray about, don't participate in that which the church is doing and what will the child think? Tell a child that the only way we can learn about God and His Son (who died for us) is by reading His word (it is) by praying over it, meditating about it and studying (not the same as reading) it (and this is good) but if you don't (won't) study, if you don't pray, don't meditate, don't attend classes (where the Bible is taught) what will the child think?

I have said all of the above to say this, if you love your child then see that your child receives not only the necessities of this life but see that your child receives the kind of spiritual training that the writer of Proverbs was talking about. See that your child is in each and every Bible class and see that your child is prepared (because you have helped prepare him). Our Bible class teachers are limited in what they can do as far as instructing your child. 40 or 50 minutes a couple of times a week just isn't enough time to not only off-set the influences of the world but to train that child in spiritual things as he needs to be.
Parents (you and I) need to become vitally concerned with the spiritual welfare of our children. We need to realize that much of what he becomes depends (generally) upon what kind of foundation we have laid in his early life. Study with your child, pray with your child, attend with your child. Be an example to your child in order that your child might have someone worthy to follow after.

Parents, do you love your child? Yes, we all love our children and because we do love them let us not neglect the most important part of their education. Let us support our children with truth, let that truth be given in word and in deed. Let our children see the "light of Christ shining in us" as a guide for them.

If your child is not learning much in Bible class, don't blame the teacher, blame the parent (Dad and Mom) You and I.

There is one item that greatly hinders efforts to attain and maintain unity in the churches of Christ, and it is caused by ignorance, a malady with which all of us are "evil affected" to some degree in all areas. The ignorance is over the time at which a church divides. How often have you heard it said, that this or that church split "fast summer," or "three years ago?" What is meant by this? Simply that two groups began meeting in place of one. Hence, the split, the division, is said to come when two visible segments begin to meet as "separate and distinct churches." In other words, a church is "united" as long as it meets under one roof.

Though most know better, this remains the popular conception and consensus, and nothing could be further from the truth. It appears that "the church of God" in Corinth met in "one place" (I Cor. 1:2; 11:18-20), but there was among them "envying, and strife, and divisions" (I Cor. 1:10,11; 3:5; 11:18). Brethren, therefore, need to look at themselves in the mirror, God's mirror (James 1:25).

Take a good look and comb into place the members who have been blown out of order by "every wind of doctrine." Do not delude yourself or the church into thinking that unity and brotherly kindness prevails just because all meet in one building on Sunday morning. Some of the most split, divided, and "sawn asunder" churches (of whom the world is not worthy) are still gathering in one meetinghouse. They are not one but while parking in the same lot and sitting under the same rafters, they fancy that they are "united in the common faith." It would be funny if it were not so tragic.

I have known that cigarette smokers are without self-control, but I finally heard of one who will admit it. Leonid I. Brezhnev, of the Soviet Communist Party is trying to stop smoking, and it seems that he is having such a hard time that he has a timed cigarette case which will allow him only a specified number per day. Now I can understand that for a Communist, but a Christian should control himself by such passages as I Cor. 6:19,20; 9:25 and II Pet. 1:6.

Eugene Britnell
search for divine truth as revealed in the inspired book of God in an effort to be workmen unashamed (II Tim. 2:15), and equipped unto every good work as ordained of God (II Tim. 3:16,17; Eph. 2:10). Jesus said, "And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32). Again, he said in prayer to the Father, "Sanctify them through thy truth; Thy word is truth" (John 17:17). "For the hope which is laid up for you in heaven, whereof ye heard before in the word of the truth of the gospel" (Col. 1:15).

When Jesus said we are made free by the truth, he meant the gospel which is the power of God unto salvation (Rom. 1:16). We are saved by hearing "the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation" (Eph: 1:13). Our souls are purified in obeying the truth (I Pet. 1:22).

No man or group of men have power to decide what divine truth is. No editor, paper, church, eldership, school, board of directors or institution of any kind may decide what is and what is not truth. The word of God is the only source of pure truth. Each man must search for truth from this fountain of the Spirit and learn the truth required of him to be made free.

Searching The Scriptures had its beginning in January, 1960. From the beginning we have earnestly sought to use the printed page to study the word of God with all who will read and study with us. We belong to no man or group. We strive to serve no special human interest. We are not for sale to any man for any price, because our own salvation and the salvation of others is in the balance.

In the first issue of Searching The Scriptures we set forth the only editorial policy we have ever had, which is still our only guide lines in articles published. In that first issue we said: "We have no policy but to be scriptural, fair, sincere, and faithful in our work as editors of this paper."

I have made it clear that I am not bound to be in agreement with all who may write in this journal. Each person is responsible for what he writes. In the interest of fairness to all and for the sake of a sincere search for truth, articles are sometimes published which require a reply in the judgment of someone, and he should be heard. Of course, reason and fairness would dictate that a reasonable length and number of articles be used.

This monthly publication is dedicated to the search for divine truth as revealed in the inspired Book of God. Controversy is expected and we are not afraid of it. Sarcastic and abusive replies are expected in response to some things said, but we must say them in the interest of truth. We fear no man, but we do fear the God in whom "we live, and move, and have our being" (Acts 17:28). We do not strive to please men, but Christ, we do not persuade God, but men (Gal. 1:10).

We want to do all the good we can and no harm at all. May God bless us to be faithful to His word, open minded to receive divine truth, unashamed and unafraid to boldly speak His word to all men, and to give God the glory for all good done to the very end.
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QUESTION (Continued from last issue): Please answer me if Isaiah 29 and Ezekiel 37:16-28 really have to do with the Book of Mormon? — A.O.M.

ANSWER: Concerning Ezk. 37:16-28, the position of Latter Day Saints is clearly set forth in the following: "Ezekiel saw in vision the coming together of the stick of Judah, and the stick of Joseph, signifying the Bible and the Book of Mormon ... The Nephites were then of the tribes of Joseph, and their record or 'stick' is as truly represented by the Book of Mormon as is the 'stick' of Judah by the Bible" (The Articles Of Faith, p. 276, by Talmage).

In reply, let it be pointed out that there is no proof for their claim. It all rests upon mere assumption, namely, that the "sticks" are books; that the "stick of Judah" is the Bible, and that the "stick of Ephraim" is the Book of Mormon. Of course, assumption is not proof! Furthermore, both the Bible and the Book of Mormon contradict the claim.

The Bible teaches that while Manasseh was the first born of Joseph and entitled to the blessing, it was later bestowed upon his brother, Ephraim, who was to become the greater of the two (Gen. 48:8-22). Jewish history confirms the fulfillment of this prophetic utterance. In time "Ephraim" became synonymous with "Israel," the northern kingdom (Cf. Isat. 7:8,9; 9:8,9; Hos. 4:16,17; 5:2; 9:3). However, it should be remembered that the blessing for all men was to come out of Judah: "Moreover he refused the tabernacle of Joseph, and chose not the tribe of Ephraim: But chose the tribe of Judah, the mount Zion which he loved" (Ps. 78:67,68).

The truth concernign Ezekiel's prophecy in chapter 37 involves the people of God in Babylonian captivity and their restoration to their own land. All of this is prefigured symbolically by the valley of dry bones and their resurrection (vs. 1-14). The uniting of the two "sticks" (Judah and Ephraim) prefigures the uniting of all men under one king, Christ, the spiritual David (not literal David, for he was already dead), so that there would be "one shepherd," ruling with an "everlasting covenant of peace," in His tabernacle set in the midst of them for evermore. All of this has its fulfillment in the reign of Christ over His kingdom, which is His church, in which relationship it is said of its subjects, "I will be their God, and they shall be my people" (Ezk. 37:27; II Cor. 6:16).

The Book of Mormon teaches that the North American Indians are descendants of Manasseh, not of Ephraim: "I am Amulek; I am the son of Gideonah, who was the son of Ishmael, who was a descendant of Aminadi; and it was the same Aminadi who interpreted the writing which was upon the wall of the temple, which was written by the finger of God. And Aminadi was a descendant of Nephi who was the son of Lehi, who came out of the lane of Jerusalem, who was a descendant of Manasseh who was the son of Joseph who was sold into Egypt by the hands of his brethren" (Alma 10:2,3).

If this be so, then it is impossible for the Book of Mormon to be the "stick of Ephraim." Thus, their claim is false according to their own witness. Neither the Bible nor the Book of Mormon support their claim that Ezekiel's "stick of Ephraim" refers to the Book of Mormon.

PAUL, THE "SERVANT"

In contrast to many world religions which are predominantly meditative and contemplative, Christianity is largely a system of spiritual service, both to God and to man.

In the epistles of Paul, there are several Greek words which originally denoted certain aspects of servitude. Inasmuch as English versions often translate each of these words as "servant," we fail to see the shades of difference involved in the terms. It is possible that Paul, by inspiration, used this variety of Greek words to stress specific facets of his own service to Christ.

This article is a brief study of only three of these "servant" words.

DOULOS, "SERVANT," "SLAVE"

The Greek words of the doulos family primarily stressed the concept of subjection; that is, subjection to the kurios, "lord." The very idea involved in doulos was utterly repugnant to the Greek mind, for the Greek found his very self respect in the thought that he was free in all respects: socially, politically, and in other ways.

The doulos was free to do only the will of the kurios; no more and no less. He was, in fact, the very property of the kurios. In many passages Paul refers to himself as the doulos of Christ, Philippians 1:1, etc. I am convinced that Paul, in his use of this term, is stressing his utter and complete subjection to Christ, his kurios.
**DIAKONOS, "SERVANT," "MINISTER"**

In I Cor. 3:5 Paul refers to himself as a diakonos, "minister," "servant." This Greek term placed the emphasis upon the service that was rendered; usually stressing the service as an act of love. The term occurs very frequently in classical Greek. (See a very full discussion of these "servant" words in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, edited by Kittel.)

**HUPERBTES, "SERVANT," "ATTENDANT"**

In I Cor. 4:1 Paul refers to himself as a huperetes of Christ. This very interesting Greek noun originally denoted an "under-rower," no doubt referring to the ancient ships that were propelled by several levels of rowers.

Huperetes came to denote an "assistant" or "adjuvant." In this sense, it occurs very often in classical Greek writings. Perhaps Paul thinks of himself as "assisting" Christ in the great work of redemption.

Is it true that a congregation of Christ can function in, and only in, activities authorized for congregational activity in the New Testament, viz., worship, benevolence, edification, evangelism, and discipline? Is it equally true that the assembly being authorized to so function is thereby authorized to provide facilities for such activity?

If we respect the silence of the scriptures, are we thus to conclude that the church has no business in any other activity, and consequently is unauthorized to formally and purposefully provide facilities for any other activity not expeditious or incidental to the performance of these responsibilities?

If so, is not this basically what is wrong with congregations building banquet rooms (fellowship halls) with their concomitant kitchens in their meeting houses, or gymnasiums and swimming pools, or even using or allowing to be used such facilities as they have for social or any other activity not a function of a congregation of Christ?

In other words, may a church use its building only in the functions that authorize the building's existence, or may it construct a meeting house for authorized activities and then use it or overtly sanction its use otherwise for the convenience of its members or even for that of others?

If a building is to be used only for the activities which authorize its existence, might there be something amiss in the practice of using a congregation's authorized facilities for unauthorized (as far as what a church is to engage in) formal wedding ceremonies? On the other hand, if we may use the meeting house for the convenience of members of the body or for that of others in the doing of those things not author-ized for an assembly of Christ to perform, what standard can we use to determine which activities to allow and which to prohibit? Would we allow anyone the use of the meeting house in any activity not inherently wrong? A young people's party and the singing of folk songs, preceded by a "period of devotion?"

But if a church cannot purposefully lend its facilities to camaraderie per se, with secular singing, albeit connected with acceptable spiritual activity, what place does a humanly originated ritual (however beautiful and acceptable elsewhere) involving secular love songs ("O Promise Me", "I Love You Truly") have there? In what function of the church is comparable parading, and pageantry, and protocol acceptable?

Though these things may not be wrong in themselves if an assembly of saints may lend its facilities to such are we left with any other standard than personal judgement as to the building's use by whoever? If judgement is the standard, how do we reproce anyone's use or supposed misuse of the saint's meeting house? Is there any safe middle ground for determining a building's use between using it only for authorized purposes and attendant activities, and personal judgement?

As for weddings, beyond the pageantry, spectacle, secular love songs, and distinctions, are weddings a legitimate function of churches of Christ? Where is the scripture that indicates such? Did we get the idea from the scriptures or from Catholicism to which matrimony is a church sacrament? Is that not really where the idea of a formal "church wedding" came from? Is the evangelist fulfilling his ministry in officiating, really doing more (and certainly involved in more) than just preaching about marriage, or acting as an agent of the state?

If we argue that the churches' facilities may be used because marriage has the approval of the Lord and is ordained by Him, are we to conclude that everything that the Lord ordains is justification for churches to specifically and overtly lend their facilities to, e.g., the "due benevolence" of I Corinthians 7:3, which if a couple appropriates God's concession to a commandment regarding approved behavior of husband and wife? Could the newly-weds use the building as a honeymoon residence under the same conditions of permission that it was provided for the ceremony; moving in pertinent counternet as they earlier did in the forms of flowers, candle holders, and such?

If we argue that we are to obey the law and that obeying laws pertaining to marriage justifies use of the building, would not such argument justify use of them as specified places of formal tax collection as well? Does a church have any scriptural involvement with marriage other than teaching God's truth about it and keeping its membership free from known adulterers?

If it is objected that refraining from using the facilities of churches for weddings involves making too many laws about what can and what cannot be done in "church buildings", could we not just use the buildings for what functions and attendant activities scripturally authorize their existence? Then if some use them otherwise, have they not been the law-breakers, making lawful something unknown to the functioning of the body of Christ? If there were no violation of this principle, where would by any need for restrictions? What principle may we use to deter-
mine the right of a congregation to build a meeting house and then its use, if not the principle of formally using authorized facilities only for the purposes and accessory informalities which authorize their existence?

Box 95
Zion, Illinois 60099

EXAMINE YOURSELVES, WHETHER YE BE IN THE FAITH

Ken Green
4001 Taylor Blvd.
Louisville, Ky. 40215

GIVING OF OUR MEANS IN SPIRIT AND TRUTH

Contributing to the Lord’s work should be considered an act of worship. It is one of the ways in which we bow before our God. Let us consider what is necessary in order to give in spirit and in truth (John 4:24):

GIVING IN TRUTH

(A) Who is to give? "Upon the first day of the week let every one of you lay by him in store..." (I Cor. 16:2). The apostle was addressing Christians (I Cor. 1:2). Those who are not members of the church are not expected to give.

Some religious groups go from house to house begging money from those of other faiths and of no faith. Adventists raise much money this way and then boast of having the highest average contribution per member of any religious group. We do not encourage those who are not members of the church of Christ to contribute. God’s order is that one first give himself to the Lord (II Cor. 8:5). When this is accomplished, the other gifts will follow naturally.

Does the phrase "— let every one of you —" demand that both husband and wife drop something into the basket? NO. If one check is written, both are giving. They should discuss and agree upon the amount of their contribution, however.

(B) When should we give? "Upon the first day of the week let everyone of you lay by him in store..." Sunday, the first day of the week is specified. If we were simply commanded to give and nothing was said regarding the time — then the time would be an indifferent consideration. But as it is, we have Divine authority to contribute into the church treasury upon the first day of the week and no authority to do so any other time.

(C) How should we give? "Upon the first day of the week let everyone of you lay by him in store, as God hath prospered him—". Someone may say, "But we can raise more money if we have a weekly bingo game," or "We should sponsor a car wash for this particular project." But such means are not authorized by God’s Holy Word. A book is on the market which is entitled "199 Ways To Raise Money for the Church." God’s way is not mentioned.

No specific percentage of one’s income is specified in the New Testament. Tithing was required under the law of Moses, and a couple of things are usually overlooked in regard to that Old Testament law: (1) The Jew gave much more than ten percent when all tithes, free-will offerings, sacrifices and thank offerings are counted; (2) the tithes of the Jews not only constituted religious contributions — but civil taxes as well. The Jews lived under a theocracy and their tithes helped maintain their civil functions.

Christians should give according to the need. The same principle that motivated early Christians to sell lands and houses and give the prices to the apostles permitted them to decrease their contributions when that need was eliminated. Sometimes the question is raised: "Is it scriptural for a person to send a part of his contribution elsewhere?" Certainly it is if there is a greater need elsewhere.

If I were a member of a group that was doing little worthwhile and was building up a bank account, I would send at least the bulk of my contribution to help support an evangelist somewhere.

If the needs of the home congregation are being met and one desires to make additional gifts to other needs, no scriptural principle would be violated in so doing.

(D) Why Should We Give? The children’s song says "Noah built a great big ark, WHY? Because God told him to." This is the primary reason that we should give. God does not need the money (Acts 17:11). He does not command that we serve and worship Him to satisfy a superego on His part, but rather, because there is a part of man that cries out for communion with God. He tells us to give.

We cannot deny that self-interest is another reason to give. People naturally desire to put their money where it will do the most good. Some invest in stocks, some in real estate, and there is nothing wrong in this. But we must make sure we’re investing enough where it will really do the most good (Matt. 6:19,20).

Another reason to give liberally to the Lord is the uncertainty of riches (I Tim. 6:17). We all realize that we cannot take it with us when we go, but most of us learn that we can’t keep it very long while we’re here either. The disciples of whom we read in Acts 4 made a commendable sacrifice in the selling of their lands and houses, but we find that they were later “scattered abroad” by persecution. Had they tried to cling to their possessions, they would have lost them anyway.

GIVING IN SPIRIT

(A) We Must Give Willingly. "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" (II Cor. 8:12). If one has a willing mind, the rest is easy. If he does not, he may as well not give.
(B) We Must Give Purposefully. "Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerful giver" (II Cor. 9:7). Our giving should not result from a spur of the moment decision. One should carefully figure and decide the amount of his gift.

(C) We Must Give According to Love: From John 3:16 and Gal. 2:20 we learn that the gift is commensurate with the love that one possesses.

SUGGESTIONS

Elders should strive to keep before their congregation what is being accomplished with church funds.

Each member should be concerned enough to inquire about this information if the elders do not keep the flock advised.

In this age of mental, emotional and spiritual frustration, more and more doctors, sociologists and psychologists are giving advice which really amounts to living as Christ has taught us. Dr. S. I. McMillen has written a book entitled "None of These Diseases." It is based upon a promise which God made to Israel: "If thou wilt diligently hearken to the voice of the Lord thy God, and wilt do that which is right in his sight, and wilt give ear to his commandments, and keep all his statutes, I will put none of these diseases upon thee, which I have brought upon the Egyptians: for I am the Lord that healeth thee" (Exod. 15:26).

Dr. McMillen shows that many of the diseases which plague mankind come as a result of violating some of God's laws. He gives the following interesting statement from Dr. William Sadler:

"No one can appreciate so fully as a doctor the amazingly large percentage of human disease and suffering which is directly traceable to worry, fear, conflict, immorality, dissipation, and ignorance — to unwholesome thinking and unclean living. The sincere acceptance of the principles and teachings of Christ with respect to the life of mental peace and joy, the life of unselfish thought and clean living, would at once wipe out more than half the difficulties, diseases, and sorrows of the human race. In other words, more than one half of the present affliction of mankind could be prevented by the tremendous prophylactic power of actually living up to the personal and practical spirit of the real teachings of Christ.

"The teachings of Jesus applied to our modern civilization — understandably applied, not merely nominally accepted — would so purify, uplift, and vitalize us that the race would immediately stand out as a new order of beings, possessing superior mental power and increased moral force. Irrespective of the future rewards of living, laying aside all discussion of future life, it would pay any man or woman to live the Christ-life just for the mental and moral rewards it affords here in this present world. Some day man may awake to the fact that the teachings of Christ are potent and powerful in preventing and curing disease. Some day our boasted scientific development, as regards mental and moral improvement, may indeed catch up with the teachings of this man of Galilee."

We have another sponsoring church. Since so many Christians move about over the nation each year, there is a problem involved in trying to keep
in touch with them and see that they place membership with some church. The church in Vancouver, Washington has the solution. They say, "We offer a plan — A SERVICE FOR THE WHOLE BROTHERHOOD — which is designed to prevent this loss to Christ and the church. The Vancouver Church of Christ, a concerned congregation is willing to serve as the Single Co-Ordinating Congregation for the Whole Nation."

If you want to participate in this plan, when members move just notify the "Co-Ordinating Congregation" and they will take care of it. I don't recall reading of any church in the New Testament which offered any kind of service "for the whole brotherhood."

"Dr.-------- has served many congregations of churches of Christ as minister ...") (Harding College Bulletin, May, 1972). "They will visit 57 congregations of the Churches of Christ this summer and present their 'Sermon in Song' in various areas of Texas" (Medina Children's Home News, May, 1972).

Can anyone explain the meaning of these statements? No wonder we have so many in the church who can't recognize scriptural terminology and have lost sight of our plea to call Bible things by Bible names.

An Associated Press article out of Tokyo said, "Ten thousand prostitutes face unemployment in Okinawa with the return today of the island chain to Japan. Prostitution is banned under Japanese law.

That is a sad commentary on the morals of those people, but it is even worse to consider the fact that those prostitutes were kept in business by the 45,000 American servicemen stationed there. This is just another of the evils of war.

When the Democratic vice presidential candidate was selected, he was interviewed and questioned extensively by the news media. When a television newsman asked him why he felt that he would be an asset to the party, his first reason was, "Well, I'm a Roman Catholic." When WE oppose a Catholic for such a high office, they tell us that it is an intolerable degree of bigotry. Is it worse to refuse to vote for a man who is a Catholic than it is to vote for him for the same reason? Catholics often deny that their religion is a political issue, but in their careless moments they admit that it is. We fail to see how Catholicism is a factor in qualifying one for the presidency; it is a factor in getting votes.

"Naked youths take dip; elderly just watch." This was the headline of an article concerning the conduct of some of the hippies and zippies in Miami Beach during a recent political convention. "This place must look like a zoo to them," said young Don Bode of Bryan, Ohio. "They looked at us like animals. It doesn't bother me though because I'm used to it."

Do you wonder why people looked at them like animals in a zoo? I see much similarity between hippies and monkeys. (The hippies have been taught that they were once monkeys anyway.) Animals live in communes, have no morals, and go naked. And it doesn't bother them for people to look at them for they are used it.

Premillennialism is spreading through the religious world like a wind-blown prairie fire. The Armstrong's, Billy Graham, Back to the Bible Broadcast, many Baptists and others teach it all the time. Since the theory is based in part upon the restoration and salvation of Israel, I submit the following proposition: When any man advocates a doctrine which demands or includes the idea that God has or ever will have a chosen race or nation on earth — a people who will be especially blessed because of their race or nationality— that doctrine is false! (Acts 10:34,35; Romans 2:28,29.)

Perfection is the only worthy goal for the individual Christian, and perfection should be the goal for a congregation of the Lord's people. He never suggested that we lie or steal very little, nor has He suggested that the church should be the pillar and ground of some of the truth. The goal is beyond us, but the Lord would have us press on unto perfection.

"For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." (Rom. 3:23). "If we say that we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us." (I John 1:8). If you and I are so inclined to sin, we need not be greatly surprised if we find some one else in error. Could we worship with that one whose error we see? We err, too! Could he worship with us? We may not be so conscious of our sins, but he likely is. If we qualify as being spiritual, and have the proper meekness, and awareness of the danger of our being tempted, we may seek to restore our erring brother whom we love and respect for his many good traits. (Gal. 6:1; James 5:19,20; 1 Peter 3:15).

It might be proper for us to attend worship with that brother whose error we see, and kneel with him in prayer and earnestly pray for mercy for both of us in our sins. Let us be blessed with ability to see our own sins and weaknesses. The church is not a museum of perfect models. It is, rather, a group of people who love the Lord enough to do what they know to do, and who seek to grow in the grace and
knowledge of the Lord. Let us teach and admonish one another. Let us warn, reprove, and rebuke one another. Let us exhort and comfort one another also. And when ye meet let us love one another so we can speak the truth in love.

We all need to come together for the Lord’s supper. (Acts 20:7) We need to teach and admonish one another in song. (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16) We need to lay by in store as the Lord has prospered us. (1 Cor. 16:1-3) Some who read this may no longer attend because they have seen imperfections. There are no congregations that do not need to improve. If all the present membership become exact copies of the example that Christ left us, by that time there would be some new converts who are babes. They must learn many things, and improve in many ways before they become as good as the Master. None of the older members or of the new converts will ever make an exact copy of the life of Christ. We can try. We can improve. We can help one another improve.

One faithful Christian may be distracted at how slowly others learn and break with their errors. That “faithful” one may have been slow to learn many of the truths he now knows, and he may be slow to learn the many lessons he yet needs to learn. None knows everything. We need patience in dealing with one another. Christ, the Master Teacher, taught many good lessons concerning the nature of His kingdom, but it took the wonderful twelve a long time to learn this. Our first duty is to examine ourselves. (2 Cor. 13:5) A second thing to do is to see the many good traits of those whom we seek to help. They may lead better than they drive. We may be more likely to lead them if we take time as the farmer waits for his harvest.

We, with our brand of ignorance and need of help, may sit on the pew with some brother who needs to grow, and profit by hearing a good gospel sermon. By our regular attendance, humility, brotherly love, and good Bible knowledge, we may gradually help our brother. If we drop out we lose our chance. We cut ourselves off from the help we need, and we narrow our chance to help those with whom we did worship. We will not be marked guilty of all the sins of the erring man with whom we sit. Each gives account of himself. (2 Cor. 5:10; 13:5).

Some do sin so that they need to be marked, avoided, and rejected. Factious people who cause division contrary to the doctrine of Christ would be examples of this. The man whose moral behavior brings reproach on the body of Christ is another example of the type to be put away. (1 Cor. 5; Rom. 16:17,18; Titus 3:10,11). Many are weak and need teaching. Please read and reread Romans, chapter 14. Some whom we think black with guilt may not be so guilty.

Some churches have been divided in the last few years into two angry parts, each looking for sound gospel preachers for regular work and for meetings. Is this sowing of discord one way to crucify the Lord afresh and to put Him to an open shame? Should the church be divided into two camps over that question that troubles you? (Read Romans 14 again.) Teach, yes, but do not drive a wedge. Do not weaken the pillar of truth because you have discovered a scar in the paint. Repaint in time rather than hurry to destroy.

Churches may turn in a digressive direction and reach a point when they will no longer endure sound doctrine or receive warning so that faithful men must come out and be separate, but we need to think more than twice before coming out because there may be more hope than we first thought.

P.O. Box 866 Hartselle, Ala. 35640

HEARTFELT RELIGION NO. 3

In our other two articles on this subject we have pointed out that the "heart" that we are writing about is not the muscle that pumps the blood through our veins, but the thinking part of man, the intellect. Then in our second article, we showed the function of the Bible heart. It understand, believes, obeys, and loves. In this article, we want to show how the heart is changed.

Many today have the truth concerning what the Bible heart is have a misconception of how the heart is changed. They think you must wait for a direct operation of the Holy Spirit in order for the heart to be changed. But this is not in harmony with the teachings of the Bible. The truth of the matter is that a change of heart comes about as a result of FAITH.

SAUL’S CONVERSION

For example, when Saul of Tarsus was converted to the Lord, he had a change of heart. He hated the Lord and his disciples, believing that they were teaching contrary to that which the God of Israel would have them teach. But in later years he changed and began to love the Lord even to the extent that he was willing to give his life for the Christ. What, brought about this change? Faith in the crucified Savior. In Acts 26:11 Paul (for so his name was changed from Saul after his conversion) said of himself that he was "exceedingly mad against them I persecuted them even unto strange cities." Also in Acts 26:9 Paul says, "I venly thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." But, Paul’s thinking was changed. The Lord Jesus Christ spoke to him on his way to Damascus as he was on his way
there to persecute the saints. When he was convinced that the one speaking to him was Jesus of Nazareth he said, "Lord, what wilt thou have me do?" (Acts 9:6). "Well," someone may ask, "are our hearts changed today by the Lord speaking to us?" The answer to that is yes — but NOT directly as he did to Saul. He speaks to us today by the Holy Spirit and the Spirit uses the Word (the Bible) to convict us today. Actually, it is the thing believed that causes a change of affections. The effects of faith comes about as a result of the thing believed.

**JACOB AND JOSEPH**

The Bible teaching concerning Jacob and Joseph is a good illustration of the above statement. When Joseph was sold into slavery by his brothers and they returned his coat of many colors to his father Jacob with the blood of an animal on it, Jacob rent his clothes and put sackcloth upon his loins, and mourned for many days for his son and would not be comforted. Though his sons had told him a lie, the lie believed was the thing that brought about the effect — namely, Jacob's mourning.

**MEN'S LIVES ARE CHANGED**

Men's lives are changed today in harmony with what they believe. I see many who claim they believe the Bible, and claim they want to live the Christian life. However, it is very easy to see that their claims are untrue in fact. How do we know this? By the results we see in their lives. Name anything you want to name, immodest apparel, dancing, drinking, failure to attend services, or anything you want to name. Then ask yourself the question, what can we do to change all that? The answer is, change the heart! Preach the gospel to them. For, Faith comes by hearing the word of God (Rom. 10:17); and the effects of faith comes about as a result of the thing believed.

**WHY THE CHANGE?**

My brethren have changed in regard to the authority of apostolic examples. When I was a boy preacher in the hills of Oklahoma I never heard anyone question the authority of apostolic examples. It was with the advent of the "sponsoring church" and other innovations that brethren began to question the authenticity of Bible authority by apostolic examples. Since that time reams of paper have been used to deny them. In this brief article I would like to point out why this had to be done. First let it be known for all time that our authority for observing the Lord's Supper on Sunday is through the medium of apostolic example (Acts 20:7). This forever refutes the sectarian concept that the Lord's supper can be observed at any time. Second, it needs to be made clear that our position on a plurality of elders in every congregation is established by apostolic example (Acts 20:17). This refutes the Catholic concept of ONE elder rule. It needs to be made perfectly clear that in evangelistic work, apostolic examples tell us that the money was always sent direct to the evangelist (II Cor. 11:8; Phil. 4:15, 16). This forever refutes the liberal position of the missionary society of the sponsoring church. It also needs to be observed that through the medium of apostolic examples we learn that money in the field of benevolence was always sent direct to the church in need (I Cor. 16:1, 2). This refutes forever the modernistic view that such work can be done through an orphan home or society of some kind.

When liberal preachers took a long, hard look at the facts above they saw the hand writing on the wall. Their conclusion was, "we must either give up our idols and innovations or get rid of apostolic examples." They chose the latter. However, this did not fully solve their problem because they had taught for years that the Lord's Supper must be observed on Sunday. If they did away with apostolic examples then this old time practice goes down the river. So the question was, what shall we do? The answer thundered back, destroy apostolic examples but try to salvage the Lord's Supper and plurality of elders some other way.

To illustrate, I have in my hand an article written by G. K. Wallace on this very subject. He, like many of his colleagues, felt the need of getting rid of apostolic examples but tried to salvage the Lord's Supper. I now quote from this article which appeared in the Firm Foundation:
"In Acts 20:36 the Bible says in regard to the apostle Paul, 'And when he had thus spoken, he kneeled down and prayed with them all.' Here is an example of the apostle Paul and the brethren that were with him kneeling on the beach in prayer. This is not a binding example because there is no law that requires a kneeling posture in prayer. The law of God requires us to pray, but the posture is loosed. Prayer is bound but the position of the body, in prayer, is not bound. An example of one kneeling or standing in prayer is an example of liberty and not an example of carrying out a law governing position or posture of the body while praying. For an example to be binding, it must illustrate a requirement."

It has always been amusing the way brethren try to get rid of apostolic examples. Did you notice the way brother Wallace worded his last sentence. Well, here it is: "For an example to be binding it must illustrate a requirement." Another man put it this way, "In order for an example to be binding it must have a command to back it up." Great shades of Aristotle! Don't these men know if we have a command or requirement we don't need an example? What could motivate a person to reason in such a manner? What these brethren are really saying is that an apostolic example is NEVER binding; because if it takes a requirement or command to back it up what possible authority could there be in the example itself?

Brother Wallace anticipated this problem with the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week so he went to I Cor. 16:1,2; I Cor. 4:17; Heb. 10:25; I Cor. 11:17-34; Acts 20:7 and came up with the incredible idea that we are to observe the Lord's Supper on Sunday. What brother Wallace failed to do is apply his LAW. He found a command to assemble. He found where they observed the Lord's supper when they assembled. But what he failed to find was the REQUIREMENT to do it on the FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK! He had to go to the very thing he denied to get this — Acts 20:7. This is an approved example telling us WHEN the early disciples observed the Lord's Supper and it does not have a REQUIREMENT OR COMMAND TO BACK IT UP! All the talk on I Cor. 11 does not mention the important thing and that is the first day of the week. No living man or dead one has ever found the FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK IN FIRST CORINTHIANS ELEVEN. Where is the requirement to back up the first day of the week observance of the Lord's Supper? You will find it on the blank page of your Bible.

Gentle reader, we do not need a command or requirement to back up an apostolic example. Brother Wallace said kneeling for prayer was not bound because there was no law which required it. This is not so! The reason kneeling is not bound is because we have different postures of prayer in the Bible. In Matt. 26:39 "And went a little further, and fell on his face and prayed." This shows different postures of prayer. No one single posture is bound. Would brother Wallace say kneeling was not bound if ALL the examples in the New Testament were of kneeling and there was not one exception? Would he still argue we must have a command or requirement to back it up? The stubborn fact remains we observe the Lord's Supper on Sunday because of ONE and ONLY ONE scripture and that is Acts 20:7. Brother Wallace or his colleagues cannot and will not find a REQUIREMENT or COMMAND to back up this apostolic example.

Fellow Christian, when the great apostle Paul said in Phil. 4:9 "Those things, which ye have both learned, and received, and heard, and seen in me do; and the God of peace shall be with you." He said what he meant and meant what he said. We must emulate any apostolic example when the consistent pattern of their activities shows a thing was done in a certain way, time or place.
PREACHER WANTED

Northside church, Brunswick, Ga., is in need of a preacher. Will need partial support. Small congregation of 8 adults and 3 children. Contact W. N. Potter, P.O. Box 13, Arco Branch, Brunswick, Ga. 31520 or call (912) 265-9164.

PREACHER NEEDED

Vernon, Fla. — A strong, knowledgeable man is desired here, as much teaching and leadership is badly needed. He must be able to secure most of his financial support from elsewhere, as we can contribute very little towards his salary. The church is tiny, with most of the members being young in the faith. Please contact Richard Geswein, Rt. 1, Ponce de Leon, Florida 32455.

Young gospel preacher (25 years old) with four years full-time experience would like to locate and work with a strong congregation with elders. Will consider moving with wife and one daughter anytime up to one year from now. Mike T. Rogacs, (816) 232-6110, 401 S. Noyes Blvd., St. Joseph, Mo. 64501.

UFOT JACOB AKPAN

by Fred A. Shewmaker

It is with a sad and aching heart that I write this notice. However, it is my duty before God to make known to all those who have in any way aided Ufot Akpan since he has been in the United States that he is not worthy of support. Several have urged him to repent and do what is right but all such efforts have failed.

Because I have been party to every effort to assist Ufot, of which I am aware, since his coming to the United States and due to the fact that I have urged brethren all over the country to aid him, I am the one, among all who have helped, who is obligated to make known his unworthiness.

Details will be furnished upon request to those who have aided Ufot.

Ralph Joiner, P.O. Box 208, Cambridge City, Ind. 47327 — August will mark the beginning of our third year in Cambridge City. Progress has been slow and difficulties within the congregation have, no doubt, hindered us in many ways. But, as we look back on two years of labor we see: three baptisms, two restorations, eight identifications and three confessions of error. Our attendance has increased from an average of 40 to an average of 60. In addition to our regular services and gospel meetings, we have held a Personal Work Class and a Preacher-Teacher Training Class. This latter graduated one preacher who is preaching once a month in a nearby town, three song leaders and several others are performing in ways they never thought possible. The Lord has blessed us surely. When in East-Central Indiana or West-Central Ohio, please pay us a visit.

Robert Wayne La Coste holds a meeting for the church in Hildago, Illinois August 7-13 and one for the church in Spring Creek, Tennessee Aug. 21-27.

Robert J. La Coste held an early July meeting for the church in Cooper, Texas where the theme the first two nights was "Why I left the Roman Catholic Church." One precious soul was baptized in that meeting.

W. Lafayette, Indiana — A new congregation was established in Sept. 1971 in W. Lafayette, Ind. and presently meets near the Purdue University campus at 2353 Yeager Rd. The congregation consisted of 3 families at that time but has increased to 7 families as of Aug. 1, 1971. The preaching was done by men from the various congregations within a radius of 80 miles. We wish to acknowledge the wonderful assistance given by these congregations, to whom we are deeply indebted. Brother Bob Nealy, preacher at Kokomo, has taught the mid-week Bible study and has been of special help throughout this period of time. Brother Henry Smith moved to W. Lafayette June 1st to take up the full time work as a preacher here. Should anyone know of students attending Purdue or others living in this area, please send their names and addresses to Henry Smith, 1820 Summit Dr., W. Lafayette, Ind. 47906. (317) 463-2638.

RELIGIOUS DEBATE

There will be a religious debate between Mr. J. T. Smith and Dr. Albert Garner. Mr. Smith is the preacher for the Northside church of Christ in Conway, Arkansas. Dr. Garner is a Baptist preacher from Lakeland, Fla. The debate is to be conducted in the Beeedville, Arkansas, High School Auditorium. Dates are set for Aug. 7, 8, 10, 11. The subjects to be discussed are baptism and apostasy. The sessions are to begin at 8:00 p.m. each evening.

JIM BEECH TO AUSTRALIA

At this writing we have $4,655.00 of our travel fund and $670.00 of our monthly support either committed or on hand. I would like to ask those who have promised travel fund to go ahead and send it now. Those who are ready to support us monthly will receive their deposit slips soon and we would like to have the August support that we may take it with us so we will not have to live one month...
without support after we get to Wagga Wagga. The monthly support is our only worry now, financially, and we believe the other $230.00 will come before we leave.

So many churches and brethren have done so much that I am completely unable to express my thanks and I hesitate to call any by name less I slight (unintentionally) one who has sacrificed the most. The amount of money received so far represents the support of eight brethren and fourteen churches ... we thank you all!

My address in Australia will be P.O. Box S-93, Wagga Wagga, N.S.W. 2650, Australia. When you write a letter I suggest you go to the post office and get an "Aerogramme" for fifteen cents as that is the cheapest way to send a letter. From now on my reports will be in the bulletin of the Huffman Church, 525 Roebuck Dr., Birmingham, Ala. 35215. We will be sending a report every other month unless something special happens. We would like to hear from all of you I know for others have said this was one thing they needed and missed, letters from the States; so write us, ask questions about the work or whatever, we will be glad to hear from you.

I hope to mail my next report from Wagga Wagga. Remember us in your prayers, as we do you also.

NEW CONGREGATION

Last summer two families decided to start a sound congregation of the church of Christ in or near Morgansfield, Ky. They rented the Community Center Building at Pride, Ky. Brother B. G. Hope of Beaver Dam, Ky. with the help of C. L. Purdom of Paragould, Ark., conducted a gospel meeting in September. A new congregation was established with seven members. Now we have twelve.

In November an acre of land was purchased in Tilden, Ky. on highway 56, just off Alt. 41. This plot had an old three car brick garage which was renovated by adding a concrete, carpeted floor, panelled walls and a tile ceiling. This is equipped with electric heat and is air conditioned. It will seat 75 people. A one bedroom trailer was purchased and furnishes us with two class rooms and a rest room.

There is no other sound church in the area closer than 40 miles to the north and 60 miles either to the east or south with about 90 miles to the west. The work is hard. The liberals do not like us but the fields are white for a preacher who wants to do as Apollos did after Paul had planted. Support can be arranged for a preacher who wants to meet the challenge.

If interested in the work contact either C. L. Purdom, 824 West Vine St., Paragould, Ark. 72450 or B. G. Hope, Route 3, Beaver Dam, Ky. 42320.

Otis Jordan, P.O. Box 414, Perry Florida — I have been with the church at Spring Warrior (just outside of Perry, Fla.) for just less than two years. We have had a very good work. We have had 37 responses here, 18 baptisms and 19 restorations. I also traveled to Titusville and baptized 3 as the result of a funeral over there. I was with two young men, brethren, Jim Poppell (Lake City) and Nathan Hagood (Jennings) in a tent meeting at White Springs, Fla. in May. We had very good attendance and a young lady from Lake City was baptized. I will be in a meeting at Steinhatchee, Fla. Sept. 3 through the 10th. We will be engaged in a meeting here Sept. 18 through the 24th with brother Conway Skinner.

Paul M. Smith, 22 Schell Street, Kincheloe Air Force Base, Maine 49788 — I am presently in the Air Force but will be getting out in October and, the Lord willing, I will go into full-time preaching. I would like to locate and work with some sound congregation. These facts about myself might be helpful to anyone who may consider my services. I am 37 years of age and my wife, Jacqueline, and I have four children: Bill, 16; Ann, 14; James, 12; Brenda, 10. I have been active in the church for almost 25 years and have preached, taught Bible classes and lead singing everywhere we have lived during this period, both overseas and in the States. If you desire additional information or references, please write to me at the above address or call (906) 495-2436.

Terry L. Sumerlin, 216 Dunbar, Refugio, Texas 78377, Aug. 10, 1972 — I have just completed my second year of work with the faithful brethren here in Refugio. In the past year we have been blessed with 13 additions: 4 baptisms, 8 to place membership, and 1 restoration. This makes a total of 24 responses in 2 years. We urge you to pray for us that the church might continue to grow in this area.
THE ROOTS OF DISRESPECT FOR AUTHORITY

What is the cause of disrespect for authority? Who is responsible? Shall the blame be placed upon permissive (or domineering, as the case may be) parents? Or is it government? Too many scandals and too much corruption and social inequities too gross for authority to survive with anybody's respect? Perhaps the church is to blame, what with the hypocrites and all. Who is at fault? Upon whom does the burden of guilt rest? In the final analysis it is suggested that the burden of guilt belongs to the individual who, notwithstanding his circumstances and frustrations, does not respect authority. The final burden is not upon those in authority who may perchance (and most likely) have misused and abused their authority upon occasions. This is not said in any justification of any abuse of authority, nor to deny that by incompetence, corruption or arbitrariness a given authoritarian (parent, governmental body or what have you) may both lose and deserve to lose the personal respect of those under it. It is not denied that human authorities can and often do contribute to a breakdown of respect and actually trigger reactions of resentment and rejection. But there is a deeper cause, quite apart from any earthly authority and its exercise of rule, that must exist within the individual under authority before the follies of some authoritarian can trigger the discontent and evidence the disrespect.

The foundation of authority is God. Stated negatively, the wisdom and fairness of parents or rulers is not the basis for authority. No. Contrariwise, respect for authority depends very simply upon human recognition of God and his ordination of such authority as he has delegated to men, and the humility to accept the divine arrangement. In the very nature of the case, the rights of God cannot be granted and accepted in a heart that disrespects authority. He who knows the facts and loves God necessarily respects all authority (that is, all authority exercised by God himself or delegated by God to men). Respect for authority itself is co-existent and synonymous with respect for God, though personal respect for the individual in the God-delegated position of authority will depend upon that individual's exercise of his powers. The point is vital — one may respect God and disrespect a man who shows himself unworthy of the power given him by God, but since it was in fact given by God he will still respect the position or authority itself. That means he will submit and obey. It also means he cannot be the rebel. The burden is on the individual under authority to respect it.

Now we come to the what in the root of disrespect. Since respect is based upon the (1) knowledge and (2) acceptance of God's right to rule and to delegate authority, and since respect necessarily lives on so long as this knowledge and acceptance is in the heart, disrespect is the result of either this knowledge or acceptance being destroyed. It is that simple.

The first root of disrespect is ignorance — ignorance of God and his rights and power, ignorance of our own puny frailties and utter dependence, ignorance of the nature of things, and ignorance of law and life and the light of hope. The man who does not have the knowledge of God cannot possibly have the proper perspective of authority. If so, how? On what ground should he accord men the prerogative of telling him what to do? Do the strong have the right to dominate the weak because they have more might? May the intelligent usurp rule over the simple because they are smarter? Can a majority by a vote make a lie truth? Or does a majority inhere any right within itself to put one man or system in
authority over a dissenting minority? No. And that on the simple ground that man has no inherent right to seize for himself or to confer to another any authority whatsoever. All authority properly begins with God! Well might a man, who has no knowledge or perspective of God to law, shout, "I will not obey any law in the making of which I had no part." Indeed, if there is no God, it can be successfully and categorically denied that any man or group of men have the right to rule over any other men. But give God his place in a heart, and respect for authority can survive in good health all the foibles and abuses of weak, foolish or even evil men in high places. The second root of disrespect is rebellion. In its rankest form it has full knowledge of God and his right to rule. But it stubbornly and arrogantly refuses to humble itself. It will not accept divine rule. It is defined as "open resistance and defiance." Gesenius in his definition of the Hebrew word (marah) translated rebellion most graphically depicts its sul len and insolent spirit: *(to stroke, to stripe .. ; spec, to lash with a whip) ... to be contumacious, rebellious ... to reject a divine command ... (which, perhaps, formerly taken in its proper sense meant, to stroke or strike anyone's mouth, i.e. to refuse to hear his words, to treat him with contempt...)." This is a horrid and damnable disposition. What a revolting scene comes to mind in the spirit of the definition when we see a boy rejecting correction or guidance from his father or mother, rebelling and defiantly refusing and taking the back of his hand and slapping them in the mouth for daring to tell him what to do. "I don't have to." "You can't tell me what to do." It is not necessary to slap the mouth every time it speaks, it is quite sufficient to do it one time. (See James 2:10.) Contempt for a person can be shown by spitting in their face one time, and rebellion against God is quite clear when a man takes even one point and says that he will or will not do a certain thing regardless. Is it not one of the greatest tragedies of our day that some are so foolish and self-inflated as to think that it is their "right" to disobey laws they do not like? They would smite God in the mouth, declare it to be their right, and opine that it is a small thing. And this is what we do when we stubbornly disobey, or reject authority.

It would be wonderful if all human authorities ruled well. It would be sweet if we suffered no mistreatment or injustices from those over us. But experience and common sense tells us that it shall never be. Nonetheless the foundations of respect stand; it came not by man's wisdom, it falls not with his folly; it stands in the knowledge and acceptance of the living God.
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CONCERNING THE KETCHERSIDE-TURNER EXCHANGE

In the February 1972 issue of this paper appeared the first of what was to be a series of three articles showing the devious, subtle appeal Carl W. Ketcherside makes across this country, sowing discord and alienating brethren. He is heralded as a healer of the "fragmented segments of the heirs of the Reformation." He is a self-acclaimed example of that spiritual maturity that gives him insight into the meaning of "unity of the Spirit" that most of the rest of us do not possess.

The fact is that Carl Ketcherside is one of the most prominent promoters of discord in America today. More division of churches of Christ follow in his wake than any other one man in religious circles today. Most all of his divisive work is done by "good words and fair speeches" which deceive the untaught (Rom. 15:17).

We shall make some further observations on his misuse of God's word in future issues of this paper.  
H. E. P.

"GOD IS NO RESPECTER OF PERSONS"

One of the several reasons for the general apathy and unconcern on the part of most "church members" is that they believe God will respect their person in that day of accounting for their years spent upon this earth. Such important factors to the world as wealth, high position of power and responsibility, fame, moral goodness, benevolent works, and religious activity will bring them special favor from Almighty God when their eternal destiny is revealed.

The near universal practice of showing favoritism and expecting special treatment in all walks of life because of respect of persons is so common in most churches of Christ that I must speak of the sin again. I know a half dozen congregations that are now divided over the basic problem of showing respect of persons. I know that "both sides" charge some scriptural issue as the reason for the divided state, but the foundation of these scriptural issues may be traced to some degree of showing respect of persons in regard to sinful practices which are used to justify the divided condition. The divided state to which I am referring does not necessarily mean that two separate groups exist, but that dispute and hatred exists in some of the churches.

In an editorial in the July 1969 issue of Searching The Scriptures the following appeared which I believe needs to be considered as soberly now as when I wrote the article. I bid you read it carefully in the light of God's word.

RESPECT OF PERSONS

I get that feeling of disgust mingled with anger when I observe some brother in the Lord being mistreated, ignored, even slandered, and for no other reason than that he is poor, uninfluential, or less educated than others. Every time I see or hear of this I think of the scene the Lord gave of the judgment in Matthew 25. He said the treatment one gives to "one of the least of these my brethren" is the treatment given to the Lord. You just remember this: what you do (or do not do) to the brethren you do to the Lord.

That feeling of disgust becomes more loathsome when I see some brother unduly honored, praised and bowed to as if he were an emperor, and for no reason other than that he is rich, popular, highly educated academic-wise, and socially or politically powerful. The political maneuvering, financial mergers, and social alliances are avenues by which many seek to have others respect their persons, or they seek to express their respect of the persons of others.

I can imagine someone saying, "That editor is trying to make himself a champion of the poor and less fortunate among brethren" or "He is envious and jealous of those who are more fortunate and more popular than he." Nothing is further from the truth on both counts. There is no special virtue and purity about poverty or illiteracy, and there is no special evil and impurity about wealth, fame and academic attainment. It is as disgusting to me to see the poor and less-educated look with disdain upon those who have worked hard to acquire wealth and education as it is in reverse. The extremes in wealth, popularity, education, etc., have nothing to do with how one brother ought to treat another. This is the very point of this lesson. Men ought not to be judged and respected upon their persons, but upon what their lives are as measured by the word of God.

Let me give the reason why I abhor the abuse of some and the unearned praise and honor of others. To show respect of persons means to accept (or reject) one upon the basis of who he is or what he has. It means "acceptance of faces" or persons; to receive or reject one on appearance or recognition of his person alone.

The matter of showing "respect of persons" is mentioned nine times in the New Testament: five times of God and four times of men. In each of the five passages relating to God it is affirmed that He is NO respecter of persons and the areas where He does not respect persons are given. But in the four verses where showing "respect of persons" relates to man they show the very nature of the sin and where it leads. Three verses are found in James 2 and one in
Jude. This respect of persons is unjust and unfair in the measurement of a man; it makes man a judge of others by his own standard and ignores God’s standard of right and wrong, and the word of God says it is sinful. This pits the truth against the person. If I respect the person I tend to "bend" the truth to make it conform to the person. But if I honor God and His truth I will strive to persuade the person to conform to truth. He then deserves respect, not because of his person, but because of his obedience to the truth.

We are taught to be like Christ. All who believe the Bible believe God to be perfect in every sense. If God does not respect the person of any man, it must be right, merciful, just, holy, and Christ-like to show respect to no man’s person. If we learn to do this the law of the Lord will become the standard of judgment and not the person of any man.

First, God respects the person of no man in accepting those who become His children. The Jews had the notion that they were favored by God because of their nationality, but God showed Peter and the six Jews with him when they went to the house of Cornelius that "God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him" (Acts 10:34,35). Every man is not accepted by the Lord, but it is not on the basis of his person that he is rejected; it is because of his disobedience. Peter said the truth is that "God is no respecter of persons: but in every nation" (Jew and Gentile) "he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." It is what a man does and not who he is that determines whether he is accepted with God.

Second, God respects the person of no man when sin is involved. The righteous judgment of God, "who will render to every man according to his deeds" (Rom. 2:6), applies equally to "the Jew first, and also to the Gentile" (vs. 9,10). With God sin is sin whether it be by Jew or Gentile. "For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law" (Rom. 2:11,12). If you transgress the law of the Lord, He will not stop to check whether you are Jew or Gentile, rich or poor, popular or unknown, ruler or servant, scholar or unlettered. You will be a sinner whoever you are because God respects the person of no man when sin is involved.

Third, God will render good to those who do good without respect of persons. The poorest, least esteemed man on earth will receive good from the Lord for the good he has done, and it will be by the same standard and on the same principle that the most esteemed on earth will receive it. "Knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free ... neither is there respect of persons with him" (Eph. 6:8,9). Whatever good any man doeth he will receive of the Lord, and the person of that man has nothing to do with it. It is what the man does, not who he is, that counts with God.

Fourth, God will render just punishment to all who do wrong without respect of persons. "Knowing that of the Lord ye shall receive the reward of the inheritance: for ye serve the Lord Christ. But he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons" (Col. 3:24,25). The most noted evangelist or the most highly esteemed bishop in the Lord’s church will receive the same punishment for his wrong as any other person on the face of the earth. His position or his honor will in no wise affect God in dealing out the just wages for his wrong doing.

Fifth, the judgment of God toward every man will be without respect of persons. "But as he which hath called you is holy, so be ye holy in all manner of conversation: because it is written, Be ye holy; for I am holy. And if ye call on the Father, who without respect of persons judgeth according to every man’s work, pass the time of your sojourning here in fear" (1 Peter 1:15-17).

Now compare this with man’s dealing with man. "My brethren, have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons. For if there come unto your assembly a man with a gold ring, in goodly apparel, and there come in also a poor man in vile raiment, and ye have respect to him that weareth the gay clothing, and say unto him, Sit thou here in a good place; and say to the poor, Stand thou here, or sit here under my footstool: are ye not then partial in yourselves, and are become judges of evil thoughts?... But if ye have respect to persons, ye commit sin, and are convinced of the law as transgressors" (James 2:1-4,9).

These verses picture the abominable condition so evident among many brethren today. A well-known evangelist will come into an assembly and some brethren will act as if Christ himself has arrived. They must honor him with special eulogies and favors. They do the same for a very rich man, a famous political figure, or a noted entertainer. But these same brethren will hardly speak to an unknown, poor man who is "just a faithful Christian." If you think I am saying that all well-known evangelists, rich brethren, and brethren who have become successful in their fields of endeavor should be ignored and the poor honored, you have missed the point of this study. The word of God teaches that we should treat the rich and poor alike. We should honor the brethren — all brethren, regardless of who they are or what they have. They should be respected for what they have done and are doing of the living word of God. This is the way God deals with all of us.

We show respect of persons for personal advantage. It is a selfish move. We tend to favor the wealthy because we hope to profit by it. We run after the influential because we expect to enhance our own influence and popularity by the association. We associate with the powerful because we desire to be secure. What can the poor, weak and unknown do for me? Nothing! Why then should I give him any special attention? This is the root of the whole matter. There is no love for the brethren, and, consequently, no love for God (1 John 4:20,21).

The Spirit said by Jude that the evil "brute beasts" who had committed every conceivable sin known to man, were "walking after their own lusts; and their mouth speaketh great swelling words, having men’s persons in admiration because of advantage (Jude 16). The A.S.V. says, "showing respect of persons for the sake of advantage." Like many brethren today, these were using flattering words to show respect of
"NO DEAD ISSUE — NO. I"

With the permission of brother Phillips, I plan to run a series of three articles under the above title. The fact that brethren who believe in the support of human institutions out of the church treasury write so often on the subject proves beyond any question that they do not consider it a dead issue. It would be tragic indeed if we are lulled into complacency with reference to this question. The first article to be printed is by brother Gus Nichols, and appeared in the July 1972 issue of the Boles Home News. Boles Home is almost my next door neighbor being located some twelve miles south of Greenville. The title of brother Nichols' article is "Whose Work Is It?" The second article we will review is one by brother Reuel Lemmons, editor of the Firm Foundation, Austin, Texas. Brother Lemmon's article is called "Benevolence and Education," and appeared in the March 21 issue of the Firm Foundation. It shall be my purpose to print the articles in their entirety, then show the true and false affirmations of said articles. In a third article, I plan to show the contradiction between brethren Nichols and Lemmons. These men both teach the support of orphan asylums and yet they are as far apart as the poles in what they teach. We will notice this in the third article month after next.

Now for brother Nichols' article called, "Whose Work Is It?" Please notice article and the reply at the close:

"Whose Work Is It?" One brother is "anxious" to know whose work is being done when the "church contributes to an orphan home — the work of the giving church? or the work of the orphan home is caring for the destitute children?" He thinks the orphan home was established "by the church to do the work of the church," and that because it was thought that the church is insufficient for its work. So he asks, "whose work is it?"

All essential work done by the church in caring for homeless and destitute children is a work of the church. But all essential work done by the home in caring for the children is a work of the home. It is just that simple! Paul taught that the church is to relieve widows (I Tim. 5:16). The church might not need to do more than send a bill of needed groceries, or to have a doctor's prescription filled, and all at church expense. The church would not have to send someone to cook the groceries and administer the medicine, if the widow is unable to cook and see to such details. The church has done its work when it has done what is essential for the church to do.

Then the home takes over, and does its work in applying what the church has in benevolence supplied. The home has its work to do. It is not the work of the church to be a home; neither is it the work of a home to be a church. Each institution functions in its own place, and does its own work.

The church in giving to a destitute home is simply aiding the home in its work, helping it to carry on under stress and strain, till it can wholly take care of itself without church benevolence.

The church has no scriptural right to take over destitute homes and oversee them. God put individuals over their own homes. Adam was to rule over Eve (Gen. 3:16). God said of Abraham, "For I know him, that he will command his children and his household after him" (Gen. 18:19). Joshua was to be over his house, and hence said: "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord" (Joshua 24:15). This is also a true principle under the new covenant, under which we live. A Christian man is to be "one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity; (for if a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the church of God?) (I Tim. 3:4-5). This denies the idea that elders are to rule our homes for us, even in times of sickness and distress. Paul says of young widows, "I will therefore that the younger women (widows - A.S.V.) marry, bear children, guide the house, give none occasion to the adversary to speak reproachfully" (I Tim. 5:14). Here the wife is to "guide the house," and not leave it for the elders to take the oversight of her home.

Furthermore, God did not put the elders over homes. The elders are placed over the churches, and not homes. We read of "elders in every church" (Acts 14:23); and of "elders of the church" (Acts 11:29-30). From Miletus, Paul "sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the church" (Acts 20:17). When they came to him, he said unto them, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood" (verse 28). These elders were not over homes, but over the churches in which they served. God did not put elders over families of Christians, but over the church and its work.

Of course, elders could serve as trustees of a home, just as they could be principals of schools, or postmasters; just as citizens and Christians, without filling the positions as elders. Hence, the church does not have to take over homes and operate them when it is contributing to the necessities of such homes.

The church of Antioch sent a contribution to the
elders of another church, or churches, in Judea (Acts 11:29-30). The giving church did not have to take over the receiving church, or churches, and destroy their autonomy before it could aid them in their own work of benevolence. The receiving church, or churches, did their own work, and the giving church was aiding them in sending the contribution. Another way to say the same thing, is to say each church did its own work; neither did the work of the other. The giving church did not send men along to the receiving church to take charge and oversee the receiving church, nor to control the contribution sent: the receiving elders were trusted to their work, and the giving church had done its part. Both the giving institution, and the receiving institution had its work to do. The receiving church did the actual work of applying the relief, while the giving church was working in sending the relief. Then further down the line, when the needy applied the funds distributed by the receiving church they, also, as homes and families, did their work in appropriating the benevolence of the sending church (Acts 11:29-30). The contribution was sent by the church at Antioch, to elders in Judea, but for "the brethren." Let us say then, that it is the work of the giving church to send relief, or do what it can for the relief of the destitute, and it is the work of those receiving aid and assistance to apply what is received to the extent of their abilities. The giving church does not have to take over and do all the work to be done. Others may give whatever relief they can, and the receiving church, and the being assisted, can do, each its own work, to the extent of ability. Surely this is scriptural and right.

**ANSWER:** The tragedy of brother Nichols' article is that it ASSUMES the very point which has divided churches all over the land. He did not give ONE scripture showing that a church ever gave to an organization like Boles Homes. It would be nice if he would write us an article showing where this was done in Bible times! As a matter of fact, he can't even find a scripture where a Church ever gave to any kind of a HOME; much less one like BOLES! In Bible times the Church helped SAINTS not HOMES! A man once said to me, "Yes, but Hogland, all saints are a part of a home." I said, "Yes, indeed, I am a part of the Church but I am not the Church — I am also a part of the U.S. but I am not the United States." If we are not careful these brethren will ASSUME the point they must prove from the scriptures. Where does the Bible say the church ever gave one cent to a home? Well, it is found on the same page you read about the church haying all kinds of instruments of music in the worship service — the blank page!

Now for the true statements of brother Nichols' article. He said a number of times that the Church could not take over the work of the home. That is exactly correct. He said God put individuals over their own homes. Yes, this is true and it would have been interesting to have heard brother Nichols tell us WHICH individual is over Boles Home! Is it the Superintendent? Is it a member of the Board of Directors? In the Bible we are taught that the father is the head of his home. Who is the father of Boles Home? This is one question I can't get answered. Gayle Oler, while sitting in one of the rooms of Boles Home would not tell me. If the Superintendent is the head of the home then he would have to become destitute before he could be churches in behalf of his children! Paul said, "If a man provide not for his own and specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than in infidel" (1 Tim. 5:8). So while brother Nichols was correct in saying God put the individual over his home, it would have been refreshing to have heard who is over Boles Home!

Brother Nichols tells us in the support of widows the Church could buy a bill of groceries, or have a doctor's prescription filled at Church expense. Yes, indeed, but this is where he slipped a cog. He should of said the elders may send money to the Board of Directors or a grocery association and they in turn buy the widow the groceries. Or the elders take money out of the Church treasury and donate to a doctor's association under the control of a Board of Directors and they in turn pay for the doctor's prescription. Brother Nichols says one thing and practices another. This was the same violation of the Missionary Society. In supporting preachers it was God's plan that the work and conduct of the preacher being supported be under the control and authority of elders. But they shifted that to a Board of Directors and sent donations to that organization. The same is true with organizations like Boles Home. There is still a difference in the elders buying services of an organization and making a donation to an organization. One is scriptural and the other is not.

It was fatal indeed when brother Nichols gave us the example of Acts 11:29-30. He says one church sent to another church and autonomy was not destroyed. Yes, I agree one thousand percent. Now, brother Nichols, in sending to Boles Home what church receives the money? This pattern doesn't fit your practice. This is one Church sending to another Church to take care of its benevolent wards. This is exactly how it should be done today. If a Church has poor saints and cannot take care of them, then let other Churches send to the church in need and let the Church take care of its poor saints as it did in Acts six. If this were practiced, division would end all over this great land of ours. Please notice that the above example does not justify a sponsoring Church gathering up poor saints from all over the brotherhood and asking for donations but only taking care of its own members!

Remember, gentle reader, just because a group of elders take money out of the Church treasury and spend it DOES NOT make it scriptural. Those elders must have Bible authority for spending the money and they will answer to God if they prostitute the Lord's work. Brother Nichols didn't tell us what we need to know — that is, authority for elders taking money out of the Church treasury and giving to an orphan asylum like Boles Home. We all know the difference in a home and the Church but where did the Church ever give to a real home, much less an organization like Boles Home? If Boles Home is a home then so are the Catholic Hospitals in the state of Texas, because I checked the record and they are chartered exactly alike Think it over.
THE HEBREW DAY

The Hebrew word for day is "yom" and is found over 2,100 times in the Hebrew Old Testament. The Jewish method of time-keeping is based upon the day beginning from evening to evening. It is in accordance with the order observed in the Biblical account of Creation, "and there was evening and there was morning, one day" (Gen. 1:5). This principle is repeated several times in the Torah (cf. Lev. 23:32; Ex. 12:18).

The word day is used in a number of senses (cf. Brown, Driver & Briggs Hebrew-English Lexicon of the Old Testament, pp. 398-401). But there are two senses of prime importance. The first is in the sense of an ordinary 24-hour day. With sunset, the Jewish 24-hour day comes to an end. This type of day consists of two parts, or periods, i.e., light and darkness. The second sense is used by calling the light "day" and the darkness "night" (Hebrew word is layelah). Thus the term "day" is used in a double sense of a 24-hour day consisting of light and darkness and a 12-hour (approx.) day consisting of light. Context will determine which of the two meanings the word has in a particular text.

THE HEBREW WORD DAY IN CREATION

Whether the days of Genesis chapter one are six immediately successive literal 24-hour days, whether the six days of creation are separated by long intervals of time, whether the days of creation follow a long geological time period/gap after the first creative act or whether these days refer to six indefinite periods of time or ages, are questions that have plagued Bible students and scholars alike.

The Hebrew word "yom" first appears in Genesis 1:5 and is here used two times in the two senses mentioned above, i.e., in a double sense of a 24-hour day and in the sense of daytime or light.

There are two periods of transition during each 24-hour day that need explanation. These periods are called morning (boker) and evening (‘ereb) and are of indefinite length. The evening begins before sunset and continues after sunset merging into the darkness of the night. Likewise, morning begins before sunrise and continues after sunrise blending into the light of day. These transitions are gradual and include both the full setting (evening) and the full rising (morning) of the sun on the horizon in both west and east respectively.

The first creative Divine act after the first verse was the creation of LIGHT. When God had pronounced the light good, He divided the light from the darkness. God then named the light DAY and the darkness He named NIGHT. This division is the first reference to a point of time in the Bible. Darkness was not blotted out of existence but rather we find two entities existing at the same time, darkness and light. We are not told the source of light and it is not connected with a source until the fourth day (cf. 1:14-ff.). Science recognizes that there are other sources of light than the sun.

Guess what you get as a free prize for subscribing to MISSION Magazine. No, not a New Testament, for they don't go in too much for that. You get a printed interview with Pat Boone. Now that is a real appropriate gift for that paper, for neither of them would be worth a plug nickel!

In an advertisement which I received they say, "Thousands of Christians find MISSION one of the most relevant and exciting Church of Christ periodicals available today. MISSION is not a typical Church of Christ periodical. It was never meant to be. MISSION is a thought and talk starter that keeps readers talking, reacting, asking questions, and expressing their own opinions."

What is a "Church of Christ periodical?" Such language is a good indication of the type of teaching found in MISSION. And we are thankful that it is not a "typical Church of Christ" publication. I have found that the writers express "their own opinions" more than those of the Lord and the inspired apostles. And I notice that Carl (anything goes) Ketcherside is now one of the writers.

The opening line of a hit song by Glen Campbell says, "Manhattan Kansas ain't no place to have a baby, when you've got no man to give it its last name." Before an omnipresent God, is there any good place to have a baby when there is no one to give it a legitimate name? We realize that many thousands are born each year under such conditions, and the number is increasing. In fact, illegitimacy and venereal disease continue to increase at an alarming rate. We thought that sex education in the public schools was supposed to correct this. That's what the liberals argued. Teaching children about sex to discourage experimenting makes about as much sense as teaching a man how to cook in order to keep him out of the kitchen!
According to the Official Catholic Directory for 1972, there are 48,390,990 Catholics in the United States. That is 23.3% of the nation's population. I think that it is safe to say that 90% of those became Catholics without their knowledge or consent! They were "baptized" and Catholicized as infants. It we should count the children of all of our families as members, whether they wanted to be or not, we would probably triple our membership within a week. I have proof of Catholics "baptizing" babies while they were asleep. If that be right, could you baptize a ten-year-old child while asleep? Thirty-year-old man? Just how old would one have to be before he would have to wake up in order to be baptized scripturally?

The Bible teaches that only those who can hear the gospel, believe, repent, confess faith, and be immersed can (or even need to) become Christians (John 8:24; Luke 13:3; Acts 8:37; Rom. 6:4).

While our Government spends millions of dollars annually in an anti-smoking campaign — warning people of the hazards of smoking — it also spends millions in subsidizing tobacco farmers. It looks like anyone with enough judgment to run a nation could be more consistent. No wonder we are hopelessly in debt.

I cannot understand the attitude of a man who will stand in front of a building sucking his lungs and body full of nicotine before going inside to worship the God who commands temperance (self-control), and has informed him that his body is the temple of the Spirit and is to be kept holy (I Cor. 6:19; Rom. 12:1).

Almost everyone is in favor of going to heaven, but too many are hoping they will live long enough to see an easing of the entrance requirements.

Sign on a bumper sticker: "If God Seems Far Away, Guess Who Moved."

The scriptures abound with teaching relative to the importance of unity. For instance, in Jno. 17:21, Christ in praying to the Father taught concerning the importance of unity among Christians: "That they all may be one (Christians); as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." Christ states that one reason Christians are to be united (one) is "that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." Hence, division and disunity among Christians is one of the most prolific causes of disbelief!

In the process of studying the teaching of the New Testament concerning the importance of unity, I have experienced members who took the position that it is utterly impossible for Christians to be united. I would concede that in some instances it is difficult for Christians to be one; however, it is not impossible. (1 Jno. 5:3) One reason, and I might add one of the most common reasons for disunity prevailing, is our overlooking and ignoring the teaching found in Eph. 4:3. In this passage, Paul gives the antidote for disunity - "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." The antidote or remedy is, "Endeavouring (earnestly trying) to keep the unity of the Spirit..." Also to be taken into consideration is the fact that Paul penned this letter to the Christians at Ephesus; thus, each individual Christian is to endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit. So many times, members complain because the church of which they are a member is divided and they wonder why disunity exist. Why does disunity exist? In many instances, simply because we (members) just do not earnestly try (endeavor) to keep unity! Frequently, members sit back in their easy chairs and watch the preacher and the faithful few try to promote unity. Then when disunity prevails they gripe and complain and threaten to go elsewhere if the division does not cease. Beloved, let us be aware of the following: there will always be disunity to some degree in a church where only part of the members are "Endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit."

In view of the fact that we must all do our part to keep unity, let us sincerely ask ourselves this question, "How can I promote unity?" and ponder the following answers:

1) By being involved and taking an active part in the work of the local church. The old proverbial saying that idleness is the devil's work shop, while not found verbatim in the Bible, is certainly a Biblical truth. When members are not busy in the Lord's work, they will be apt to take part in gossip and other divisive things. (I Tim. 5:13) In this vein of thought it has been said that the brethren are going to fight if they are not busy fighting denominationalism and sin, they will be busy fighting each other. Beloved, are you taking an active part in the work of the local church of which you are a member? (Matt. 6:33) If you are not, I say kindly but candidly, you are not promoting unity!
Promoter of Unity? (All emphasis mine. D.M.)

Going, why not repent and resolve now to be a promoter of disunity? If you have not been practicing the former, you are either helping to sow discord among brethren. (I Cor. 3:31, 16, Pro. 6:16, 19).

Brethren in Christ, are you a promoter of unity or disunity? If you have not been practicing the foregoing, why not repent and resolve now to be a promoter of unity? (All emphasis mine. D.M.)

Rt. 1, Box 20
Pineland, Texas
75968

(2) By examining every motive and making sure that everything you do is prompted by love. (I Cor. 13:1-7) So many times division is begun with members quarreling over silly, immaterial things that are inconsequential. The absence of love was one of the paramount causes of disunity at Corinth. (I Cor. 8:1-2, 3:1-3)

(3) By contending for the once delivered faith. (Jude 3) On numerous occasions I have encountered the "peace at any price" attitude. Some mistakenly believe that when error is introduced or practiced the best thing to do is remain silent. We are told, do not oppose error or you will be guilty of sowing discord among the brethren. Brethren, this attitude is diametrically opposed to unity as darkness is to light. God's word is the only standard for authority. (Matt. 28:18, Jno. 6:63) Therefore, when we deviate from it or sit back quietly while others depart from it - we will unavoidably experience division.

(4) By considering others and their needs before ourselves and our needs. Frequently, division is conceived over "personality clashes" or personal disagreements. Beloved, we need to put others before ourselves (Phi. 2:4) and esteem others better than ourselves. (Phi. 2:3) We need to be involved in the needs of others (Rom. 15:1-3; Phi. 2:4) and not our own needs to the exclusion of others.

(5) By realizing the awful consequence of promoting disunity. "If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy..." "These six things doth the Lord hate; yea, seven are an abomination unto him. He that soweth discord among brethren." (I Cor. 3:16, Pro. 6:16, 19).

Brethren in Christ, are you a promoter of unity or of disunity? If you have not been practicing the foregoing, why not repent and resolve now to be a promoter of unity? (All emphasis mine. D.M.)
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RELIGIOUS DEBATE

There will be a religious discussion between J. T. Smith of Conway, Arkansas and Orville Lee Smith of McAlester, Oklahoma on the One Container, Classes, and Women Teacher questions. The discussion will be October 2, 3, 4, 5 in Tulsa, Oklahoma. For further information, write James D. Watts, preacher for the East Central church of Christ, 1702 South Memorial Drive, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74112; or call brother Watts at 627-5670 in Tulsa.

THE GRIDER-HIGHERS DEBATE

Dick Blackford, P.O. Box 651, Central City, Ky. 42330 — It was my privilege to moderate for A. C. Grider for five nights in the debate at Central City, Ky., with Alan E. Highers, March 6-10. It is not our purpose to discuss the debate in detail but only to mention what we consider to have been the main arguments.

The first two nights were on limited benevolence. Brother Highers presented a chart on II Cor. 9:13 as his major argument. The chart contained Acts 5:11; I Thes. 3:12; I Thes. 5:15 and Gal. 6:10 which are parallel in construction to II Cor. 9:13. (This chart is in The Arlington Meeting, p. 221.) His argument was that because each of these verses includes more than saints, that the same must also be true in II Cor. 9:13. Brother Grider replied that we must keep a passage in context to determine who was relieved. He presented a chart containing I Cor. 16:1; Rom. 15:25,26,31; II Cor. 8:4; II Cor. 9:1,12, all of which say it was for the saints. He then asked if Paul misappropriated the funds by giving it to someone other than whom he said it was for. Brother Highers did not deal with the context but stuck to his "parallel constructions" argument.

On the second night when brother Grider again cited all the cases of church benevolence and pointed out that only saints were mentioned in each case, brother Highers replied by trying to parallel Grider's argument to a Baptist preacher reading all the verses on faith and concluding that salvation was by faith only. Brother Grider effectively pointed out that there were other scriptures on the subject of salvation which proved that more than faith was involved. He emphasized the point that the Bible did not say only said sing only, but that it only said sing; that it did not tell us to take the Lord's Supper on the first day of the week only, but that it only said the first day of the week; and that it did not tell us to take a collection on the first day of the week only, but it only said on the first day of the week.

Brother Highers presented a chart on James 1:27 and Gal. 6:10 (appears in The Arlington Meeting, p. 218) in an attempt to show that individual duties are discharged through the church. He paralleled James 1:27 to I Cor. 11:28 (Lord's Supper) and said...
it was an individual duty discharged collectively and that Gal. 6:10 was collective because it was addressed to churches (Gal. 1:2). Brother Grider answered this with two charts — one showing that the Lord's Supper was both individual and collective (I Cor. 11:28 and Acts 20:7) but that orphan care was only individual (James 1:27) and that there was no passage authorizing orphan care on a collective basis. The other chart showed that Gal. 6:10 could not be collective because of the context — particularly that fact that "they compel you to be circumcised" (Gal. 6:12) could not be collective action. These were the major arguments the first two nights.

The third night was on institutionalism. Brother Highers introduced a chart called "Which Organization?" with the church on one side, the home on the other and such things as "provide food, shelter, recreation, etc." in the middle. His purpose was to show that these were home duties and not church duties. Thus the church could only contribute the money to the home and it could provide these things. Brother Grider again pointed out that it was the individual who was to practice pure and undefiled religion (James 1:27).

Brother Highers presented his "Hobby Wheel" chart in an effort to make it appear that we are just like the anti-Bible class brethren. Brother Grider replied with a chart called "The Hobby Wheel Broke Down." He pointed out the brethren who oppose classes are objecting to something that does not exist — an organized Sunday School society separate from the church. He said if that was what it was he would oppose it too. He noted that the organized Sunday School society, the benevolent society, and the missionary society are parallel and that all three are wrong. It was also pointed out that brother Highers was confusing the word "home" by using it in several different ways without noting the distinction. Grider cited the charter of the Shultz-Lewis Children's Home showing that the organization called a "home" existed for the purpose of "providing a home" (another usage) and thus was an institution which could provide a thousand "homes" if it wanted to. He further emphasized that the church helps individuals, not "homes."

On the fourth and fifth night cooperation in evangelism was discussed. Brother Grider showed what was involved in the sponsoring church system and noted that concurrent cooperation and not joint cooperation was the scriptural kind. Brother Highers did not show where one church sent to another in evangelism but asked by what authority Brother Grider got his salary from the first-day-of-the-week contribution. Brother Grider showed from II Cor. 11:8 that it is necessarily inferred that preachers were paid from the treasury and that I Cor. 16:1,2 is the only passage telling when a collection could be taken. This did not satisfy brother Highers and became his main argument the final night. On the last night brother Highers admitted that I Cor. 16:1,2 was not on evangelism but made a "two wrongs make a right" type argument that if preachers could get their salaries from this passage that he could also get authority for World Radio, etc. Again brother Grider said he did not get his salary from I Cor. 16:1,2 but that a treasury was necessarily inferred in II Cor. 11:8. He forcefully emphasized that I Cor. 16:1,2 was the total revelation from God as to when a collection was to be taken and it was specific (first day of the week) and exclusive (first day of the week only). Grider further noted that we must first find authority for spending the money and that I Cor. 16:1,2 was not authority for spending anything in evangelism and thus was not the passage which authorized a preacher's salary.

Good order prevailed throughout the discussion and the atmosphere among brethren seemed to be much better than it had been at previous debates.

Brother Highers remarked that whether we (conservative brethren) "win" in a debate or not that we always "win" when we write it up. Though the same could be said about them, we simply want to point out that we were not seeking a personal victory. Both truth and error were presented. And in spite of brother Highers' outstanding ability as a speaker one can study the arguments presented and arrive at the truth. Thus we encourage the reader to purchase the complete debate on tape from Phillips Publications, P.O. Box 17244, Tampa, Fla. 33612.

Charles Gentry, C.P.O. Box 179, Nagoya, Japan 40 — The second Sunday in April we set a new record in attendance with 20 present. We had five new visitors this month. The enrollment in Bible classes and correspondence course continue to increase. Osaka: The Lord continues to give the increase. One has been baptized since last report. Our Saturday evening Bible class is showing continued interest and great results. The first week in April we had a three day meeting with brother Shintoku Oshiro from Okinawa doing the preaching. The attendance and interest was good with visitors every night.

DEBATE

A religious debate was conducted on Aug. 14-17, 1972 in Decatur, Ala., between T. N. Thrasher, representing the church of Christ, and Mr. Eddie K. Garrett, representing the Primitive Baptist Church. The propositions for discussion were as follows:

Aug. 14-15, "The church of Christ, of which T. N. Thrasher is a member, is scriptural in origin, doctrine, and practice."

Aug. 16-17, "The Primitive Baptist Church, of which Elder Eddie K. Garrett is a member, is scriptural in origin, doctrine, and practice."

A PLEA FOR HELP IN GERMANY

Dudley Ross Spears — There is an opportunity for someone to preach the gospel in West Germany at the present time. There are at least two groups of brethren meeting there where the truth can be preached and where the work of the church is done scripturally. These small outposts need help and they need it now.

After trying to find some qualified man to go there
and meeting with no success, my family and I have agreed to go and work in Germany. It is a big decision to make, especially for anyone with a family that is well situated in this country. Were it not for conscience I would not be making plans to go there and consequently not writing this plea for help in going.

I will go to Germany for a series of meetings in November. At that time I will make an assessment of the possibilities for establishing a lasting conservative work among the German people. By that time I will be able to preach a sermon in the German language.

With great anticipation for wonderful opportunities I am trying to raise the necessary support now. After consultation with brethren who are over there and have been over there I conclude that living expenses there are equal to the U.S.A. in most things and excessive to our costs in others. I am asking for $800.00 monthly support for salary, $250.00 monthly support for rent and utilities and $150.00 up for the publication of a monthly paper in German and in English as well as tracts, Bibles and other teaching materials.

I do not believe that the amount I am asking for is excessive for the living conditions there now. Also the devaluation of the American dollar means that more money will be needed there to buy the same amount of goods here.

I also need money for a travel fund which will be used in transporting my family and me, purchasing whatever is necessary in order to have living quarters there.

The Park Ave. church, where I am currently working, has promised to support me monthly while I am in Germany. The church in Altamonte Springs, Fl. (which is in the Orlando area) has already begun their support. They are already sending me money monthly which I will use to defray moving expenses when I go permanently.

My plans now are to go to Germany in November for two or three meetings. Then I will move permanently next Spring with my family, I will be able to speak and write German by the time I make the move. I already have a linguistic background in the language and will enroll in conversational German this fall at one of our local schools.

If there is a congregation anywhere who is willing to contribute substantially toward this endeavor I would appreciate hearing from you very soon. Any amount will help, but I would like to be assured of the monthly support before I make further plans and commitments. Please let me hear from you. I will be glad to come anywhere to talk to anyone about the work and answer any questions I can. 35 W. Par Orlando, Florida 32804

BOBBY HERSCHEL FRANKS
July 31, 1926 - September 3, 1972

At 1:25 in the afternoon of Sunday, September 3, Bob Franks left this life. The long and painful struggle he waged against the effects of rheumatoid arthritis is generally known to the brotherhood. For fifteen years he did the work of an evangelist, with pain a constant, present reality. This past June he was forced, by an acute recurrence of the disease, to cut short his part in a gospel meeting in New Orleans, Louisiana. His last sermon was preached in New Orleans. Shortly after his return to his family in Fort Worth, he began the first of three periods of hospitalization, the last of which was terminated by his death.

Brethren Jim McDonald and Stanley J. Lovett conducted funeral services Monday morning, September 4, in Fort Worth. Brother McDonald spoke movingly of association with Bob, of their efforts together in the proclamation and defense of the gospel. In those remarks, brother McDonald described Bob's determination to preach, even in great physical discomfort. He used the words of the apostle Paul to depict also the attitude Bob had: when there was strength still to work, "I am debtor ... I am ready... I am not ashamed of the gospel" (Romans 1:14-16). When strength was exhausted, when months and years of ravage by disease and medication and surgery exacted their toll, when the gathering of the shades of night was apparent: only then was the past tense apropos: "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith" (II Timothy 4:7).

The last two years of his sojourn he labored with the Westside Church in Fort Worth. Prior to that, he had done local work with churches in Lafayette, Louisiana; Luikin, Beaumont, Kaulman, and Kirbyville, Texas.

Bob Franks is survived by his wife, Roma Dean; a son, Rickey; three daughters, Teresa, Sandra, and Rene; his mother, Mrs. J. A. Franks; a sister and three brothers. The burial was at the Franks Cemetery, near Merryville, Louisiana, in the late afternoon, September 4.

"For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed to us-ward."

The Church of Christ which began meeting at Omaha, Nebraska in July 1971 has rented space in the Parkview Heights Elementary School. Meeting times are 9:30 a.m. Sunday morning Bible study, 10:30 a.m. morning worship, and 6:00 p.m. Sunday evening worship. The new location is in southwest Omaha at 7609 South 89th Street, a fast growing area of metropolitan Omaha. Anyone wishing to contact the church may write one of the following: W. F. Bates, Route 1, Box 298, Plattsmouth, NE 68048, phone 402-298-8543, or Timothy Fox, 53 Travis, Offutt Air Force Base, NE 68113, phone 402-291-6009, or Kenneth Hirshey, 4405 Terrace Drive, Omaha, NE 68134, phone 402-572-7838.

Ralph Joiner, P.O. Box 208, Cambridge City, Ind. At the end of September my family and I will be returning to the Sunshine State where I will work with the church in Clermont, Fla. This will terminate a little over two years labor in the Hoosier State. All sound preachers of the gospel interested in this work are encouraged to write: J. C. Newton, E. Cambridge Rd., Cambridge City, Ind. 47327, or call 317-478-1968.
Wendell M. Powell, Barber Lane, Loudon, Tenn. 37774 — As of August 20, 1972 I began full-time work with the congregation of Lord's people at Loudon, Tenn. Please, assemble with us, if ever- in the East Tennessee area.

PREACHER NEEDED

Small but sound congregation needs experienced preacher. We have been meeting here for two years. The body of Christ here was recently purified by breaking from the liberal element.

We are presently meeting in a home while looking for a building. We can arrange full support for the preacher. Contact: Roger Lewis, Rt. 1, Box 514, Waupaca, Wis. 54981, phone (715) 258-7705 or Tom Comely, 506 Waupaca St., Waupaca, Wis. 54981, phone (715) 258-7900.

PREACHER NEEDED

We are two Christian women with families who are trying to start a sound congregation in Rochester, Minn. We need a preacher to help us with this work. If any man wishes details about our circumstance he can get in touch with Patsy Johnson, 725 3rd Ave. N.W., Plainview, Minn. 55964, phone 534-2685 or Leslie Diestelkamp, 1398 St. Paul Ave., St. Paul, Minn. 55116, phone 690-0254.

Philip A. Morr, P.O. Box 97, Gymea N.S.W. 2227, Australia — The work in Sydney continues to make satisfactory progress. I am preparing to leave Sydney for 2 1/2 weeks while I visit with most of the congregations in Queensland. The trip will cover 3500 miles. There is a great distance between cities in the outback. Most of the congregations are few in number but there are two congregations in Queensland which number 30 and 45.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION

A public discussion between Drew E. Falls of Hanceville, Ala. and Ben J. Franklin of San Diego, California was held in the Midfield church of Christ building in Birmingham, Ala. on July 24, 25, 27, 28, 1972.

The proposition was: "What the Scriptures teach about the baptism of the Holy Spirit and the gifts of the Holy Spirit for our day."

Each night there was a forty and twenty minute speech by each participant. There was also a question and answer session each night following the speeches.

Ben Franklin was endorsed by the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International.

There has already been a written discussion on this subject by these men.

Thomas C. Sweeney, 2307 Maplecrest Drive, Nashville, Tenn. 37214 — I am available for part-time work within driving distance of Nashville, Tenn. References will be furnished and I can be contacted at the above address or phone 883-8847.

EVANGELIST NEEDED

The church at St. Cloud, Fla. needs a full time preacher. This is a small congregation in one of the fastest growing areas in Florida. The congregation is able to provide only partial support at this time. Interested individuals may contact the Church of Christ, St. Cloud, Fla. 32769 or Farley Adams, 616 Clearlake Rd., Cocoa, Fla. 32922.
In speaking to the elders of the church in Ephesus Paul reminded them of the time he had spent with them, and of the work he had done in their presence. Among other things he called their attention to the carefulness with which he had preached the gospel in its fulness. In Acts 20:20 he said, "... I kept back nothing that was profitable to you ..." In verses 26-27 he said, "Wherefore I take you to record this day, that I am pure from the blood of all men. For I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." Implied in this statement is the fact that the condemnation of those who hear a preacher rests not only upon the hearer, but also upon the preacher himself, and that the only way he can relieve himself of that burden is by confronting the sinner with his sins and showing him what he must do to obtain pardon in the sight of God. As Paul expressed it, the preacher must declare all the counsel of God. In the case of the Ephesian elders Paul could rejoice knowing not only that he had fulfilled his own responsibility, but also that his hearers had received the truth and obtained pardon.

Paul also made a statement to some Jews in Corinth similar to the one he made to the Ephesian elders. These men, however, were not like the Ephesian elders who obeyed the truth. Instead they rejected it with blasphemy. Paul could nonetheless say to them, "Your blood be upon your own heads; I am clean" (Acts 18:6). He had fulfilled his responsibility by preaching the truth, and in so doing had placed the burden of guilt squarely upon the shoulders of his hearers; he himself was clean.

Although it is a sad thing to see the truth rejected, there is still consolation to the preacher who has done his job well. How peaceful it is to retire at night having given diligence in handling the word of truth, and thus being assured of God's approval (II Timothy 2:15).

But by the same token, how fearful it must be to a preacher to go to bed at night with the knowledge that his work is not faithful to the word of God. Indeed it must be terrifying to one who does not care enough for the truth to preach it, to realize that he must face Jesus Christ in judgment who loved it enough to die for it. And how burdensome it must be to know that at that day he must also face those whom he might have saved if he had only tried, but instead whose condemnation he must share.

Finally, notice that in the two instances cited from Acts 20:26-27 and Acts 18:6 that the gospel preached to both groups was the same, yet one had been saved by it while the other blasphemed. This simply, but clearly, points out the fact that when the preacher has done his work, when the truth has been declared, that the responsibility for its reception rests upon the hearer. "Therefore putting aside all filthiness and all that remains of wickedness, in humility receive the word implanted, which is able to save your souls" (James 1:21, New American Standard Bible).
IMITATORS

Men are better monkeys than monkeys. We begin aping our ancestors and others who are around us almost from the moment we are born. Patterns of speech, vocabularies, facial expressions, mannerisms and even the style of our walk, are pretty much the product of our copy-cating. We never really get over this tendency to imitate others. It is doubtful that many of us undertake any "new" activity or interest without at least a little imitation, however muted and sub-conscious, of those experienced therein. This is in no way a criticism. It is an observation. And we do well to acknowledge the powerful tendency to imitate and make this valuable technique of learning and developing more useful. Its power in the moral realm needs to be realized for obvious reasons.

Imitation has been said to be the greatest flattery one human being can accord another. But it is not flattery; it is the sincerest of compliments. Words may be spoken freely and emptily containing intoxicating flattery and praise, but imitation... this is something else. Somebody thinks enough of you to want to be like you, and they are copying you in order to accomplish it! No words need be spoken here. He who professes to love the Lord may be doubted, but he who imitates and follows removes all questions.

Children usually begin by making mother and daddy their heroes, and we often see parents reflected in their children as much by speech and manner as by looks. My infant son now reminds me of how my daughters used to (and still do) copy their mother. They always preferred an old dress of hers to a new one of their own. They identified with her when they wore her clothes and the delight they ex-pressed made it unnecessary to say, "Mother, we love you and want to be like you." That little fellow now scares me by the influence he permits me to have in his life, and it is most sobering when during the course of a common day a point of imitation is so obvious as to be specified. God help me, for I shall directly influence his temperament, attitude, character and essence of manhood. This is the burden of all parents, and we do well to prayerfully tremble and exercise care to be fit examples.

What is so clearly seen in small children still lives on in us in a subtler but no less real measure all our days. We are both examples to and imitators of one another. This may not always be a conscious action, but imitators we are. This accounts for fads in clothing and discernible characteristics of various groups and movements. The closer and more sympathetic people are to one another, the more like one another they become, for their social modes have by association been more or less absorbed from one another. Suits are commonly worn by men, not because each one has independently and in isolation selected the modern conventional suit from all the styles in history as the most becoming and comfortable to mankind. We sorta copied, didn't we? Perhaps we did not deliberately copy any certain person, but still we copied even if it was "folks in general." And who would ever think that the rebellious segment of our generation's youth chose, without regard to one another or the hair styles of their contemporaries, long and shaggy hair? Because it is pretty? Feels good? Manly? No. Mostly copy-cats... and most of them do not even know they are copy-cats.

Let me repeat that this is not an indictment against imitating others. But do let us be conscious of the fact that we are all imitators of others to varying degrees and with varying degrees of awareness about the copying we do. But it does raise the question as to who we imitate, and why. The answer to this question can tell you a great deal about your
personal character and the direction in which your life is headed.

We tend to imitate most those from whom we would most like to have approval, and those who impress us and thereby somewhat idealize what we would like to be. This is why it is so important as to who our "heroes" are, and why it is such an index to our character. We cannot admire the profane and ungodly in their sin, vainly attempting to minimize their wrongs because we "like" them, without being profoundly affected. Check the moral and spiritual fiber, to the extent you are able to discern it, of the people you most "look up to." Doesn't that tell you something about yourself? And what effect does their weakness have on you, that is, do you make allowances for them or rather earnestly long for them to make a penitent correction. Why we admire is about as important as who.

Paul urged a deliberate and conscious imitation of good men in the right: "Be imitators of me, just as I also am of Christ" (I Cor. 11:1, NASV). The same point and principle is made over and again (I Cor. 4:16; Eph. 5:11; II Thess. 3:7) and one of the great values of sacred history is to supply us with an acquaintance with genuinely great and winsome men. It is hard to imagine anyone really coming to know Jonathan, for example, without loving and admiring him. And it rubs off. The admiration affects us for the good. And what of Job? Or Nehemiah? Or Esther or Ruth? And what of the humble, faithful, and genuinely good people of our own generation who serve the living God above all other considerations?

As an example to others and an imitator of others, both of which you are, exercise the greatest care of which you are capable. God forbid that because someone thought enough of you and paid you the high compliment of shaping their life a little after yours, that they were morally or spiritually injured thereby. Make it redound to the eternal good of that one who thinks so much of you as to become more like you. As an imitator, set your eyes on those who will strengthen and make you better, and as your chief exemplar enthrone in your heart our Lord Jesus and become more like him.
Obedience to the gospel of Christ. This would make him a false teacher and unworthy of the fellowship of the saints (II John 9, 10). There must be some line of separation between obedience and disobedience, but it is hard to find that line when one hears or reads what Carl Ketcherside teaches. No matter what subject he may discuss, his true position bleeds through the colorful speeches and written pages. This position is the universal fellowship of all who have been baptized into Christ, regardless of their involvement in denominational error and spiritual corruption. Even the unimmersed who believe in Christ are considered his brethren in prospect. His teaching on the subject has forced him to extend the right hand of fellowship to his "brother in prospect" in the embryonic state. He does not want to accept the consequences of his position, but where else can he go?

**THE KETCHERSIDE DOCTRINE**

In the February issue of *Searching The Scriptures* I wrote the first of what was to be three articles dealing with Carl Ketcherside's abuse and misuse of figures of relationship a Christian sustains to God. My doctor brought to a halt my work in this direction and I had to shelve my original intention. I shall not try to continue a review or examination of the figures he abused in that exchange with Robert Turner in the late evening of January 25, 1972 in the University church building in Tampa, Florida. The exchange of positions on "fellowship" and related subjects between Ketcherside and Turner was further discussed by a panel consisting of Ferrell Jenkins and Harry Pickup, Jr. in addition to Ketcherside and Turner. (This entire exchange together with questions and answers from the floor is available on tape from Phillips Publications.)

An attempt to continue the series from last February would not be very fruitful because of the interval of several months between the first article and one that would appear now as a continuation of the original theme. Instead I shall give some attention to another gross error Ketcherside uses in his deception all over this nation.

I do not profess to know the heart of any person or to understand his motives except by his fruits or his words which plainly tell of his motives. But I believe it is so apparent that I need not argue the point that Carl Ketcherside's misuse of scriptural figures and terms has been used to justify his teaching and practice of joining forces with all forms of theological perverts and misfits in a yoke of "fellowship." He vehemently denies that he is a part of any splinter, wing, movement or segment of religious thought, yet he seeks ways and means of "joining them in fellowship" and attempts to justify it by the word of God.

I wish to restate my personal attitude toward Carl W. Ketcherside for the benefit of new readers. As I stated in the February, 1972 article, he has a pleasant disposition and a congenial personality. From all I have seen of him he is a kind and pleasant man; a neat and dignified gentleman. All of this, however, is not enough to establish scriptural fellowship with him in the work of the Lord. Many men have these desirable qualities who are far from being servants of Christ who are led by the Spirit.

Carl Ketcherside's arguments on a number of views that are peculiar to him would produce dis-
WHAT THE LOVE OF GOD REQUIRES

A lawyer once asked Jesus the following question as he tempted him: "Master, which is the great commandment in the law?" Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. The second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Matt. 22:36-39).

The one question with which I am concerned in this study is what does man’s love for God require of him? We know that man must love God with all his heart, all his soul, all his strength, and all his mind (Luke 10:27), but what does all this mean?

My love for God requires three things of me that even Carl Ketcherside would not deny, I don’t think.

First, I must love His Son Jesus Christ above all others upon earth (Matt. 10:37). This love for Christ is shown by obedience to his commandments (John 14:15,24). In light of these verses, how can I claim to love God and not love His Son by obeying his sayings?

If one should teach another gospel (Gal. 1:6-9), or bring another doctrine (II John 9,10), how could I embrace him in his error and still claim I love Christ? This will not be answered by saying that one must have perfect and complete knowledge to obey all the will of Christ. We are to grow in the knowledge of the Lord, and no one can justly claim to have perfect and perfect knowledge of the will of God. This is a long way from saying that the lack of complete knowledge is equal to Christ approving disobedience to his revealed will.

Second, I must love the word of God. II Thessalonians 2:10-12 tells of the destiny of those who believe a lie because they had not the love of the truth. We are to exhort one another to love and to do good works (Heb. 10:24). John 15:10 says: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love." Again, "But, whoso keepeth his word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby know we that we are in him. He that saith he abideth in him ought himself also so to walk, even as he walked" (I John 2:5,6). "And this is love, that we walk after his commandments" (II John 6).

The word of God must be loved before one can scripturally claim to love God. The word of the truth will not allow men to walk in their own ways and still claim fellowship with God and those who love His word and obey it.

Third, I must love the children of God. This would be my brethren in the Lord by virtue of obedience to the word of Christ. If one does not walk in this truth, he is not subject to the same God I serve. John 13:34,35 teaches that we are to love one another as he loved us, and by this love all men would know that we are his disciples. But we must remember that love for God requires love for the truth. And love for the truth requires obedience to it.

Carl Ketcherside’s views on this subject and his misuse of the word "love" is responsible for many believing that love for the person will allow for the lack of love and respect for the word of God by not obeying it. Those who use instruments of music in worship cannot do it by the authority of God’s word. But Carl says “fellowship” them anyway! "They are the sons of God, and my brothers." There is no ground for having fellowship with those who do not love and obey the truth.

This is just one of the things wrong with the ideas from the pen and speeches of Carl Ketcherside and Leroy Garrett that have caused so many troubled churches and individuals where they have spread this doctrine which has no foundation in the word of God.

I have said what I believe to be truth and in the spirit that I believe is required of the Lord. Next month I have more to say about love as it is defined and used by the Holy Spirit.
ARROWS of TRUTH for denominational error

Ward Hogland
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"NO DEAD ISSUE — No. 2"

This is the second in a series on the above title. The first dealt with an article by brother Gus Nichols. Brother Nichols advocated the support of orphan homes under boards of directors from church treasuries. He used the old "home argument" in trying to sustain his position. You may read his article in last month's paper. The article this month is by brother Ruel Lemmons and is entirely different. It forcefully condemns the support of orphan homes under a board of directors. I shall have very little comment on the article because I believe brother Lemmons spoke with Bible authority in practically everything he wrote. I want to make it crystal clear that I have nothing personally against either of these brethren. I know them both and have no "ax to grind" with either man. However, I also want to make it clear that a vast contradiction exists between these men who are supposedly standing together. In a third article I plan to discuss the difference between these two articles. I have a personal letter from brother Lemmons saying he has never opposed orphan homes — Neither has Ward Hogland. He also says he has never opposed colleges — Neither has Ward Hogland! But what brother Lemmons failed to tell in his letter is that he does OPPOSE the church donating to orphan homes and colleges under boards of directors — So does Ward Hogland. So brother Lemmons needs to clear the air. There is one thing about brother Lemmons article which needs to be corrected. It is implied that an eldership may engage in a, brotherhood benevolent program. This is entirely without Bible foundation. The Bible allows elders in a local congregation to ONLY take care of the benevolence at the congregation where they are elders. They have no right nor authority to engage in general benevolence or in trying to do the benevolent work of other congregations (see Acts 6 and Acts 11). Just because it is scriptural for elders to oversee the benevolent work of their home congregation does not give them the authority to collect money for a brotherhood work! Now read and enjoy this fine article by brother Lemmons:

BENEVOLENCE AND EDUCATION

Recent months have seen a revival of the effort to seek church support of "our" colleges, and to "put the college in the budget of every church." This issue seems to be like the liquor issue; you can put it down, but it will come up at the next election. It is not difficult to expose, but because of the personal interest of a minority in a purely personal project the issue keeps coming up. Unless it is opposed as often as it comes up, it will ultimately win out.

We wish here to write about only one angle to the problem: the existence of a Board of Trustees. This board is inevitably universal. Our brethren have always preached that any organization larger than the local church and smaller than the church universal is an unscriptural church organization. This is the basis on which they have opposed the missionary society and the other "boards" of the Christian church. Now, a college board, or an orphan home board for that matter, is larger than the local church and it is smaller than the church universal. Is it, or is it not, an unscriptural "church arrangement"?

Usually when the "board" question is mentioned church leaders reply with a non-committal "Well, I have thought about that and there are two sides to the question." Are there, really? Or is this just another way of refusing to face up to really determining whether these boards are scriptural arrangements through which the church can do its work or not. We have never met anyone who would seriously attempt to justify the existence of these boards by the scriptures. The only attempt has been to divorce the works being done under boards from the work of the church. We simply cannot see how churches could then be obligated to support a work which is not their work.

We surely have no objection to the existence of a Bible college. And we have no objection to its being operated under a board. Any private enterprise has a right to be operated in this way. And we call these "private colleges." If this designation be true, then upon what scriptural grounds can they appeal to churches for support? Unless a church can support a work that is not its own, through a board which is larger than the local congregation and smaller than the church universal, then colleges are not eligible for church treasury funds. Individuals can, and should, support them, as they would support any other educational enterprise.

This is the reason why we have opposed the operation of children's homes under boards rather than elderships. We believe that caring for orphans is a work of the church, and should be supported by the church. If it can be done under a board with church support, then let us first apologize to the Christian church for opposition to boards, and establish boards under which we can do all charity work, missionary work, retirement work, educational work, hospital work, and a dozen other works. By now, we are used to the old bromide, "He is opposed to orphans homes." That is an untruth. We are opposed to boards, interposed between the church and its work. First let us establish that a work of the church; then let that work be done by the church through and under its elders. This we believe to be safe.

It seems to be the most difficult thing in the world to get brethren to really face this board issue and resolve it. They seem to want it this way and they intend to have it this way. We who have always attempted to speak where the Bible speaks and be
silent where the Bible is silent should be willing to study this board issue and resolve it. It is wholly possible that we have overlooked something, and that our opposition to boards is not legitimate. We would be happy to be shown our error. Just address yourself to the task of proving by the Scriptures that boards are a scriptural arrangement through which the church can do its work. If this can be proven, all opposition to the arrangement will cease, and, as an added serendipity, we will, after we have apologized to the Christian church for a century of opposition to them, find ourselves much nearer union with them. These boards are either scriptural or unscriptural; right or wrong. We ought to be able to decide which. It is not right to ignore the issue because it is the basis of much contention. Let's settle down to the task of settling it once and for all. This is a relatively simple issue, and it ought to be resolved.

If it be resolved that such boards are legitimate, then opposition to church support of colleges on this point at least would be settled. There would be other issues to solve, but if we could solve this one it would be a start. And if it be determined that such boards are not to be interposed between the church and its work, then we would dissolve the boards we have and put the work these separate corporations are doing back under the elders of the church. Reuel Lemmons, Firm Foundation March 21, 1972

The Bible warns of the deadly effects of hatred. Jesus taught us to love our enemies, not hate them (Matt. 5:43,44). Paul said that before his conversion, he and others were "hateful, and hating one another" (Titus 3:3). John tells us that if we hate our brethren we are walking in darkness rather than light (1 John 2:9-11). He even says that hatred is a form of murder. Hear him, "Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer: and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him" (1 John 3:15).

In his book "None Of These Diseases," Dr. S. I. McMillen makes the following comment concerning hatred. Study it carefully:

"The moment I start hating a man, I become his slave. I can't enjoy my work any more because he even controls my thoughts. My resentments produce too many stress hormones in my body and I become fatigued after only a few hours of work. The work I formerly enjoyed is now drudgery. Even vacations cease to give me pleasure. It may be a luxurious car that I drive along a lake fringed with the autumnal beauty of maple, oak and birch. As far as my experience of pleasure is concerned, I might as well be driving a wagon in mud and rain.

"The man I hate hounds me wherever I go. I can't escape his tyrannical grasp on my mind. When the waiter serves me porterhouse steak with French fries, asparagus, crisp salad, and strawberry shortcake smothered with ice cream, it might as well be stale bread and water. My teeth chew the food and I swallow it, but the man I hate will not permit me to enjoy it.

"King Solomon must have had a similar experience, for he wrote: "Better a dish of vegetables, with love, than the best beef served with hatred" (Prov. 15:17, Moffatt).

"The man I hate may be many miles from my bedroom; but more cruel than any slave driver, he whips my thoughts into such a frenzy that my innerspring mattress becomes a rack of torture. The lowliest of the serfs can sleep, but not I. I really must acknowledge the fact that I am a slave to every man on whom I pour the vials of my wrath."

A few weeks ago I preached in a series of gospel meetings for the church in Sumter, S.C. The congregation is composed primarily of men who are stationed at Shaw AFB, and their families. Although small in number (about fifty members), I found them to be zealous, well informed, and dedicated to
the cause of Christ. They had one practice which I found rather unique and interesting, and the reason why I'm writing this.

At the beginning of each service, the song leader would call the names of all members who were not present and tell why. Yes, believe it or not, that's right. I was impressed. Some were sick, some on duty, etc., but it seemed that all had a reason for being absent. I just thought that if such were practiced in most congregations there would not be time for the rest of the service! And then you would have a number offended because their names were called. Of course they would be those who could and should have been present. I have learned that those who could and should but didn't are the ones who do most of the complaining anyway.

But why not name those who are absent? The faithful will appreciate it, for they want others to know why they are absent; and the unfaithful need to be reproved, rebuked and exhorted.

An editorial in the Vatican newspaper recently acknowledged that "Pope Paul VI was being criticized by priests and laymen, but contended that he was ultimately responsible only to God." The article was unusual in its admission that the present deep dissent exists, a fact which has long been disregarded by the Vatican.

Referring to protests against pontifical decisions, the editorial said, "The Pope must suffer from such lack of understanding, but this does not induce him to change his conduct in the pastoral leadership of the church." The editorial also declared, "The last word regarding the leadership of the church, the universal pastor (the Pope) receives from his conscience as successor of Peter, as center of unity and charity, as custodian of truth." They stated that his mandate came from Jesus.

This is further evidence that millions of Catholics, including many in the Roman hierarchy, no longer believe in the infallibility of the pope. If they did, there would be no rebellion nor criticism of his decisions. A word from him would settle such controversies as what to eat, birth control and celibacy, and obviate the councils and conventions wherein they endeavor to ascertain truth.

Beyond doubt, the doctrine of the papacy is the greatest hoax ever perpetrated on the world. There is absolutely no evidence in the New Testament that Peter occupied such a position, or that the apostles were to have successors. The church is built upon Christ (Matt. 16:18; I Cor. 3:11; I Peter 2:6-8). Christ is the only head of the only church he ever built, and he has all authority (Matt. 28:18; Eph. 1:22,23).

If there is ever an appropriate time for me to use the sword of the Spirit, it is when an attack is made upon it. Such was done in an article "The Book Almost Nobody Reads" by Frederick Buechner in the September Reader's Digest. Ironically, he was writing in defense of the Bible. One reason why so many people don't read the Bible is that they have the same attitude toward it which he expressed in his article. For example, consider the following statement:

"In short, one way to describe the Bible, written by many different hands over a period of 3000 years and more, would be to say that it is a disorderly collection of 60-odd books which are often tedious, barbaric, obscure and teeming with contradictions and inconsistencies. It is a swarming compost of a book, an Irish stew of poetry and propaganda, law and legalism, myth and murk, history and hysteria."

With friends like that, the Bible doesn't need any enemies! After making a statement like that, he goes ahead to recommend it, and much of what he says is good.

The Bible either came from God or it did not. If it did not, there is no profit in reading and obeying it. If it did, then it is not filled with "contradictions and inconsistencies" for God is not the author of confusion (I Cor. 14:33). The "contradictions" in the Bible stem from ignorance or unbelief on the part of the reader.

WITH FRIENDS LIKE HIM — WHO NEEDS ENEMIES?

Recently I received a copy of MISSION magazine containing an article by Neal Buffaloe entitled "Frauds, Fools and Freedom" in which he took some very unusual positions for a "Christian" (?). Now for those who may not know who Neal Buffaloe is, he is an elder in the College church of Christ in Conway, Arkansas and a Biology teacher (who believes in Theistic Evolution) at State College of Arkansas located in Conway. The article has a very heavy aroma of Ketcherside's doctrine on fellowship. In this article, I want to examine several of the statements of brother Buffaloe.

In the first few paragraphs he relates the story of a young lady who is a Christian coming to him to talk about her fiancé, who was a Catholic, about the doctrine of Transubstantiation. She was wanting some good Bible arguments in favor of truth. Brother Buffaloe said I asked her, "Let me ask you something, Joyce. Do you really think Landon's present views on Transubstantiation are all that important?" I thought her reply was a good one. But brother Buffaloe simply brushed it aside ... well, see for yourself what was said. "Why I hadn't thought about that," she answered taken aback somewhat. "But it seems to me that if the Church of Christ is the true church, and if it teaches what the Bible teaches, then Transubstantiation is a
false doctrine. Landon doesn't see how he could come into the Church of Christ if he disagrees with its doctrines. And I don't either." Now I ask you, doesn't that sound like good logical, scriptural teaching? But no, brother Buffaloe is not going to let it go at that. He then proceeds to show why she should not worry about it. He begins with the same old line of argumentation that brethren have used for hundreds of years when they want to show their true colors in trying to "soft-soap" the scriptures. He said, "Do you mean a person cannot find salvation unless he acquiesces in every point with 'Church of Christ doctrine?'"

To this answer the young lady replied, "No, I'm sure we all disagree on some points. But it seems to me where we are unanimously agreed on some doctrine like this one, that makes it official, so to speak, and all I'm trying to find out is how to defend our doctrines."

Now it seems to me that this young lady was a very honest seeker for truth, but she certainly came to the wrong person for help. For even according to his own admission he said, "It was an honest cry from the heart. We talked on for some time, and I'm afraid I left the poor girl in a very confused state of mind." Isn't that pathetic that the devil has men afraid I left the poor girl in a very confused state of mind. Now no friend might be right, he used the following line of reasoning by Alexander Campbell. He said, "And how can I reconcile the inconsistency that, although this person is a veritable model of Christ-likeness, he would not be invited to fill any pulpit in the brotherhood? How do we manage to swallow this kind of exclusivism while extending the hand of fellowship to every selfish, unloving, unchristlike baptized-for-the-remission-of-sins individual who darkens the door of any building that says 'Church of Christ' over that door?" To answer brother Buffaloe's question I would simply say that I do not know of anyone who would be willing to extend the hand of fellowship to any unchristlike, unloving, selfish person. If, however, he had been baptized for the remission of sins, at least he would be a Christian whereas the person who is a Methodist is not a Christian, for he has not received the remission of sins. If therefore, I came to know a person who was a Christian who had the kind of attitude that brother Buffaloe describes, I would try to teach him the truth on the points mentioned. If he would not listen I would be for withdrawing from him.

Brother Buffaloe quoted Alexander Campbell's Lunenburg letter (or at least a part of it) in an effort to try to substantiate his point. Campbell said in the letter that if he could find a Baptist whose life more generally conformed to the requisitions of the Messiah, who was more spiritually minded than one who had been immersed for the remission of sins, his approbation and love as a Christian would be for the former rather than the latter. The point that brother Buffaloe fails to recognize is the fact that BOTH he and Campbell are wrong.

**MATTHEW 9:38-40**

Brother Buffaloe said that "perhaps Campbell was thinking of still another of Jesus' expressions on the subject of exclusivism" and cited Matthew 9:38-40. But, brother Buffaloe missed the point on this also. Christ was not saying that this person was not a disciple of his, but those disciples who were closely associated with Jesus said that he was not among them. However, Jesus made many disciples, even more than John according to John 4:1-2. But, to equate this person with a Methodist or Catholic, who has not accepted the gospel of Christ and been obedient to Christ's commands that he might receive the remission of sins, is foolish indeed. For, we know from the scriptures that a sinner could not perform such miracles. This is exactly what the Pharisees accused Jesus of being when he healed the blind man in John 9:31. And this is exactly what the man who had been blind said could not be so. "For we know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshipper of his, and doeth his will, him he heareth." So, not only does brother Buffaloe fail to understand or else mis-applies the scriptures.

Now, on the basis of his understanding of Mark 9:38-39 and what Mr. Campbell said brother Buffaloe concludes, "If this was my Lord's attitude, how then shall I say that my Methodist and Catholic friends are not his followers?" Well, of course he
Brother Buffaloe concludes his article by talking about the elders and their right to rule in matters over which brethren may disagree. He says, "It seems to me that specific doctrinal problems can be handled by elders at the local level without resorting to the official party line approach. For example, I do not consider it inconsistent that I recognize my Methodist friend as a fellow Christian — if I did not do so, I could lay no claim to being one myself — while agreeing with my fellow elders that we must insist upon immersion for membership in the local congregation." Now seeing is believing. However, it would have been very difficult for me to believe that a person who claims to be a Christian, an elder, and a preacher of the gospel, could have made such a statement. That is Baptist doctrine pure and simple. Not only has brother Buffaloe and his "fellow elders" gone beyond the doctrine of Christ in accepting one who has had water sprinkled on him and called that scriptural baptism, but now they have invented a purpose for baptism that God has not authorized. God never intended for baptism to be a requirement for one who is a Christian to have to submit to in order to get into the local congregation. That is a perversion of the Scriptures. John said, "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God" (II John 9). The thing that really hurts is the fact that a man in brother Buffaloe’s position could use his influence to do so much good for the cause of Christ. Instead, according to his own admission, they are more confused AFTER they discuss the Bible with him than they were BEFORE they came. So, with friends like that, the Lord doesn't need any enemies.

"And inasmuch as it is appointed for men to die once, and after this comes judgment; so Christ also, having been offered once to bear the sins of many, shall appear a second time, not to bear sin, to those who eagerly await Him, for salvation" (Hebrews 9:27,28 NASB).

Hebrews begins almost with mention of the priestly work of our Lord who "made purification of sins" (1:3). Chapter two concludes with mention again of His priestly work, and encourages His people to come to Him for help (2:17,18). Chapter three begins by calling the readers to "consider Jesus, the High Priest of our confession" (3:1). Christ's priesthood is legitimate, having come through divine appointment (ch. 5). But it is "after the order of Melchizedek, and is based on the Lord's "power of an indestructible life" (ch. 7). The main point to be made, however, is that Christ's priestly work takes place in heaven itself — the true sanctuary erected by the Lord and not man, and that this heavenly service is based on the better promises of a new covenant" (ch. 8).

"The first covenant had regulations of divine worship and the earthly sanctuary" (9:1), but our great priest offers in heaven a sacrifice able to take away sins. "Through His own blood, He entered the holy place once for all, having obtained eternal redemption" (9:12). This is the context of the beginning quotation of our article. Christ was offered "once," and will not be offered again. To make this point, our author calls attention first to the general state of man, then to the specific case of Christ. Finally he speaks of His second coming, under the figure of the high priest on the Day of Atonement.

LIFE, DEATH AND JUDGMENT

Each human being must live, die and be judged. Furthermore, he must live, die and be judged — in that order. And finally he must live, die and be judged — but only once. The life once lived can never be repeated when ended by death. Death can not happen but one time because life is not repeated. And judgment will happen only one time for each man because his life once lived needs but one judgment. What is true of mankind in general is true also of Christ, for He became in every regard as His brethren, excepting sin.

But Christ’s case involved more than the life, death and judgment of one ordinary man. For in every respect His was a representative case. He was standing in for others. He was the second Adam, mankind’s second and last chance for salvation. As the Israelites and Philistines once sent representative warriors to battle, entrusting with those two men their respective destinies as a whole, so mankind is represented in the person of the Christ. What happens to Him will count for all His people.

Jesus lived one life, and it was for all men. He was given a human body for that life; in it He prepared a human record perfectly acceptable to the Father. He came to do the will of God and, in that body, did it fully (10:1-9). Jesus died but one time, and that death was for all men. He was "offered once, to bear the sins of many" (9:28). Jesus was judged for that life, and that judgment was for all who would be His. For Jesus, having died, "entered into heaven itself to appear in the presence of God for us" (9:24).

This figure is exceedingly rich. The Old Testament high priest entered the second tent with the sacrifices of the Day of Atonement. With this blood of animals he came before God — but always behind a veiling cloud of smoke (Lev. 16:11-13). Christ entered heaven itself — with His own life-offering — and directly "in the presence of God." It is no small matter to face God for judgment. When Christ was "judged," His life-sacrifice was examined by Him before whom "all things are open and laid bare" (4:13). Every thought and motive, every secret or public action, every word spoken — all was examined carefully by the Father. On this verdict would rest the final hope of every lost sinner. Our high priest entered into God’s presence to appear for us.
THE PEOPLE WAITING

Under the law, the people waited outside while the priests offered sacrifices on their behalf. When the priest returned the people knew the offering had been accepted. When Zacharias was delayed in the temple by the appearance of Gabriel, "the people were waiting, and were wondering at his delay." (Luke 1:21). Well might they be uneasy, for their waiting, and were wondering at his delay"

If this anticipation accompanied ordinary offerings, it was enormously intensified on the great Day of Atonement. One Jewish writing from before the time of Christ describes the waiting for the high priest on that occasion.

> Then all flesh hasted together
> And fell upon their faces to the earth,
> To worship before the Most High,
> Before the Holy One of Israel.
> And the sound of the song was heard,
> And over the multitude they made sweet melody:
> And all the people of the land cried In prayer before the Merciful, Until he had finished the service of the altar And His ordinances had brought him nigh unto Him.

The next lines describe the joy of the people when the high priest came safely out to tell the people that they were forgiven by God.

> Then he descended, and lifted up his hands
> Upon the whole congregation of Israel; And the blessing of the Lord was upon his lips, And he glorified himself with the name of the Lord.
> And again they fell down, now to receive The pardon of the Lord from him.

Our high priest has remained in the heavenly sanctuary to mediate perpetually for His people on the basis of His single offering. But He has sent a messenger ahead to His waiting people, telling them that the offering was received by God! His people are "saved to the uttermost!" Jesus had said He would send this messenger (John 15:26); on the Day of Pentecost the good news came (Acts 2:32-36): Remission of sins is fully guaranteed in Jesus' name! As another apostle would later write, "There is there-

The great potential for Christ at Perkins Rd., the attitude of the Tolles, which is seen in their letter, and the crying need for a gospel preacher there influenced my wife and I to move to Baton Rouge by the end of June, 1972. We fully know that no money has been promised or indicated by any Christian or church for my wages, but we are going to Baton Rouge. I will do the work of a faithful proclaimer for our Lord and Saviour in that city. The Perkins Rd. church is not able financially to contribute anything toward my wages yet, but I believe the brethren and churches will respond to my need for wages and money to cover my moving expense.

The Building

The money collected presently by the Perkins Rd. Church pays the $255.36 monthly payment on her building, which only has a $6,300.00 remaining debt, the building utilities, and the cost for some teaching material. Two families (5 in attendance) are doing their best to handle these absolute costs.

The building is located in a growing section of Baton Rouge. It will seat comfortably 160 to 175 people and would conservatively have a replacement cost of $40,000 to $50,000. The building has 4 classrooms, the auditorium, an empty space for another classroom, an adequate preacher's study, and a nursery.

The Money Future

At least five years must pass before the church will even be close to what is called self-supporting. By God's help, much work, much prayer, and declaring "unto all the counsel of God," we will be self-sustaining and a tower of spiritual strength. Peace and fellowship does exist between this church and the church where brother Bill Crews preach.

What Happened to the Perkins Rd. Church?

The Tolles described well the attitude seen in "certain actions" which started the church where Bill Crews works and slowly diminished a 70 plus attendance down to two families, now numbering five in attendance!! Digesting such unscriptural "certain actions," weak pulpit preaching, unscriptural leadership, and the ideas of brother W. Carl Ketcherside, where else could the Perkins Rd. Church go but to hobnobbing with the liberals ? The Tolles described well the attitude seen in "certain actions" which started the church where Bill Crews preach.

REGAINS HER SENSES

George T. Eldridge

The Tolles described well the attitude seen in "certain actions" which started the church where Bill Crews works and slowly diminished a 70 plus attendance down to two families, now numbering five in attendance!! Digesting such unscriptural "certain actions," weak pulpit preaching, unscriptural leadership, and the ideas of brother W. Carl Ketcherside, where else could the Perkins Rd. Church go but to hobnobbing with the liberals ? The teaching of brother Ketcherside is many sided, but please read his own written word to an admirer of his at Perkins Road.

"When we arise above the artificial walls and barriers and begin to love all of the brethren, God can give us a whole new dimension of service and he will. We must simply ignore the di-
visiness and factionalism of the past and refuse to be trapped inside the narrow enclosures which men have built... A great door has been opened to witness to Baptist folk, sincere, eager, and seeking!"

Even with brother Ketcherside's "speech of Ashdod" and having gone to "the plain of Ono," what conclusion is drawn from his writing? You don't love the brethren when you point out their rejection of Bible authority by their practices, for example, if instrumental music, centralized control, sponsoring church cooperation, churches building and maintaining man-made organizations, one container in the Lord's Supper, or Premillennialism.

This admirer of brother Ketcherside and the two young preachers of Perkins Road, who were Ken R. Durham and Lynn McCauley, attended the A.C.C. lectures together and heard his unity speech, "Authority of the Word." He then wrote brother Ketcherside March 2, 1971 these words, "You really impressed Ken and Lynn. They have already been to see Max Goins at Calvary Christian Church and he invited Lynn to speak there on a Sunday evening.

They are also swapping pulpits with two of the other ministers of churches of Christ in town. They were very impressed with the black minister and he is going to swap out with one of them this month. When I told our 'double-trouble' team they were not letting any grass grow under their feet, Lynn said, 'We've got to put all this trivia aside and get on with it. How about that?'

The "double-trouble team" of Ken and Lynn had the right environment at Perkins Rd. to make certain no grass grew under their feet. The church was soft. She would tolerate error. She wanted unity at any price. Men of the stature of B. Hall Davis and Thomas Smitheman had left. These false teachers (Ken and Lynn) could view "make all things according to the pattern" as "trivia" (Heb. 8:5). Imagine so-called preachers calling the pattern for (1) music in the church, (2) church work, (3) church worship, (4) church fellowship, or (5) church cooperation as "trivia.

The false teachers got on with their ship, (4) church fellowship, or (5) church cooperation, churches building and maintaining man-made organizations, one container in the Lord's Supper, or Premillennialism.

This admirer of brother Ketcherside and the two young preachers of Perkins Road, who were Ken R. Durham and Lynn McCauley, attended the A.C.C. lectures together and heard his unity speech, "Authority of the Word." He then wrote brother Ketcherside March 2, 1971 these words, "You really impressed Ken and Lynn. They have already been to see Max Goins at Calvary Christian Church and he invited Lynn to speak there on a Sunday evening.

They are also swapping pulpits with two of the other ministers of churches of Christ in town. They were very impressed with the black minister and he is going to swap out with one of them this month. When I told our 'double-trouble' team they were not letting any grass grow under their feet, Lynn said, 'We've got to put all this trivia aside and get on with it. How about that?'

The "double-trouble team" of Ken and Lynn had the right environment at Perkins Rd. to make certain no grass grew under their feet. The church was soft. She would tolerate error. She wanted unity at any price. Men of the stature of B. Hall Davis and Thomas Smitheman had left. These false teachers (Ken and Lynn) could view "make all things according to the pattern" as "trivia" (Heb. 8:5).

Imagine so-called preachers calling the pattern for (1) music in the church, (2) church work, (3) church worship, (4) church fellowship, or (5) church cooperation as "trivia." The false teachers got on with their work and destroyed the church more, but the Perkins Road Church had asked for it!!!

The church kept going down and down before the Tolles awakened. When they did get scripturally aroused it was too late. The congregation was in shambles! The church now has seven in attendance, counting my wife and I.

The Perkins Rd. congregation is a classic example of what happens when softness is permitted, error is tolerated, truth is compromised, "chief men among the brethren" are not Bible leaders, pulpit preaching is weak, immature men fill the pulpit, and unity at any price is desired. "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?" I Cor. 5:6.

Church's Present Attitude

She will now "hold fast the form of sound words ... in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus" (II Tim. 1:13). We know we are small in number, but we want all faithful Christians coming to Baton Rouge to work with us. The lazy, the unconcerned, and the indifferent person should not want to come our way because we need workers to labour with us in filling our present building with saved sinners. Our location is easy to find: I-10 & College Drive; 4270 Perkins Road; near Colonel Sanders; less than four minutes off I-10.

The City

Baton Rouge is called the "Growth Center of the South." Her population is a growing 200,000. She has four main pillars to her economy: She (1) is the state capital of Louisiana, (2) is the center of one of the world's largest petrochemical areas, (3) is home of two large state universities: Louisiana State University and Southern University, and (4) has a major world port.

Industrial Complex. The petrochemical center of the South, the growing industrial development along the Mississippi River is based on petroleum, but it claims chemicals, rubber, plastics, light and heavy metals and other products. At least 150 manufacturers employ 18,500 people.

Port of Baton Rouge. It is the seventh largest port in the nation. It is the farthest inland deep water port on the Mississippi. It serves both deep water and river transportation. Vessels from many countries berth here.

Need

Brethren, pray for me. I need your financial assistance for my wages and to pay my moving expense (II Cor. 11:8; II Tim. 1:16-18). Also, tracts are needed. I know you will respond because we serve the same God, are guided by the same Bible, are interested in the lost souls of men, and want to go to Heaven together. Also, you answered the call when I authored an article about the new church in Monroe, Louisiana, which concerned H. Tom Swilley.

I await your answer.

P. O. Box 52964
Lafayette, La. 70501

Parksdale church of Christ, 29111 Avenue 13 1/2, Madera, Calif. 93637 — We are in need of a full time preacher for the Parksdale congregation of Madera, California. Anyone interested please contact: Doyle Webster, 1500 W. 5th St., Madera, Calif. 93637, phone (209) 674-4369 or Burt Bridges, 28881 Avenue 13, Madera, Calif. 93637, Phone (209) 674-4288.
Herb Braswell, 1280 Dodson Way, Sparks, Nev. 89431 — The church in Grass Valley, California, is looking for a preacher to work with them on a full time basis. I have been preaching for the church there since the first of this year, driving over every weekend from Reno, Nevada. This Dec. 19th I plan on moving to Georgia, Lord willing. The men of the congregation feel that it would be best for the Grass Valley church to have a full time preacher. This church is made up of about eight families, so the church is not able to supply full support for the preacher. The preacher who moves here will have to arrange to have most of his financial support provided by another church or churches. This church has a nice frame building that seats about one hundred people, and is nearly debt free. Any man that could move to Grass Valley should contact Arthur Montgomery, Rt. 2, Box 2626, Auburn, Calif. 95603; phone (916) 885-7464; or Ray Clanton, 143 Walker Dr., Grass Valley, Calif. 95945. After January 1, I will be available for full or part time preaching work in the Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, or Florida areas. My address is now, 1280 Dodson Way, Sparks, Nevada 89431; and after Dec. 19th, it will be Rt. 1, Waco, Georgia 30182.

JACK FROST, SR. MEMORIAL FUND

Several years ago we began compiling stories of interesting, amusing, or unusual events in the lives of gospel preachers. Such a collection was the ambition of Jack Frost, Sr. He thoroughly enjoyed a good story, especially the true situations of men who labor in the gospel. Before he was able to execute his plan to collect and publish this compilation he was carried from this life. Since then we, members of his family, have tried to bring this desire to fruition.

After many unavoidable and frustrating delays, the material has been collected and prepared for printing. However, as we weigh the cost of publication with the good the same amount of money could do in other areas, we have second thoughts. It is our decision now, as being that which would please him, to establish a memorial fund with Florida College to provide loan funds to young men desiring a college education in their preparation to preach the gospel. This does not mean that the book project will be abandoned. The material will appear as a column in the Gospel Guardian, and at a later date if there is a demand it then can be published under separate cover.

We take this opportunity to thank all who have contributed "stories," and hope that the above arrangement is satisfactory.

Florida College has opened an account for the "Jack Frost, Sr. Memorial Fund." We hope that this fund will be of benefit to many young men, enabling them to further their education.

— The family of Jack Frost, Sr.

B. G. Echols, 5 Marwood Drive, Poughkeepsie, New York 12601 — We recently had a young couple worship with us who have moved to Connecticut. They are interested in contacting any brethren desirous of starting a sound church in that state. If you are interested or know of anyone who is, please contact me at the above address or phone: (914) 462-4788.

Thomas Hogland, Central church of Christ, P.O. Box 116, Charlotte, Tenn. 37036 — I have just moved from Dallas, Texas where I worked with the St. Augustine Drive church of Christ to begin laboring with these fine brethren in Charlotte. I look forward to a prosperous and very enjoyable association with this congregation. If you are in the Charlotte area, drop in and visit us.
While water baptism is one of the simplest subjects taught in the New Testament, it remains to be one of the most misunderstood and disputed Biblical subjects. There has been no small amount of controversy and disputation over the action of baptism, whether it is sprinkling, pouring or immersion and also over the purpose and design of water baptism. It shall not, however, be our burden in this article to consider these foregoing disputed aspects of water baptism, but rather an aspect that is characterized by an equal amount of disputation — whether or not baptism is necessary for the salvation of the alien sinner. Perhaps you have heard gospel preachers teach that water baptism is necessary for salvation but have not been fully convinced because you believe that the objections to water baptism being essential are valid. It shall be our design in this article to consider some of these objections to water baptism being necessary and see if they are worthy of our entertainment.

"WE ARE NOT SAVED BY WORKS AND BAPTISM IS A WORK"

Many contend that baptism cannot be necessary for man's salvation because if it were, man would be saved by works! Friends, I say kindly but candidly that those who reason thus do not understand what the New Testament teaches concerning works. Beloved, the New Testament does teach that we are not saved by the works of the Old Law, Rom. 11:6, neither are we saved by our own works (works of our own creation), Eph. 2:8-9, Tit. 3:5. But under which heading would water baptism be found? Certainly, none would contend that water baptism is an Old Testament work, and surely none would be so brazen as to argue that baptism is a work of man's creation! Hence, the simple conclusion would follow -- Baptism is a work which almighty God himself has commanded. To this kind of work James referred, "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." (Jas. 2:24) Those who contend that water baptism is unnecessary because it is a work, if they were consistent would teach that belief is also unnecessary because it is a work, a work which God has commanded. (Jno. 6:29) Thus, the objection that baptism is unnecessary because it is a work is groundless!

"BAPTISM IS NON-ESSENTIAL BECAUSE THE BLOOD OF CHRIST SAVES US AND NOT WATER"

Intelligent reader, those who teach that water baptism is necessary because the water saves you - are teaching error! Nowhere does the word of God teach that the encountered water when one is baptized is capable of saving the sinner and neither do gospel preachers teach such a fallacious doctrine. Baptism is a commandment and water is simply the element. (Acts 2:38, cf. 8:36) We now raise the question, when does one contact the benefits of the blood or the death of Christ? The apostle Paul answers the question as follows: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death" (Rom. 6:4) Please observe the preceding verse, "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" (Rom. 6:3) Thus the objection that baptism cannot be necessary because the blood of Christ saves and not water, clouds the issue. The alien sinner when baptized is not saved by the
water but by the blood or death of Christ, which he contacts in water baptism. Hence, this objection only shows that water baptism is necessary because we must contact the blood of Christ in order to be saved. Again, we know that it is in the act of water baptism that one contacts the saving blood of Christ because of the following consideration: In Matthew 26: 28, Christ taught, "For this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Now, observe the language of Peter and Ananias concerning one purpose of water baptism - "Repent, and be baptized." Peter commands the Pentecostians, "every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins..." (Acts 2:38, 22:16) Jesus said that His blood was shed for the remission of sins; the miraculously guided Peter and Ananias taught that water baptism is for the remission of sins; thus, baptism is the act in which we contact the blood of Christ, the benefit being the remission of sin.

"IF BAPTISM WERE FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS, THEN EVERY TIME THE CHRISTIAN SINNED HE WOULD HAVE TO BE BAPTIZED."

Many who maintain that baptism is unnecessary use the foregoing "logic". They deny that baptism is for the remission of sins, even in view of the plain teaching of the New Testament to the contrary, endeavoring to disprove its essentiality. Friends, the simple truth -of the matter is that baptism is for the forgiveness of the alien's sins and not the Christian's. 1 Jno. 1:7 explains how the Christian obtains the remission of sins, "For if we walk in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (See also verse 9)

"THE THIEF ON THE CROSS WAS NOT BAPTIZED AND YET HE WAS SAVED."

Many people today try to be saved as the thief on the cross was. (Lk. 23:39-43) Beloved, I submit that the thief to whom Christ said, "Today shalt thou be with me in paradise", lived and died under the Old Law (Law of Moses) under which system baptism was not required. Also to be taken into consideration is the fact that Christ had power on earth to forgive sins as He chose (Lk. 5:24) because his Testament, law, in which baptism is required was not in force while he lived. (Mk. 16:15, 16, Heb. 9:16,17) Therefore, this objection, like the other, is not valid.

"FOR CHRIST SENT ME NOT TO BAPTIZE BUT TO PREACH THE GOSPEL."

Those who use this passage thus are perverting and distorting the teaching of Paul in this passage, 1 Cor. 1:17. They reason that Paul is saying that baptism is unimportant because Christ sent him not to baptize. Friends, if this passage were understood as some would have us to understand—Paul would be stating a falsehood; because Christ did send him (apostles) to
THE SIN OF JEROBOAM

The magnitude of the sin of Jeroboam is seen in the fact that it is mentioned over twenty times in the inspired record. It was the prime cause of the downfall of Israel (the ten tribes). "Jeroboam drove Israel from following the Lord, and made them sin a great sin. For the children of Israel walked in all the sins of Jeroboam which he did; they departed not from them; Until the Lord removed Israel out of his sight... So was Israel carried away out of their land to Assyria..." (II Kings 17:21-23).

Jeroboam was obviously a man of tremendous ability, great military valor and astute political insight. He was promised and appointed to the throne of Israel by Jehovah himself. God blessed him with the additional assurance that his "house" would be established in Israel as David's was in Judah (I Kings 11:37,38). This meant that his descendants would reign securely in Israel even as the sons of David ruled in Judah (I Kings 11:37,38). This meant that his descendants would reign securely in Israel even as the sons of David ruled in Judah. When Rehoboam (successor to his father Solomon as king over Judah and Israel) spoke harshly to Israel at his "inauguration," triggering the revolt and division that left him as king only over Judah, Israel turned to her outstanding and distinguished hero, Jeroboam. Popular with men and favored of God, few men in all history have enjoyed the abilities, opportunities, honors and powers given Jeroboam.

But he sinned a great sin. Its root was faithlessness, its spirit disrespect for God, and its action that of religious innovation. Mark that down — the sin of Jeroboam was not one of immorality, but was religious in character. Remember that he came to the throne through no cleverness of his own, but was truly given his kingship by God. God guaranteed his throne as sure, contingent only upon simple obedience (I Kings 11:38). But Jeroboam reasoned that when the people returned to Jerusalem to worship that their hearts would again turn to Rehoboam, and he would lose his throne and his life (I Kings 12:26,27). This demonstrated his astute political acumen and cunning, and also his unbelief. He obviously had no faith in God's promise that his throne was sure. He reasoned that if God's laws were obeyed it would be suicidal, and therefore he devised a scheme of his own wisdom. The plan of Jeroboam is not to be faulted for lack of human wisdom. It was politically sound and accomplished the immediate and practical objectives he had in mind. We could unhesitatingly say, from his viewpoint, that his plan succeeded. He set up places of worship conveniently located for the deliberate purpose of keeping the people away from Jerusalem (I Kings 12:28-32). In the same connection he introduced other substitutes and innovations designed carefully to appeal to the desires and seeming best interests of the people. Let us speak more particularly of the specific acts, innovations and arguments of Jeroboam in another study, and focus our attention for now on the fact and spirit of his enormous sin. He disobeyed God. And he taught and encouraged Israel to disobey as though religious violations are innocent.

Religious sins need to be seen in perspective. They are real and horrifying, not because of social injury or physical harm resulting (ordinarily neither of these are immediate effects), but because they can only spring from (1) ignorance in areas where one is supposed to be a leader or (2) exhibit utter faithlessness and rebellion. Religious sins committed with piety seem ever so innocent and even meritorious, and gently but surely drive people to sin. They increase faithlessness and subtle self-satisfaction, for they make the will of man equal (or preferable) to the will of God. Mark it that no man
ever imposed his own will or substituted his own ideas in the place of or alongside what God had given, until first of all he had lost confidence in God's way as being best. Or put another way, man never imposes his own way until he has first lost faith in God. Man wants change because he imagines improvement.

The frequent references to and the terrible consequences of the sin of Jeroboam should be a sobering warning to all religious men. His message that men did not necessarily have to go to Jerusalem was the exact equivalent of saying they did not strictly and technically have to obey God, and his unauthorized imitation of the worship in Jerusalem salved consciences and comforted men in their disobedience. In so doing he led a nation into sin and disaster as terrible as any ever suffered because of immorality. His name lives in infamy and his posterity is cut off from the earth (1 Kings 13:34). The "house" that could have been secure on the throne is destroyed, and only a sad lingering "what might have been" remains. Oh Jeroboam, you had it all and threw it away for lack of faith and respect, and for counting religious sins as a small thing. And shall we, gentle reader, have heaven within our reach only to lose it for the same reasons?
THE BIBLE MEANING OF LOVE

Love is one of the greatest words in the English language and one of the key words in the revelation of God to man. However, there are two things about the use of this word that will determine whether or not it is scripturally used. The first is the object of love. The Bible tells no man to love without telling him the object of that love. We are not to love the world (I John 2:15), but we are to love truth (II Thess. 2:10). The second is the nature of love that is pure and right. Unpretended and pure love of the things of God is the only kind acceptable to God.

In this column in the last issue of Searching the Scriptures I made some observations of Carl Ketcherside's use of the term love. I in no way insinuate that Carl is incapable of loving people or that he does not in fact love people, especially those who try to serve God. I do believe, however, that Carl misuses the word by assuming that the love of an immersed believer, to say the most for his view, will ignore that person's unscriptural practices and disobedience to God in both attitude and deed, and allow fellowship with such. This is not Bible love.

WHAT IS BIBLE LOVE?

Several years ago I wrote on the subject of love as it is described in the word of God. At that time I had no thought of Carl Ketcherside or anything in reference to what he teaches or practices. I reprint two articles from Searching The Scriptures on the subject; the first one from June, 1965 and the second from May, 1962. This would be as objective as I know how to be in discussing this theme in the present setting. I bid you read them carefully.

HOW FAR WILL LOVE GO?

Love is one of the greatest words to the human race, especially as it concerns man's eternal hopes. Love is the key word to God's provision for man's salvation. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life" (John 3:16). "But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us" (Rom. 5:8). "Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God" (I John 4:7). "Be-

hold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God . . ." (I John 3:1).

While love is the very nature of God, and this expression of love provided salvation for man, it does not follow, as some seem to think, that love will excuse man in his disobedience and rebellion against God. Even the love of God (we mean the benefits of His love) is limited by the channels of His word. No man can expect to benefit from the love of God as it is given through the death of His Son unless that man is willing to appropriate that love by obedience to God's word. Nevertheless, millions today have been led by denominational doctrines to believe that the love of God will save under any and all conditions. The philosophy seems to be: Profess religion; do as you please, and the love of God will save you. Such is the doctrine of the Devil and in no sense the love of God.

Jesus made it clear that love is shown in obedience to his commands. "As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love" (John 15:19). But how does one continue in his love? The next verse: "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love . . . Could it be plainer? We must continue in his love, but to continue in his love is to keep his commandments. This means that the benefits of the love of Christ abides when we keep his commandments. By the same token, we show our love for Christ by obeying his commandments. "If ye love me, keep my commandments" (John 14:15). Now then, when one does not obey the commandments of Christ, he does not love Christ and Christ's love does not abide in him.

One came to Jesus while he lived upon earth and asked what he should do to inherit eternal life. Jesus told him to keep the commandments. He answered: "Master, all these have I observed from my youth." Then Jesus beholding him loved him, and said unto him, One thing thou lackest: go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven: and come, take up the cross, and follow me" (Mark 10:21). Jesus loved this man, but when he went away and would not do as the Lord had directed, Jesus did not follow him and beg him to reconsider. Even though Jesus loved this man, his love would not bless him in his disobedience.

This is the limit of God's love.

In this age we live under a different covenant from the one Jesus told this man to keep. We are not under the law, but the gospel. When those to whom Peter and the apostles preached on Pentecost in Jerusalem asked what to do — and of course they were asking what to do for the remission of sins — Peter did not tell them to keep the law. He told them to "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins . . ." (Acts 2:38). Those who obeyed this command showed their love for the Lord, and, of course, the love of Christ began to abide with them. On the other hand, those who refused to obey this command indicated that they did not love the Lord, and the benefits of Christ's love were not theirs.

This concept of God's love that He will save men in any state relating to His word is nowhere taught in the Bible. It is one of the doctrines of the Devil and its consequences will drive millions more into the
eternal destiny of the Devil and his angels. God's love will save if we will love him. We love him when we obey his will.

THE REAL MEANING OF LOVE

H. E. Phillips

Denominational views are generally known by the subjects that are discussed in pulpits and papers, and the subject of LOVE occupies a top place in nearly all religious groups. I would like to search the scriptures with you on the Bible meaning of love in an effort to see if this subject is any more accurately represented by denominational teachers than many other subjects with which they deal.

Love is one of the key words in the word of God. The fact that God loves man is again and again stressed by every inspired man who was used by the Spirit to reveal the will of God. I John 4:7-21 is an example of the importance placed upon love by the word of God. Several facts are given in these verses which show that love is indispensable to fellowship with God. John says that "God is love" and that 'love is of God". Since God loves us, we are instructed to "love one another". "If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us." "God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." This is the theme of John in this section of his epistle, and he concludes the chapter by saying: "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen? And this commandment have we from him, that he who loveth God love his brother also" (I John 4:20, 21).

The question arises, What does love for my brother require of me? I was recently told that I did not have proper love for my brethren (some of them) because I spoke against their views and teaching on certain subjects. I have been told a number of times that the "Spirit of the Anti group is without love". Now if that be true of me, I am wrong. No man can please God without love in his heart. No matter how much truth and power he has, if he does not have love, he is nothing (I Cor. 13:1-3). But what is the real, scriptural meaning of brotherly love? What does it require in my relationship to my brother?

Love is an action of the heart. "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto the unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently" (I Pet. 1:22). It is also an action of life motivated by a heart filled with love. "My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth" (I John 3:18). Love, then, is the state of heart or attitude of mind that responds in word and deed. It is what we do and say that is prompted by an attitude of heart called love.

In I Corinthians 13 we have a description of the love that is approved by God. It suffers long, is kind, does not envy, is not puffed up, does not behave in an uneven manner, does not seek its own, is not easily provoked, does not think evil, nor rejoice in sin, but does rejoice in truth. Love endures all things. This state of mind and conduct of life may be directed toward the wrong object. Many love, but they love the wrong things. "For men shall be lovers of their own selves..." (II Tim. 3:2); "lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God..." (II Tim. 3:4); "For Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world..." (II Tim. 4:10); "For the love of money is the root of all evil..." (I Tim. 6:10); "But Diotrephes, who loveth to have the preeminence among them..." (III John 9); "For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God" (John 12:43). We are commanded to love God (Matt. 22:37, the truth (II Thess. 2:10), the brethren (I Pet. 1:22), and our enemies (Matt. 5:44). It may be that one has once loved the right things, but has lost this love. "And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold" (Matt. 24:12). "Nevertheless I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love" (Rev. 2:4).

THE TRUE MEANING OF LOVE

For a long time the denominational world has contended that members of the church of Christ do not have love in their hearts, and the proof of it is in the fact that they debate and oppose "other churches". Love to these people means a kind, loving, compromising, soul who will agree with and endorse almost any kind of religious teaching. Now some denominational minded brethren have adopted this same view of love, and they cry that anyone who exposes their weak and unscriptural doctrines lacks true love.

God is love. John the inspired apostle said so. How does God react to sin and disobedience in those who are his children? In the Old Testament "every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward" (Heb. 2:2). In the New Testament "he that doeth wrong shall receive for the wrong which he hath done: and there is no respect of persons" (Col. 3:25). The wages of sin is death (Rom. 6:23), and the death he speaks of is the second death. "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire" (Rev. 20:14,15). God is love; but he deals with sin just as he promised. It follows that love is not incompatible with strong dealing with error and sin.

When I was a child I sometimes wondered how my father and mother could say, "Son, this is because I love you," when they applied the rod where it would do the most good. If they loved me, why did they have to show it by a thrashing second to none? But by and by I became a man and a father myself. I had to do for my children exactly what was done to me. Then I knew what they meant when they said, "This is because I love you". I know now as you know, love demands correction and chastisement when it is needed to make the person you love better. "For whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth" (Heb. 12:6).

Many think love requires absolutely no hate for anything. If one hates anything he cannot have the love of God in his heart. The writer of Hebrews quotes God as saying of Christ: "Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity" (Heb. 1:9). Christ hated iniquity! Christ writes to Ephesus: "But this thou hast, that thou hast hated the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate" (Rev. 2:6). The angel of the church in Pergamos Christ said: "So hast thou also them that hold the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate" (Rev. 2:15). Christ hated the deeds and the doctrine of the Nicolaitans, yet he is the embodiment of love. Seven things are listed in Proverbs 6:16 that God hates, yet God is love. It follows that true love does not mean that hate cannot exist in the heart of the person. He must love what he should love and hate what he should hate.

Many think love will not permit discipline. Any sign of exercising discipline against those who sin is a sign of the lack of love. Paul writes the Corinthians about a man who was living in adultery, and tells them "to deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be
saved in the day of the Lord Jesus" (I Cor. 5:5). Because of their "puffed up" state he writes in the last verse of I Cor. 4: "What will ye? shall I come unto you with a rod, or in love, and in the Spirit of meekness?" Now, Paul, you should not write that way. Don’t you know it is not a sign of love to speak so harshly to brethren? But in the 13th chapter Paul tells what love is, and says that if he does anything without love it does not profit him anything. Evidently he understood a harmony to exist between discipline—strong discipline—and true love. Remember, Paul wrote the commandments of the Lord (I Cor. 14:37). We are commanded by the authority of Christ to deal with false teachers (Rom. 16:17), and with the unruly and vain talkers (Titus 1:10), and to do it "sharply" (vs. 13). The God of love required this, therefore it must be in harmony with true love to rebuke sin and false brethren.

Many think love requires a compromise. False brethren of Paul’s day "privily" came in to spy out the liberty of Christians in order to bind them again to bondage, but Paul said of them: "to whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the truth of the gospel might continue with you" (Gal. 2:4,5). Paul even rebuked another apostle (Peter) by withstanding "him to the face" because he "walked not uprightness according to the truth of the gospel" (Gal. 2:11,14). Love for God and the gospel will never permit compromise with anyone. On the other hand, love for God, the gospel and men in sin will call upon us to sound out the word "in season and out of season" without compromise at any level.

Many will argue that love substitutes for obedience. How many have you heard say, "God is love, and He will not send a man to hell for doing a little thing that is wrong"? They mean by this that God’s love is such that He will overlook our failure to obey Him and save us anyway. I believe some brethren think that is so and so. The term makarios sometimes described non-physical characteristics. For example, a knowledgeable man might be a makarios man.

WHAT DID JESUS MEAN?

Who is the "blessed" man of the Beatitudes? We sometimes say that the term means "happy." It is my judgment that "happy" is not a very meaningful translation. How is the man who mourns (Matt. 5:4) a "happy" man?

"FORTUNATE"

If the term "happy" be used in its original sense of "fortunate," etc., it would suffice as a good translation of makarios; but, usually, when we use "happy" we use it in the sense of the emotion of happiness, and this is not what Jesus is speaking of. I believe that Jesus is telling us that the man who is in a right relationship with God is "blessed"; that is, he is truly a fortunate man; not because he is necessarily physically blessed, but because he has the hope of a continuity of life in eternal happiness.

MAKARIOS, "BLESS ED"

The first section of the Sermon on the Mount is often called the "Beatitudes," a term that comes from a Latin word which means "blessing."

Matthew’s account of the Beatitudes is recorded in 5:1-12. In these verses Jesus repeatedly pronounces certain people as "blessed." The term "blessed" is translated from the Greek makarios. This Greek word is not a verb in these passages; that is, Jesus is not saying "having been blessed" is so and so. The term makarios is a Greek adjective which has a very long and interesting history and use. The present article is a brief study of this adjective.

IN CLASSICAL GREEK

The root of the term makarios goes all the way back to Homer. In its earliest use the term was always applied to the gods, and was descriptive of the surpassing bliss of the gods who lived apart from the trials and troubles of humans.

About the time of Aristotle the term makarios came to be applied to humans. It often described those who were physically rich; hence, the makarios man was able to live above the struggles of the poor man.

There is some indication that makarios sometimes described non-physical characteristics. For example, a knowledgeable man might be a makarios man.

WHAT DID JESUS MEAN?

Who is the "blessed" man of the Beatitudes? We sometimes say that the term means "happy." It is my judgment that "happy" is not a very meaningful translation. How is the man who mourns (Matt. 5:4) a "happy" man?

"FORTUNATE"

If the term "happy" be used in its original sense of "fortunate," etc., it would suffice as a good translation of makarios; but, usually, when we use "happy" we use it in the sense of the emotion of happiness, and this is not what Jesus is speaking of. I believe that Jesus is telling us that the man who is in a right relationship with God is "blessed"; that is, he is truly a fortunate man; not because he is necessarily physically blessed, but because he has the hope of a continuity of life in eternal happiness.
Dear Reader:

As we come near the close of the thirteenth year of continuous publication, I feel the need to call upon you again to lend a helping hand in increasing the circulation of this media of spreading the word of the Lord.

Some of you have received this paper for several years through the generosity of a friend or relative. Someone was interested in your soul. It is now time that you became interested in your own soul as well as the souls of others.

The great majority of the population of this country is so cold and apathetic toward spiritual things that almost nothing will reach their hearts. Billions of printed pages of "garbage" for the mind are distributed each year. Doesn't it stand to reason that a healthy and sound mind depends upon sound reading material?

Be a friend and do your brethren and neighbors a favor: send them Searching the Scriptures for one year. The price is $5.00 per year, or three subscriptions for $12.00. Do this today so they will begin receiving the paper January, 1973.

A number of churches are ordering a bundle each month to distribute to those they believe would best benefit from Searching the Scriptures. If the church where you worship is unable to do this, why will you not do so for one year? The prices are listed on the second page. Above all, renew yourself. We want you as a reader of this journal. If you are on the ARP send your renewal in the amount you sent last year.

I thank you so much for every word of encouragement, every act of help, and your prayers for the continuation of this effort. A special thanks to those who have helped so long and continue to do so. May God bless you richly.

With unfeigned love,

H.E. Phillips

HEP/ef
NOTE: During the construction of our new auditorium and the remodeling of our former building, my study was in an almost continual state of confusion. For a few weeks it was in storage, and hence, in disuse altogether. During this period some questions for this column were misplaced and lost. Will those who sent questions of late please submit them again? I am now in position to give such prompt attention. — M. E. P.

QUESTION: Is there a local congregation when the members, after worship periods, depart to their houses and while they go about their daily duties? I know we belong to the church universal all the time, with privileges to pray or sing praises to God, but does the church, locally, exist between worship or assembly time? — S. P.

ANSWER: The answer to the above questions is to be found in a study of the word "church," the different senses in which it is used, and what the Bible teaches concerning each.

The word "church" is from the Greek word "Ekklesia," which according to scholars means "the called out; an assembly."

In New Testament times it did not necessarily have religious significance. It was used to identify assemblies of men as well as assemblies of God's people. It is twice applied to the mob in Ephesus, once to the proconsular court, and once to the people in the wilderness (Acts 19:32,39,41; 7:38). The context must determine whether reference is made to a church of men or a church of the Lord.

The word "church" is used in the Bible to identify the Lord's people in different senses. It will suffice to answer the above questions to examine three of these uses in this article.

It is used in the universal sense (Matt. 16:18; Eph. 1:22). In this sense it includes all the saved of all the earth. It is a spiritual relationship. It is not joined, but rather the Lord adds to it daily such as should be saved (Acts 2:47). He controls its fellowship, and does so accurately. It has no earthly organization. It has no earthly structure or arrangement by which it can function, and, consequently, has no mission. It is a passive, spiritual relationship in which its members receive and enjoy blessings and privileges.

The word "church" is also used in the local sense (I Cor. 1:2). In this sense we find a tangible arrangement or organizational structure (Phil. 1:1) by which it can function. Furthermore, the sum total of divine revelation reveals a threefold mission, namely, evangelism, benevolence, and edification. The church in this sense controls its own fellowship and is "joined" by mutual agreement on the part of those involved, in harmony with the word of the Lord (Acts 9:26-28). It is a very active relationship involving grave responsibilities, which, in the final analysis, are accounted for on an individual basis by those making up its membership.

In this sense, while the organization exists all the time, not every act of the individuals is an act of the organization as such. In this sense it is somewhat comparable to civic clubs, e.g., Lions, Kiwanis, Parent Teachers Association, etc. The organization functions through the framework of its organizational structure when its members jointly participate in something that has been duly authorized by it. It also functions through one or more of its members who being duly authorized by the organization act in behalf of the whole.

One of the functions of the local church is to assemble or "come together into one place" (I Cor. 11:20; Acts 14:27; 20:7; Heb. 10:25). That the local church does exist before, between, and after assemblies, i.e., coming together into one place, is evident from the language used in Acts 14:27: "And when they were come, and had gathered the church together, they rehearsed all that God had done with them, and how he had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles." It was the church before it was gathered together, while it was being gathered, and after it had been gathered together. It was the local church all the time.

The word "church" is also used to identify an assembly of saints or an assembly of the local church (I Cor. 11:18; 14:28,34). In this sense the local church churches, i.e., the local assembly assembles — those "called out" and assembled together in a spiritual and local sense assemble or come together into one place. Furthermore, in this sense it is proper to say what would otherwise not be true, namely, "Saints go to church." They go to the assembly which the local church calls "church" in the above Scriptures. Sometimes brethren arbitrarily limit the use of the word church and thereby overlook other scriptural uses and concepts.
Even the very slightest observation of the above question upon the part of one who believes that the Bible is the word of God would prompt him to answer in the affirmative. Yet, many who sincerely believe that they need the Bible indicate by what they believe and teach that they really do not need it.

While there are some who believe that the Bible is essential to their understanding of what God requires of them in order to go to heaven, there are many others who apparently recognize their need of the Bible for other reasons. There are some who feel more secure simply because they have a copy of "the old book" around, and that by doing so, they have better touch with what is sacred and holy. To such people the Bible is a special book, a precious bound volume of pages which affords special powers by its very presence, and so actually it is a fetish.

In some parts of Scotland the sick were fanned with the leaves of the Bible, and a Bible was placed under the head of a woman after childbirth and into the cradle of new-born children (McClintock and Strong, Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature, Vol. 1, p. 810). A copy of the Bible also serves as a convenient file for others who place their objects of devotion in it for safe keeping.

Various usages are made of the Bible, revealing a conglomeration of ideas as to what it is and why it exists. Divination by means of the Bible, known as Bibliomancy, taking passages of scripture at hazard and drawing future things from them is an old established practice. A few examples of Bibliomancy are interesting. "In former times, among the common people in England and Scotland, the Bible was consulted on New Year's day with special formality, each member of the house, before he had partaken of food, walking to it, and placing his finger at random on a verse — that verse declaring his fortune for the next twelve months. The Bible, with a sixpence inserted into the book of Ruth, was placed under the pillows of young people, to give them dreams of matrimonial divination. A Bible and a key were sometimes employed to detect a thief. A suspected witch was taken to church, and weighed against the great church Bible. If she outweighed the Bible she was acquitted, but if the Bible outweighed her, she was condemned" (McClintock and Strong, Vol. 1, p. 810).

Certainly the Bible was never intended to serve as a charm or a means of divination, but if such conceptions be the truth, then there is no real need for the Bible as far as it being the revelation of God's will to man is concerned. The Bible, when understood as to what it actually is and why it truly exists, will not be relegated to a charm or a means of divination. The Bible, in contrast to the uses made of it, as illustrated in the foregoing examples, has a lofty and divine purpose and ignorant, careless, and flagrant mishandlings of it only serve to cheapen it and impair its good influence.

What is the Bible? When we speak of the Bible in its true and strictest sense, we do not mean a mere volume of printed pages, a literal book; but we mean its contents, its teaching, God's revelation to man. Comprised of sixty-six books, man's redemption is its theme, and like a golden thread it runs from Genesis through Revelation. It is the word of God (John 8:32; 17:17; Ps. 19:7; 119:105; II Tim. 3:16, 17; Heb. 4:12, etc.). We believe that it is verbally inspired, that not only did the Holy Spirit reveal the thoughts to the writers but the very words. (See Matt. 10:19 and II Pet. 1:21.) Paul wrote to the church at Corinth: "Which things also we speak, not in words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Spirit teacheth; combining spiritual things with spiritual words" (I Cor. 2:13). The Bible is God's final and complete revelation to man (Jude 3); therefore, it should be read, properly divided, and obeyed.

(To be continued)
2:3.4. What one sermon does not accomplish, a thousand sermons might. More teaching needs to be done on the home.

Children should be taught to take care of their widowed mothers. 1 Tim. 5:4 says, "If any widow have children or nephews, let them shew piety at home, and to requite their parents: for this is good and acceptable before God." Verse 16 of the same chapter says, "If any man or woman that believeth have widows, let them relieve them, and let not the church be charged: that it may relieve them that are widows indeed." We should first work on the home in this matter of benevolence. Here is where piety begins. Here is the point of special responsibility according to the Lord's plan. The church is the pillar and ground of the truth. It has responsibilities in the field of benevolence, but it should not be assigned tasks that belong to one group of parents or to another group of children. Work under the hood if the knock is in the motor! Start teaching home responsibilities, if that is where the trouble lies.

Where shall we go next? We need to go to the neighbor's house. What can he do? What should he do? To find the answer to practical questions like this we should turn to the Bible. "Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth" (Eph. 4:28). What is the well man to do? He is to work to provide for himself and for his family, and to have to give to him that needeth. The more this is done the less pressure there will be on the church to give. Some might like to take this out of the Bible because they like the package plan. They would like to drop a bill in the collection basket on Sunday and feel no further responsibility. They say that they have nothing left after they give to the church what they think they should give.

They hurry to add that they want the church to get the glory! Where does the Bible say the church should get the glory? The Lord should get the glory! If the individual Christian does his work, the Lord receives the glory. "Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 5:16). Is this not clear? "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 6:1). Is this not clear? "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven" (Matt. 6:1). Is this not clear? "Take heed that ye do not your alms before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven?"

I John 3:17-19 says, "Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth. And hereby we know that we are of the truth and shall assure our hearts before him." It is as evident as can be that the man who would keep himself unspotted from the world and have pure and undiluted religion must himself visit the fatherless and the widows in their afflictions. This will cost him money, but that is one reason for his earning. The Lord will bless. The good Samaritan ministered with his hands and paid the bill from his own pocket. Any plan that makes it so a congregation of one hundred fifty members can give $15 a month (100 per member) to some heavily endowed society and leave all feeling relieved of any personal responsibility toward those of their acquaintance who may be in need is an unhappy and unscriptural plan.

In Acts 20:33-35 we find this statement, "I have coveted no man's silver or gold, or apparel. Yea, ye yourselves know, that these hands have ministered unto my necessities, and to them that were with me. I have showed you all things, how that so laboring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive." We need to memorize this! Paul showed each Christian that it is right for one to provide for the weak. He taught the message of the Lord that the giver is blessed above the receiver. We receive a hundred fold here and eternal life in the world to come if we comply with the Lord's will. It is the Master's will that a man find an honorable occupation and earn in order to give to him that hath need. Can any doubt it? "To do good and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased" (Heb. 13:16). You want to please God, do you not? Here is scriptural advice on how to do it.

"If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and one of you say unto them, depart in peace, be ye warmed and filled; notwithstanding ye give not those things which are needful to the body: what doth it profit? Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone" (James 2:14-16). He did not say, "Tell it to the church." He taught that you should give to that brother or sister yourself or be classified as being as unprofitable as faith without works. If the church gave, it would have to get its money out of your pocket or from some other individual.

I John 3:17-19 says, "Whoso hath this world's goods, and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his bowels of compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? My little children, let us not love in word, neither in tongue; but in deed and in truth. And hereby we know that we are of the truth and shall assure our hearts before him." It is as evident as can be that the man who would keep himself unspotted from the world and have pure and undiluted religion must himself visit the fatherless and the widows in their afflictions. This will cost him money, but that is one reason for his earning. The Lord will bless. The good Samaritan ministered with his own hands and paid the bill from his own pocket. Any plan that makes it so a congregation of one hundred fifty members can give $15 a month (100 per member) to some heavily endowed society and leave all feeling relieved of any personal responsibility toward those of their acquaintance who may be in need is an unhappy and unscriptural plan.
"NO DEAD ISSUE — No. 3"

This is the third and last in a series on the above title. The first, dealt with an article by brother Gus Nichols in the Boles Home News. The second was on the position espoused by brother Ruel Lemmons and appeared in the Firm Foundation. The prominence of the men involved and the recent dates on the articles show they do not consider this a dead issue.

It has never been my purpose to feed brethren a steady diet on any one subject. However, I believe when we are goaded into complacency in regard to this subject the devil will once again gain the advantage.

In this third series I plan to point out the difference between brethren Nichols and Lemmons in regard to the orphan home question. These brethren are supposedly on the same side of this issue but it will become apparent they are as far apart as the two poles. Brother Nichols takes the position that "homes" under a board of directors may take money from the treasury of churches. On the other hand, brother Lemmons takes the position that "homes" under boards have no scriptural right to take money from church treasuries. It is apparent that both of these men cannot be right. The odd thing about this is that these brethren will sleep with one another but won't sleep with me. Now, don't misunderstand me, "I ain't hankering to sleep with either!" But these brethren exchange pulpits and act as if no difference exists and yet one can read their articles and see a great chasm between Nichols and Lemmons.

Brother Nichols takes the old Guy N. Wood position that the board is in existence only because of the demands of the state. It is a legal matter. What brother Nichols and his colleagues need to learn is that Bible students have never objected to what the men are called but rather to what they are DOING. You can call them boards or bees and the violation is the same. If this is the benevolent work of the church it is to be done under local elders where the benevolence is needed. However, if it is not the work of the church they have no business giving to it in the first place! I don't object to a group of men being called a board. I object to any group of men usurping the function of the elders. You can call them anything you want. Even if the men over Boles Home were not members of a board it would still be unscriptural because they are not elders in a local church. If they were elders the only benevolent work they would be responsible to oversee would be in their local congregation (See Acts 11:27-30; 1 Pet. 5:1-2). It is in direct violation of the scriptures for a group of elders to try to oversee a brotherhood benevolent program. This is where brother Lemmons missed the boat. He was correct in condemning the board but wrong in justifying a brotherhood eldership to oversee general benevolence. This was not done in Bible times.

Now, gentle reader, if you will forgive the use of names let us note the agreements between brethren Nichols, Lemmons and Hogland. First, we all agree that the orphan home has a right to exist as a humanitarian institution. There is not disagreement here. I am not talking about abuses. Second, we agree that an individual could give to such an institution just as he could give to a hospital or the cancer fund. Permit me to make it clear that the individual could not give if the institution takes money from church treasuries!

Now let us consider the disagreements. Brother Nichols believes that a church may give to a home with a board of directors. Brethren Lemmons and Hogland object. Brother Lemmons objects simply because the home is under a board and not under elders. Hogland objects not only because of the board and what they are doing but because they are trying to do a brotherhood benevolence work. He objects also because they are trying to care for people who are not saints or Christians. In summary, all three brethren agree that individuals could support Boles Home if they would divorce it from the church. It would then be a humanitarian institution like the Red Cross or cancer fund. Brother Lemons thinks the board should be ousted and a local eldership put in its place. This might be a little closer to the truth but that LOCAL ELDERSHIP is out of its place when it oversees any more than the work of the LOCAL congregation. Taking care of children from all over the country who are not saints is not the function of the local church. People on the outside are to be cared for by individuals (See Jas 1:27, Gal. 6:10). If it be argued that the individual cannot take care of all the widows and orphans of the world — may I say neither can the church. I will go one step further and say neither can the United States Government! Does this make it scriptural for the church to do it? Nay verily. Gentle reader, we need scripture and not emotionalism for all we do. Think it over.
The question of abortion is a very live issue in both the religious and the political realm in modern America. This problem must be dealt with upon certain eternal principles. Most Christians will have little difficulty coming to grips with this issue, if they flee themselves to study the problem objectively.

**BIBLE PRINCIPLES ARE INVOLVED**

There are at least two Bible principles involved in the abortion question, (1) there is life before birth and (2) that life is human. Let us examine Luke 1:36-44. Note particularly verse 36, "This is the sixth month with her;" verse 41, "The babe leaped in her womb," and verse 44, "The babe leaped in my womb." There are two indications in this passage of scripture that there is human life in the unborn infant, (1) he leaped (movements indicates life) and (2) he was called a "babe" (Greek, brephos). The Greek word, brephos is used in the N.T. to identify a human infant, either born or unborn. See also Luke 2:12, 16; 18:15; Acts 7:19; II Tim. 3:15; I Pet. 2:2.) Luke, qualified both by profession (Col. 4:14) and by inspiration used this same word to describe the infants put to death in ancient Egypt under the command of Pharaoh, "they cast out their young children (Gr. brephos) to the end that they might not live" (Acts 7:10). If the parents of John the baptizer had secured the services of an abortionist during the sixth month of Elizabeth's pregnancy they would have been doing the same thing that was done by Pharaoh recorded in Exodus 1:15ff; they would have been casting out their "babe" (Gr. brephos) to the end that he "might not live.

The fact that the un-born infant has life is not to be disputed in the face of his movements in the womb. And a Bible-believer could not afford to doubt that where there is life there is a spirit. "For the body without the spirit is dead" (James 2:26). Certainly a fetus may die at birth (or before) but as long as he is alive, the human spirit is within him, for without the spirit, his little body would be lifeless.

In view of the natural laws that God set in order "in the beginning" (see Gen. 1) that all of God's creatures produce "after their kind" it could hardly be denied that the spirit in the un-born infant is a human spirit. He has a human father and a human mother; he could be nothing but human himself. All he needs to become a useful member of society is nutrition, oxygen and time.

Other passages of scripture in which these same indications of life before birth include Genesis 25:22 and 38:28-30.

**SOME SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE**

Some with whom I have discussed the abortion question have been slow to acknowledge the principles that I feel are clearly evident in the above scriptures. For the benefit of such individuals, I feel it might be helpful for us to consider a few facts from the scientific point of view. For instance, it has been established that:

The heartbeat of the unborn fetus begins between the 18th to 25th day.¹

Electriccardiogram recordings can be taken at nine or ten weeks.²

Electric brain waves (electroencephalogram) have been recorded as early as 43 days.³

Actual skeletal movements of the unborn baby begin at six weeks. The mother cannot feel them, however, at that time.⁴

At nine to ten weeks he squints, swallows, moves his tongue, and if you stroke his palm will make a tight fist. At eleven to twelve weeks, he is sucking his thumb vigorously.⁵

By eleven to twelve weeks, he is breathing fluid steadily and continues so until birth. At birth, he will breathe air. He does not drown by breathing fluid within his mother, because he obtains his oxygen from his umbilical cord. This does, however, develop the organs of respiration. His stomach secretes gastric juice by eight weeks. Fingernails are present by eleven to twelve weeks; eyelashes by sixteen. All his body systems are present by eight weeks, and are all working by eleven weeks. Electrical waves at six weeks indicate brain function by that time.⁶

In fact, there is every indication that there is full human life in the infant before birth. With these facts in mind, let us see what effect abortion has on this life.

**FOUR BASIC TYPES OF ABORTION**

There are four basic types or methods of induced abortion, (1) dilatation and curettage (D&C), (2) the suction method, (3) hysterectomy and (4) the saline solution method.

In D&C the baby is cut into pieces while still in the uterus and scraped out into a basin.

In the suction method a hollow plastic tube attached to a powerful suction apparatus is used to tear the baby to pieces and suck the pieces into a bottle. "Most careful abortionists won't use these methods (D&C, suction) after the twelfth week."⁷

The hysterectomy is like a Caesarian section. The mother's abdomen is surgically opened and the baby is lifted out. "This method is used after the 14th to 15th week of development. . . One hundred percent of all babies aborted by hysterectomy are born alive. They must either be then killed or left to die from lack of attention. One baby in New York that was 'aborted' in this manner refused to die and has been adopted. (U.P.I., Dec. 19, 1970)... One surgeon in our area who used this method removed a tiny baby who breathed, tried to cry, and was moving his arms and legs — so he threw the placenta on top of the baby and smothered him."⁸

"If a baby is born alive, as in hysterectomy, then dies, he or she may be used as a full deduction on the parent's federal income tax."⁹

The saline method involves the use of a large needle which is inserted through the abdominal wall
of the mother and into the infant's amniotic sac. A concentrated salt solution is injected into the amniotic fluid; the baby swallows it, is poisoned, and usually dies within about an hour. About a day later the mother goes into labor and delivers a dead baby. This method cannot be used much before the 16th week, but can be used any time thereafter.

**ABORTION HAS COST MORE AMERICAN LIVES THAN WAR**

According to Dr. Paul Marx, a sociologist at St. John's University in Collegeville, Minnesota, the liberalizing of abortion laws in recent years has cost more American lives in one year than the toll of all the wars in American history.  

Dr. Heather Morris, Canadian obstetrician and gynecologist, speaking in Ontario, Canada voiced the view that any country accepting abortion has descended into an abyss of cruelty and can no longer be called civilized. "A civilized society is judged on how it takes care of those who can't take care of themselves," the doctor stated on the campus of McMaster University. Dr. Morris further stated, "Abortion is a situation in which life is killed. Human life starts at conception. A complete, unique human being is the result.

In the Federal Republic of Germany every year there are from 100,000 to 500,000 interruptions of pregnancy, mostly illegal. More than 100,000 human lives were suppressed last year in England through abortions. Some 3,000 abortions were performed on foreign women in Great Britain.  

**WHERE WILL IT ALL END?**

Many informed individuals see permissive abortion laws as the first step toward a society in which euthanasia (mercy killings) will be socially and legally acceptable.

Attempts to justify abortion often employ arguments that the aborted babies would have been unwanted, battered children, perhaps deformed or deformed, and eventually candidates for the welfare rolls. It is reasoned that they should be put to death for their own benefit, and for the convenience of society.

The next step, after abortion has become socially acceptable, might well be to systematically "put to sleep" the aged, the infirm, the mental patient, the deformed and diseased,... then the unskilled, and who-knows-who might be next.

An editorial in the September, 1970 issue of the official journal of the California Medical Association stated, "Since the old ethic has not yet been fully displaced it has been necessary to separate the idea of abortion from the idea of killing, which continues to be socially abhorrent. The result has been a curious avoidance of the scientific fact, which everyone really knows, that human life begins with conception (emp. cr_j) and is continuous whether intro- or extra-uterine, until death. The very considerable gymnastics which are required to rationalize abortion as anything but taking a human life would be ludicrous if they were not often put forward under socially impeccable auspices."

It is time for Christians to lift their voices in this matter and use their influence to restore sanity to the laws of the land concerning the sanctity of human life, both before and after birth.

**FOOTNOTES:**

1 James M. Tanner, *et al.*, *Growth* (Life Science Library, Time-Life Books, p. 64  
2 Ibid.  
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6 *Life Before Birth*, Life Magazine reprint, pg. 13  
8 Ibid., pg. 27  
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10 Ibid., pg. 27  
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**Herschel E. Patton, 4605 Dyshel Dr. S.W., Huntsville, Ala., 35805** — I have been living in Huntsville, Ala., working with the Jordan Park church since the first of August. Raymond Harville followed me at Mt. Pleasant, Tenn. He has been well received and I am sure he will do a fine work with the Locust St. church there. The work at Jordan Park in Huntsville is thrilling and challenging. There have been three baptisms, three restorations, and three to place membership since my coming. Please announce in **Searching the Scriptures** that my tract on "The Seriousness of Marriage" is now back in print and I have a good supply on hand. They sell for 100 each or $10.00 per hundred.

**W. E. Bowers, 519 Cedar Rock, Pickens, South Carolina, 29671** — A congregation of the Lord's people is now meeting in Pickens, South Carolina. Three families presently make up the membership of the Pickens church which meets in a rented building at 123 E. Main Street, Pickens. This is the only church meeting near Clemson University that stands firm for the truth of God's word. The church would like to hear from students who may be attending Clemson or plan to in the near future. James Hahn of Scottsville, Kentucky was with the church for meetings in July and October of this year. The Pickens church is interested in finding a man to move into this area to labor with them in preaching the gospel. Partial support could be provided. If interested write...
the Pickens church of Christ, P.O. Box 626, Pickens, South Carolina 29671; or phone (803) 878-4203.

DEBATE

J. T. Smith and James Ivy will debate on the subject of predestination and election. The dates are December 11, 12, 14, 15. This debate will take place at the meeting house of the Northeast church of Christ in Conway, Arkansas.

NEW RELIGIOUS JOURNAL

A new religious semi-monthly periodical to be called The Bible Standard. The editors will be Kent Ellis and R. L. (Bob) Craig. This paper will be published twice each month, containing not fewer than 12 pages per issue. To begin the first of November. Subscription price: $3.00 per year, $5.00 for two years, $10.00 for five years. One year subscription or extension free to anyone sending in ten subscriptions. All subscriptions and articles should be sent to Kent Ellis, 3807 Woodmere, Bryan, Texas 77801.

Arnold A. Granke, Jr., OSI District 12, APO San Francisco 96274 — I am currently assigned at Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, and worship with the church in adjacent Angeles City. Brother Castorio F. Gamit, the regular preacher, and I have been attempting to gather information concerning the welfare of faithful brethren during the recent flood. Our information is still incomplete, but insofar as we know, none suffered any serious injury. Some have been rendered needy, however. We know of about 20 souls in nearby Macabebe, Pampanga, about 75 in the vicinity of Subic, Zambales, and approximately 100 scattered about in small towns in Rizal province. These brethren need clothing and food. Many lost their crops, and due to similar damage throughout the general area, the price of food has become considerably higher than usual, causing them an extreme burden. We have not heard from any brethren in Pangasinan and Tarlac provinces which were also heavily flooded. Damage here at Angeles City was relatively light. Any churches or brethren desiring to send relief to Christians in the affected areas may write me for the names of brethren to whom they should address it.
JEROBOAM'S ARGUMENTS FOR INNOVATIONS

Psychiatrists tell us that most people who are deceived wanted to be deceived. At least they had their minds set to try to believe a certain type of message. This is the tremendous advantage the medical quack has with the seriously or incurably ill — they want to believe him. The false teacher enjoys exactly the same advantage when he says what is pleasant and desirable to his hearers. These purveyors of false hope are not without ability and usually exercise themselves to develop a smooth, reasonable and credible presentation. But the real element of deception is not ordinarily so much the ability to intellectually confuse as it is the ability to understand and pander to peoples' wants and weaknesses. This is the key to successful religious innovation, ancient and modern.

Jeroboam's arguments in leading Israel into tragic apostasy is a vivid case in point. Notwithstanding his position as king, his success is astonishing in bringing about a drastic and popular change in the religious devotions of a nation in a single generation. His own appointed places stood as rivals with Jerusalem as seats of worship (Deut. 12:14; I Kings 12:28,29), and the people have three holy places instead of one. He instituted his own distinctive features, such as images and non-Levitical priests (I Kings 12:28, 31). He changed the dates of the feast days according as "he had devised of his own heart" (Lev. 23:34, 39; I Kings 12:33). So instead of religious loyalty and unity among the people, we have a deep division: three holy places instead of one, two orders of worship instead of one, utterly unauthorized imagery, rival priesthoods and competitive feasts. And one of Jeroboam's establishments was in Bethel, a scant twelve miles from Jerusalem, a brazen declaration of the division and disregard for true worship. For a man to accomplish so much, even for the wrong, requires ability and an insight into the wants and weaknesses of a people. The arguments of Jeroboam reflect his possession of this insight.

1. He appealed to comfort, convenience and self-indulgence: "It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem" (I Kings 12:28). Jerusalem was indeed a long way away for those who had no problem of pollution from automobile exhaust. It was a trip that consumed considerable time and expense. No doubt many of the less zealous were glad to hear a man of Jeroboam's prominence and personal vitality and force say it was 'too much' to expect. He understands. And who would be so narrow-minded as to say that God would condemn worship in Dan but accept it in Jerusalem?

2. He appealed to their sense of piety and worship: "Behold they gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (12:28). Do not underestimate Jeroboam's cleverness by charging him here with trying to tell Jews that Jehovah is not God. This would likely have so offended a point of fact and faith so basic that it would have been nearly impossible to believe. But the people did delight in having a tangible representation of deity. Perhaps it was patterned somewhat after the cherubim, as some suggest, which would have augured well for Jeroboam in appealing to the people to identify God with his calves and to seek him therein.

3. He appealed to pride: The Israelites had already bolted from Judah in a huff upon hearing the rash words of Rehoboam. They had rebelled, saying "What portion have we in David? neither have we inheritance in the son of Jesse: to your tents, O Israel" (I Kings 12:16). Yes, Judah offers us nothing! Let's go home! Jeroboam offered them holy places in their homeland! Israel is as good as Judah. Dan and Bethel are as satisfactory as Jerusalem. Sectional pride can run strong.

4. He appealed to nostalgic and precious memories by the very selections of Dan and Bethel as holy
places, and Shechem as capital. Aside from its convenience to the people in the north, Dan would be associated with the worship of God through the teraphim covered with silver (Jud. 18:15-31). Jeroboam devised a calf of gold. Bethel was strongly associated with Jacob and Samuel and thus was tender in their sentimentality historically, and became the site of a pretentious temple. Shechem recalls the days of Abraham, and was a priestly city. These are "our" cities.

5. He implied that all is well: it is simply the old worship for those who have no portion in Judah and no desire to support her establishments. It was a religious revolution, but it is doubtful that most of the people really knew it. What he said, they liked, and wanted to believe, and did believe. Deceived, and in error, all the while thinking all is well and we serve God!

All successful innovations more or less possess the same ties to popular taste, convenience, pride, apparent reasonableness and innocence, and piety. Howbeit all were not deceived. Some stubbornly resisted the innovations, preferring God's authority for man's "just as good as ..." Though to all appearances and for his purposes Jeroboam succeeded, he never had the authority or approval of God, and his apparent success not only led Israel to its downfall but wrested the kingdom from Jeroboam and destroyed his posterity from off the face of the earth. And still some say, "You can't argue with success." You'd better argue with it, my friend, and go all the way back to Jerusalem.
"I WANT TO BE FREE"

Freedom is one of the most universal and cherished desires of the human race. Like love, freedom has been misunderstood, misused and abused so that many who think they are free are really deep in bondage. Some who have enjoyed freedom have lost it because they did not properly use it.

The political slogan all over the world is "freedom" and peace. The chief representatives from most nations of the world assemble in the chambers of the United Nations, each with a political philosophy guaranteeing freedom to those who accept it. But freedom does not mean the same to all. The Communist speaks of freedom as the pressure upon people to abandon all political ideology and embrace Communism. The dictator identifies freedom as the opportunity to obey his every demand without question. The wild, rebellious demonstrators in the streets and public buildings identify freedom as the license to disrobe and insult the self respect of innocent people, all for the purpose of defying properly constructed authority and getting public attention. They call this their "civil rights."

The angry and rebellious youth of this decade who have no parental care or control think of freedom as the license to disrobe and insult the self-respecting public by emphasizing nudity, the unashamedly practice illicit sex and incredible orgies, drunkenness and drug addiction. Why? because they have "freedom" to do with their lives what they want to do. To these unloved, untaught, undisciplined drop-outs of society, freedom means their right to sink lower than brute beasts in thought, speech and action.

There are as many movements and organizations promising and promoting "freedom" as there are groups of people, minorities, or majorities. The black people want freedom; the white people want freedom; the women want freedom; youth wants freedom; the employers want freedom; the laborer wants freedom. Everybody wants freedom, but hardly anyone knows what it really means and how to use it.

Jesus said, "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" (John 8:32). "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:36). These two statements from the word of God confine genuine freedom to one source and one agency. It is the Son of God who makes one really free, and the word of God (truth — John 17:17) is the only agency that will really make one free. If you really want to be free, obey the word of truth and the Son will make you free indeed.

Freedom is a great blessing, but it carries a great responsibility. Absolute freedom without regard for the obligations of that freedom is not possible in our society. This kind of "freedom" would allow one to kill any person he wanted to kill. He could take another's property without payment because he had this "freedom."

All genuine freedom is subject to two conditions. It must consider from what one is made free and to what he is made free.

To be made free from sin does not allow us to do anything we please. If we have been made free from sin by obeying the truth, we cannot continue to live in sin (Rom. 6:18, 22).

By the "law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus" we have been made free from the law of sin and death (Rom. 8:2) and enjoy the "glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. 8:21). It is in obedience of the law of liberty that we are made free (James 1:25) and by the law of liberty that we be judged (James 2:12). Consequently we must "stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and not be entangled again with the yoke of bondage" (Gal. 5:1).

The Holy Spirit said, "For, brethren, we have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another" (Gal. 5:13). Some would spy out our liberty which we have in Christ in order to bring us unto bondage (Gal. 2:4).

The freedom of which I speak — the freedom that is granted by the Son in obeying the truth — has two characteristics by which it may always be identified.

First, it frees from the consequences of sin, the bondage of the law, and the hopelessness in death. We should not return to live under the bondage of the law of Moses (Gal. 2:4; 5; 4:1-11; 5:1-4). We are free because of the hope in death (Heb. 2:14, 15).

Second, the freedom from sin makes us bond servants of Christ. We have been redeemed by his blood (Eph. 1:7) and have been bought with a price (1 Cor. 6:19, 20; 1 Peter 1:18, 19). This kind of servant is really free under the law of liberty (James 1:25). Those who disregard this law of liberty become unfaithful servants and are brought back into bondage (II Peter 2:19-22).

I want to be free in the only real sense of the word: separated from sin and a faithful servant of Christ to obey his will and not that of man. I must please Christ to be his servant (Gal. 1:10).
QUESTION: How can church discipline, as taught in I Cor. 5 and II Thess. 3:6 be justified in the light of our Lord's teaching in the parable of the tares (Matt. 13:24-30)? He said for the good and bad to remain together until the end of the world. — A.M.

ANSWER: Any time verses of Scripture appear to contradict, one may be assured that the contradiction is not in the Scriptures, but rather in his own mind. He simply does not understand the truth concerning one or both passages under study. When he does come to an understanding of truth concerning both passages, harmony will always be apparent.

When Jesus explained the meaning of this parable (verses 34-43) he pointed out carefully the application to be made of it and what each thing represented. Everything, then, must be understood in the light of His explanation.

There is nothing in our Lord's explanation to indicate church action of any kind — discipline or otherwise. The concerned ones (the servants of verse 27) are the angels of verse 39, who are explained further to be the reapers who gather the harvest at the end of the world. They are the ones who are told not to separate the tares from the wheat, i.e., right now, but wait until the end of the world. They were to "let both grow together until the harvest."

Jesus further explains that the field in which both the good seed and the tares are found growing together is the world — not the church (verse 38), and that the good seed are children of God and the tares are children of the devil. The obvious lesson is that Christians must live "in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world" (Phil. 2:15), not being taken out of the world, but keeping themselves from it (John 17:15). Paul also wrote in recognition of this situation when dealing with the very matter of church discipline (I Cor. 5:10). If the angels were to destroy or gather out of the world all evil men right now, it would result in severe and detrimental consequences to the welfare of the saints and the benevolent design of God in behalf of His children. Hence, children of God and children of the devil are to remain in the world together until the end of time.

The expression "gather out of his kingdom" in verse 41 cannot mean that the tares are gathered out of a spiritual relationship once sustained in His kingdom, but rather it must be understood in the
light of its context and the above explanation. Furthermore, a study of the Greek preposition "ek," which is translated "out of" in this particular phrase, confirms this, and brings to light truth that harmonizes this phrase wonderfully with all else in the parable.

Scholars show that the Greek "ek" may be translated "out of," "from the midst of," or "from." Therefore, the phrase "gather out of his kingdom" must mean, in the light of its context, that His angels will gather the tares not "out of" His kingdom (a spiritual relationship), but "from the midst of" His children (those who make up His kingdom) among whom they are permitted to dwell until the end of the world. Thus, the word "kingdom" in this instance is used to identify not a spiritual relationship, but rather the children of God among whom the tares have been scattered and are permitted to grow until the harvest. Both the tares and the wheat are gathered out of the field which is the world. But also, the tares are gathered "from the midst of" the wheat. Hence, the gathering of verse 41 refers not to the removing of some from a spiritual relationship, but to the separating of the good and the bad at the harvest time. This separation demands gathering the tares from among the children who make up the kingdom, both of which have grown together during their time in the world.

Consider the following:

"41. Out of his kingdom (ek tēs basileias autou). Out from the midst of the kingdom, because in every city the good and the baa are scattered and mixed together. Cf. in 13:49 "from the midst of the righteous." What this means is that, just as the wheat and the darnel are mixed together in the field till the separation at harvest, so the evil are mixed with the good in the world (the field). Jesus does not mean to say that these "stumblingblocks" (τα σκάνδαλα) are actually in the Kingdom of heaven and really members of the Kingdom. They are simply mixed in the field with the wheat and God leaves them in the world till the separation comes. Their destiny is "the furnace of fire" ... (Word Pictures in the New Testament by A. T. Robertson, Vol., p. 110)

"The preposition ek (or ex) which frequently signifies 'out of or from the midst of,' has a variety of meanings, among which is 'from,' as virtually equivalent to apo, away from, e.g., II Cor. 1:10, 'who delivered us out of so great a death, and will deliver;' since death was not actually experienced, but was impending. ek here does not signify 'out of the midst of.' In Acts 12:7 it is used in the statement 'his chains fell off from his hands.' In Matt. 17:9 it is used of descending from a mountain, not 'out of; 'We are not to suppose that they had been in a cave' (Dr. A. T. Robertson, Gram, of the Greek N.T.)." (An Expository Dictionary of New Testament Words By W. E. Vine)

The above scholarly notes help further to confirm the conclusions reached in this article. Hence, what Jesus taught in this parable and what is taught elsewhere in the word of the Lord concerning church discipline is harmonious.

"I NEEDED MIRACLES . . . NOW!!"

On a recent visit to the campus of Oral Roberts University in Tulsa, I was given a package of literature. In a little book called "Daily Blessings," which is described as "a guide to seed-faith living," there is an article by Pat Boone entitled "I Needed Miracles... NOW!!"

I shall give the article in its entirety, then offer some comments which I trust will be interesting and informative. The article follows:

"I've always been a faithful churchgoer. But I went through some really tough periods in spite of the fact that I was regularly attending church. My whole life was disintegrating. People didn't know about it, but my marriage had just about dissipated. Shirley and I really felt we didn't love each other anymore. This was only four years ago. My four daughters, who were coming into teen-age years, had already seen three or four Pat Boones. They weren't sure which one was really their daddy — the Pat Boone on TV, the Pat Boone at church, or the Pat Boone they saw at home. When they needed the strong guidance of their father, I realized I had lost a lot of their respect for me. In addition, I felt my career and business life had lost its meaning.

I NEEDED MIRACLES!!

"I'd always been taught that miracles don't happen anymore. Frankly, I used to listen to people talk about miracles (including Oral Roberts) and I thought they were deluded. But here I was needing a miracle in my life TODAY... NOW! So I began to cry out to God, Lord, if there is a way to put my marriage back together, to bring my family back together, and to put my career back together, please do it!" I knew it would take some miracles ... and miracles happened. But they didn't 'just happen.' They came only as I committed my life to Jesus again, and I came to know Him not only as my Savior but as LORD of my life. There is such a big difference at this point. As I came to know Jesus as Lord through the Holy Spirit dwelling in me, my life changed. And God put my marriage back together. Shirley and I love each other more than we ever thought we could. And I have four bright-eyed teen-aged girls who love their daddy and who know he is just one guy all the time. And, boy! Those are miracles!

"I believe strongly in the church. But I've learned that after I've gone to church I still haven't won the battle. The most important thing in life for me
is being a Christian — having not only my own personal relationship with Jesus but also having a daily avenue of communication with God through the Holy Spirit. This new understanding has brought miracles into my life!!"

What Pat here states is a condensed version of the message in his book "A New Song." After reading his book, I reached the following conclusions: Like so many others, Pat was "raised in the church" and more or less inherited his religion and "convictions." Consequently, there was much truth that he never knew or understood from a personal standpoint. Then it is obvious that he did not practice much of the truth which he knew. He made the mistake of going to Hollywood and becoming associated with some misguided religious fanatics who convinced him that miracles were possible and had influenced his life.

But did he need miracles? Were miracles performed in his life? I think not. Every correction and improvement in his life came as a result of his obedience to truth which had already been revealed by the Holy Spirit.

Take a look at his problems and needs: (1) He needed to be a Christian, rather than simply "going to church." (2) He needed to love his wife and direct his children. (3) He needed to be honest and successful in his career and business life. (4) He needed a real, meaningful, daily relationship with the Lord and an avenue of communication with God. I maintain that he could have had all of these without a single miracle, and if he now has them, they came as a result of obedience to the revealed will of God. Instead of furnishing miraculous guidance and revelation today, the Holy Spirit has already guided us into all truth (John 16:13) which may be learned from the scriptures which furnish the guidance and revelation today, the Holy Spirit has already revealed all truth and guides us through the written word (John 16:13) which may be learned from the scriptures which furnish the man of God "unto all good works" (II Tim. 3:16,17).

Here are the scriptures (listed to correspond to his four needs) which offer the guidance and influence which he needed: (1) James 1:27; Titus 2:11,12; Rom. 12:1,2; I Peter 4:14-16. (2) Ephesians 5:25, 28; 6:4. (3) Matt. 6:33; Eph. 4:28; Rom. 12:17. (4) I Cor. 2:10-13; I John 1:7; Gal. 5:16; Rom. 8:11-14; I John 2:1-6.

We must conclude, therefore, that Pat did not need nor receive miracles. He, like all of us, needed only to be guided by that message which was miraculously revealed by the Holy Spirit — the New Testament. In spite of his unsupported claims, there are at least three reasons why we must deny that he has received any miraculous guidance or indwelling of the Holy Spirit: (1) The Spirit has revealed all truth and guides us through the written word (John 16:13; Acts 1:8; 2:4; Eph. 3:1-5). (2) The Spirit would not lead one to compromise the truth and associate with denunciation error (Gal. 1:7-9; II John 9-11). (3) The Spirit would not lead one to look, act or speak as I have observed in Pat on several television programs.

Those who think that they must rely upon miracles and miraculous revelation today, deny the power and purpose of the written account of true miracles (John 20:30,31), the promise of Christ to the apostles (John 16:13), and the completeness of the Spirit's work.

Webster's third definition of "pontifical" reads thusly, "having pomp, dignity or dogmatism of a pontiff: often used to imply arrogance or haughtiness." Such a spirit doubtless ruled Diotrephes, and those it rules it ruins. God warns against the pontifical spirit in words that manifest his scorn and contempt for it. In like manner does the word of the Lord show God's grace and favor toward the meek, quiet, and condescending heart (Rom. 12:3,16).

A pontifical attitude may be both audible and visible. The Pharisee of Luke 18:9-14 is an example, but we must exercise care in our judgments. Harsh and censorious surmisings are as sinful as arrogance and haughtiness. Men of God have been labeled and libeled as being possessed and obsessed with a domineering demeanor. Occasionally, the charges are founded on false standards.

THE PONTIFICAL SPIRIT IS NOT FOUND

1. Just because one cites false doctrine: The epistles of the apostles are permeated with citations of false teachers and their teachings. Hymanaeus and Philetus' doctrine, which said "that the resurrection is past already," was revealed, rebuked, and repudiated. In I Cor. 15:12 Paul asked, "Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection from the dead?" Was Paul a prating pontiff because he named an error? No, a man should not be unjustly charged with having a pontifical spirit because he cites a particular error.

2. Just because one fights false doctrine: Some will admit that a certain doctrine is false. They will cite it, but they will not fight it, and they brand anyone who will as a dogmatic dictator. A man may be arrogant and haughty, but he is not so simply because he is willing to negate a false position or practice. Is a man to be considered suspect by reason of the fact that he is "set for the defence of the gospel?" Is a man to be castigated because he is willing to "earnestly contend for the faith?" Is a man to be likened unto a pompous pontiff because he is instant and urgent in season and out of season to reprove, rebuke, and exhort?

CONCLUSION: There is no defense or excuse to be given for those who exalt themselves. There is nothing more repulsive or repugnant than the "look at me — I know it all" attitude. But let us not allow our sympathy for error or our friendship for its proclamers lead us to an unfair, uncharitable, and sinful condemnation of one who is standing on the firing line where we ought to be.
"THE SABBATISMOS"

In Hebrews 4:9, the writer says, "There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God." In the margin of some bible's the word rest is rendered "Keeping of a sabbath." Because of this many Sabbatarians insist that the old testament sabbath should be observed today. This word "rest" from 'Sabbatismos' is used only one time in the New Testament. The word "Sabbaton" is used in Mark 2:27 and other places in the New Testament when the Old Testament sabbath is mentioned. The words are basically the same except for one big factor and that is one is NEUTER gender and the other is MASCULINE. Both words are singular nouns, third person, nominative case and used as the subject of sentences. It must be remembered that the word sabbath always comes from "Sabbaton" and not "Sabbatismos." The "Rest" of Heb. 4:9, refers to the eternal rest which all christians anticipate and not the sabbath of the Jews.

It has been my observation through the years that most Sabbatarians are very aggressive in the doctrine they have espoused. A few of them will sign propositions for public debate. It is also amusing that many of their preachers claim they were former members of the church of Christ. When I met Burt F. Marrs in debate he boasted publicly that he had been a member of the church. He also asserted that his father before him and possibly his grandfather were all members of the church. I had no way of confirming or denying his allegation. However, I did point out that in the history of the church many had left the one body. I called his attention to Paul's statement about Demas, "Demas hath forsaken me, having loved this present world" (II Tim. 4:10). I insisted that Demas, like Mr. Marrs, had left the church; but unlike him we have no record of his bragging about his departure!

Another Sabbatarian preacher who claims he was a former member of the church is Roy B. Thumon. Mr. Thumon put out a little book called, "The sabbath today" in which he also makes the claim of being a former member of the church. In his introduction he tells of attending Freed-Hardeman college and other related matters. His little booklet was published largely as a reply to Brother A. G. Hobb's tract on the sabbath. It is not my purpose to enter into the discussion of these men but rather to take up the arguments of Mr. Thumon in regard to the sabbath.

In the first chapter Mr. Thumon attempts to show that only the ceremonial part of the Law of Moses was abrogated. But to my surprise instead of showing this, he merely showed that some commands are MORAL and some CEREMONIAL. There is no controversy over this. I would agree that some of God's laws are Moral and other ceremonial. He said, "There is a definite distinction, positive and powerful between the ceremonial laws and the moral laws of God's Book." To this I would agree but this is not what he claims the Bible teaches. We need the scripture which says the ceremonial laws (such as offering animal sacrifices) have all been done away but the Moral ones have not. In this he dismally failed. One can read his book and see that NO scripture was given to prove his assertion. Webster says moral means, "Relating to, dealing with or capable of making the distinction between right and wrong in conduct." Certainly no one would argue with Mr. Thumon that some of the commands of God are moral in nature. Mr. Webster also tells us that "Ceremonial" means "An established system of rites or formal actions connected with an occasion as a religious ritual." Certainly no one would argue that some of the commands of God fall into this category. Just because Mr. Thumon found these two types of commands proves nothing. One might as well argue that we are to have animal sacrifices in the church because one can read about "bulls and goats" in Heb. 9:13. We still need the scripture which says the ceremonial was nailed to the cross but the moral remains. This he will not find!

On page ten of his booklet Mr. Thumon says, "God is the author of all things written in His Book, the Bible. All laws concerning both moral actions and ceremonial observances originated in the mind of God, and holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Holy Spirit. At different places it is stated that God gave the 'law of Moses;' some scriptures, such as IF Chronicles 34:14, teach that Moses gave the 'law of the Lord.' There is certainly no conflict here; neither is there any suggestion that all the ordinances of the Old Testament were included in the one term The law. There is a definite distinction, positive and powerful, between the ceremonial laws and the moral laws of God's Book."

It is rather strange that Mr. Thumon would admit so much in one paragraph. He fully admitted that the terms "law of Moses" and "Law of the Lord" are used interchangeably. This is some admission for a Sabbatarian. He tried to soften the impact by saying ALL ordinances were not included in the term "the law" but gave no proof for his denial, (more to follow)
We now consider the question, "Do We Really Need the Bible?", from another point of view other than those whose notions and superstitions convey that they do not even know what the Bible truly is, and therefore improperly use it, as we have pointed out in our previous article. Let us examine this question now from the standpoint of those who acknowledge that the Bible is the word of God, but who demonstrate by their doctrines (if they be true), that they do not really need the Bible.

One of the doctrines, Universalism, is a system which avows "the final harmony of all souls with God" (Statement of Faith, 1899). The belief that all men will ultimately be saved is diametrically opposed to the teaching of the Bible at every turn (see Matt. 7:13,14; Heb. 5:8,9 etc.). One thing can be deduced; if such a doctrine is true, there is no need of the Bible. If we are to be convinced that all will be saved anyway, then why have the Bible?

Predestination, another of these doctrines, is the theory that "God, from all eternity, did, by the most wise and holy counsel of his own free will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass" (Presbyterian Confession of Faith, ch. 3, sec. 1). It is known as the doctrine of unconditional election and is stated in the creed: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life, and others fore-ordained to everlasting death. These angels and men thus predestined and fore-ordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed, and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished ..." (Ibid, ch. 3, sees. 3,4,5). This doctrine, too, is a contradiction of the Bible which teaches that all mentally capable and morally responsible men may come to God for salvation (Matt. 11:28-30; II Pet. 3:9; Rev. 22:17 etc.). This much can be concluded; if God chooses or elects to save some and predestines others to be lost unconditionally, man's destiny is already settled and there is no need of the Bible.

Another of these doctrines is total depravity, the Calvinistic view that as a result of Adam and Eve's sin in the garden of Eden, "all mankind are now sinners not by constraint but choice; being by nature utterly void of that holiness required by the law of God, positively inclined to evil; and therefore under just condemnation, without excuse" (The Standard Manual For Baptist Churches, Edward T. Hiscox, p. 60). It is believed that man is born a sinner, and being dead in sin, he cannot act until there is a direct operation of the Holy Spirit upon his heart. Again, this theory is the antithesis of what the Bible teaches; namely, that men are not born sinners, but rather, those responsible become sinners when they violate God's law (I John 3:4). Sin is the transgression of the law and infants have not violated any law; therefore, they are not born sinners. When man becomes a sinner because he sins, he is saved by obeying the gospel which is God's remedy for sin (see Rom. 1:16; 6:17; Acts 2:38 etc.). If we are to be convinced, however, that one is born a sinner and that he is so dead in sin that he cannot act, and that he is nothing more than a passive recipient in salvation — only a checker in God's hand to be moved by God's impulses, then why have the Bible which teaches man how to act? There would be no need for the Bible.

The above are but a few of the doctrines of men which have been considered, but obviously if these doctrines be true, there would be no need for the Bible and our answer to the question at the head of this document would have to be in the negative. On the other hand, if definite things are true, then we do really need the Bible. Please note that if the following conditions be true, then we do really need the Bible: (1) if we desire to know God's will (Matt. 28:19,20; Eph. 5:17), (2) if we expect to have faith (Rom 10:17), (3) if we are to please God (Heb. 11:6), (4) if we are to come into relationship with God (Rom. 5:1; Acts 17:30,31; Rom. 10:10; Mark 16:16; Acts 2:38; Gal. 3:27; II Cor. 5:17, etc.), (5) if we are to become a part of God's family (Eph. 5:23), and (6) if we eventually go to heaven (Matt. 7:13,14). The Bible reveals two ways: the way of life and the way of death. Salvation is obtained through Christ and His church and this truth is revealed in the Bible, the word of God.

We have viewed our question, "Do We Really Need the Bible?" circumspectly; and in spite of what people think of the Bible, regardless of how they may use it, and in disregard of all man-devised doctrines which contradict it, we really do need the Bible. We need to respect its teaching, obey it, and live by it in order that we may someday live with God eternally in heaven.

12528 E. Alaska Place
Aurora, Colorado 80010
MAY WE WORSHIP TOGETHER

While Christians meet to worship God, there is a need always to check our attitude toward those with whom we worship. There are some questions that should be considered and my attitude toward them and others in order to worship God properly.

NO REVELATION

There are some matters that we do not have any revelation on from God. What kind of a bush was the burning bush? (Ex. 3:1-5) Why was it Nicodemus came to Jesus by night? (John 3:1-2) What was Paul's thorn in the flesh? (II Cor. 12:7) These questions and others the Bible does not answer. Therefore, I have no attitude about them.

REVELATION

Then there are matters that God has revealed, in fact in some instances even in specific language. God specified "gopher wood" for the ark (Gen. 6:14). Faith before baptism is specified (Mark 16:16). A plurality of elders in every church is specified (Acts 14:23). Singing is the kind of music God has specified in the worship of the church (Eph. 5:19; Col. 3:16). Men have no choice to obey God but accept such specific instructions. To these most brethren would agree.

REVELATION NOT SPECIFIED

There are matters that God has revealed but which He did not specify. Whatever is involved in obeying God in these matters inheres in the very command of God. The Lord's Day (Acts 20:7) is the day specified, but the time on the Lord's Day to eat the Lord's Supper is not revealed specifically. The time of day is authorized since the time inheres in the day.

Teaching is authorized of God (Matt. 28:18-20; I Thess. 1:8), but while we have revelation we have no specific means or methods the church must use.

The church has revelation that it is to relieve certain needy (I Tim. 5:8; Acts 6, 11:27-30), but since the New Testament has not specified any method or means that the church must use in doing this, we understand that whatever means the church uses inheres in the revelation to relieve. We have revelation that the local church is the organization specified (Acts 6) to do the work and gospel preachers have contended for that specific organization doing its work. However, no gospel preacher to my knowledge has ever bound any specific means or method upon the church.

A place to come together (I Cor. 11:18-20) is necessary and revealed but not specified. Whatever provisions the church makes for such a place inheres in the revelation to "come together."

INDIVIDUALLY APPLIED REVELATION

There are also matters revealed by God that whatever the New Testament teaches about them, they find their application with the individual before God. Some such matters have affected the peace of some local church. Such ought not so to be.

Such questions as (1) the covering of I Cor. II. (2) Should a Christian engage in carnal war? (3) Should a Christian attend ball games? (4) What about a Christian going to a movie? (5) Is a certain posture in prayer required? (6) Should a Christian enforce capital punishment? (7) How many children should an elder have? (8) The style of dress within modesty and many more must be settled in the light of New Testament teaching.

However, what the New Testament teaches about these and other such related matters will find their application with the individual Christian. You may believe one thing on each of these questions and I believe another and each respect each other and work and worship in the same congregation. Some of these questions could also come under consideration for our wives. Each of them could believe different things and yet sit together and worship God.

What one practiced would not affect the worship of another before God.

I have worked with brethren in meetings that held different views from mine on the above questions. Preachers have worked with congregations where I have preached who did not agree with my views on the above matters. If brethren could all have the attitude of being understanding of each other and not push their understanding of such matters, both they and the church would be better off.

May you worship with me? Will I push my understanding of such questions to the point that you can not worship and work with me? Not if I am making an effort to keep the "unity of the spirit" (Eph. 4:1-3). May I worship with you? Will you push your understanding of such matters to the point that I can not worship and work with you?

On such matters a difference of understanding doesn't divide people into different groups. It is the pushing of such matters in order to get to "agree" that divides. "Hast thou faith? have it to thyself before God" (Rom. 14:22).
THE NEWS LETTER REPORTS
"...They rehearsed all that God had done with them..." — Acts 14:27

A NEW PUBLICATION

We are happy to announce the beginning of a new semi-monthly periodical called The Bible Standard. The owner and publisher will be Kent Ellis and the editors will be Kent Ellis and R. L. (Bob) Craig. The Printer will be Bob Craig. This new paper will be published twice each month and will contain no fewer than 12 pages per issue. It is to begin November 1, 1972. The subscription price per year is $3.00, $5.00 for two years, $10.00 for five years. One year subscription or extension free to anyone sending in ten subscriptions. All subscriptions should be sent to Kent Ellis, 3807 Woodmere, Bryan, Texas 77801.

Charles D. Lindsey, 553 Riverside Dr., Omond Beach, Fla. 32074 — We need a full time worker within the next six months, or sooner if possible. We are small in number and the only congregation in a metropolitan area of 100,000 that takes a firm stand against the support of any and all human institutions from the church treasury. We can assume most, if not all, of the financial support for the right man. If interested in a challenging work contact me at the above address or call 677-1825.

Arnold A. Granke, Jr., OSI District 42, APO San Francisco 96274 — For your information, I am currently assigned at Clark Air Base, Republic of the Philippines, and worship with the church in adjacent Angeles City. Brother Castono F. Gamit, the regular preacher, and I have been attempting to gather information concerning the welfare of faithful brethren residing in the areas of Luzon which were heavily damaged during the recent flood. Our information is still incomplete, but insofar as we know, none suffered any serious injury. Some have been rendered needy, however. We know of about 20 souls in nearby Macabebe, Pampanga, about 75 in the vicinity of Subic, Zambales, and approximately 100 scattered in small towns in the Ilocos province. These brethren need clothing and food. Many lost their crops, and due to similar damage throughout the general area, the price of food has become considerably higher than usual, causing them an extreme burden. We have not heard from any brethren in Pangasinan and Tarlac provinces which were also heavily flooded. Damage here at Angeles City was relatively light. Any churches of brethren desiring to send relief to Christians in the affected areas may write me for the names of brethren to whom they should address it.

Ralph Joiner, P.O. Box 387, Clermont, Fla. 32711 — For sale: Jule Miller's "Visualized Bible Study Series" Home Bible Study equipment. Complete cottage meeting package including the "Graflex 500" projector with slide changer, 5 film-strips (1969 revision), 5 records, 30" x 40" screen, several sets of student manuals and close to 100 enrollment and record cards. All in perfect condition functionally and appearance-wise. Original cost was $149.50 plus shipping. Will sell for $110.00 and pay the postage myself. This is a good opportunity to pick up a piece of good equipment many of you have probably been wanting.

Don Martin, Route 1, Box 251, Pineland, Texas — Since the last progress report in July of 1971, we have enjoyed, I believe, good, sound growth. In the past four years, the time that I have been working with the church and therefore personally know about what she is doing, the Pineland church has had one hundred percent increase in the contribution and other improvements in practically every phase of the work. The culmination of much work and planning was recently realized in the building of a nice house for the preacher located next door to the church building. This house was badly needed and will be an asset to the church here. I have mentioned the progress of the church in Pineland not trying to put a feather in my own cap but to commend the church for their good works and to let others know of her existence. When thinking about retirement or moving into the Sam Rayburn or Toledo Bend area, worship with the Pineland church of Christ.

PREACHER WANTED

D. B. Coakley, for Greensburg church, Greensburg, Ky. — The church of Christ meeting on Court Street in Greensburg, Kentucky is seeking a gospel preacher to work with them full time. We are interested in a man of about middle age, sound in the faith, who will preach with truth in love without respect of persons. We are working together towards converting the lost to Christ and strengthening the saved. We need a man to work and build with us on Christ the only foundation. If interested, write or call collect: D. B. Coakley, 123 Public Square, Greensburg, Ky. 42743; phone: (502) 932-4857 or 932-4488.

PREACHER WANTED

Curry Lynch, 1330 Milton, Las Cruces, N. M. 88001 — The church of Christ, 1325 Panlener St., Las Cruces, New Mexico is a self supporting congregation and would like to contact a preacher of the gospel. In interested, please contact: P. R. Smith, 525 Capri Arc, Las Cruces, N. M. 88001; phone: (505) 526-9734.

L. L. Applegate, General Delivery, Okeechobee, Fla. 33472 — I began work for our Master in Okeechobee, Fla. on October 15, 1972, and would like to thank my brethren for helping me with their prayers, support and bulletins. Please print the following as our liberal brother Young has made it public:
THE OKEECHOBEE NEWS, Thursday, June 29, 1972

A CLARIFICATION

Editor:

We would like to clarify an ad that appeared in your paper recently concerning the Church of Christ that meets in the Woman's Club. The Okeechobee Church of Christ that meets at 1401 Parrott Ave. does not endorse or support this work. The group began because the church here supports widows and orphans out of the church treasury. We believe the Bible teaches us that we should care for widows and orphans out of the church treasury. We stand upon the Bible and invite your questions at any time.

Yours truly,

William H. Young, Minister
Okeechobee Church of Christ
1401 Parrott Ave.

I have answered our brother Young in the paper that will come out next week and will send a copy to any one who may request it.

THE CHURCH AT OROVILLE, CALIFORNIA

John Wilson

The church which meets at 12th and Plumas in Oroville had its beginning with three families in the fall of 1962. In February 1963, brother Charles Limberg began with them as full time preacher, being supported by Southern California churches. He remained with them five years during which time many were added to the number, lots were paid for and a commodious building was erected by the brethren themselves. Brother Jack Adams has been preaching for the brethren there since Brother Limberg left and has done an excellent job.

Due to the fact that industry is scarce in this area, the work has fluctuated and has not as yet become self-supporting, but are able to supply a good amount of the preacher's support. Their building will be paid for in a few months and they will then be able to do more toward carrying their own load.

I will begin work with the Oroville church November 1st. other churches supplying my needed support. My hope is to be able to reach out into other counties in Northern California where there is no church.

Oroville nestles against the lower bosom of the Sierra Nevada's in North Central California where the mountains level out into the fertile plains of the Sacramento Valley. Oroville is about 65 miles north of Sacramento and 150 miles northeast of San Francisco. It is the site of the highest earth-filled dam in the United States where Lake Oroville furnishes 167 miles of beautiful shoreline. The vast wilderness of the Sierra mountains, rivers, lakes and streams furnish everything in water-mountain recreation. For those who look for a retirement paradise, here it is with a chance to work and worship... WHERE YOU ARE NEEDED.

1154 Plumas Oroville, Calif. 95965

FAMILY PROBLEMS SERIES

I am now in process of scheduling my series on "Solving Family Problems" for 1973. At the end of 1972 I will have delivered this series 85 times, most of which have been on week ends. I now have approximately one-half of the week ends scattered through 1973 booked, and I will be glad to visit any congregation as soon as I can get to it when dates are not already requested. Several brethren across the country have spoken to me about coming sooner or later for the series. Many of these were oral contacts with scheduling left indefinite. In several of these cases I do not even remember the persons who made contact since it was not official. I will appreciate a contact at the earliest possible date from any of the churches anticipating the series in 1973. Out of all the times this particular series has been offered, about 35 of the churches have set all-time attendance records sometime during the period. This is explained not by the particular ability of the preacher but by the fact that I am talking about matters where all of us live every day. I thank God for the physical strength to carry on the rigorous schedule I have pursued for the last several years. I suspect that I will have traveled well over 100,000 miles this year, much of which has been on week ends in addition to my regular duties at Florida College.

Again, if there are those anticipating this series in 1973, I need to hear from you in the immediate future.

James R. Cope
Florida College
Temple Terrace, Florida 33617

NEW CHURCH IN VALDOSTA, GEORGIA

The North Valdosta Church of Christ was established in July 1972 with about 35 people present for the first worship service. For the first few weeks, services were held in various homes of the members. We are presently renting a large house at 104 East Force Street, Valdosta, Georgia. Our first Gospel meeting was held in October with Pete McKee doing the preaching. Bro. McKee is presently working for the Lord in Pensacola, Fla. Another meeting was conducted in December by Hollis Creel, formerly of Valdosta, and now with the church in Paragould, Arkansas. We are presently in search of a preacher to work with us and to further the cause of New Testament Christianity in a predominantly liberal community. We would appreciate any assistance in this matter, your encouragement and your prayers, on behalf of this work. For further information, please refer to the Directory in this publication.

Mike Dubose, 1144 Chicksaw, Paris, Tennessee 38242 — After two years of working with the Kentucky Lake Road Church of Christ in Buchanan, Tenn., my family and I will be moving to work with the Shacklett church out from Nashville, Tenn., the faithful brethren here in 1973. Only partial support is available. Anyone interested in this work may contact: Kentucky Lake Road church of Christ, Route 1, Buchanan, Tenn. 38222 or call J. R. Gean (901) 642-2910.
PREDESTINATION AND ELECTION

By the time you read this article, the Lord willing, I will have completed a four night discussion with Mr. James Ivy on the following proposition: "The Scriptures teach that, before the foundation of the world, God elected or chose a definite number of people and ordained them to eternal life; that their salvation is unconditional and, therefore, certain through the death of Christ, who died for them and only them." In issues to come, I want to explore this doctrine, what men teach concerning the matter, and what the Bible teaches — or at least what I believe the Bible teaches on the subject.

In this article, I want to set forth what I understand to be the basics of this doctrine. It is commonly referred to as the doctrine of "Calvinism" because Calvin was one of the first to set forth the idea and to try to defend it as scriptural. It would be foolish, indeed, for me to say that the Bible does not teach the doctrine of Predestination; for it does, in fact, teach such a doctrine. However, the Biblical position on predestination and election and Calvin's position are as far apart as the north and south poles.

There are five major teachings set forth in Calvin's doctrine on predestination. Actually they can be remembered by recalling the letters of a very familiar word T-U-L-I-P. The thoughts expressed by the letters of this word are: (1) Total depravity; (2) Unconditional election; (3) Limited atonement; (4) Irresistible grace; (5) Perseverance of the saints. These ideas are clearly set forth in the above proposition. The difference, in a nutshell, of those who believe in Bible election and Calvin's brand of election is simply: Does God choose all who shall believe? or, does He choose his elect, and will they, as such, believe? In other words, is belief the result of God's election, or is God's election the results of man's faith or belief? I believe the Bible teaches the latter instead of the former.

In lessons to come, we will discuss what we mean by the word "predestination" and also we will discuss individually the five points of Calvinism.

APECHO, "I HAVE"

During His earthly ministry Jesus severely rebuked the religious leaders of His day for their hypocrisy. He usually addresses these people as "scribes and Pharisees;" however, I doubt that Jesus meant to condemn every scribe and every Pharisee.

In a part of the Sermon on the Mount Jesus simply refers to these people as "the hypocrites." In Matt. 6:2, 5, 16 Jesus says that these people "have their reward." The word that is translated "have" is from the Greek apecho. In contemporary Greek this term was commonly used to describe a note that had been "paid in full." Jesus was probably saying that the hypocrites had been "paid in full;" that is, they were seeking the praises of men; they had received the praises of men; and that was all they would receive. They were "paid in full;" there would be no further reward in the eternal world after this life.

A RELIGION OF HAVING

In one sense, Christianity is a religion of having. In John 5:24 Jesus says that the true believer "has" everlasting life. In I John 1:7 we learn that by walking in the light we may "have" fellowship with God. In II John 9 we are taught that by walking in the doctrine of Christ we may "have" both God and Christ. Many other illustrations of "having" could be given.

BUT NOT IN FULL

As it has been observed, Christians are taught that they "have" many things in this life in Christ. But the great hope of the Christian is that he may "have" in the complete and full sense a continuity of life after the death of the body.

In other words, the faithful Christian does not "have in full" here and now. He has eternal life with God to look forward to. On the other hand, the "hypocrites" that Jesus described were "paid in full;" that is, they had no further reward to hope to receive from God.

WHY DO WE WORSHIP?

Undoubtedly, many motives stimulate "worship." It is simply a matter of fact that if our "worship" is prompted by ulterior motives (the pleasing of husband or wife; the seeking of social acceptance, etc.) we are certainly going to be "paid in full" in this life. The rewards of those ulterior motives are the only rewards we shall receive.
RADIO EDITORIAL ON ABORTION

(Following is a KDXI Radio Editorial as broadcast on 12-6-72, 1360 KC, Mansfield, Louisiana, Bennett Strange, General Manager. We publish it here to underscore the need for factual information on this subject — Editor.)

We are disturbed by the seeming acceptance of abortion as an answer to what is termed "unwanted pregnancies" — a term we're not too sure is a correct one.

It is our opinion that an abortion for anything except clear clinical reasons where the mother's life is in eminent danger is homicide.

We could go into a long list of reasons why we are opposed to abortions. If you want a good, short defence of our stand, we'd refer you to an item on this in the November, 1972 issue of Searching the Scriptures. There Clarence Johnson of Springhill presents a good brief on this topic.

The reason for this editorial at this time is the fact that we have just become aware of a group in this state to which we have no sympathy at all. It's called the "Louisiana Clergy Consultation Service on Problem Pregnancies." We don't know who these clergymen are but the literature claims that they have 40 clergy staff persons in every major city of our state and "a number of smaller cities." If you want an abortion, they'll refer you to a New York clinic.

Anthropologists are now studying an African tribe called the Ikys. They have no love at all. Children are put out at three years of age to fend for themselves. If they try to return to their parents, the parents will lock them up, leave and return when the child has starved. The elderly are killed off as soon as they become too weak to defend themselves.

In brief, we don't buy the concept of abortion for anything except clear clinical reasons. We find such an organization as the "Louisiana Clergy Consultation Service on Problem Pregnancies" to be an affront to us and we hope that it has a short-lived career.

HAVE YOU CHECKED YOUR EXPIRATION DATE?
RENEW TODAY